

Dear Sir / Madam

I understand that the Press Recognition Panel (PRP) has been set up to assess whether the press self-regulators meet Leveson's criteria, and that the PRP are consulting the public on what we think about the situation, prior to reporting to Parliament in the autumn on the state of the press regulatory system. In this regard, as a concerned member of the public, I should like to make the following suggestions:

1. The PRP should remind Parliament of what the Leveson Report said should happen if the industry tried to veto his recommendations and refused to comply. To quote the Leveson Report: *"if some or all of the industry are not willing to participate in effective independent regulation, my own concluded view is to reject the notion that they should escape regulation altogether. I cannot, and will not, recommend another last chance saloon for the press. With some measure of regret, therefore, I am driven to conclude that the Government should be ready to consider the need for a statutory backstop regulator being established, to ensure, at the least, that the press are subject to regulation that would require the fullest compliance with the criminal and civil law, if not also to ensure consequences equivalent to those that would flow from an independent self-regulatory system."*

2. Irrespective of whether the PRP recognises IMPRESS, the PRP should strongly recommend to Parliament that the key 'guaranteed access to justice' incentive (section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act) for victims of libel and press intrusion, must be brought into effect as Parliament intended.