

Attendance note

12/04/2016

Speaking to JH IMPRESS on his calling. He anticipated that they would have a response on the call for information responses to us before or on the 20<sup>th</sup> and wondered if we could have a meeting shortly thereafter to discuss these. He wanted to be sure of the process as he was meeting his Board later today.

SU – if the responses amounted to a significant change in their application then we would be putting out a further call for information so far as those amends/additions related to the application. it would probably be best to meet after the further call for information if there was going to be one. If one was not necessary, we would arrange a meeting to verify and validate the information we had received and clarify any areas that we still had questions about.

JH – they were not sure that the matters that concerned us would be the ones that concerned them they wanted to make sure that they had identified all the key points relevant to the application from the information we had sent to them as it wasn't clear to them. For example, he didn't know what we expected in terms of the Code given that this and the issue of ownership has been raised by some of the responders.

SU – pointed out that it was our Board who would decide on the application and to that extent our views as the executive were just our views; they may or not be the same as those held by the Board so anything we had to say had to be strongly caveated. Saying that our reference was the Charter. In the preamble for the Charter it was recognised that the independent regulatory body should put forward the editor's code of practice as its initial code. Our Board had already recognised that there may be more than one application and that we may end up with more than one approved regulator if the applicant/s met the criteria. The issue of ownership was one for Impress and or the Courts. The Charter anticipated that an applicant would rely on that code until or unless it had put another in place. We hadn't separated the Call information into key points as we had anticipated we would have done as we drafted the process as it seemed to us that it was useful for Impress to have the whole application. There were no additional questions we had beyond the points made in the call for information as far as SU could recall but she would have a check. Saying that if they feel a meeting would be useful then it would be useful to have this before they send in their response as our procedure didn't allow for a two stage response process. SU would get back to JH.

Calling back – we didn't have any additional questions but we could do a meeting if they thought it would be helpful at this stage. Agreed Thursday at 11am.