

Dear PRP,

In response to Question 1 of your consultation (*In your opinion, has the new system for overseeing press regulation in the UK been a success or failure so far? Please explain your reasons.*):

The new system has clearly not yet been a success, as evidenced in your consultation document. Even if IMPRESS is recognised By PRP, it only has 14 members. By contrast, IPSO, which has not applied for recognition (and would clearly fail a number of the criteria for recognition if it were to do so), covers over 1500 print titles and over 1100 online titles.

Further encouragement to the press is clearly required. Therefore, regardless of whether IMPRESS is granted recognition, I believe PRP should:

- A. Remind Parliament what the Leveson Report said should happen if the industry tried to veto his recommendations and refused to comply:
"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."

- B. Strongly recommend to Parliament that the key 'guaranteed access to justice incentive' (section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act) should be brought into effect as Parliament had intended.

I am responding as a member of the public.

Crispin Allard