

# Minutes of the 58<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Communications Consumer Panel

Tuesday 14 July 2009 at 9.00 hours

Ofcom, Riverside House, 2A Southwark Bridge Road, London, SE1 9HA

Present

## Consumer Panel

Anna Bradley (Chair)  
Fiona Ballantyne  
Louisa Bolch  
Kim Brook  
Colin Browne  
Roger Darlington  
Leen Petré  
Damian Tambini  
Bob Warner

## Apologies

Maureen Edmondson

## In attendance

Alistair Bridge (Principal Adviser)  
David Edwards (Panel Secretary)  
Emily Keaney (Policy Adviser)  
Peter Phillips (Ofcom Board member and Partner, Strategy & Market Developments – item 11)  
Stewart Purvis (Partner, Content & Standards – item 11)  
Dominic Ridley (Policy Adviser)  
Antony Walker (Broadband Stakeholder Group – item 3)  
Ofcom colleagues (items 6, 9 and 11)

### **1. Declaration of members' interests**

1.1 There were no declarations.

### **2. Minutes of the meeting on 9 June 2009 and matters arising**

2.1 Members were asked to forward any comments on the minutes to the Secretary. Any issues of substance would be dealt with by email, or at the next meeting if necessary.

2.2 The majority of outstanding actions from previous meetings were included on the Panel's Forward Plan. The Chair would finalise with the Secretary the record of the discussion with Ofcom Chairman Colette Bowe that took place at the last meeting and forward this on to her. Members noted that Colette Bowe

was scheduled to attend the Panel meeting on 20 January 2010. The note on implications for consumers of Deloitte's work on consumer scenarios, a topic discussed at the June meeting, had been drafted. It would be finalised and copied to members. It was agreed that it was not necessary to revise an earlier paper on how the Panel should work together. Alistair Bridge had exchanged emails with Paul Whiting of PhonepayPlus on the format of a quarterly data set that PhonepayPlus would provide to the Panel – the format was close to being agreed. A response had been submitted to Ofcom's *Access and Inclusion* consultation and published on the Panel website.

AP1 Members to email Secretary comments on the June minutes by 17 July.

AP2 Secretary/Alistair Bridge to audit list of outstanding actions from previous meetings to ensure relevant actions are built into the Panel Forward Plan.

AP3 Damian Tambini to edit of a note on implications for consumers of Deloitte's work on consumer scenarios and Advisory Team to copy final note to members.

AP4 Roger Darlington to update his paper on local next generation access (NGA) initiatives as background to an NGA discussion at the September Panel meeting.

### **3. Digital Britain discussion with Antony Walker**

3.1 Antony Walker, Chief Executive of the Broadband Stakeholder Group (BSG), had been invited to speak about the Digital Britain Final Report. He explained that the BSG was a forum and advisory group funded through government and industry sponsorship, with the Panel a member of its Executive Committee.

3.2 He spoke about the Universal Broadband Commitment of 2Mbps by 2012, articulated in the Report. He felt that although this could be achieved there was some uncertainty around the proposed £200m public funding and the final cost was unclear, some commentators saying that twice as much could be required. Key procurement decisions would be needed to maximise value and ensure the most efficient technology mix. He thought that £200m would probably be sufficient provided that it was procured in a way that ensured the most efficient technology mix and maximised value.

3.3 BSG had recognised that next generation deployment might be confined to urban centres, with rural areas disadvantaged over time. Although open-minded about intervention to address this, it now felt that timing was right but there could be a gap of some years between devising a policy and making it happen. BSG was broadly positive about the Final Report and the strategy/intervention proposed to drive deployment of next generation broadband. In its public response it had argued that the approach was smart and proportionate, limited but sufficient - taking account of the wider economic context and including what appeared to be an effective funding mechanism in the form of a levy, an independent Next Generation Fund to help reach the 'Final

Third' of homes.. Nevertheless, industry reaction to the levy had been mixed and there was some concern about how it would be implemented and the potential for market distortions. The levy would be based on a supplement of 50 pence per month on all fixed copper lines. With monies available from the Next Generation Fund available by 2011, and the prospect of steady revenue streams, there could be activity in rural areas and urban fringes within five years.

3.4 For illustrative purposes Antony Walker used a slide to show the likely setup costs per premise for deployment of fibre to the cabinet, mapped against population. Next generation broadband costs were expected to remain fairly level for the first two thirds of the market, with a business case for deployment. Costs would then climb rapidly for the remainder. Subsidy proposed by the Government could be sufficient to ensure next generation broadband was delivered to 90% of the population. Beyond that, fibre to the cabinet and its cost became disproportionate as a solution. Funds from the levy would be available on a tender basis to any operator and provide a part-subsidy for deployment of next generation broadband to the 'Final Third' of homes – procurement was expected to be complex and its presentation to the market would need to make sense to all players. A 'Final Third Project' would seek to deliver coverage to at least 90% homes and businesses by 2017.

3.5 Antony Walker mentioned a number of local projects and suggested that these and others might benefit from funding. The BSG was launching a year-long project to examine how to make local projects interoperable. Standards would need to be harmonised to allow scaleable solutions. BSG expected that the Independent Networks Co-operative Association (INCA), service providers and technology vendors would be included in debates. Another aspect of BSG's work related to demand and digital participation. The economics of fixed networks meant a high proportion of costs were fixed and higher take-up would mean lower costs per user. An effective promotional campaign could stimulate demand and improve the business case - BSG was learning from community initiatives but there could be a central Digital Britain role.

3.6 Antony Walker referred to mixed reactions from the media and from politicians to the Final Report. There had been a lack of consistency, with some commentators arguing that the proposals were too interventionist while others said that they were inadequate and little response between these extremes. It appeared that the case for next generation broadband was still not understood, nor was there an understanding of what the market could deliver. The levy proposal could become a political target and following the banking crisis there were critical voices about public money being channelled in the direction of communications providers.

3.7 There was brief discussion as follows:

- The 'Final Third' should not be left to be tackled at the end of deployment of next generation broadband. The Panel's view was that there should be

simultaneous deployment to the easy-to-reach and to communities that the market would not reach, which would include some areas without current generation broadband. The Digital Britain Final Report contained the argument for deployment at 'both ends' - the issues would be to turn proposals into actions and whether there was the political will to make this happen.

- The Chair had been a speaker at the 9 July 2009 Westminster eForum event on *Priorities for Digital Britain*. There had been an audience of stakeholders and concerns voiced about implementation issues.
- It would be important to maintain momentum but there were uncertainties about the ministerial lead once Lord Carter stepped down as communications minister and with the prospect of a change of government. But next generation broadband would need to be addressed irrespective of who was in government.
- Reference was made to the positioning of the Panel in relation to Digital Britain. The Panel would need to be clear about which aspects of the Final Report proposals it supported – digital radio upgrade, for example, had met with negative public reactions. The Panel would need to focus on the consumer interest and avoid the politics of debates.

3.8 The Chair drew discussion to a close and confirmed that the Panel shared the BSG's desire to see progress on deployment of next generation broadband. The Digital Britain agenda was huge and sustained Panel engagement would be required. An example of this would be the Chair's keynote address at the Westminster eForum event on *Broadband for all? Access and inclusion and media literacy* on 17 July. BSG was planning a November 2009 conference on the universal service commitment and NGA and keen to work with the Panel in influencing the debate.

AP5 Advisory Team to revisit recent key speeches on broadband by Jeremy Hunt MP and Ed Vaizey MP and copy highlights to Panel members.

AP6 Advisory Team to liaise with BSG on plans for its conference in November.

#### **4. Update on mobile number portability**

4.1 Members had received an information paper to update them on Ofcom's mobile number portability (MNP) policy. The Panel agreed with the paper's recommendations that the Panel respond to Ofcom's planned *Mobile number portability* consultation, due for imminent publication, making a connection with the Panel's earlier response to Ofcom on fixed mis-selling and the call for a single switching process for all communications services. The Panel would then engage with Ofcom to discuss the latter's consumer preference research which would be conducted later in the Summer, look at four possible MNP options and be in anticipation of a second consultation on MNP.

AP7 Dominic Ridley to draft a response to Ofcom's consultation on MNP.

AP8 Panel to discuss with Ofcom the latter's MNP research findings

## **5. Update on behavioural online advertising**

5.1 Members had received a briefing note prepared by the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA), with supporting notes provided by Louisa Bolch. Louisa Bolch is an ASA Council member and was not present for discussion of this item. The Panel might wish to engage with the ASA in its consideration of the rules that should apply to online behavioural advertising. There was a brief discussion.

- Behavioural targeting of advertising was based on information collected on an individual's web-browsing; it meant that users received advertising related to their interests and it generated advertising revenue streams for certain websites.
- There were a number of issues to consider in relation to online advertising: the value for consumers of more personalised information; privacy; the ability to opt out; ethical issues, eg separation from editorial when advertising was not always identifiable; and certain aspects of media literacy.

5.2 It was agreed that dialogue with the ASA would be useful to explain the Panel's role and interest in issues related to online advertising. The United States appeared to be ahead of the UK in this area of regulation and this could be one of the topics for discussion with the ASA.

AP9 Sofia Stureson to set up a meeting between the Chair and the new Chief Executive of the ASA.

AP10 Advisory Team to research the US approach to regulating behavioural advertising.

## **6. Universal broadband commitment and NGA**

6.1 The Panel was joined by Ofcom colleagues for this item. Ofcom had already engaged in some detailed but limited work related to the universal broadband commitment and NGA – to progress further, clarity was required on how the Government would deliver its ambitions in the Digital Britain Final Report, part of which would require legislative changes expected in the Autumn. For the moment there could be discussion about the structure of the Network Design and Procurement Group (NDPG) but no tendering exercise. Ofcom expected to provide advice on issues related to state aid and on competition issues. The procurement process would need to focus on outcomes rather than insist on a particular solution such as upgrade of all cabinets. A number of firms were expected to bid to deliver universal broadband at 2Mbps, whilst bidders to deliver next generation broadband to the 'Final Third' could be fewer in number. There was discussion as follows.

- The under-spend from the Digital Switchover Help Scheme was expected to become available in 2011/12 to help fund the universal broadband commitment, with the amount involved clearer by Spring 2010. Members noted that funding broadband had become caught up in debates about top slicing and the purpose of the BBC licence fee.
- The Panel felt that mechanisms would need to be in place to ensure delivery of universal broadband and it would be important to know where responsibility lay for this – this would make a difference to the Panel's engagement. Although suppliers would need some flexibility about delivery, an Ofcom colleague said that procurement specifications were expected to set a baseline requirement and include an exceptional circumstances test. The Panel would want to understand mechanisms for guaranteeing outcomes for consumers and noted that the Department for Business, Innovations and Skills and the Treasury would have oversight roles.
- The Panel wished to engage with the NDPG and to comment on how Ofcom would interact with that body.
- Issues were raised related to quality criteria, whether service providers would be permitted to discriminate between content providers, and to speed, whether a lower limit would be set but with network providers permitted to vary this depending on the service. This led to a questioning of the purpose of a 2Mbps commitment if providers could vary speed such that consumers were unable to access online public services. It was argued that the 2Mbps commitment should specify a level of service quality but it was noted that the universal broadband commitment was about provision of a basic level of access. An Ofcom colleague said that some services would not require 2Mbps for delivery and so some consumers might not wish to pay for 2Mbps.
- In the Republic of Ireland and following a competitive tendering process a contract to implement and operate a national broadband scheme had already been entered into. It was essentially a wireless scheme and Ofcom had been in contact with colleagues in Ireland.
- Common standards and access obligations would need to be a consideration to ensure inter-working with/between local broadband initiatives and factored into the tendering exercise for the NDPG.

6.2 The Chair drew discussion of this item to a close. It was agreed that the Panel would give further consideration to funding issues related to the universal broadband commitment, to quality criteria and to the desired outcomes for consumers and citizens. The Panel would have views on the specification in the NDPG tendering exercise, including fixed and wireless elements and issues of affordability. It would continue to engage with Ofcom and with the NDPG, once set up.

AP11 Advisory Team to engage with Ofcom on the universal broadband commitment and the specification for the proposed Network Design and Procurement Group arising from Digital Britain (Ofcom offered to provide the

Panel with an Autumn update).

AP12 Advisory team to draft a letter from the Panel Chair to the NDPG Chief executive - once appointed - to ensure engagement.

AP13 Steve Unger to provide Panel members with the url of the Irish National Broadband Scheme.

## **7. Empowerment and digital participation**

7.1 Members had received a discussion paper from Emily Keaney covering the new definition of digital participation from the Digital Britain Final Report; the paper proposed development of a digital participation framework to provide a citizen and consumer perspective; and explained how the framework could be used and developed, the latter including a proposal for a qualitative research exercise. A stand alone Digital Participation Toolkit was another possible output. The paper referred also to issues of trust and security and it was suggested that these could be incorporated as a sub-set of work on the framework. There was discussion as follows.

- It would be useful to include metrics in the framework; to make the point that digital participation was a moving target, ie it was not a 'snapshot' and would change over time; and to explore related research that had already been undertaken.
- As part of the research exercise it would be necessary to obtain participants' agreement to allow the Panel to make use of any related video material.
- An output of the proposed (ethnographic) research could be a video diary - it would have illustrative value and could be used at Panel speaking engagements. Selection of participants could be based on quantitative sampling of representative groups.
- The Panel's empowerment framework diagram had been modified to reflect Digital Britain's focus on digital participation. It was a work in progress and had been discussed with Ofcom's consumer policy team. It would be discussed further with Ofcom colleagues, including the media literacy team, and with the Ofcom Content Board.
- Related issues of trust and security were noted – the Panel's February 2009 research *No one should miss out* had identified the need to ensure data security and privacy. Participants expected individuals to assume some responsibility but had indicated that they would embrace communications fully only if they trusted companies, service providers and government to treat their personal information with care.

7.2 Discussion turned to issues that could be raised with Ofcom later in the meeting. For the Panel, media literacy was a subset of digital participation. There would be the opportunity to discuss Ofcom's thinking on the new definition of digital participation and the way it intended to organise its work on media literacy. For example, in relation to the social marketing programme and the targeted outreach to be delivered by the consortium of stakeholders proposed in the

Digital Britain Final Report. Ofcom had provided a summary comparison table on the consortium and the Digital Inclusion Task Force - a similar exercise comparing digital participation with media literacy would have been useful. Other issues that required clarification were: the funding of Ofcom's work on digital participation, ie whether this would be in addition to the funding that Ofcom received from Government for its work on media literacy; the governance arrangements for the consortium; and its relationship to the Task Force, the former as a delivery body and the latter involved in promotion/lobbying and possibly monitoring work.

7.3 The Chair spoke briefly about the Digital Inclusion Task Force, of which she was a member and which was meeting at the same time as the Panel - the Panel Chair had been unable to attend. The Task Force's initial focus would probably be on getting older people online, including looking at how UK Online Centres work with older people and at a mentoring scheme for older people by young people.

7.4 The Panel agreed with the proposal to develop the digital participation framework and to conduct the ethnographic research proposed, taking into account relevant discussion points and evaluating any existing research and evidence. It was agreed that the Advisory Team and a Panel sub-group would take forward the research, with Fiona Ballantyne to take the lead, other sub-group members being Damian Tambini, Leen Petre, Colin Browne and Kim Brook. The Advisory Team would give consideration to related trust and security issues.

AP14 Emily Keaney to undertake a literature review, looking at research relevant to digital participation.

AP15 Advisory Team and Panel sub-group to take forward the digital participation research proposal and consider inclusion of trust and security elements provided that the literature review showed that such research would be useful.

AP16 Advisory Team to scope out what the planned work on trust and security might involve and after 3/4 months consider whether it is being addressed sufficiently through the Panel's work on digital participation or whether a separate piece of work is needed.

AP17 Chair to provide Panel with feedback on the first meeting of the Digital Inclusion Taskforce.

## **8. Governance**

8.1 Members had received a paper arising from discussions of the Panel's governance sub-group. After brief discussion the Panel decided to leave review of the Consumer Focus memorandum of understanding (MoU) until next year and in line with an action agreed at the previous meeting it was agreed that the Panel's MoU with Ofcom would be reviewed in the Autumn – this was with a view to presenting the Panel with a revised MoU for approval in December. The



review would consider the text of the MoU and the Panel's day-to-day engagement with Ofcom. It was agreed that the timetable to revise and implement the appraisal process - for members, the Chair and the Panel as a whole - would be accelerated. The Panel agreed with the sub-groups' proposals on Panel accessibility, referring to issues including an accessibility statement; the Panel website; publications; and events and meetings. It was further agreed that a Panel-only area be added to the Panel website to provide members with electronic access to Panel meeting papers. RNIB guidance on audiovisual materials would be adopted. It was not expected that training would be a major activity for Panel members but, on request and when places were available, Panel members would be able to attend Ofcom's training courses on topics such as spectrum and telecoms. Other training requests would be given consideration.

AP18 Advisory Team to review timetable for Panel appraisals and aim to bring forward with the process agreed/ready for implementation by October 2009.

AP19 Advisory Team to follow RNIB guidance on making audiovisual materials when commissioning Panel video material.

## **9. Digital Britain and illegal file-sharing**

9.1 Proposals to tackle illegal file-sharing had been raised in the Digital Britain Final Report and members had received two discussion papers related to this topic, one from Ofcom on how the proposals would be taken forward and including a top-level timetable and technical issues. The second from Emily Keaney provided additional context and set out some of the wider policy and consumer issues raised by the proposals.

9.2 Ofcom colleagues joined the meeting, one of whom introduced this item and explained that Ofcom had engaged in debates about copyright infringement in the previous year due to its role in facilitating MOU discussions (by invitation from Government and stakeholders) and had built up an understanding of the issues. There was an aggressive timetable to implement the Digital Britain proposals, the detail of which remained subject to some uncertainty. The Department for Business, Innovation & Skills was consulting on an approach, under which Ofcom would place obligations on internet service providers (ISPs) that included notification of alleged infringers of rights that their conduct may be illegal. Ofcom also expected to have powers to require ISPs to take specified technical measures to deal with repeat infringers. There was discussion as follows.

- Illegal file-sharing was a new policy area for the Panel and it would need to consider its level of engagement, during the legislative process and otherwise.
- Debates about copyright infringement would appear more balanced if 'fair use' was included in the proposed legislation; due process and a proportionate response to alleged infringements were required.
- In designing the right form of due process it would be important to

- consider the financial costs for both rightsholders and ISPs.
- An evidence-base was required to determine the scale of illegal file-sharing and the likely effectiveness of remedies and a graduated approach to sanctions.
- Debates appeared to have been dominated by rightsholders and ISPs. It would be important to ensure that consumer organisations were involved - since consumers would be the target of certain sanctions it was even more important to ensure that their interests were articulated.
- The Panel might wish to consider the balance of rightsholder versus consumer interests and the form of any tribunals. It might also wish to engage with the impact of sanctions, such as denial of access/disconnection or a reduction in bandwidth to the consumer – there could be critical services to be taken into account but a universal service threshold could suggest a cut-off point.

9.3 The Chair drew discussion of this item to a close. The Panel wished to make a positive contribution to debates but to engage with the issues discussed it would also need to consider the resource impact, relative to its current Work Plan. It was noted that Consumer Focus had undertaken work related to issues of 'fair use'.

AP20 Advisory Team to consider whether the Panel should add illegal filesharing to the Panel Work Plan.

## **10. Stocktake on Digital Britain**

10.1 Members had received a discussion paper from Alistair Bridge setting out a provisional Panel response to the Digital Britain Final Report. It reflected comments received from members. The paper included a proposal for a series of four by invitation Panel-hosted policy lunches between September 2009 and March 2010 to discuss key issues emerging from Digital Britain and an annex to highlight the various institutions that will be involved in implementing the Digital Britain report. There was discussion as follows.

- Switch-off of analogue radio had not been addressed in the paper; it was suggested that this issue be included in the Panel's response. It was noted that the case remained to be made that digital radio switchover would benefit consumers. The costs and benefits of switch-off would require consideration.
- In its response the Panel could be more positive about both digital switchover of television, drawing on the Panel's research on interactive services and their benefits, and about the proposal for a next-generation broadband levy, expressing views on how the latter might be applied.
- It was noted that the Consumer Expert Group (CEG) had been asked to report on issues confronting people with disabilities' use of the internet, as it had already done in relation to digital television – Panel member Leen Petré is Chairman of the CEG.

- The paper had highlighted some areas of uncertainty related to delivery of the Government's vision for Digital Britain and that section would be expanded further.
- The Panel welcomed the Government's intention to improve online public service delivery; to that end early involvement of public service providers would be beneficial.
- By raising the issue of ownership of the proposed publicly funded elements of a next-generation broadband network the Panel could help to inform public understanding of the issue.

10.2 The Panel agreed to submit a limited but formal response to the Digital Britain Final Report, giving due credit to the Government's ambitions and proposals, and supported Panel plans to host policy lunches. The Panel expected to have a fuller debate about next-generation broadband at its meeting in September; it could then reach a common position on the Government's proposed 50 pence funding mechanism. There had been criticism of Digital Britain's engagement with consumer and public bodies and the policy lunches could help to facilitate that engagement.

AP21 Alistair Bridge to revise, submit and publish a Panel response to the Digital Britain Final Report (response to be sent to the new minister and other key players).

AP22 Advisory team to take forward plans for policy lunches with the focus on the Panel's work and Digital Britain issues and with the intention of writing up events as Panel publications.

AP23 Leen Petre to provide Alistair Bridge with details of a cost benefit analysis on switch-off of analogue radio.

## 11. Digital participation

11.1 Members had received a discussion paper and supporting annexes from Ofcom. The paper was a working document covering definition of digital participation; the role of the consortium of stakeholders for delivery of a National Plan for Digital Participation; governance; coordination between Ofcom's work on access and inclusion, digital participation and media literacy; membership of the consortium; setting priorities and measuring progress; interdependencies with other initiatives; and issues related to the Panel's response to Ofcom's recent *Access and Inclusion* consultation. Ofcom colleagues, including Peter Phillips and Stewart Purvis, joined the meeting. There was discussion as follows.

- The Panel welcomed the Government's proposals to promote digital participation but had been puzzled by Ofcom's delineation of the relationship between digital participation and media literacy (and access and inclusion) in the discussion paper, ie an overlap but with the assertion that there were discrete areas of media literacy (and access and inclusion) falling outside the remit of digital participation. This seemed to imply that Ofcom would continue to pursue its media literacy agenda as it had done

- so in the past. The Panel's view was that media literacy was an element of the umbrella term digital participation.
- For Ofcom the priority was to assist the Government to achieve a coordinated strategy - Ofcom had duties related to media literacy; the consortium would have a responsibility for digital participation; and the Digital Inclusion Taskforce would promote digital inclusion. Each of these bodies would make decisions about priorities and focus. In respect of its duty to promote media literacy Ofcom would have some continuing responsibilities outside the immediate priorities of the Consortium with a statutory duty to address these. So while conceptually digital participation would include all elements of a person's engagement with digital communication technologies there would need to be some additional focus on areas which will fall out of the immediate proprieties of the consortium (likely to include promoting a better understanding of the nature of content, editorial processes and critical awareness).
  - Whilst the Panel felt that digital participation presented an opportunity to co-ordinate all three areas of activity, an Ofcom colleague agreed that that more thought could be given to a conceptual framework but suggested that it would be more useful to judge success by assessing the impact of the enterprise, getting more households online, the breadth and depth of engagement and the effect on groups economically. The Panel accepted the importance of these outcomes but felt that the right framework was required to achieve them.
  - Ofcom would lead a consortium to deliver digital participation. The Panel felt that decisions about the composition of the consortium would require clarity on the meaning of digital participation. Ofcom would also have to consider how the consortium would work with the devolved Nations, trade bodies, consumer and other interest groups – Ofcom's Advisory Committees for the Nations could be involved. As yet the Panel did not have a view on who should be represented on the consortium.
  - The Panel had touched on the importance of metrics earlier in the meeting, it was suggested that consumer organisations should be given a say in determining metrics and in identifying needs. The Government would be keen to see the formal launch of the consortium in the Autumn and at that point an accountable framework would need to be in place.
  - Careful consideration would need to be given to issues related to the services and content that would drive digital participation, eg attractive and easy to use public services.

11.2 The Chair drew discussion to a close. She confirmed the Panel's view that the task was now to ensure digital participation, which went beyond promoting media literacy. It would be important to have metrics to monitor/assess success. The Panel would have further dialogue with Ofcom about the regulator's work on digital participation, media literacy and access and inclusion.

AP24 Advisory Team to continue to engage with Ofcom over the Summer on issues related to the consortium for digital participation.

**12. Any other business**

12.1 It was agreed that the next Panel meeting date would be brought forward, to take place the day following a joint session with the Ofcom Content Board to discuss digital participation. The Panel had noted that David Cameron MP had made a speech on Conservative policy on regulation which included references to Ofcom. Members noted that shortly the Chair would be meeting with the advisers to Jeremy Hunt MP, Conservative Shadow Culture Secretary.

AP25 Secretary to act on Panel decision to move the next Panel meeting to 8 September.

.....Chairman

.....Date