



Press Recognition Panel
Mappin House
4 Winsley Street
London W1W 8HF

Jonathan Heawood
IMPRESS
By email only

6 June 2016

Dear Jonathan

I attach the responses to the second call for information. There were twelve respondents in total as follows:

1. A group of academics
2. Hacked Off
3. Associated Newspapers
4. 89up
5. Society of Editors
6. NUJ
7. Scottish Newspaper Society
8. Telegraph Media Group
9. Christopher Whitmey (member of the public)
10. News Media Association
11. Professional Publishers Association
12. Simon Carne

Under our published procedures you have until 27 June to provide any further response.

Your response is of course entirely a matter for you and we will publish it in full at the end of the process. It may assist however if we clarify that we do not consider it necessary for you to repeat comments already made in response to the first call for evidence – we will take those comments into account. If you have nothing to add in relation to a particular issue, failure to respond to points made by respondents to the second call for information that amount to repetitions or restatements will not be taken by us to mean agreement by you with those points.

As before, we do not require comments in relation to matters that are not relevant to our decision, such as criticisms of the system set up by the Royal Charter and the legislation or in relation to the role of the PRP which is not a matter for respondents or applicants to determine.

Set out below are some areas raised in the responses to the second call for information where we would be particularly interested in hearing from you. (Note that this does not guarantee that there are no issues in other areas).

Independence and adequacy and stability of funding - criterion 1 and 6.

Bearing in mind the existence of clause 3 in the IMPRESS/IPRT agreement allowing termination of your funding on short notice (particularly the catch-all at 3.2(vii)) and the existence of a similar (but narrower clause) in the IPRT/ACMT agreement - do you have any further information to provide on this issue?

In your response to the first call for information on the matter of funding and independence you refer to the Independent Press Regulation Trust as being 'a charity whose trustees are professionals with clear legal obligations set out in the IPRT Deed of Trust, a publicly available document'. We have been unable to find a copy of this deed available to the public. We presume that you have seen this deed since you refer to its contents in support of your application, and we would be grateful if you would send us a copy.

Criterion 5(c) -the Board should include a sufficient number of people with experience of the industry (throughout the United Kingdom).

Do you have any comments on the letter from the Scottish Newspaper Society in so far as it relates to your Board membership?

Criterion 6 - Funding for the system should be settled in agreement between the industry and the Board, taking into account the cost of fulfilling the obligations of the regulator and the commercial pressures on the industry and criterion 23- membership open to all publishers on 'fair, reasonable and non -discriminatory terms'.

You will have noted the provisional views of the PRP Board on the interpretation of criterion 6 in the note that we sent you on 31 May. Respondents have again raised this issue of how this agreement (taking into account the relevant matters) was reached and of the fees proposed to be charged to larger publishers which would, they say, preclude their membership.

Credible complaints system - criterion 10 and 11.

Do you have any further comments on the points made by respondents (particularly Associated Press second response, paragraphs 67-70) on the need to ensure that complaints can be kept confidential and also to sometimes grant anonymity to complainants?

As you know we wrote to you on 27 April with a number of further questions. Although we don't not require responses until the verification/validation stage of the process, if you are in a position to provide them sooner please do so. It will assist us in assessing your application and narrowing down the issues which remain live. In the meantime we have an additional query in relation to criterion 8. We are of course aware that you have adopted the Editors Code as your initial Code pending consultation on a new one. Could you clarify the way in which your Board considered the way that the Editors Code meets criterion 8? In this connection you will note that one of the indicators for criterion 8 that we set following our consultation on the recognition process last year was '*The regulator has demonstrably considered relevant legislation, codes, rules and/or guidance in developing the code.*'

Yours sincerely

Susie

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Susie Uppal', written over a large, faint circular stamp or watermark.

Susie Uppal
Chief Executive