

Dear Members of the Panel

I'd like to respond to the consultation with two points:

1. The new system for overseeing press regulation in the UK has not been successful because any recommendations you make will not be based on a truly representative engagement with it. Many relevant publishers have decided to stay outside the recognised system undertaken by IMPRESS so the panel should take the opportunity of its report to remind Parliament of Lord Justice Leveson's words should this situation present itself. In such a case he said he would be:

*'...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.'*

I therefore urge the PRP to remind Parliament and the Government of this.

2. Lord Justice Leveson proposed a system of 'cost-shifting' and it is this measure which is the main incentive for a publisher to join a recognised regulator - and for a regulator to seek recognition. This measure should have been achieved by section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act 2013: a critical part of the Royal Charter system which Leveson recommended in outline terms. Parliament endorsed this measure, intended it to apply however, it is now blocking it.

I also therefore urge the PRP to recommend to Parliament and the Government that section 40 is commenced as soon as possible, as it is integral to the system of recognition & incentives system.

I am a member of the public with no interest other than seeing a free, yet fully accountable and responsible press in this country. Thank you for considering my views on this important matter.

Yours sincerely

Philip Selbie