

MINUTES 2020

The Editors' Code of Practice Committee decided to adopt a flexible approach to meetings during 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions.

The meeting due to be held on **July 7** was replaced by an email consultation. The committee agreed to consider submissions to the triennial public consultation on the Code and to meet again in the autumn.

On **October 13** the Code committee held an online meeting to consider the Editors' Code triennial public consultation.

Present:

Chair: Neil Benson

Ian Carter, The KM Group; Sarah de Gay, independent lay member; Charlotte Dewar, CEO, IPSO; Christine Elliott, independent lay member; Chris Evans, Daily Telegraph; Lord Faulks, Chairman, IPSO; Anna Jeys, Reach Birmingham; Gary Jones, Daily Express; Donald Martin, Newsquest Scotland; Gary Shipton, JPIMedia; Kate Stone, independent lay member; Emma Tucker, Sunday Times; Harriet Wilson, Condé Nast Publications; Ted Young, Metro.

Attending: Jonathan Grun, secretary

Editors' Code triennial public consultation

The committee considered the submissions to the public consultation on the Code and agreed to amend Clause 2 to add mental health to the categories that it protects.

The revised clause – with changes in red – reads:

2. *Privacy

i) Everyone is entitled to respect for ~~his or her~~ their private and family life, home, physical and mental health, and correspondence, including digital communications.

ii) Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. In considering an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy, account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information and the extent to which the material complained about is already in the public domain or will become so.

iii) It is unacceptable to photograph individuals, without their consent, in public or private places where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

The committee concluded that that the revision will improve understanding of the protection that the privacy clause provides for individuals. Mental health was already covered implicitly in the clause, but the amendment makes this explicit and the committee considered that this was a timely reminder of the changing attitudes in society, which the press has helped to drive.

The committee considered that the Code review had helpfully raised awareness and mutual understanding of issues, even if the proposed amendments were not accepted because they would be unduly restrictive.

The submissions had also included suggestions that would be usefully reflected in the advice provided in the new edition of the Editors' Codebook, the handbook to the Code and how it is interpreted by IPSO.

The committee noted that the next edition of the Editors' Codebook would mark the 30th anniversary of the Editors' Code.