

Michael Toze:
Dear IPSO,

I would like to provide the following comments to the Code Review.

- The Code states "Editors must maintain in-house procedures to resolve complaints swiftly and, where required to do so, co-operate with IPSO. A publication subject to an adverse adjudication must publish it in full and with due prominence, as required by IPSO" However in practice, inaccurate statements are frequently not corrected until months after they were originally published (particularly problematic if they were made in the context of a time-limited event such as a referendum, election or public consultation) and are not given comparable prominence. I would like this section of the code to incorporate target timescales, and to take a default stance that corrections or adjudications should be given identical prominence to the original claim (i.e. a front page headline should be corrected on the front page).

- Section 12 on discrimination should also cover making prejudicial or pejorative comments about groups of people on the grounds of religion, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, sex, disability etc. I do not see that this precludes reasonable comment on matters of legitimate public policy or public interest, since a reasonable comment on public policy would not be prejudicial or pejorative.

- There should be further thought given to Section 1 (Accuracy) in contexts where the inaccurate claims are likely to promote prejudice, hatred or discrimination against minority populations, misrepresent the law in regard to minority groups, or where inaccurate claims are made regarding specific individuals (e.g. in the case of Danielle Hindley). Inaccuracy in such cases should be seen as particularly egregious, and prioritised for a rapid, highly visible correction. IPSO should proactively make use of its power to issue substantial fines in such cases.

Kind Regards
Michael Toze