

Item	Actions
<p>WM explained that IMPRESS would be a Community Interest Company (CIC), with appropriate objects and powers for its role as an independent press regulator.</p> <p>The briefing note made a number of additional proposals, which the Board considered in detail.</p> <p>To include a ‘sunset clause’ in the Articles, to cause IMPRESS to be wound up in the event that its independence is compromised by a future government. <u>Agreed.</u></p> <p>To retain the services of the Appointment Panel and accept their proposals that the Board should be appointed on two-year and four-year terms, initially, with the Chair to be appointed on a four-year term. <u>Agreed.</u></p> <p>To create an obligation to consult participating publishers on any proposed changes to the IMPRESS Articles, procedures, contracts, code, auditors and budget; and on the decision whether to seek recognition under the Royal Charter. <u>Agreed.</u></p> <p>To involve the public in the work of IMPRESS through an ‘Advisory Council’ of stakeholders, to be consulted on a range of issues but with no formal status in the constitution. <u>It was agreed that the Board should consider several models of public involvement in comparable organisations before finalising this proposal.</u></p> <p>To establish a Code Committee to advise the Board on the use and development of the Editors’ Code. <u>Agreed.</u></p> <p>Whether to adopt the existing Editors’ Code of Practice or develop an original IMPRESS code. It was noted that the Regulatory Funding Company has asserted copyright in the code, and may seek to prevent IMPRESS from using it. <u>It was agreed that IMPRESS should use the existing code, and that WM and JH should raise this issue with the House of Lords Communications Committee in their evidence session on 13 January.</u></p>	<p>WM to agree terms of appointment with Board members individually</p> <p>AC to draft an options paper on public involvement</p> <p>JH and WM to instruct Goodman Derrick LLP to revise the Articles</p>

Item	Actions
<p>WM then asked the Board for their preliminary views on the IMPRESS complaints-handling procedure, investigations, sanctions, contracts and arbitration scheme. <u>After some discussion, it was agreed that these complex issues should be discussed in more detail at a future meeting.</u></p>	<p>in light of this discussion, and to circulate a revised draft before the February meeting</p>
<p>4. The Royal Charter</p> <p>The Board considered the note on the Royal Charter which had been circulated. <u>It was agreed that the decision whether to seek Charter recognition would be taken very carefully.</u></p>	
<p>5. Finances</p> <p>JH introduced the note on finances which had been circulated. He explained that The IMPRESS Project had £51,000 cash, with £10,000 pending. At current rates, this would last until approximately the end of March. The future costs of IMPRESS would be significantly higher than this. Max Mosley had pledged up to £6m towards these costs over five years. JH had discussed this offer on the basis that any funding would be made by an independent charitable trust, to which MM would make an unconditional donation. This trust (the Independent Press Regulation Trust) was being established.</p> <p>The Board emphasised the importance of secure and credible funding for IMPRESS.</p>	
<p>6. Dates of future meetings</p> <p><u>The dates previously circulated were agreed.</u></p>	
<p>7. Confidential Business</p> <p>The Board agreed to offer JH an ongoing role with IMPRESS.</p>	<p>WM and JH to discuss potential terms of engagement</p>
<p>8. Any other Business</p> <p>There was no other business and the meeting closed at 4:00pm.</p>	