

ASSOCIATED NEWSPAPERS

**Annual statement to the Independent
Press Standards Organisation 2017**

1. Factual information

1.1 Overview

A division of Daily Mail and General Trust, Associated Newspapers is one of the largest publishers of national newspapers and news websites in the UK, its titles including the Daily Mail, Mail on Sunday, MailOnline, Metro and Metro.co.uk. The company also publishes the Irish Daily Mail, Irish Mail on Sunday and evoke.ie website in the Irish Republic. MailOnline is a global news website with independent editorial operations in the USA and Australia.

1.2 List of Titles

The Associated Newspapers titles regulated by IPSO are:

- Daily Mail (*Circulation area England, Wales and Northern Ireland. **Average circulation including Scotland and Ireland 2017: 1.43 million***)
- The Mail on Sunday (*Circulation area England, Wales and Northern Ireland. **Average circulation including Scotland and Ireland 2017: 1.22 million***)
- Scottish Daily Mail (*Circulation area Scotland. **Average circulation 2017: 79,856***)
- The Scottish Mail on Sunday (*Circulation area Scotland. **Average circulation 2017: 67,981***)
- Metro (*Distribution in major cities and suburban areas in England, Scotland and Wales. **Average circulation 2017: 1.47 million***)
- MailOnline (all content relating to news events in the UK) (*Global audience. **Global monthly unique visitors 2017: 222 million***)
- Metro.co.uk (all content relating to news events in the UK) (*Global audience. **Global monthly unique visitors 2017: 42 million***)

1.3 Responsible person

Associated Newspapers' responsible person is Peter Wright, Editor Emeritus.

2 Editorial standards

2.1 Overview.

Associated Newspapers has always been committed to upholding the editorial standards enshrined in the Editors' Code of Practice. The CEO is chair of the Regulatory Funding Company; and the Editor Emeritus is a member of the IPSO Complaints Committee.

Compliance with Editors' Code, Data Protection Act and Bribery Act is a requirement written in to all journalists' contracts.

Whenever there are changes to the legal and regulatory framework within which our journalists work we ensure they are informed and, where necessary, undergo training to guarantee they understand and comply with new requirements.

The most significant change in regulatory requirements in 2017 was the publication by the Editors' Code Committee of a revised Editors' Code, which came into effect on January 1, 2018.

All journalists were sent a copy of the revised Code and during the course of 2018 the Editor Emeritus will deliver a series of seminars explaining the changes to the Code, and educating them in how recent rulings by the Complaints Committee affect working practices. All journalists will be required to attend (see section 4.1).

All our newspapers carry regular corrections and clarifications columns, normally on page two. Our websites carry regular corrections and clarifications panels on their news page.

All Associated titles employ managing editors with responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Editors' Code and resolving any alleged breaches. During this period there were two for the Daily Mail and Metro, one for The Mail on Sunday, and four (one of them part-time) for MailOnline and Metro.co.uk.

We operate an automated complaints management system to ensure all complainants have access to the Editors' Code and assistance in making a complaint, and complaints are logged, acknowledged and outcomes recorded.

We publish our Complaints Procedure (See Appendix 1).

All journalists are required to seek advice from managing editors and/or the editorial legal department in respect of any journalistic inquiries or proposed stories which may raise issues under the Editors' Code or the law.

The editorial legal department currently employs six full-time lawyers and one part-time. An in-house lawyer is present until the daily newspapers go to press, and they remain on call 24/7 for the newspapers and for Mail Online. Additional cover is provided by rota lawyers during the evening for the Daily Mail and Metro, and two rota lawyers for The Mail on Sunday on a Saturday. All the editorial content of the newspapers is read before publication by either an in-house lawyer or a rota lawyer.

Two in-house lawyers are embedded with MailOnline and Metro.co.uk and work shifts to provide cover between 8am and 10pm. At the weekend, rota lawyers provide cover between 9.00 am until 9.00 pm. Editors select content for legal advice pre-publication, there is constant dialogue

between editors, journalists and lawyers, and lawyers monitor content as it is published. A rota provides legal assistance overnight.

2.1 Guidance from IPSO.

All desist notices received from IPSO are circulated to all relevant journalists, and placed on the legal warnings database. On receipt of desist notices managing editors will occasionally speak to IPSO's Director of Operations, either to seek clarification, or to check whether the notice relates to any activities of Associated journalists.

More rarely, from time to time managing editors speak to IPSO's Executive for guidance on Code issues. Practice varies a little from title to title, according to the nature of the material they publish. The Daily Mail would generally only seek guidance on the application of the Code, or helpful precedents, without reference to a specific story. The Mail on Sunday may give some detail of a particular story or picture. MailOnline and Metro do not normally seek pre-publication advice from IPSO

Similarly the IPSO Executive will occasionally contact a managing editor regarding a story they believe one of our titles might be about to publish, and draw his/her attention to potential Code issues.

In either case IPSO's Executive invariably make clear that any advice they give is only for guidance and not for official clearance. They always point out that the IPSO complaints committee would ultimately rule on any complaint and they may well take a different view to that offered by the executive. The decision to publish rests with the Editor alone.

2.2 Verification of stories.

We are very aware that across the industry a large proportion of all complaints are about accuracy, and our titles are no exception. Associated Newspapers has a formal step-by-step Verification Policy which has been distributed to all journalists. This is reinforced by a Pocket Guide to compliance with the Editors' Code, which is given to all journalists when they attend seminars on the Editors' code. (Appendices 2 and 3).

3 Complaints handling

3.1 Forms in which complaints are accepted.

All our titles have very large, broad-based readerships and, unsurprisingly, we receive complaints in many different forms, about a wide variety of issues. For this reason we offer a range of avenues for complainants: *(Please note this section gives Daily Mail web and email addresses; there are parallel web and email addresses for our other titles).*

(a) IPSO. The most frequently used avenue for complaints is IPSO. Complainants go directly to IPSO and are then referred to us.

(b) Readers' Editor. Readers who prefer to make a formal complaint under the Editors' Code directly to us are encouraged to do so via an automated complaints form which is hosted on a dedicated web page www.dailymail.co.uk/readerseditor. Here they are given full information about the Editors' Code, details of our Complaints Policy, and easy-to-follow instructions on how to formulate a complaint. This route is prominently displayed on page two of our newspapers and the UK news page of our websites.

(c) Corrections. We are aware that some readers may want to take issue with a simple point of accuracy, which may not be a significant inaccuracy under the Code, or for a variety of reasons may not wish to engage in a formal process. We therefore offer in parallel with the Readers' Editor service an informal email route through corrections@dailymail.co.uk. It is publicised in the same way. If these complaints engage the Code in any way we record them with formal complaints.

(d) Contact Us. Some readers who use the Readers' Editor service realise, on reading the Editors' Code, that the matter which concerns them is not a Code issue, but a question of taste and decency, an opinion they wish to express, or something they simply wish to make known to us. Others may decide, having looked at the IPSO process, that they would rather not make a formal complaint. We therefore offer, on the landing page of the Readers' Editor web page, a second informal route called Contact Us. As with Corrections complaints that arrive by this route do nevertheless sometimes engage the Code, in which case they are recorded as formal complaints.

(e) Email/Letter. Some complainants prefer to complain in writing directly to the editor or journalist involved. Where these complaints might engage the Code they are recorded with other formal complaints.

3.2 Handling of editorial complaints.

Due to the very different nature of newsprint and digital publishing, there are some differences between the way our print and web titles handle complaints.

(a) Newspapers. Daily Mail and Metro complaints are assessed at the outset to determine whether there any issue under the Code. If there is no breach a member of the Managing Editor's team will write to the complainant explaining carefully how this decision has been reached. If the complaint is more serious and likely to go to IPSO for a ruling, it will be passed to the Managing Editor so it can be dealt with straight away. Mail on Sunday complaints follow a similar process, but are generally handled from the outset by the newspaper's managing editor.

(b) Websites. The much larger volume of content, and the speed with which it is published, makes websites more open to complaint than newspapers. At the same time continuous 24-hour publication means inaccuracies can be corrected immediately and permanently, sometimes within minutes of publication. Speed is of the essence, and for that reason online complaints go directly to managing editors, who try to resolve them as soon as possible. If that can't be done they will engage with the complainant and IPSO in the same way as the newspapers' managing editors.

3.3 Keeping of records.

All complaints that are entered via the complaints management system are recorded electronically. Complaints that are framed under the Code and are submitted by letter or email independently are also entered into the system, as are complaints referred by IPSO. When complaints are resolved key information is transferred to a central register which records the name of the complainant, nature of the complaint, Code clause raised, outcome, remedial action (if any), and time taken to resolve

3.4 Resolution of complaints.

The average time taken to resolve complaints in 2018 was 17 working days. This represents the time taken from our receipt of a complaint to our last substantive exchange with the complainant or, in the case of complaints which proceed to IPSO for ruling, the last substantive exchange with IPSO. It does not include time spent waiting for IPSO to rule on a complaint or issue its ruling, as this is beyond our control.

3.5 Information provided to readers.

All readers using our automated complaints service are given full details of how to make a complaint and our Complaints Procedure. The Complaints Procedure gives an outline of how IPSO handles complaints, and encourages potential claimants to visit IPSO's website for further information. (Appendix 1) The automated complaints service is publicised on page two of our newspapers and the news page of our websites (Appendix 4).

4 Training Process

4.1`Details of training programmes

In December 2015 we launched a major series of training seminars for all staff, given by the Editor Emeritus and entitled 'The Editors' Code: How it's changed – and how IPSO interprets it'.

The purpose of the seminars was to explain the changes in the Code which were introduced on January 1, 2016, and the lessons learned from IPSO's first 18 months of rulings on the Code. 38 seminars were held during the year.

This programme continued in 2017, when two more seminars were held for new joiners and trainees. The subjects covered are summarised in Appendix 5. Each attendee was given a copy of the revised Editors' Code and a 15-point Pocket Guide (Appendix 3).

Many of our journalists have also received initial training through our Journalism Training Scheme. This took a new intake of 40 trainees in September 2017 and a further seven in March 2018. Full details of the current course are given in Appendix 6.

In addition to this, MailOnline and Metro.co.uk hold internal induction sessions on key topics for new members of staff.

4.2 Numbers taking part.

111 trainees and new joiners attended the Editors' Code seminars.

4.3 Plans for further training

We will hold a new series of Editors' Code seminars during 2018, for all staff and freelancers. These will cover the changes to the Editors' Code introduced in January 2018 and issues raised by significant IPSO rulings during the last two years.

5 Compliance

5.1 Complaints ruled on by IPSO

During this period IPSO ruled on 35 complaints against Associated Newspapers titles. Nine were upheld. The rulings were:

- 08899-16 Kelly v Mail Online. Not upheld**
- 09612-16 Aina v Scottish Mail on Sunday. Not upheld**
- 09810-16 Hales v Mail Online. Upheld**
- 13903-16 Versi v Mail Online. Upheld**
- 14261-16 Rooney v Daily Mail. Not upheld**
- 00342-17 Pandor v Daily Mail. Upheld in part**
- 11533-16 Miller v Mail Online. Not upheld**
- 01729-17 Beckham v Mail Online. Not upheld**
- 01722-17 HRH Prince Henry of Wales v Mail Online. Upheld**
- 13839-16 Baroness Scotland v Daily Mail. Not upheld**
- 13840-16 Baroness Scotland v The Mail on Sunday. Upheld in part**
- 13841-16 Baroness Scotland v Mail Online. Not upheld**

11534-16 Miller v Daily Mail. Not upheld
01824-17 Kwik fit v The Mail on Sunday. Not upheld
05877-17 Coutts v Metro. Not upheld
00894-17 Wass v The Mail on Sunday. Upheld
06855-17 Dean v Daily Mail. Not upheld
06740-17 Palestinian Return Centre v Mail Online. Not upheld
09046-17 O'Brien v Daily Mail. Not upheld
15165-17 Versi v Mail Online. Not upheld
01032-17 Ward v The Mail on Sunday. Upheld
01701-17 Hill v The Mail on Sunday. Upheld
06615-17 Guppy v Daily Mail. Not upheld
12922-17 Armstrong v metro.co.uk. Not upheld
16927-17 Bryan v Mail Online. Not upheld
05943-17 Mansford v Daily Mail. Not upheld
16191-17 Syed v Mail Online. Not upheld
16690-17 Walker v Mail Online. Not upheld
17466-16 O'Sullivan v The Mail on Sunday. Not upheld
16970-17 Obuchowska v Mail Online. Not upheld
17509-17 Evans v Daily Mail. Not upheld
17481-17 Stunt v Mail Online. Not upheld
17499-17 Stunt v Daily Mail. Not upheld
17500-17 Stunt v The Mail on Sunday. Not upheld
16236-17 Ahmed v Daily Mail. Upheld

IPSO mediated 45 complaints without making a determination on whether or not there had been a breach of the Code:

13786-16 Middleton v The Mail on Sunday
11813-16 A Woman v Mail Online
14421-16/08840-16 John and Mercidita Darwin v Mail Online
14082-16 Millband v Daily Mail
00315-17 Kelly v Mail Online
09371-16 Boaler v Mail Online
13246-16 Palestinian Return Centre v Daily Mail

13364-16 A woman v Metro.co.uk
00608-17 Shooter v Mail Online
00827-17 Ayliffe v Daily Mail
01401-17 Llewellyn v Mail Online
01689-17 A woman v Mail Online
08778-16 Champion v Daily Mail
00211-17 Zalcmán v Mail Online
06538-17 Hybrid Air Vehicles Limited v Mail Online
13585-16 Gibbins v Mail Online
13586-16 Gibbins v Daily Mail
13587-16 Gibbins v The Metro
13751-16 Gibbins v Metro.co.uk
00477-15 Williams v Mail Online
00569-15 Williams v Daily Mail
00638-17 Singh v Daily Mail
14335-16 Enright v Mail Online
01720-17 A Woman v Mail Online
13019-17 Holehouse v Daily Mail
01235-17 Patil v Daily Mail
01558-17 Albert v Mail Online
07620-17 Watkins v Daily Mail
16362-17 Jeary (a court appointed guardian) v Daily Mail
16654-17 March v The Mail on Sunday
17021-17 Survivors Network v Mail Online
16888-17 Clare Moseley and Care4Calais v Daily Mail
16591-17 Basaru-Sanni v Mail Online
17922-17 Hitchman vs Mail Online
18462-17 Bracegirdle v Mail Online
04161-17 A woman vs Mail Online
07887-17 A woman vs Metro.co.uk
18758-17 Chiariello v Mail Online
18598-17 Stand Against Racism & Inequality v metro.co.uk
18599-17 Stand Against Racism & Inequality v Mail Online
19327-17 A woman vs Mail Online

18427-17 A woman v Mail Online

18840-17 The English Democrats v Daily Mail

18882-17 Nelstrop v Mail Online

17894-17 Milburn v Daily Mail

5.2 Steps taken to respond to adverse adjudications:

09810-16 Hales v Mail Online. This concerned quotes, supplied by a freelance, which appeared to have been obtained directly from the complainant but were actually assembled from comments found on the internet and a conversation with an unidentified third party. A letter was sent to all freelancers reminding them that they must make the attribution of quotes in stories absolutely clear.

13903-16 Versi v Mail Online. This article was based on an inaccurate report in another publication, and repeated the inaccuracy. A memo was sent to all staff reminding them that when reporting stories from other publications independent checks should be made, particularly where publicly available documents are quoted.

00342-17 Pandor v Daily Mail. This complaint was upheld in relation to the article's representation of an exchange in a BBC radio interview, which was held to be inaccurate. A memo was sent to all staff reminding them of the importance of ensuring that statements made in radio or TV interviews are reproduced accurately.

01722-17 HRH Prince Henry of Wales v Mail Online. This involved pictures of the Prince on a private resort beach, published in the belief that it was a public beach. Picture desk staff were issued with new guidelines to ensure that they established more accurately whether the subjects of pictures supplied by freelancers were in a private or public place when the pictures were taken.

13840-16 Baroness Scotland v The Mail on Sunday. This concerned a claim in a headline that complainant's performance was under review, when the review was of the performance of the Commonwealth Secretariat as a whole. A memo was sent to all staff reminding that information taken from official documents must be reported accurately, and put to the subject of the story.

00894-17 Wass v The Mail on Sunday; 01701-17 Hill v The Mail on Sunday. These complaints, which were contemporaneous, both involved complex court cases. The Committee ruled that the way the articles were presented gave a misleading impression of key aspects of both cases. A memo was sent to all staff requiring them to ensure draft copy and supporting documents are supplied to the Legal Department at an early stage, and that particular care is taken not to adopt the arguments of one side in a court case, and to ensure that any statements issued by parties to a case are reported as fully as possible.

01032-17 Ward v The Mail on Sunday. This was another article dealing with a complex issue, in this case climate change. The Committee held that claims made by a leading scientist were over-stated and an accompanying graph was inaccurate. A memo was sent to all staff that when attempting to represent scientific evidence in layman’s terms, including graphics, great care should be taken to check accuracy, preferably against original sources.

16236-17 Ahmed v Daily Mail. This involved an article reporting on an account by writer Lynn Barber in another newspaper of how she had invited the complainant, then an asylum seeker, to stay in her home. The Committee ruled that even though there was a significant public interest in publishing the article, a number of the writer’s anecdotes, taken together, amounted to an invasion of privacy. A memo was sent to all staff reminding them that the fact that information had already been published in another major publication did not necessarily mean that a privacy complaint would not be successful.

5.3 Details of other incidents

Any complaints which arrive outside the IPSO system are normally settled without admission of liability. Although they are investigated internally, they do not go through an independent process of investigation and adjudication, so it would be unfair to both the complainants and the journalists involved to offer a view on whether or not there was a breach of the Code in individual cases. In addition some complainants choose not to use the services of IPSO because they prefer to resolve their complaint with us privately, and we must respect that.

However we can supply the following details for complaints resolved under IPSO rules during 2017. This list does not include legal complaints, or those resolved informally:

Total number of complaints resolved: 348

This figure includes:

Number of complaints adjudicated or mediated by IPSO: 80

Complaints referred by IPSO and resolved by us within the 28-day period: 131

Clauses of the Code raised (some complainants raised more than one clause, none raised clauses 13, 15 or 16):

1 Accuracy	293
2 Privacy	105
3 Harassment	31
4 Intrusion into grief	30
5 Reporting of suicide	7
6 Children	27
7 Children in sex cases	1
8 Hospitals	3
9 Reporting of Crime	6
10 Subterfuge	8
11 Victims of sexual assault	2
12 Discrimination	30

14 Confidential sources 12

Outcomes (internal determinations do not reflect an independent investigation and adjudication):

Code not engaged (internal determination)	153
Code potentially engaged (internal determination)	114
Outside remit (internal determination)	10
Upheld by IPSO	9
Not Upheld by IPSO	26
Outcome mediated by IPSO	45

Ways in which complaints were resolved (some complaints involved more than one action, an agreement to resolve a complaint does not necessarily mean there was a breach of the Code):

Online article amended	116
Online article or picture removed	79
Correction/clarification published	85
Footnote added to online article	34
Donation to charity	12
Apology published	12
Private letter of apology	13
Goodwill payment/compensation	6
Meeting with complainant	1
No remedial action required	48

Complaints rejected by IPSO without referral to Associated Newspapers: 303

Appendix 1. Complaints Procedure

Daily Mail

Complaints Procedure

We take great pride in the quality of our journalism and do our utmost to ensure the accuracy of everything we publish. All our journalists are required to observe the rules of the Editors' Code of Practice and we are members of the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO), the new regulatory body for the press set up in response to the Leveson Inquiry.

One of IPSO's key principles is that all its members should have effective mechanisms for dealing with complaints and correcting errors as promptly as possible. If you wish to complain about a story in one of our publications, or the behaviour of one of our journalists, we will do everything we can to put matters right.

But first, please take a few moments to read the advice below:

1. Is your complaint covered by the Editors' Code of Practice?

The Editors' Code sets standards for accuracy, respect for privacy, cases of intrusion into grief or shock, stories involving children, discrimination and the behaviour of journalists, including photographers. [Click here](#) to check whether your complaint is covered by the Code and make a note of the clause you believe has been breached.

If you wish to draw an issue to our attention but do not wish to make a formal complaint under IPSO rules, [click here](#) to send your concerns to our Managing Editor.

2. Important points to check before you submit your complaint

Under IPSO rules complaints will normally only be accepted within four months of the date of publication of the article, or the journalistic conduct in question. Outside that period, complaints can be considered up to 12 months after the date of first publication only if the article remains on our website, and it can be investigated fairly given the passage of time.

Please note that we cannot begin considering a complaint until we have received all supporting documentation you wish to submit, including correspondence with the journalist concerned.

Normally complaints can only be considered if they are made by a person who has been personally and directly affected by an alleged breach of the Editors' Code. If you are making a complaint on behalf of another individual you need to enclose with your complaint an email or letter from that individual, giving you permission to act on their behalf.

If you are taking legal action against any of our publications, you need to let us know, because we may then be unable to consider your complaint under IPSO rules.

Complaints from representative groups affected by an alleged breach of the Code can only be considered where the alleged breach is significant and where there is a substantial public interest in it being considered.

Third party complaints can only be considered where they seek to correct a significant inaccuracy of published information, in which case the position of the party most closely involved will be taken into account.

Complaints may be rejected if there is no apparent breach of the Editors' Code, or if they are without justification (such as an attempt to argue a point of opinion or to lobby), vexatious, or disproportionate.

Complaints about headlines will normally only be considered in the context of the article as a whole to which they relate.

3. What happens next?

As soon as we have checked that we have all the relevant information to consider your complaint it will be acknowledged and considered by our Readers' Editor.

The Readers' Editor, who is a qualified lawyer and not a member of any of our publications' editorial staff, will come to an independent decision on how to take your complaint forward.

If the Readers' Editor cannot establish that there has been a potential breach of the Editors' Code, they will inform you of their decision.

If we receive a number of complaints about the same issue the Readers' Editor may identify one complainant as the lead complainant, with whom we will attempt to resolve the case. If a resolution is agreed we will inform other complainants of the outcome.

If the Readers' Editor believes there has been a potential breach of the Code they will pass your complaint to the Managing Editor, who may offer you remedial action.

In cases of inaccuracy you may be offered a clarification or correction. If this is the case the Managing Editor will offer you a wording, which will usually be published in the Clarifications and Corrections column which appears on Page Two of the newspaper concerned, or in the case of our websites online.

Unless it involves a straightforward factual error, a clarification or correction will normally not be published until you have told the Managing Editor you are happy with the wording. Once you are satisfied and the clarification or correction has been published the complaint is closed. It may also be closed if you do not respond to our offer.

In cases where a clarification or correction is not an appropriate remedy, such as invasion of privacy, intrusion into grief, or behaviour by a journalist which is in breach of the Editors' Code, the Managing Editor may offer you an apology. This may be in the form of a published statement or a private letter. If a statement is to be published you may be asked to approve the wording.

If your case has been referred to us by IPSO both parties must inform IPSO of the outcome.

4. What happens if I am not happy with the remedy offered to me?

Under IPSO rules we must attempt to resolve all complaints before they are considered by IPSO. If after 28 days your complaint has not been resolved you are then free to take it to IPSO. Visit the IPSO website to find out how to do that: www.ipso.co.uk

If IPSO's Complaints Committee finds that your complaint has disclosed a potential breach of the

Editors' Code it will try to mediate an agreed resolution.

If the Complaints Committee cannot resolve your complaint by mediation it will determine whether or not there has been a breach of the Editors' Code. This may result in an adjudication with a requirement for us to take remedial action, which may consist of publication of a correction and/or the adjudication itself.

The nature, extent and placement of such an adjudication and/or correction will be determined by the Complaints Committee. Remedial action will not normally include an apology unless that has been agreed by you and the publication.

Please note IPSO has no authority to award financial compensation.

Appendix 2 - Verification of stories



Verification of stories

Accuracy is at the heart of everything we do as journalists. The following is a list of the various steps that should be taken to verify a story is accurate. It is not an exhaustive list - there may be occasions when a story can be verified by means not covered here, but if so great care should be taken, and the steps taken to secure verification should be made clear to the legal department and to your Editor or Acting Editor before publication.

Journalists must also be aware that a story may be accurate, but still in breach of the Editors' Code, or the laws of libel or contempt. You also need to take into account the Data Protection Act, the Bribery Act and Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act.

1. **Is your story supported by an on-the-record quote or bone fide document?** If the quote or document is reported accurately and in context, describes the activities of the person or organisation who produced it, and is attributed to them, there should be no need for further verification.
2. **Does the quote or document you are relying upon describe the activities of another person or organisation?** Then its accuracy needs to be checked and the person or organisation given an opportunity to comment. You need to be sure that the questions you want to put have been received by the individual or organisation concerned, and quote their response fairly.
3. **What if the person or organisation refuses to comment?** If you are sure they have received your request for comment, you must make it clear the material you intend to publish is a claim or allegation and attribute it to its source. You must also accurately report the refusal to comment, which may in itself contain an element of comment.
4. **What if it is not possible to contact the person or organisation concerned?** You need to keep a note of all the steps you have taken to reach them. Do not say in your story that so-and-so 'did not comment' but make it clear that you were unable to reach them. If it is a substantial story and you suspect they are evading you, briefly spell out in the story the steps you took. Make it clear to your editor and legal department that you have been unable to contact the subject of the story.

5. **Are you relying on an off-the-record briefing?** If someone has briefed you about their own activities, or their own organisation (and they are qualified to do so) you can normally regard that as sufficient verification. However, if you think there is a danger that they will later complain, you may need to make it clear that in such circumstances you would regard the obligation of confidentiality as broken and may name them as your source. You may also be asked to give your source, confidentially, to your editor. If you are unable to do so your editor is unlikely to run the story. An off-the-record source who can't be named is unlikely to be strong enough evidence to defend an accuracy complaint to IPSO.
6. **Are you relying on an off-the-record briefing concerning the activities of a person or organisation other than the one giving you the briefing?** Then any claims need to be put to the person or organisation as in steps 2-4.
7. **What if I have two independent off-the-record sources?** It is helpful, but not sufficient to ensure verification. You still need to go through the processes in step 2-4.
8. **Check the legal warnings basket before you approach anyone for comment, and before you file your story.** If the facts in your story have been the subject of legal warnings or corrections in the past, make sure you take this into account and seek advice from the Legal Department. If the subject of your story has issued a desist notice, asking journalists not to contact them, you should not make an approach unless you have consulted the Legal Department and/or a senior editor and established there is a public interest in doing so. *Note – we are aware some journalists currently have difficulty accessing the legal warnings basket. An improved, easy-to-access basket is under construction and will be launched very shortly. It will be followed by a new clarifications and corrections basket.*
9. **Public interest justification.** Before you engage in any activity which might give rise to a possible breach of the Editors' Code, you must be able to demonstrate that you have a reasonable belief that your actions, and the publication of any story involved, are justified by the public interest. In the case of misrepresentation or subterfuge, you must demonstrate that you have pre-existing evidence of the activities you plan to investigate, that your actions are in the public interest and that the material cannot be obtained by other means. To do this you must consult the Legal Department and/or a senior editor, and keep a record of how the decision was taken.

Appendix 3 – Pocket Guide

THE EDITORS' CODE

This is a pocket guide to the key points of the Editors' Code, and the steps you need to take to demonstrate to IPSO that you have made every effort to comply with it. It is not comprehensive – it concentrates on the issues you are most likely to encounter. Keep a full copy of the Code with you at all times.

1. More than 80 p.c. of complaints to IPSO are about accuracy – you must be able to show you have taken care to check your facts.

Go through your story before you file it and make sure you have an on-the-record quote or document to support every significant fact – that's every fact that affects the thrust of your story.

1. Take extra care when you are relying on confidential sources.

You can't rely on a confidential source on its own to defend an accuracy complaint. You must get independent on the record confirmation, put any allegations to the parties concerned, and include their response in your story. Be sure to distinguish between allegations and facts.

2. You must also take extra care with stories concerning statistical, medical or scientific information, particularly if it relates to controversial subjects.

It is not enough just to check your facts, you also need to check your interpretation of your facts. Ring the authors of official reports, tell them how you plan to interpret the information in them, and give them the opportunity to respond.

3. Significant inaccuracies must be corrected promptly.

Both the Editors' Code and IPSO recognise that sometimes, despite all your checks, a story will contain a significant inaccuracy. When that happens get it corrected promptly. It's what our clarifications and corrections columns are for – and if you don't, you risk another breach.

4. Make sure every headline is supported by the facts in the story.

One of the major changes to the Code is that it now includes a specific reference to headlines, which must be supported by the text of the story. Don't just copy out a headline from the news schedule, which may have been written before the reporter even started work on the story. Check the text of the story supports every element of the headline.

5. Everyone involved in a story has a responsibility to ensure headlines are correct.

Headlines must be seen by the subs who subbed the story and the reporter who wrote it. If the reporter is not in the office they can be sent a pdf by email.

6. Always ask yourself whether the subject of a picture has a reasonable expectation of privacy.

This can cover public places – supermarket car parks, for instance – as well private ones like homes and gardens. Seek legal advice over any pictures taken in a situation where the individual concerned might not have expected to be photographed.

7. Take great care with pictures from Facebook.

Check pictures are not protected by any privacy settings and do not include 'private information' – take advice over any picture which shows more than a head and shoulders.

8. Remember that simply taking a picture can be a breach of privacy – even if it isn't published.

Always take legal advice before commissioning pictures in a situation where there may be a reasonable expectation of privacy. Take particular care with aerial photography.

9. Take great care with pictures of children.

Always check Legal Warnings to make sure the parents of children have not issued IPSO desist notices requesting no pictures of their children are published. The notices are advisory, but ignoring them will almost certainly lead to an upheld adjudication

10. Intrusion into privacy can sometimes be justified by the public interest – but never try to make that decision on your own.

To make a public interest defence you must show you considered it carefully, and took advice from the legal department and senior editors – BEFORE publication. Keep a note of your discussions and decisions taken.

11. Always seek legal advice about any story involving suicide.

The Code is very strict about reporting any detail of a suicide which may lead to copycat attempts – including detail given in open court at inquests.

12. Always seek legal advice about any story involving children in sex cases.

The Code goes further than the law in protecting the identity of children – particularly in incest cases where anything that might identify the relationship between the victim and the accused is a breach.

13. Make sure anyone identified in a crime story is genuinely relevant to the case.

It is a breach of the Code to refer to, or picture, a friend or relative of anyone accused of a crime unless there is a genuine reason for doing so. Take particular care with Facebook pictures.

14. Never engage in subterfuge unless you have cleared every stage of your investigation with the legal department and senior editors.

You must establish that (a) there is a public interest in the story you are proposing, (b) you have evidence that the subject of the subterfuge is engaged in the activities you are investigating, (c) there is no other way of verifying this evidence and (d) any intrusion into privacy is outweighed by the public interest. You must be able to show that you have discussed all these points with lawyers and senior editors, and have a record of decisions taken.

15. Do not refer to an individual's race, colour, religion, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or to any physical or mental illness or disability unless it is genuinely relevant to the story.

Another change to the Code is that for the first time it makes specific reference to gender identity. Before you describe someone as black, Asian, Muslim, gay or transgender – or white, English or straight for that matter – make sure it's genuinely relevant to the story. If not, it's a breach.

Appendix 4 – Complaints Service

The following pages give examples of the way our complaints service was publicised in our various titles during this period. Please note that the Metro.co.uk content management system automatically gives the page the date on which it was first created. It has been updated since then, and the version below was current during 2017

'Russian spy' was in Downing Street

THERESA MAY said she is aware of reports that a Ukrainian interpreter photographed with her in Downing Street has been arrested on suspicion of being a Russian spy.

The prime minister told a press conference in Poland: 'The action that's been taken is a matter for the Ukrainian authorities.'

Stanislav Yezhov accompanied Ukrainian PM Volodymyr Groysman on a visit to London in July. Ukraine's security service said Mr Yezhov had acted 'in the interests' of the 'aggressor'.

Jerusalem as Israel's capital is null and void, says the UN



Overruled: 128 votes against Trump

MORE than 120 countries yesterday defied Donald Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, voting it as 'null and void'.

The UN General Assembly voted 128-9 calling for the US to drop its declaration.

Mr Trump, who said he would move the US embassy to Jerusalem, had threatened to cut financial aid to countries voting against this.

His threat appeared to have some impact, with 35 countries abstaining and rejecting the resolution. This was

by MICHELLE NICHOLS

more than usually associated with Palestinian-related resolutions.

Nevertheless, Washington found itself isolated on the world stage as many of its Western and Arab allies voted for the measure.

Ahead of the vote, Nikki Haley, US ambassador to the UN, complained about being 'singled out' by the vote.

She said: 'We will remember it when we are called upon to once again make the world's largest contribution to the

United Nations and so many countries come calling on us, as they so often do, to pay even more and to use our influence for their benefit.'

Turkish president Recep Tayyip Erdogan said in a speech: 'Mr Trump, you cannot buy Turkey's democracy with your dollars.'

But Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Israel 'totally rejects this vote, even before its approval'.

And in a Facebook video, he said Jerusalem 'always was, always will be' Israel's capital.

MASSIVE £40 MILLION CLEARANCE

THOUSANDS OF LINES PRICED TO CLEAR

IN-STORE ONLY



UP TO 50% OFF

Karcher Pressure Washers

Petrol Lawnmowers FROM £50



Lighting FROM £1



Bosch Garden & Power Tools 30% OFF



UP TO 50% OFF, WHILE STOCK LASTS!

Separatists 'on course to win' Catalonia poll

PRO-independence parties in Catalonia were last night on course to keep control of the regional assembly, according to an exit poll.

The separatists were predicted to win between 67 and 71 seats in the 135-seat chamber, according to La Vanguardia newspaper after the polls closed.

Opinion polls before the vote had seen pro-independence and unionist neck-and-neck in the Spanish region.

Meanwhile, Manchester City manager Pep Guardiola is facing a police investigation for alleged 'rebellion' before the Catalan referendum this year.

The former Barcelona boss (pictured) is said to have read a pro-independence manifesto at a march on June 11.



Mum's family 'positive' over early release

THE family of detained Brit Nazanin Zaghari-Ratcliffe are feeling 'more positive' her ordeal may soon end after her case status was changed to 'eligible for early release'.

The 38-year-old (pictured) has been held in Iran since April 2016 over spying allegations.

Her sister, Rebecca Jones, said the family had 'always thought it was a closed case'.

She said: 'The lawyer is much more positive and Nazanin is much more positive.'

Husband Richard Ratcliffe said he was hopeful his wife would be home by Christmas. He said: 'It is definitely a positive step. I'm probably a bit cautious to see just how positive.

'There is still some paperwork to finalise, so hopefully by Christmas. But Christmas is not very far away.'



This is your final Metro of the year. We'll be back on Tuesday January 2. We wish all our 3.4million daily readers a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year. Don't forget, you can still get our digital edition if you download the app!

CONTACT US

email
news.london@metro.co.uk
pictures@metro.co.uk

text
Views* to 65000
(Standard network charge)

Web edition
metro.news

Editorial
020 3615 0600

Advertising
020 3615 0570

Distribution
020 3615 0560

Classified
020 7926 3338

FIND US

Download our tablet edition and mobile apps from the App Store, Google Play and the Amazon Appstore.

CORRECTIONS & CLARIFICATIONS

Metro strives for complete accuracy but mistakes do sometimes slip in. If you spot any, please email corrections@metro.co.uk with the article and date as the subject line.

Metro is a member of the Independent Press Standards Organisation, the regulatory body for the Press. IPSO members must have effective mechanisms for accepting complaints and correcting errors as promptly as possible.

If you wish to make a formal complaint about a story in Metro, visit www.readerseditor@independent.co.uk or contact IPSO directly at ipso.co.uk.

 The Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) is a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee. It is a company registered in England and Wales.

 Certified Distribution October 30 - November 26, 2017. London: 890,936 Metro UK 1,469,446

 METRO is independent of UK and Irish news agencies and is not controlled by any UK or Irish news agency.

 **IPSO Regulated**

How to Complain

Editorial Content

Please contact our editorial team for any issues with our content:

- If you notice a factual inaccuracy on MailOnline, Daily Mail or Mail on Sunday, please email corrections@mailonline.co.uk and we will address the issue as soon as possible
- If you wish to make a formal complaint over a potential breach of the Editor's Code of Practice under IPSO rules please go to www.dailymail.co.uk/readerseditor where you will find an easy-to-use complaints form
- You can also write to Readers' Editor, Daily Mail, Northcliffe House, 2 Derry Street, London W8 5TT

Dailymail.co.uk, Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday are members of the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO). Dailymail.co.uk, Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday adheres to the Editors' Code of Practice as enforced by IPSO who are contactable for advice at:

- **IPSO, Gate House, 1 Farringdon Street, London, EC4M 7LG**
- Website: <http://www.ipso.co.uk/>
- Email: advice@ipso.co.uk
- Telephone: **0300 123 2220**

Contact us: How to get in touch with us at Metro newspaper and Metro.co.uk

 Metro News Reporter Friday 24 Mar 2017 12:16 pm

f t G+ ✉ 33

The Metro.co.uk is a member of the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO).

If you wish to report any concerns over accuracy, please email correct@ukmetro.co.uk.

To make a formal complaint under IPSO rules please go to metro.co.uk/readerseditor or write to Readers' Editor, Daily Mail, Northcliffe House, 2 Derry Street, London W8 5TT.

Editorial enquiries:

For Metro.co.uk:

Contact our online news desk at webnews@metro.co.uk.

Contact our online picture desk at onlinepictures@metro.co.uk

To register complaints or corrections, please email correct@ukmetro.co.uk

For Metro newspaper:

Contact our news desk at news.london@ukmetro.co.uk.

Contact our picture desk on picturedesk@ukmetro.co.uk

Text: 'Views' to 85400 (Standard network charge)

To register complaints or corrections, please email correct@ukmetro.co.uk

Commercial enquiries:

To book national or London advertising, email displayadvertising@ukmetro.co.uk or phone 020 3615 0570

To book a classified ad, visit www.metroclassified.co.uk or phone 020 7938 3838

To book promotions, competitions and for digital advertising enquiries, email Andrew.crossland-page@metro.co.uk

For media partnerships, email chris.dunne@metro.co.uk

To book advertising in a regional edition of Metro please call Zach Drake on 020 3615 0539 or email zach.drake@metro.co.uk

Appendix 5 2016 seminar programme

The Editors' Code: How it's changed – and how IPSO interprets it.

The precise content of seminars varied according to the audience and topical issues in the news, but the outline remained broadly constant:

1. Introduction
 - IPSO has been a fresh start. It looks at complaints in an independent way and puts more onus on us to resolve them ourselves.
 - Revised Editors' Code came into force in January 2016 – it's vital everyone reads and understands it.
 - What IPSO statistics tell us about how Associated titles are performing.

2. Accuracy
 - IPSO approach this in a structured way.
 - Significant inaccuracy – what constitutes a significant inaccuracy.
 - Taking care – what this means and the importance of being able to demonstrate to IPSO that care has been taken to ensure accuracy.
 - Particular care needs to be taken with the interpretation official statistics and medical and scientific reports, and with stories based on information from anonymous sources.
 - Case histories – Office of the First Minister v Daily Telegraph; Blair v Daily Mail

3. Correction of inaccuracy
 - The importance of correcting inaccuracies promptly.
 - But even if an inaccuracy is corrected promptly it won't avoid an upheld ruling if care was not taken.
 - Case histories – Farrell v Metro.co.uk; Clark v MailOnline

4. Headlines
 - The Code now makes explicit reference to headlines, which must be supported by the text of the article below.
 - Sub-editors on potentially contentious stories must check headlines with reporters and reporters must ask to see headlines.
 - Case history: Walker v Daily Mail.

5. Privacy
 - Explanation of reasonable expectation of privacy.
 - Why some public places carry a reasonable expectation of privacy and others do not.
 - Aerial photography.
 - The problems of balancing potential invasion of privacy and the public interest and the need to demonstrate legal advice has been taken.

- Using pictures published on Facebook: the importance of privacy settings and establishing whether a picture shows information which is intrinsically private.
 - Case histories: Tunbridge v Dorking Advertiser (PCC); Duke of York v Daily Mail; Hogbin v Herne Bay Gazette.
6. Pictures of children
- Special care should always be taken with pictures of children.
 - Pixelation of pictures of children is not a specific requirement of the Code, but nevertheless editors do sometimes pixelate.
 - The importance of being aware of IPSO desist notices, which may request pixelation.
 - Case history: Weller v MailOnline (legal action).
7. The public interest
- The revised Code gives a fuller definition of the public interest, with more examples.
 - However it is deliberately not a comprehensive list and there are also many stories which are perfectly legitimate without being covered by the public interest.
 - The important thing, if the public interest is likely to be raised in defence of a story, as that the journalists involved can show they had a reasonable belief that their actions were in the public interest, that advice was taken, and a record kept.
8. Harassment
- The importance of checking for IPSO desist notices before making approaches to the subjects of potential story.
9. Suicide
- This has been made a standalone clause in the revised Code.
 - It balances the need to avoid excessive detail with the press's right to report legal proceedings.
 - However excessive detail is not clearly defined and there is a body of opinion that *any* detail of the suicide method is excessive.
 - Legal advice should always be taken when reporting suicide.
10. Children in sex cases
- The Code specifically goes further than the law, and prohibits any detail that even implies a relationship between the accused and the child.
 - This can make cases extremely difficult to report and even elaborate precautions can sometimes fail to prevent a Code breach.
 - As with suicide, legal advice should always be taken.
 - Case history: A man v Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard.
11. Reporting of Crime
- The importance of establishing that anyone pictured or referenced in a crime story is genuinely relevant to the crime.
 - Case history: Bobin v The Times
12. Subterfuge
- As with the public interest there is a clear procedure which must be followed

- The journalists involved must be able to show that they had a reasonable belief that their investigation was in the public interest at the time the decisions involved were taken.
- They must be able to show there was no more straightforward method of confirming the information on which they were acting.
- They have to have a record of how they came to their decision and what advice they took.
- Case histories: Liberal Democrat Party v Daily Telegraph; Issues arising from an article in the Sunday Mirror.

13. Discrimination

- This clause has also been changed, following a number of high profile cases, to make direct reference to gender status.
- Cases under part one of the clause, which deals with prejudicial and pejorative references, are relatively rare, but complaints about the second part, which addresses details about an individual which are not genuinely relevant to the story, are more common.
- When journalists are writing about an individual they must always stop, before describing their race, colour, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, or any illness or disability, and ask themselves whether it is genuinely relevant to the story.
- Case history: Trans Media Watch v The Sun.

Appendix 6 – Training of Journalists

The Associated Newspapers editorial training scheme

With another 47 journalists undergoing training in 2017-18, the Associated Newspapers training scheme remains one of the most ambitious in Britain. It is the largest run by any national newspaper group. The variety of trainees who have joined during 2017-18 illustrates the scope of the scheme, which now runs two courses, one starting in the autumn and another the following spring:

3 Daily Mail reporters

4 Daily Mail sub-editors

2 Stephen Lawrence scholarship reporters

2 Mail on Sunday reporters

1 Weekend sub-editor

20 MailOnline journalists (UK)

2 MailOnline sport reporters (UK)

6 DailyMail.com journalists (USA)

7 DailyMail.com Australia journalists

The training is run by respected journalists led by Sue Ryan, a former managing editor of The Daily Telegraph, and Peter Sands, a former editor of The Northern Echo and editorial director of Northcliffe Newspapers.

The selection process is very robust - normally at least seven people are interviewed for each place. Candidates do some basic tests at first interview, followed by a second stage where they are put through their paces for around four hours with a number of written tests.

Training varies in length. Most trainees have done a journalism master's degree, NCTJ or Press Association course so have basic skills in news writing, sub-editing, law, government, court reporting, shorthand and the Editors' Code.

The reporters do two weeks under Peter Sands, and the subs and Online trainees do four weeks. The Stephen Lawrence scholars are being supported by the Mail through the City University Journalism Masters course. We are paying the full fees and giving a generous living allowance. They also join the course run by Peter Sands.

Peter Sands runs an intensive course with a lot of red penning of exercises and zero tolerance of mistakes. These are the topics being covered in this year's basic training:

Reporting course

The course presumes attendees have already taken a qualification in journalism and had newsroom experience. It deals mainly with the tasks which will be required while working for the Mail:

- a skills checklist (grammar, spelling, accuracy, attitude, structure, media law etc)
- intro writing and story structure
- the art of storytelling for the web
- tight writing and attention to detail
- professional standards (all UK trainees study the Editors' Code in detail and are given an electronic copy, trainees from the USA and Australia study the codes of practice that apply in their home countries)
- media law (libel, privacy, copyright, bribery)
- covering a breaking story
- sources of stories
- story development
- the senior reporter's survival guide
- stories from the written word (agendas, reports, financial information)
- writing lighter stories/picture stories
- developing contacts
- writing a profile
- forward planning and working to the diary
- copy tasting, conference and putting together a newslit
- professional behaviour

- current affairs knowledge
- Mail style
- understanding the Mail audience

The thrust of the course is that they write and develop stories. They take live stories from the wire and put them into Mail style and they have to source and write an exclusive for publication during the course. These are then marked and they get detailed feedback so any mistakes or bad habits are identified. There are speakers from the newsroom - news, city, sport and production department heads, plus senior reporters and columnists.

Sub-editing course (London for week 1, Howden for weeks 2-4)

- a skills checklist (grammar, spelling, accuracy, attitude, structure, media law etc)
- the art of the sub-editor
- a glossary of subbing terms
- the 70 most common errors in newspapers
- intro writing and story structure
- the art of storytelling
- tight writing and attention to detail
- professional standards (all UK trainees study the Editors' Code in detail and are given an electronic copy, trainees from the USA and Australia study the codes of practice that apply in their home countries)
- media law (libel, privacy, copyright, bribery)
- proofreading
- the subbing perils
- Mail style
- understanding the Mail audience
- Mail headline writing and practical headline exercises
- captions, subdecks, standfirsts, factfiles

- analysis of different newspaper styles
- Photoshop
- Adobe InDesign
- an introduction to typography
- handling pictures and graphics
- layout and design
- putting together a picture spread
- editing stories from different sources
- editing a live breaking story
- current affairs knowledge

After basic training all trainees undergo a work placement at a regional paper for around three months. Reporters and online journalists also spend two months with a news agency. Courses are tailored for the individual, but generally every trainee will have six months paid training before filing or subbing their first story. And once they have joined their chosen paper or website they continue to be treated as trainees; most are given mentors and department heads take time to teach and encourage them.

More than 300 trainees have graduated from the scheme and many are now senior executives on our newspapers and websites – so trainees may well find themselves working for someone who not very long ago was a trainee themselves.

Sue Ryan

Peter Sands