

# IPSO Board Meeting

## Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 4 February 2015 10.30

Present: Sir Alan Moses (Chairman)  
Kevin Hand  
Anne Lapping  
Charles McGhee  
Richard Reed  
Charlie Wilson  
Bill Newman  
Ros Altmann  
Martyn Lewis

Attending: Matt Tee, Chief Executive Officer  
Charlotte Dewar, Director of Complaints & Pre-publication Services

### 1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Dame Clare Tickell, Rick Hill and Keith Perch.

### 2. Minutes

The Board approved minutes of its meeting of 18 December 2014.

### 3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda

There were none.

### 4. Chairman's report

Sir Alan Moses reported to the Board that he and the Chief Executive had appeared in front of the Lords Communication Committee as part of their short enquiry into 'Press Regulation, Where are we now?'. The Board discussed the issues raised at the Committee, including the possibility of regulators seeking recognition under the Royal Charter.

The Chairman reported that other witnesses had included Hacked Off, Paul Vickers and Alan Rusbridger from the Guardian. When asked about the likelihood of the Guardian joining IPSO, Mr Rusbridger expressed a view that if the IPSO Chairman was successful in his negotiations with the RFC the Guardian would be much more

likely to join. The Chairman reported that he had also met with Hacked Off separately.

5. Chief Executive's report

The Board noted the Chief Executive's written report. Matt Tee also reported that the IPSO website now made mention of the 'whistle blowers' hotline.

There had been good progress on the new office and it was hoped that the move would happen at the end of February. It was also hoped that the lease on Halton House would be assigned at the same time.

6. Branding

Why Not Associates presented the work that had been done on the IPSO brand. They began with presenting the visual identity. The Board questioned how the logo would work in smaller sizes, especially when printed on newsprint. The designers explained that at smaller sizes the font would be slightly heavier, but also agreed to look at a variant on the logo with a box around it.

The discussion moved on to the stakeholder research that Why Not had undertaken and the resultant work on mission and values. The Board appreciated the work that had been done, but felt that the mission and values part needed to be simplified. The Chief Executive undertook to do further work on this with Why Not.

7. Budget

The Chief Executive reported that the budget for transition and 2015 had been agreed with the RFC as had the payment schedule. Most of the transition funding and all of the first payment for 2015 had been received. There remained, however, an issue over the accounting treatment of the transition funding. The Board expressed a strong view that the transition funding should be treated as revenue for 2015 and asked the Chief Executive to continue discussions with the RFC on that basis.

8. Rules and regulations

The Chairman outlined progress on negotiating rule changes with the RFC. He and the Chief Executive had had a preliminary meeting with the Chairman and Secretary of the RFC and were meeting the full Board shortly. We then expected then to assign a small negotiating committee to negotiate detail with IPSO staff.

9. Complaints: Jurisdictional issues and related matters

The Director of Complaints presented a paper updating the Board and seeking decisions on two matters relating to DMG.

The first related to IPSO's jurisdiction in relation to material published on Mail Online which DMG contended had been published and targeted to a US audience. The Board resolved to support the Executive's position.

The second concerned the recording of complaints against Mail Group newspapers and Mail Online. There was an example of a complaint where similar articles had appeared in print and online, but the online article had different content which breached the Code. DMG wanted this complaint and similar recorded against Mail Online, but not the newspaper. DMG had made clear its position that the editor of Mail Online has editorial responsibility for all content which appears on the website, regardless of its origin.

The Executive recommended that the any complaint concerning material that had been published on Mail Online should be handled and recorded as a complaint against Mail Online, regardless of who produced the original content. To avoid confusion to complainants, any complaint raising concerns about the print edition or the online edition will be asked whether they wish to raise an additional complaint about any parallel version. DMG would be free to deal with such complaints jointly, if it so chose, but any outcomes would be recorded separately for each publication. The Board resolved to support this position.

#### 10. Any other business

- i. At its previous meeting the Board had asked for legal advice on social media sites that were not directly hosted by regulated publishers. The Board discussed this advice.
- ii. The Board considered how to publish IPSO's forthcoming decision on the Sunday Mirror/ Brooks Newmark case. Given the ongoing discussions with industry about IPSO's rules and regulations, part of which impacts on IPSO's ability to make inquiries of its own volition, the Board resolved that the findings in this case would be published, but not as a formal adjudication.