

Telephone attendance note

SU/Jonathan Heawood

Tuesday 26/1/16

We had done a preliminary check of the application submitted by Impress we have not done an assessment of the application. Some initial thoughts and questions;

Website

1. SU – We will be upload the application to our website on a dedicated page with a short summary of the process. The contents, cover note and matrix will be placed first, followed by the documents listed numerically.

Numbering

2. JH confirmed that the document (email) entitled IMPRESS Appointment Panel should currently be labelled '12'. Depending on what else needs to be provided Impress will renumber the documents their end and resubmit.

Redactions

3. SU -In our decision document, we noted that we would publish an applicant's application in full, but allow for commercially **confidential** information to be redacted. We asked that applicant's notified us of why redactions have been necessary, which you have done. However, in order to assess whether the redactions are confidential (and in order for us to make a full assessment), we would like to see an un-redacted version – this version will not be published.
JH – will send you the unredacted versions. If you want to unredact business plan we may choose to submit a summary document instead.
SU – we can discuss if that situation arises.

Regulated publishers and opening

4. SU – your cover letter refers to contracts with regulators coming into place on 01 April 2016; however, your website notes that you have started regulating a number of publishers. Could you confirm that you have started regulating these publishers, and if so, have the contracts actually started from now?
JH – we will be fully open on 1 April however we have started doing some regulatory activities to help publishers get ready – supplying templates etc
5. SU - Messaging unclear on website. The website says you will open in spring 2016, are you open or not?
JH – will make above position clearer on website

Criterion 3

6. SU - Our application matrix not list biographies of appointment panel members as an example of evidence. However, after reviewing the application, we believe these

would be useful for the public in assessing appointment panel against the relevant criteria. You do not have to provide them at this stage – they would just assist us and others in forming views.

JH- will provide biographies or links to website.

Criterion 6

7. SU - Could we clarify what evidence has been provided to meet the requirement of 'funding of the system should be settled in agreement between the industry and the Board'?
JH – Will consider
8. SU - "There should be an indicative budget which the Board certifies is adequate for the purpose" - Could you show where your evidence of this is? We think this might be redacted.
JH - Budget is supplied will consider further
9. SU - "Funding settlements should cover a four or five-year period and should be negotiated well in advance". This may not be a point for now but where is the evidence for settlements being negotiated well in advance?
JH – Will consider
10. SU - The agreement between the independent press regulation trust and IMPRESS is not signed.
JH – we hold signed copies of this and other agreements. Will supply but will want to redact names and addresses of signatories and witnesses.

Criterion 8A

11. SU -This criterion requires the regulator to have a service to warn the press, **and other relevant parties such as broadcasters and press photographers**, when an individual has made it clear that they do not welcome press intrusion. Could you indicate where you have evidenced that the service you provide warns the press (not just your regulated publishers), and other relevant parties?
JH- will consider

Board members

12. SU - Can you update the documents (matrix to say they've joined and conflict of interest to show any new conflicts) for the new board members?
JH – think those are on the website but will check.