

FINAL
PRESS RECOGNITION PANEL
Minutes of the 20th meeting of the Press Recognition Panel Board
held on 28 June 2016 at Mappin House, 4 Winsley Street, London W1W 8HF

Present: Dr David Wolfe QC (Chair), Harry Cayton, Emma Gilpin-Jacobs, Carolyn Regan and Harry Rich

Apologies: Tim Suter

In attendance: Susie Uppal (Chief Executive), Holly Perry (Head of Governance), Paul Nezandonyi (Head of Communications and Stakeholder Management), Camilla Capotorto (Business and Research Officer), Caroline Roberts (Head of Regulatory Affairs) (from paragraph 19 only), Simon Edward (Regulatory Affairs Manager) (from paragraph 19 only), John Speed (JS2 Ltd) (paragraphs 1 to 18) and Megan Archer (JS2 Ltd)

BOARD MEETING – PUBLIC SESSION

Welcome

1. The Chair **welcomed** Members and attendees to the twentieth meeting of the Press Recognition Panel Board.
2. The Chair also **welcomed** the member of the public who was in attendance, who confirmed that he was happy to be named as having been present: James Connal, Capital PR.

Declaration of members' interests

3. There were no new interests to declare.

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2016, outstanding actions and matters arising

4. The minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2016 were **approved** subject to an amendment to page 9 - the section of the minute relating to the IMPRESS application would be moved to the end of the document. The Chair would sign a copy of the minutes as a correct record.

5. The log of outstanding Board actions was **noted** and **agreed**, and the Board commended the executive on good progress in relation to the actions. The following update to the log were noted:
 - Action 4 – the diversity monitoring data for staff and Board Members had been collected and circulated to the Board out of committee. The Board **agreed** to its inclusion in the draft Annual Report and Accounts 2015/16.
6. The Board **noted** that there were no other matters arising that were not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

Chief Executive's Report – June 2016 – Paper PRP28(16)

7. The Board received a paper which provided an update to the Board on executive activity since the last Board meeting on 24 May 2016.
8. The following points were raised in discussion:
 - the Chief Executive reported that IMPRESS had now written to the PRP to state that it did not propose to submit further comments in response to the second call for information;
 - in relation to the IPSO speech referenced at paragraph 12, the Head of Communications and Stakeholder Management had spoken to his counterpart at IPSO to explain the PRP's concern. The Board **agreed** that the statement was misleading, and that a correction ought to be sought;
 - in relation to audit matters, the Board **noted** that the timetabling was very tight, and that the Comptroller and Auditor General was currently scheduled to sign the accounts on 14 July;
 - the Board **considered** the option of adding a post balance sheet event statement to the financial statement, to reflect the outcome of the EU referendum [post meeting note – wording now agreed and incorporated within the Annual Report and Accounts 2015/16];
 - the Board **noted** the update on key external matters relevant to the PRP's work, which was now helpfully included in the public papers.
9. The Board **noted** the contents of the Chief Executive's report.

Finance Report June 2016 – Paper PRP29(16)

10. The Board received a paper which updated the Board on the financial position as at 31 May 2016.

11. The following points were raised in discussion:
- the Board **noted** the deficit for the period ended 31 May 2016, which as £114,571 against the forecast of £122,869 which had created a variance of £8,298;
 - the Board **noted** an explanation of why key variances had arisen, mainly arising from underspend in relation to the website and visuals, as detailed against the relevant budget lines;
 - the Board **noted** that the sums transferred to the Barclays account was now showing on the balance sheet.
12. The Board **noted** the latest financial position as at 31 May 2016.

Process for the appointment of an independent Member of the Nominations Committee – Paper PRP30(16)

13. The Board received a paper which set out proposals for appointing an independent member of the PRP's Nominations Committee, following agreement at the 23 February 2016 meeting that an independent member should be co-opted to the Committee.
14. The following points were raised in discussion:

Competencies

- a number of drafting changes were proposed to the essential and desirable criteria in order to ensure that candidates had knowledge and understanding of recruitment and selection;
- care would be taken to ensure that criteria were not included that were not strictly required, so as to ensure the widest possible pool of candidates – applications would be positively encouraged from candidates from a broad background;

Selection panel

- it was **agreed** that the selection panel would comprise Tim Suter, Harry Cayton and Emma Gilpin-Jacobs;
- the option of asking the Commissioner for Public Appointments to nominate an individual to sit on the selection panel was **considered**, but on balance was felt not to be necessary;

Candidate pack

- the proposed content of the candidate pack was **agreed** in principle, including the suggested day rate (£300) and time commitment (2 days in any year when the Board is recruiting new non-executive members);
- it was **agreed** that reference would be made in the candidate pack to

giving candidates the opportunity to speak to the independent member of the Audit and Risk Committee, Kathryn Cearns;

Diversity monitoring

- the approach suggested in relation to diversity monitoring was **agreed** and there were no further observations on issues relating to equality, diversity and inclusion;

Advertisement

- the draft advert would be amended to reflect the changes **agreed** to the competencies;
- it was **agreed** that a broad range of media would be used to advertise the role;

Use of recruitment consultants

- the advantages and disadvantages of using recruitment consultants were considered. On balance, it was **agreed** that their use would be disproportionate, and the process would be managed internally;

Timetable

- the timetable would be amended on the basis that the Board would reconsider the competencies at the next routine meeting of the Board.

15. In summary, the Board:

- **agreed** the competencies against which the recruitment would be conducted - a revised version of the competencies reflecting Board Members' comments would be circulated to the Board for approval;
- **agreed** the composition of the selection panel for the recruitment;
- **agreed** the planned contents of the candidate pack, the final version of which would be signed off by the selection panel;
- **agreed** the time commitment and daily rate for the role (two days per annum during in any year when the PRP recruited non-executive members, with remuneration at £300 per day);
- **agreed** the approach to diversity monitoring to be used for the recruitment;
- **noted** the approach to advertising for the campaign;
- **agreed** that the services of recruitment consultants would not be used to help fill the role, on costs grounds; and
- **noted** the indicative timetable for the appointment of the independent member, which was likely to have to be adjusted to manage Board Members' availability.

Closing discussion

16. The Chair invited the members of the public who were in attendance to make any observations and to raise any questions.

17. No questions were raised.

Any other business

18. There was no other business.