Journalism continued to demonstrate its importance to society through 2022, which was turbulent even by the standards set in recent years. Newspapers, magazines and online news sites played an essential role in reporting and shaping a series of historic events: Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the celebration of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth’s Platinum Jubilee, and the sadness of her death, which in turn brought King Charles III to the throne. It was a year of three prime ministers, and the unlikely infamy of a lettuce which outlasted the 49-day premiership of Liz Truss.

The response to these challenges has demonstrated the best of journalism in engaging readers and explaining often technical and controversial areas. Newspapers, magazines and digital platforms have had to respond to the ever-shifting media landscape and economic pressures.

The burgeoning cost of living crisis inspired public interest reporting from newsrooms across the country with local, regional and national perspectives. The same spiralling costs have brought their own challenges for publishers to maintain standards of journalism in the face of sharply rising prices.

During 2022, we thought carefully about how best to respond to the challenges facing the industry and us as a regulator. We reviewed our strategic direction and recommitted ourselves to our core purpose: to protect the public and freedom of expression, and make regulation by IPSO a mark of accountable journalism.
This has been a pivotal year for IPSO, with a thorough independent, external review of our work, the development of our five-year strategy, and handling the largest single complaint we have ever received.

Our focus in 2022 was strategic development and renewal. Building on the experience and expertise accumulated through IPSO’s first eight years, we looked forward and prepared our five-year strategy for 2023-28.

In developing the strategy, which we launched in early 2023, we closely examined our guiding principles, how we are governed, our purpose, and our accumulated experience that shapes our day-to-day work. We spoke to journalists and editors, groups with an interest in editorial standards, publishers, people who make use of our privacy notices, and our own staff, Board and Complaints Committee.

We also commissioned an external review of IPSO by Sir Bill Jeffrey, which reported in early 2023. The Jeffrey Review found that IPSO had influenced the industry for the better; and identified areas for us to consider that could further increase our transparency and accessibility as a regulator.

A key theme of both the five-year strategy and the Jeffrey Review was the importance of IPSO communicating about its work and engaging with people and organisations concerned with press standards. John Davidson joined IPSO as Head of Communications in 2022 to promote IPSO’s expertise and build support for our work in upholding editorial standards to protect the public and freedom of expression.

IPSO regulation provides a valuable channel for the public to ask for accountability over perceived editorial standards failures. This was demonstrated in a dramatic way at the close of 2022. Over a few days in December, we received 25,100 complaints about a single column published by The Sun. This was the highest ever for IPSO. We then conducted a careful and detailed investigation of the concerns raised under the Editors’ Code of Practice (the framework we use to regulate the press), through two representative group complaints.

We ultimately found — in a ruling issued in July 2023 — that the column had made pejorative and prejudicial reference to the sex of the Duchess of Sussex. We upheld the complaint as a breach of Clause 12 (Discrimination) of the Editors’ Code. The Sun printed a prominent adjudication, flagged from its front page. Throughout, our focus was on investigating the potential issues under the Editors’ Code and not on intervening on matters of taste. As well as dealing with individual complaints, we work to support editors and journalists to meet our standards and address patterns of concern. In 2022, our standards and regulation team published guidance for editors on social media, court reporting, and due prominence of corrections in print media. For the public, they produced information on the reporting of domestic abuse.

We will continue to act proportionately and flexibly to address editorial standards issues. We have developed well-tested routes for holding publications to account. We have driven up standards across complex and challenging areas and protected the public from journalism which oversteps. This is essential work which we as the regulator of the news industry will continue to do.

IPSO CEO Charlotte Dewar
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Our strategy

IPSO will consolidate its position as the authoritative press regulator of the UK newspaper, magazine and digital news industry over the next five years.

Development of a new five-year strategy covering the years 2023 to 2028 occupied much of the year. The strategy articulates our core purpose of protecting the public and freedom of expression by upholding high editorial standards and sets out how we will fulfill this purpose.

The strategy will help IPSO protect the public interest by promoting high-quality journalism and defend the public when editorial standards fall short. To do this in an ever-changing and increasingly complex environment, we must act proportionately and flexibly, so that we can tailor our approach to uphold high editorial standards.

By protecting the public, we also protect freedom of expression, because we demonstrate that the press can uphold high standards without the need for further measures that would undermine press freedom. We must further build understanding of what we do and use our knowledge and expertise to promote engagement about press standards issues. And to do all of this, we will use our resources carefully in ways that maximise our impact.

As digital technology continues to gather momentum and brings with it new opportunities and risks, it will be vital for IPSO to cooperate with other regulators in areas where our remits overlap.

This strategy will prepare IPSO to face new developments in technology that will further transform the digital economy and shape the future of journalism. By building on our eight years of experience and unparalleled understanding of the editorial process, the strategy positions us to bolster our value to both the public and to the publishers we regulate.

The strategy sets out IPSO’s work in monitoring standards, offering advice and guidance for journalists, editors and members of the public and offering training to different expert organisations.

IPSO also provides confidential support for journalists and helps people worried about press intrusion. We offer an arbitration scheme and monitor the IPSO mark, which is a visual symbol of good quality, regulated journalism. We provide training to newsrooms and the police on the support we can offer to protect people’s privacy if they find themselves subject to unwanted press attention.

The strategy emphasises that IPSO is independent from the government, regulated publishers and other stakeholders. The organisation also aims to build transparency by developing trust around regulation among the public and policymakers.

The strategy also states that IPSO will be more responsive to the changing media landscape, become a more inclusive organisation and be more accountable to a diverse public, among other aims for the next five years for the UK press regulator.

Our five strategic principles

1. Demonstrate independence from government, regulated publications, and other stakeholders
2. Build transparency to improve trust and understanding of our regulation by the public and by policymakers
3. Be responsive to the changing media landscape
4. Become an even more inclusive organisation that is open, accessible and fair
5. Be more accessible and accountable to a diverse public
The second independent external review of IPSO has now been published, with the report’s author, Sir Bill Jeffrey, finding IPSO has “influenced the industry for the better”.

The review, which was carried out over six months from October 2022 to March 2023, analysed in detail IPSO’s governance, management and processes, from complaints handling and standards work to external communications and the future direction of the organisation.

In his report, Sir Bill, a former permanent secretary at the Ministry of Defence, makes a number of recommendations for IPSO spanning changes to processes and communications to issues for consideration, as well as more far-reaching changes to the Regulations and Articles of Association underpinning IPSO’s work.

IPSO expects to be able to carry forward most of the review’s recommendations for operational changes and is in the process of implementing these necessary changes— including some that have been taken up in this annual report.

In several instances the review recommended specifically that IPSO should consider making certain changes. Those deliberations are under way and will be made public once a final decision can be made, along with further details of the implementation of accepted changes.

Independent validation of IPSO

The Jeffrey Review finds IPSO to be a positive force
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Key findings

- **INDEPENDENCE OF IPSO’S OPERATION**
  While Sir Bill found “constraints” due to governance structures, he ultimately concluded that IPSO was “operating independently” and that there was “no sign of improper influence by the industry on complaints decisions, or that decisions were taken in other than an impartial way”.

  Sir Bill also found that IPSO had “built credibility within the industry”, while complainant views were “on balance, positive”.

  Crucially, the review also drew attention to IPSO’s work to deliver high quality guidance and training, as well as its broader work on outreach with the industry, concluding that to characterise IPSO as “no more than a complaints-handling body and not really a regulator, is wide of the mark”.

  The report recommended that IPSO takes responsibility for the Editors’ Code of Practice. This would represent a significant change to the underlying structure of IPSO. As such, this is one of a number of recommendations we are consulting Board members and associate bodies about.

- **STANDARDS**
  The review considered carefully the work of IPSO’s Standards team, noting its work on analysis, compliance monitoring, and preparation of industry guidance. It made several useful recommendations, including that IPSO should ensure that it gives appropriate regard for the Scottish legal system, where this is relevant to its remit complaints are first identified – this is something that IPSO is building into the redesign of its website to further simplify the process for potential complaints.

  While IPSO reserves the right to launch a standards investigation, the measure is intended as a last resort, carrying penalties that include a fine of up to £1 million. Where an issue can be addressed through engagement with the publication that is the preferred outcome.

- **COMPLAINTS**
  During the course of the review, Sir Bill contacted a randomly selected cross section of complainants and interviewed those who agreed to speak to him; received submissions from others with experience of IPSO’s complaints process; met staff from IPSO’s complaints-handling team; and attended three meetings of the Complaints Committee, the panel that rules on whether complaints represent a breach of the Editors’ Code.

  He noted most complainants found IPSO staff “helpful and professional”, and the decision-making process “fair, even if the outcome was not what they were seeking”.

  The review also referenced IPSO’s feedback surveys of IPSO complainants. They showed that 80 per cent of respondents rated the service at four or five out of five, while between 75 and 100 per cent of respondents (over the four quarters of 2022) said they would recommend IPSO to someone in a similar situation.

  The review’s recommendations also proposed simplification of the complaints process, specifically around the initial stages, where out of remit complaints are first identified – this is something that IPSO is building into the redesign of its website to further simplify the process for potential complaints.

  A broader recommendation to improve guidance and support for complainants is also being incorporated into the redesign of the website.

- **OTHER IPSO SERVICES**
  The review noted other services that play vital roles for both member publishers and the public.

  These include the privacy notices which can be issued by IPSO at the request of people at the centre of a story and protect themselves and/or their families from unnecessary and intrusive press interest. These notices are observed across the media – not just IPSO members – and the review found editors “took the privacy notices system seriously”.

  The review also highlighted the potential value of the 24/7 whistleblower hotline as a resource for journalists concerned they are being asked to work against the principles of the Editors’ Code and the arbitration service for dealing with legal claims against some regulated titles.

  The review recommended that more be done to promote these valuable resources.

  A separate recommendation to provide publishers with guidance about how to manage online comments is being covered by upcoming guidance on due prominence and online content.

**“The review recommended that more be done to promote the arbitration service and whistleblower hotline”**

---

**IPSO has “built credibility within the industry”, while complainant views were “on balance, positive”**
Complaints

All enquiries are carefully assessed, and if any complaint might raise a potential breach of the Editors’ Code, it is investigated fully.

Complaints and enquiries received by IPSO in 2022

- **COMPLAINTS RECEIVED**: 38,658
- **COMPLAINTS INVESTIGATED**: 358
  - 142 Complaints resolved directly with publisher
  - 86 Complaints Not Upheld
  - 65 Complaints Upheld
  - 29 Complaints Resolved with IPSO mediation
  - 5 Resolved – satisfactory remedy
  - 31 Not pursued during IPSO investigation

- **COMPLAINTS ASSESSED**: 25,622
  - 25,622 Third party complaints
    - 9,449 No possible breach of the Code
    - 1,277 Not pursued
    - 1,063 Miscellaneous
    - 257 Non-regulated publication
    - 206 Global jurisdiction
    - 177 Out of time
    - 65 Taste
    - 29 Online comment moderation
    - 7 Legal proceedings

- **OTHER ACTIONS**: 89
  - 89 Advice which did not lead to formal complaint
  - 48 Privacy Notice
  - 7 Proactive approach

---

*Calculation based on 260 working days at an average of 7 working hours per day. Does not include all phone enquiries.*

Full complaints statistics for all regulated publishers are available online at www.ipso.co.uk/monitoring/annual-reports
A controversial column aimed at the Duke and Duchess of Sussex sparked record complaints

Each complaint was reviewed by a member of the IPSO team. Almost all were from individuals not directly affected by the article and were rejected. Two complainants were considered to be representative groups, who said the content of the article affected all women.

They argued the article breached the Editors’ Code of Practice, the rules by which we regulate the press, under Clause 12 (Discrimination), Clause 3 (Harassment) and Clause 1 (Accuracy).

After careful consideration, the Complaints Committee, the panel that rules on complaints, found that the article breached the Editors’ Code under discrimination in relation to sex. It contained pejorative and prejudicial language about the sex of the Duchess. The sanction was publication of a summary of the Committee’s findings on the same page where the column usually appeared, flagged from the front page of the newspaper and its website.

IPSO also considered in detail the complaint that the article included pejorative and prejudicial references to the Duchess’ race. It acknowledged the strength and sincerity of the complainants’ view that it did, but concluded the elements of the article cited in the complaint did not provide a basis to establish that there was a pejorative reference to race, and did not uphold this part of the complaint.

In considering the allegation of harassment, IPSO concluded that the publication of this single article was not sufficient to support a breach of Clause 3 of the Editors’ Code. In addition, the column did not breach Clause 1 (Accuracy).

WHAT ARE REPRESENTATIVE GROUP COMPLAINTS?

An important part of IPSO’s regulatory process since we were established in 2014, the provisions for representative group complaints stem from a recommendation in the Leveson Report. This process acknowledges the voices of people who may be affected by coverage that potentially breaches the Editors’ Code. This is distinct from – and does not affect – Clause 12’s remit of discrimination against individuals and not against groups. It requires the Complaints Committee to make a determination that a threshold set in IPSO’s regulations has been met: that the potential breach of the Editors’ Code is significant, and that there is a public interest in IPSO considering it through a representative group complaint.

In this case, the Complaints Committee decided the alleged breach was significant and it decided to investigate complaints from the two representative groups: the WILDE Foundation and the Fawcett Society.

The article contained pejorative and prejudicial language about the sex of the Duchess”
Complained—about titles

Publications with the largest reach receive the most complaints, but have the lowest proportion of breaches

An increase in the proportion of complaints resolved between publication and complainant during the referral period demonstrates how this process encourages quick resolution of complaints.

Where complaints are listed as rejected, they did not raise a possible breach of the Editors’ Code. Some of the publications received many complaints, but they were not in breach.

Examples of the IPSO Complaints process in action

Morris v mylondon.news

Mylondon.news published an adjudication following an upheld accuracy complaint related to coverage of David Morris MP.

David Morris complained that mylondon.news breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors’ Code of Practice in an online article headlined “Taxpayers angry at MP who expensed £229.20 first class train ticket to London rather than travelling standard class”, published on 25 January 2022. The complaint was upheld. Mylondon.news was required to publish an adjudication – a summary of the Committee’s ruling – to remedy the breach of the Code.

IPSO found the article gave the inaccurate impression that the expense had been for only one ticket – whereas the cost had covered tickets for the MP, his wife, and their baby. This was compounded by the publication’s description of the expense as an “expensive ticket” and an “expensive fare”.

The article was therefore significantly inaccurate because it implied that the price of £229.20 had been only for the complainant’s travel. The publication had made no offer to correct this inaccurate information and had therefore breached Clause 1(i) and Clause 1(ii) of the Editors’ Code of Practice.

The article about the MP’s expenses claim was published ahead of a deadline the publication had given him to respond to its questions. The Committee ruled that in publishing the article before getting the MP’s response, the publication had failed to take sufficient care over the accuracy of the claim that the figure quoted in the article covered only a single ticket.

The publication had failed to take sufficient care over this description of the fare. No correction or clarification had been offered and there was a further breach of Clause 1(ii) and Clause 1(ii).

Reference: 00737-22 Morris v mylondon.news

DAYS TAKEN TO HANDLE A COMPLAINT

Average number of days to process possible breaches of the Editors’ Code

Includes all breaches, no breach after investigation and all resolved

Average number of days to process a complaint

Includes all complaints that are out of our remit or rejected, excluding special procedures for high-volume complaints.

Seven notable case studies

2022 MOST COMPLAINED ABOUT PUBLICATIONS BY ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULINGS</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Number of complaints in remit</th>
<th>Rejected **</th>
<th>Not pursued by complainant ***</th>
<th>Resolved with IPSO mediation</th>
<th>Resolved with publication</th>
<th>Fully upheld</th>
<th>Partially upheld</th>
<th>Not upheld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail Online</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesun.co.uk</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express.co.uk</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirror.co.uk</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dailyrecord.co.uk</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telegraph.co.uk</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mail on Sunday</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6317</td>
<td>6306</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metro.co.uk</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walesonline.co.uk</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mylondon.news</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manchestereveningnews.co.uk</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunday Times</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hulldailymail.co.uk</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thescottishsun.co.uk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edinburghlive.co.uk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Includes breaches (A)(ii) in remit – other investigation; Not investigated (A)(ii) in remit – other investigation (A)(ii) out of remit (A)(ii)

*** Includes rejection confirmed by Committee

**** If a complaint is upheld in one or some points, but the complainant had raised further points that were not found to be in breach, the Committee may determine that the complaint is partially upheld.
2 Portes v Sunday Express
Correction published after accuracy complaint upheld over reporting about underage asylum seekers

A Sunday Express headline of “Asylum ‘children’ actually over 18” was found to be misleading when complainants took issue with the fact that the title reported, in print and online, that “nearly two thirds of asylum seekers who claimed to be unaccompanied children were found to be over 18”. In fact, the two-thirds figure related to cases where the Home Office had actively disputed the age of asylum seekers. The majority of asylum seekers overall who identified as unaccompanied children were indeed children.

The publication accepted the possibility this wording was misleading, amended the headline of the online article and published a clarification below the headline of the original article. It also published a clarification in print, but the Committee found that the actions were not sufficiently prompt; nor did the wording identify the significant inaccuracies.

Both the headline and the sub-heading were found to be inaccurate by the Complaints Committee, as they did not reveal that the asylum children’s figures only related to cases in which the Home Office had disputed the age and in some of the cases the ‘children’ had turned out to be over 18. In the majority of overall cases however, there was no dispute, and the asylum seekers were children. Although the clarification offered was inadequate, it demonstrated a willingness to correct the matter and thus the Committee considered, on balance, that a correction putting the correct position on record was the appropriate remedy.

Reference: 10492-22 Portes v Sunday Express

3 Brown v spectator.co.uk
No breach found after investigation into accuracy complaint on reporting on Gordon Brown’s speech at a Russian bank

The former prime minister, Gordon Brown, complained to IPSO that The Spectator had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) in reporting on a speech that he gave to Sberbank and Troika Dialog. He said the article inaccurately stated that he had benefited personally from the speech and repeatedly gave him a chance to comment. The Complaints Committee found that no breach had been made as the fee for the speech had gone to an office bearing Brown’s name and the article did mention that he had not received the salary personally. It also found that Mr Brown had repeatedly turned down the opportunity to comment.

The article was updated three times after initial publication. After IPSO found that there was no breach of Clause 1 (Accuracy), the complainant approached IPSO’s Independent Reviewer, who found that there was no procedural failure.

Reference: 01896-22 Brown v spectator.co.uk

4 A man v asianimage.co.uk
Privacy complaint upheld and adjudication published against article about a man’s conversion in a mosque

The complainant said Asian Image had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) and Clause 2 (Privacy) in an article about him making a declaration of faith at a named mosque.

The article included a recording of an imam welcoming the man into the Muslim community and a photograph of his back, while he was being embraced by another worshipper and surrounded by other attendees.

The man said the recorded ceremony and the photograph had been shared by the publication without his knowledge and consent. He also complained that the inclusion of his first name, the area where he lived and photograph also identified him to his family and friends, who had been unaware of his conversion to Islam, and caused him considerable distress. The publication did not accept a breach of the Code, as it said the recording of the ceremony was available on SoundCloud and the photograph had been shared in a WhatsApp group, prior to their publishing it. It also said these details were shared with Asian Image by a source who was an upstanding member of the local community. The Complaints Committee concluded that although the publication wanted to report on a positive community event, publishing the private information about the man constituted a significant and unjustified intrusion into the complainant’s private life. So, the complaint was upheld, and an adjudication was published.

Reference: 12371-21 A man v asianimage.co.uk

5 Lynch v kentonline.co.uk
No breach found after investigation into complaint on reporting on minors misbehaving in a restaurant

The complainant said kentonline.co.uk had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 6 (Children) and Clause 9 (Reporting of Crime) in an article about him making a declaration of faith at a mosque.

The article about him making a declaration of faith at a mosque, and its accompanying podcast that were based on a video on which the article was based, showed three girls verbally abusing staff and customers at a McDonald’s restaurant. A follow-up article gave details of a security guard being arrested after being charged with assault of a policeman, after the guard had faced abuse from the girls.

The complainant maintained that the girls were identifiable from the article although their photos had been pixelated. The complaint also said that the article breached Clause 9 (Reporting of Crime), and it was not necessary to include the details of the girls in the story about the security guard’s arrest. The publication argued that the video on which the article was based was posted online three days before their report. It showed the girls being abusive to the staff and customers without having their faces pixelated. It had also already been shared on a Facebook group with a sizeable number of followers.

The Complaints Committee found that no breach had taken place since the publication had pixelated the girls’ faces and had not included any identifying features in the story, so the complaint was not upheld.

Reference: 11890-22 Lynch v kentonline.co.uk
Edwards v gazette-news.co.uk

Clause 1 (Accuracy) complaint upheld over delay in removing user-generated comment

The complainant said gazette-news.co.uk had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) in reporting a court case in which he had been found guilty of assault of a pregnant woman. He said he had denied the assault which he said had been non-contact – he had not admitted the assault as reported. The publication had failed to remove it, so it required a correction under Clause 1. It found that the comment had remained online for two-and-a-half months after being reported to the publication by the complainant. The publication was found in breach of Clause 1, and the remedial action suggested by the Committee was the publication of the corrections proposed by the publication.

Reference: 10769-22 Edwards v gazette-news.co.uk

The Radcliffe School v miltonkeynes.co.uk

Complaint upheld on reporting on a student’s suicide

The Radcliffe School acting on its own and on behalf of parents of two pupils complained that miltonkeynes.co.uk had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock) and Clause 6 (Children) in an article which claimed that a student had taken his own life due to homophobic bullying at his school.

The article quoted the sister of the deceased student who alleged that the school had not done enough to stop the bullying in a social media post. The publication was able to prove that it had accurately covered the story and had contacted the school for comment which was denied. The Complaints Committee did not find the publication in breach of Clause 1 (Accuracy) and Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock).

By contrast, the Committee ruled that including the sister’s social media post in the article without the express consent of the child’s parents was a breach of Clause 6 (Children). The Committee found that the public interest was not enough to override the paramount interest of the child’s welfare. The publication was found in breach of Clause 6 and was required to publish an adjudication.

Reference: 01972-22 The Radcliffe School v miltonkeynes.co.uk

’Satisfactory Remedy’

A faster means to resolving complaints

In most cases, publishers correct significant inaccuracies promptly and with sufficient prominence. In 2022, IPSO implemented a process – under Regulation 40 – to deal with cases in which a publisher has fully addressed a complaint that may raise a possible breach of the Editors’ Code, making it disproportionate for IPSO to raise a full investigation or continue.

This mechanism is designed to raise editorial standards; increase the effectiveness and efficiency of our complaints process; and deliver complaints with a “satisfactory remedy” much sooner than a full investigation would achieve. The application of this mechanism is considered on a case-by-case basis and does not substitute for IPSO’s role as a mediator: in 2022, we mediated the successful resolution of 33 complaints.

In considering “satisfactory remedy”, IPSO weighs up factors that include: the nature of remedial action taken or offered by the publisher; the nature and seriousness of the alleged breach of the Code; the position of the complainant; and the benefits of a fully reasoned decision being made publicly available or the publication of an adjudication, including the public interest.

In 2022, IPSO concluded five complaints through this mechanism. These included:

GRUBB v MIRROR.CO.UK

The mirror.co.uk accepted that it had published inaccurate information about the trajectory of an asteroid. On receiving the complaint, the publication removed the inaccurate information from the article and published a correction. It then offered, during IPSO’s investigation, to publish a further standalone correction on its homepage, which the complainant rejected. IPSO concluded however that the remedial measures offered by the publication were a satisfactory resolution of the complaint.

CAVES v THESTAR.CO.UK

thestar.co.uk accepted that an article had misrepresented the timeline for a government energy grant. The publication removed the article and published a standalone correction within three hours of being notified of the inaccuracy, and one day after the article had been published. IPSO concluded that the remedial measures offered by the publication were a satisfactory resolution of the complaint.

WHAT THE PUBLIC SAY ABOUT IPSO

“I was targeted by a major newspaper’s investigation team for some highly misleading and inaccurate reporting based largely on who I am married to. The unfounded and erroneous reports put me at some significant reputational risk. IPSO provided me with a helpful and effective way to achieve clear redress.”

Michael

“I was pleased IPSO ensured The South Wales Argus was more honest about my arrest re ‘transphobic’ stickers. They were in fact feminist – eg large numbers of women murdered and never mentioned anything with the word trans. Thank you for your help.”

Jenni
IPSO regulates most newspapers, magazines and digital news sites in the UK. We have an important role to play in supporting high quality journalism through our engagement, training and advice for our regulated publishers.

Guidance produced by IPSO is structured around the Editors’ Code of Practice. It focuses on key considerations for each of the relevant clauses, where possible citing useful case studies relating to recent and notable complaints.

It is not intended to replace or supersede the Editors’ Code but to complement it, so that journalists can see evidence of complaints which were both upheld and not upheld. The Standards team published three pieces of guidance for journalists in 2022.

1. **COURT REPORTING**

In March, IPSO’s first piece of guidance on court reporting was published for journalists, following concerns highlighted in IPSO’s monitoring. Consultations with stakeholders including journalists (both national and local), and experts in media law shaped the guidance.

It focuses on Clause 1 (Accuracy), and the importance of accurately reporting significant details of a case, particularly charges, pleas, dates of offences and sentencing. There is a case study to illustrate the importance of taking care when reporting on a press release.

The guidance also covers considerations under Clause 9 (Reporting of Crime) and the need to ensure that relatives or friends of a defendant are not identified or pictured in reports of court proceedings unless they are genuinely relevant to the story.

Some of the most sensitive court cases to report concern sexual offences. The guidance emphasises the importance of protecting the anonymity of victims relating to both Clause 7 (Children in sex cases) and Clause 11 (Victims of sexual assault).
The guidance highlights examples of legislation and signposts resources. It also provides a framework for the consideration of additional matters such as reporting on cases involving young people and covering cases remotely.

2 SOCIAL MEDIA GUIDANCE

IPSO also updated its guidance for journalists on the use of social media – a key tool for gathering news and comments.

The guidance explains some of the ways journalists can comply with Clause 1 (Accuracy), including taking care around non-recent posts and considering how any material will appear in different formats when it is posted. It also explores some of the key Editors’ Code issues around Clause 2 (Privacy) that journalists need to think about and looks at the additional privacy protections afforded to children under Clause 6.

One of the new features of the updated guidance is a section explaining how corrections should be made on social media, using examples from decisions made by IPSO’s Complaints Committee. A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion must be corrected promptly and with due prominence. This applies to posts on publications’ social media platforms, as well as print and online articles.

3 DUE PROMINENCE GUIDANCE

The Standards team revised its guidance on due prominence for print publications in 2022. The guidance explains what is meant by due prominence as well as how IPSO determines the due prominence of a correction or adjudication as part of its findings against a publication. Guidance on due prominence in online publications and social media will be launched in 2023.

Publisher workshops

The Standards team also carried out extensive engagement with publishers and trainee journalists in 2022. During both in-person and online training sessions they provided workshops to local newspaper and magazine titles from Kent to Dundee. Tailored to meet each publication’s requirements, the sessions include details of recent or well-known complaints to illustrate key issues and explain how IPSO’s Complaints Committee makes its decisions. Topics included:

- An introduction to IPSO, its functions and complaints process
- Key clauses including Accuracy, Privacy, Harassment, Intrusion into grief or shock, Reporting on suicide, Children, and Reporting of crime
- IPSO’s pre-publication advice service – free to all IPSO-regulated publications
- Court reporting, particularly issues arising from press releases
- Ways to resolve complaints

In 2022, IPSO carried out training for the following organisations:

- Blog Preston
- DC Thomson
- Iliffe Media
- Maidenhead Advertiser
- National World
- The University of Gloucestershire
- The University of West London

Training provides an opportunity to understand better issues journalists face and potential areas for us to develop guidance. If you are interested in arranging training, email inquiries@ipso.co.uk

WHISTLEBLOWING HOTLINE

Journalists can raise concerns about illegal activity, corruption, dishonesty, or unethical behaviour in confidence with IPSO. Journalists can seek advice at any time by calling in confidence: 0800 032 0243
## Publisher performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLISHER</th>
<th>BREACH</th>
<th>RESOLVED</th>
<th>NO BREACH</th>
<th>NOT PURSUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanction action as offered by publication (full)</td>
<td>Sanction publication of correction (full)</td>
<td>Sanction publication of adjudication (full)</td>
<td>Sanction publication of adjudication (partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Newspapers Ltd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley Chronicle Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnmon Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer Consumer Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylis Community Media C.I.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead News</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Preston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Film Institute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunel University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carn Bren Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Communications Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILEx Journal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen News &amp; Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Matters Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conde Nast Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conde Nast Publications Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Boom Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Thomson Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DnG Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Stair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye to Eye Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham House Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future PLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl Media Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan Star Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey Press Company</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey Press Company</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Publisher performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Sanction action as offered by publication (full)</th>
<th>Sanction action as offered by publication (partial)</th>
<th>Sanction: publication of correction (full)</th>
<th>Sanction: publication of correction (partial)</th>
<th>Sanction: publication of adjudication (full)</th>
<th>Sanction: publication of adjudication (partial)</th>
<th>Satisfactory remedy</th>
<th>IPSO mediation</th>
<th>Directly with publisher</th>
<th>After investigation</th>
<th>During IPSO investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guigon Publishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Bauer Publishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haymarket Media Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads (Congleton) Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearst UK Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald News (UK) Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland News and Media Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holdthefrontpage.co.uk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebuilder Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst Media Company Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Am New Generation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliffe Media Group Ltd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Media Company Ltd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landor LINKS Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fields Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAHUIS UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Bramwell Executive Services Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National World Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationCymru Cyf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Statesman Media Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsquest Media Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nub News Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Evening Chronicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Fox Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Media Group Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Publisher performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>BREACH</th>
<th>RESOLVED</th>
<th>NO BREACH</th>
<th>NOT PURSUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinpoint Scotland Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenham Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Group Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest Media Network</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach PLC</td>
<td>8 5 2 4 1 3 1 12 44 23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycler Publishing &amp; Events Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale Online Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Media</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Publishing Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Spider</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoPublishing</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday World</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Living Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Media Group Ltd</td>
<td>0 1 2 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economy News Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future Shaping Media Company Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawick Paper Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Irish News</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jewish Chronicle</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lady Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Magazine Company Ltd (Hearst UK)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spectator</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Stage Media Company Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wokingham Paper Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindle Newspapers Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Business Development Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivat Direct Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford Wire</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Enterprises Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvex Media Ltd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANCTIONS

- **Sanction:** action as offered by publication (full)
- **Sanction:** action as offered by publication (partial)
- **Sanction:** publication of correction (full)
- **Sanction:** publication of correction (partial)
- **Sanction:** publication of adjudication (full)
- **Sanction:** publication of adjudication (partial)

### RESOLVED

- Satisfactory remedy
- IPSO mediation
- Directly with publisher
- After investigation
- During IPSO investigation

### RESOLVED

- Satisfactory remedy
- IPSO mediation
- Directly with publisher
- After investigation
- During IPSO investigation

### NO BREACH

- After investigation
- During IPSO investigation

### NOT PURSUED

- During IPSO investigation
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The Board

The Board is responsible for the strategic direction and governance of IPSO. Board members advise, challenge and support. They monitor performance. They are responsible for appointing the Complaints Committee, but they do not make decisions on complaints.
Complaints Committee

IPSO’s Complaints Committee rules on potential breaches of the Editors’ Code. It decides what action a publication must take if it has breached the Code. The majority of members have no connection with the industry. Those that do are not currently serving editors.

Lord Edward Faulks
Chairman of the Complaints Committee

As Chair of IPSO since January 2020, Lord Faulks KC also chairs the Complaints Committee. He is a barrister and a former government minister. He sits as a non-affiliated peer in the House of Lords. He was Chairman of the Independent Review of Administrative Law.

Andrew Pettie
Deputy Chair of the Committee

Andrew has worked as a journalist and editor for newspapers, magazines and publishers including the Telegraph Media Group, where he was the Executive Head of Culture, EMAP, the BBC and Encyclopaedia Britannica. He is now the editor of Britannica Magazine. He is a consultant and writer.

Nazir Afzal OBE

Nazir is Chancellor of the University of Manchester. An international expert on extremism and radicalisation, Nazir was chief crown prosecutor for the North-West of England and later chief executive of the Association of Police & Crime Commissioners. He has an OBE for his work with the CPS and involvement with local communities.

Andy Brennan QPM

Andy was a deputy director in the National Crime Agency and prior to this, a senior police officer in the West Yorkshire Police where he held positions as the Head of the Homicide and Major Enquiry Teams and Head of Professional Standards and Counter Corruption Unit. He was awarded the Queen’s Police Medal for services to policing and the public in 2012.

Tristan Davies

Tristan left the Complaints Committee in 2022, having taken up an editorial position at The Independent. He is the former editor of the Independent on Sunday. Executive Editor of The Sunday Times. Deputy Editor of The Mail on Sunday, and Editorial Director of Mail +. He has worked across news features and digital.

David Hutton

David is chair of the IPSO Readers’ Panel and spent 22 years as a senior leader in secondary schools, initially as deputy head and then as head. He represented fellow headteachers on Suffolk’s Schools’ Forum, chaired the Governing Body of a Special School, and was a founder member of the Ipswich Opportunity Area Board. He is a qualified Ofsted Inspector.

Alastair Machray MBE

Alastair is former editor of The Liverpool Echo and editor-in-chief of Trinity Mirror Merseyside, Cheshire and North Wales. He spent 25 years as a daily newspaper editor. He worked in national and regional newsrooms. In 2020, he was awarded an MBE for services to local journalism. He lives on The Wirral and runs a media consulting business.

Helyn Mensah

Helyn is a barrister at 33 Bedford Row. She has broad experience in IP matters and advised well-known domestic and international clients. Helyn sits as a panel member for HS2 and East West Railway discretionary purchase schemes. She was on the Strategic Governance Panel to the English non-household water retail market, chairing its GDPR Committee.

Asmita Naik

Asmita Naik is an independent consultant on international development and human rights following a career at the UN. She is a magistrate and adjudicates for professional regulatory bodies. She co-authored a 2002 landmark report on sexual exploitation by aid workers and has been involved in measures to strengthen oversight of the sector.

Mark Payton

Mark is a journalist with more than 30 years of specialist publishing experience. He was Haymarket Consumer Media’s editorial director for 12 years, and is now a consultant for The Trust Project (a consortium of 250-plus newsrooms around the world working towards greater transparency) and a sports media launch.

Allan Rennie

Allan is visiting lecturer in Media and Culture at the University of Stirling and VC of NHS Forth Valley. Allan edited the Clydebank Post and Daily Record and served as editorial development director of Trinity Mirror Nationals and was MD of Media Scotland. Allan was a member of the Scottish Government’s working group on public interest journalism.

Miranda Winram

Miranda was head of strategy and insight and board member of Forest Enterprise. She chairs the CAEW Probate Committee. She is on the RCVS Investigating Committee and was non-exec member of the Nursing and Midwifery Council’s Fitness to Practice tribunals. She sits on the Lord Chancellor’s Advisory Committee.
# Finance

## IPSO’s financial records for the year 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover</strong></td>
<td>£2,733,498</td>
<td>£2,591,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>(£2,714,242)</td>
<td>(£2,364,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating profit/(loss)</strong></td>
<td>£19,256</td>
<td>£237,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable and similar income</td>
<td>£1,184</td>
<td>£59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit/(loss) before taxation</td>
<td>£20,440</td>
<td>£237,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on profit/(loss)</td>
<td>£14,546</td>
<td>(£45,521)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comprehensive Income</strong></td>
<td>£34,986</td>
<td>£191,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retained earnings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total retained earnings brought forward</td>
<td>£378,562</td>
<td>£186,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comprehensive income</td>
<td>£34,986</td>
<td>£191,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total equity</strong></td>
<td>£413,548</td>
<td>£378,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fixed assets:**

- Intangible assets: £53,760
- Property, plant and equipment: £40,957
- Total: £94,717

**Current assets:**

- Debtors: £182,501
- Cash at bank and in hand: £417,695
- Total: £600,196

**Creditors:**

- Amounts falling due within one year: (£228,943)
- Total: (£355,985)

**Net current assets:**

- £371,253
- £361,915

**Total assets less current liabilities:**

- £465,970
- £420,158

**Creditors:**

- Provisions for liabilities: (£52,422)
- Total: (£41,596)

**Net assets:**

- £413,548
- £378,562

**Capital and reserves:**

- Retained earnings: £413,548
- Reserves: £378,562
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