



PRODUCERS HANDBOOK

May 2024

ITV PRODUCER'S HANDBOOK

ITV's Editorial and Compliance Policies and Procedures	p4
Introduction	p4
Viewer Trust in ITV	p5
Taking Part in Programmes	p11
Protecting Programme Participants	p16
Children in Programmes	p26
Live Programmes	p33
Interactivity	p37
Covert Filming/Recording	p39
Filming With Police and Emergency Services	p41
Commercial References, Sponsorship and Product Placement	p63
Offensive Language	p69
Internet Material	p73
Charity Related Content	p74
Referral Up	p75
Ofcom Broadcast Code and Guidance	p76
Section 1 - Protecting the Under-Eighteens	
Section 2 - Harm and Offence	
Section 3 – Crime, Disorder, Hatred and Abuse	
Section 4 - Religion	
Section 5 - Due Impartiality and Due Accuracy, and Undue Prominence of Views and Opinions	
Section 6 - Elections and Referendums	
Section 7 - Fairness	
Section 8 - Privacy	
Section 9 - Commercial References in Programmes	

Ofcom On Demand Service Rules

p89

Media Law

p90

Introduction

Defamation

Privacy

Contempt and Reporting Restrictions

Copyright and Fair Dealing

Data Protection

Confidentiality

Industry Codes and Guidance

Ofcom Broadcasting Code (including the Cross-Promotion Code):

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code>

Ofcom Broadcasting Code Guidance:

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/information-for-industry/guidance/programme-guidance>

Phone-paid Services Authority:

<https://psauthority.org.uk/for-business/code-guidance-and-compliance>

ITV'S EDITORIAL AND COMPLIANCE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Welcome to the ITV Producer's Handbook.

ITV is proud to be at the heart of UK culture, connecting millions of viewers every day with content that reflects and helps to shape the world that we live in. Our vision is to be "More than TV", creating and distributing quality content on multiple platforms. As the UK's largest commercial public service broadcaster and producer, we reach mass audiences whenever and however they choose to watch.

Compliance with our legal and regulatory obligations, and our own high editorial standards, is therefore a vital requirement of our integrated broadcasting, production and on-demand businesses. This Handbook sets out the editorial and compliance standards expected by ITV of all the producers (both in-house and independent) that create content for us.

It contains:

- a) Practical guidance on ITV's compliance best practice and procedures;
- b) A summary of the main provisions of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code and the On Demand Programme Service Rules;
- c) A summary of the main areas of law that routinely concern ITV programming.

This Handbook is intended as a quick reference tool – but of course it cannot and will not answer every question that arises during the making of our programmes. ITV's commitment to compliance is reflected in our allocating to every original commission a compliance lawyer or advisor from ITV's highly experienced compliance team, who can provide advice and assistance throughout the production process, and will review the content on delivery before its first transmission or streaming. The content compliance team seeks to offer solutions-based, pragmatic advice which is responsive to ITV's editorial, commercial and operational needs. Often editorial judgments will overlap with compliance judgments, and resolving any challenges should always be a process of constructive collaboration with producers and commissioners.

Compliance at ITV is therefore definitely not about mechanical form filling, box ticking and back covering. ITV expects all of our producers to embrace our creative culture, with compliance embedded in the creative process as a shared responsibility.

Claire Posner
Director of Legal & Content Compliance
March 2024

VIEWER TRUST IN ITV

ITV has a relationship of trust with our viewers. In the era of “fake news” and “post-truth”, it is a key responsibility and a foundation of ITV’s editorial values that our programmes should retain our viewers’ trust. We have a duty not to materially mislead or deliberately deceive them.

ITV places great trust in the integrity and honesty of programme makers, and we expect them to be open with us at all times. We want programme makers to deliver the best programme possible, and the most difficult issues can usually be resolved by collaborative discussion. Openness should be at the heart of the commissioning process, and it is not acceptable to withhold significant information from the ITV commissioner or the compliance team. We will take action against any programme maker or production company found to have knowingly deceived the viewer, or us, and we may decline to work with them again.

The production company must ensure that:

- The production team is adequately staffed and resourced to deal with the demands of the programme – including appropriate training and supervision. Inexperienced team members must be properly managed, especially if they are dealing directly with contributors or other members of the public. Important tasks must be entrusted to people with suitable skills or experience.
- The production team is aware of the importance of compliance and is familiar with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code and these Viewer Trust guidelines.
- The production company has in place effective procedures so that any concerns about viewer trust or other important editorial issues can be referred up quickly within the team to an Executive Producer, and then to ITV.

What are we watching?

Whatever the genre of programme, it should always be clear to viewers what it is they are watching, and truth must not be sacrificed to make programmes more entertaining or impactful.

There are many different ways to tell a story. All TV programmes are constructed to create a narrative, and material is always selected and edited to tell that story in the most effective way. But programme makers must not invent or fake events or present reconstructions as being actual events in any factual content, whatever the genre.

Anyone involved in a production who is concerned that their programme is putting viewer trust at risk should be able to voice those concerns to their Executive Producer and/or to ITV. “It’s always done like that” or “the show didn’t work without it” are not acceptable excuses for a viewer trust issue to be concealed.

Viewer trust issues can arise in many different genres. For example:

Factual & documentary - The source and authenticity of any third-party footage included must be verified.

Reality and Entertainment - formats involving real people living in controlled environments, and competing with each other in performing tasks or displaying talents, will compress many hours of filming into short dramatic sequences. Edited material should reflect fairly how the participants behaved, and why they behaved that way.

“Constructed” Reality - formats may involve real people interacting in their real lives but in directed situations, and then often commenting directly to camera on each other’s behaviour. These formats are now well established with viewers, and although they are highly “produced” rather than simply observational, they will generally not breach viewer trust principles where the genre and the conventions being deployed are sufficiently clear to viewers.

“Factual dramas” - dramas based upon real events and real individuals will usually invent certain events or characters, and change or simplify chronology, in the interests of dramatic effect and narrative clarity. Real life is generally more complex than any drama’s chosen story arc. But factual dramas should still be based upon careful research, and should not distort important facts in a way that is unfair to any identifiable real people being portrayed.

“Deepfake” - Where any programme includes material created by “Deepfake” software, that material should be clearly identified as such to avoid any risk of misleading the audience or creating unfairness to anyone depicted.

Editing

Editing is the basic tool of programme making. Many editing devices are familiar to viewers – the cutaway, the reverse, the fade, the sound overlay – even though they may not always be consciously aware of these narrative techniques.

Editing must not distort or misrepresent facts, comments, reactions or context. It must not give a misleading impression that would lead viewers to a significantly different conclusion about events or the individuals portrayed. This applies to factual entertainment and reality TV as well as traditional documentary.

Interviews must be edited fairly and must not misrepresent the person’s views. An answer to a specific question must not be used to respond to a different question. Producers must consider the significance of what is being left out as well as what is included.

Actuality

If a programme presents footage as being “actuality” ie real events recorded in real time, then the footage should be just that. Faking actuality ie inventing things that did not happen, and presenting them as actual events, is not acceptable whether it is done during filming or in the edit suite. Presenting footage so ambiguously that the viewer will conclude, wrongly, that it is actuality, is not acceptable.

This does not affect standard programme-making conventions. For example, it is ok to ask a contributor to repeat everyday actions for the camera to use as establishers, “wallpaper” shots or illustrative cutaways, or for interviewers to record “noddie” reaction shots or “pick-ups” to cut into an interview sequence during editing. A presenter piece to camera filmed later to clarify the narrative is ok, providing it does not actively mislead viewers as to when it was shot. A reconstruction of events is

acceptable provided it is clear to viewers, either by labelling or editorial context, that is what it is.

In reality and formatted factual entertainment shows, participants are often shown responding to situations or challenges that are created by the programme makers – they will be doing things because we have asked them to. This is not a viewer trust problem when the viewer knows that they are watching something contrived or directed by the producers, or required by the nature of the show format.

But having a programme participant act out or re-enact significant actions and events, and passing this off as actuality, is unacceptable. Provoking or encouraging atypical or “bad” behavior by participants, which wouldn’t have otherwise happened, without showing the audience what provoked that behavior, is unacceptable.

If in doubt, ask yourself: would you be worried if any aspect of the programme’s making was revealed in public and in the press? If there is something that would be uncomfortable to have to defend or explain, then query whether it should be included at all.

Chronology and compression of time

Chronology – factual programmes and factual dramas sometimes need to simplify the chronology of events for narrative clarity, which is usually unproblematic. In a factual programme it may also sometimes be reasonable to portray a slightly different order of events to that of the strict chronology of filming, perhaps to tell a story more clearly, where to do so makes no material difference to the overall meaning for viewers.

Compression of time – devices like the fade or wipe are common means of signalling the passage of time. But if the programme’s narrative or format depends on the importance of a particular time scale, then care is needed to avoid the audience being misled. Likewise, if time shifts are significant to the story but are not obvious to the viewer in the programme, the actual chronology should be shared with the commissioners and compliance to consider.

Interactivity

In all programmes involving viewer interactivity, it is essential that when decisions are placed in the hands of the viewer (eg in a viewer vote, or when they are invited to take part in a competition), then we ensure there is a robust and verifiable process that delivers the outcome fairly, and which is not distorted by editorial preferences. All programmes with interactive elements are subject to ITV’s Interactive Guidelines, and these elements will be overseen by ITV Interactive and compliance staff.

Hoaxes

There will always be people who want to fool us. They may provide faked footage, or try to become show participants with the intention of gaining celebrity or notoriety, or simply to embarrass us.

So we cannot always take what people tell us at face value. If what they say sounds too good to be true, it probably is. Producers must make careful checks to ensure that people are who they say they are, and have done what they claim to have done.

Any serious doubts about participants or acquired third party footage should be referred to the Executive Producer and discussed with the commissioner and compliance before a decision is taken to include the individual or footage.

Covert recording, Deception and Set-ups

ITV treats covert recording very seriously, and never undertakes it lightly or without careful consideration. I

There must be a public interest to justify secret filming or deception in the production of news, current affairs or factual programmes, and its use must be proportionate to that public interest. Likewise the use of deception must only be employed when evidential material could not have reasonably been obtained through other means, and it must be proportionate in all the circumstances.

Covert recording for investigative purposes usually involves some breach of privacy, and is usually broadcast without the consent of those filmed. It therefore should only be carried out when it is warranted, such as where it is necessary and likely to provide evidence for a story in the public interest, and that this public interest outweighs privacy considerations.

Approval for any sort of deception and for covert filming is required from the Director of Legal & Content Compliance (or an authorised alternate) at two stages: the decision whether to record covertly at all, and then the decision whether to include the material in the programme. The same approval is required for the use of acquired third-party covert recordings, which again generally should reveal matters of public interest.

In contrast to investigative filming, British TV also has a long history of carrying out secret camera “set ups” on members of the public and celebrities purely for entertainment purposes. In such “set up” or “wind-up” situations it would often defeat the exercise to seek to obtain consent of the subject prior to filming. Since there is unlikely to be any public interest in such filming, consent therefore needs to be obtained from the individual concerned after the filming and prior to broadcast. If an individual is not identifiable in the footage or is purely incidental to what is being filmed, it may be possible to broadcast the item without their consent, but compliance advice should always be taken.

Due Accuracy

Programmes should not get factual information wrong, either deliberately or by poor research.

Respect for due factual accuracy is essential. Due means adequate or appropriate to the nature and subject matter of the programme. We should never be economical with the truth simply to make a show more entertaining or convincing.

Stated facts and figures must therefore be checked, and producers must be able to provide credible sources for them. They should not always rely on statements made simply because an interviewee, even an “expert”, has made them. It may make for a good soundbite, but is it right? If assertions of fact are not capable of corroboration, and/or fly in the face of other known evidence, this should be flagged and discussed fully at the offline stage with commissioners and compliance.

Fact checking is also important when criticism of a third party is involved. It may not be enough simply to give the third party an opportunity to reply, especially if the criticism itself is being made on the basis of factual claims that are demonstrably wrong, or anonymous.

Crime and anti-social behaviour

Filming crimes, or people talking about crimes, raises issues of ITV's social responsibility as well as Ofcom Broadcasting Code issues, and always requires advice. Someone admitting to carrying out a criminal act may be investigated and prosecuted after transmission. A police inquiry may involve a production team being identified, questioned, and possibly even required to give evidence in court. Footage, including all relevant rushes, can be ordered by the court to be handed over to the police. Everyone involved – including the individual filmed – has to be aware of these potential consequences at the outset. All decisions and rules of engagement must be well documented.

ITV will not broadcast material that would incite or encourage crime or lead to disorder, or condone criminal behaviour. We will not demonstrate detailed criminal techniques, such as how to make a bomb or steal a car. There must always be a careful distinction drawn between observation and participation. Producers must never provoke or encourage criminal actions that would not otherwise have occurred. No production team member should be put at unnecessary risk of harm when dealing with criminals.

It is generally not permitted to make a payment to a criminal to talk about their crimes; advice must be taken before any such payment is agreed or made.

If a producer may potentially commit a criminal offence for the purpose of an ITV programme (for example in the course of an investigation in the public interest, such as the purchase of drugs or the obtaining of confidential information) they must have the prior agreement of the commissioner and a senior compliance lawyer. Similarly, if producers intend to visit illicit destinations for the purposes of programme research (whether online or in the real world), they should seek prior agreement from commissioner and compliance.

Taking compliance and legal advice

Compliance at ITV is not a box-ticking process. It is a responsibility shared between programme makers, commissioners, and compliance and legal advisors.

Our ITV compliance advisors and lawyers are committed to help the programme makers that ITV has commissioned deliver the editorial goals of that commission, and can offer advice and support from the earliest stages of a programme's production. They take the lead in defending our programmes after broadcast if subject to viewer complaints, Ofcom investigation, or litigation.

But no one working in the legal and compliance team is a mind reader, or a lie detector. They can only help to resolve an issue if they are told about it. So if in any doubt, seek advice from the compliance advisor or lawyer working with the relevant production team.

ITV legal, compliance and editorial standards advice must never be simply ignored by programme makers, but it can always be discussed, and creative compromises can usually be reached. Independent production companies can always take their

own advice if they wish, but ultimately legal and compliance decisions about ITV programmes will be taken by ITV, not by the individual producer or production company (or by their own compliance/legal advisors). Very occasionally a programme maker may feel unwilling to accept ITV compliance advice or to find a compromise. In those circumstances, ITV has a clear process of referral up, through its respective commissioning and compliance chains of command.

March 2024

TAKING PART IN PROGRAMMES

People take part in TV in many different ways. They could be the central subject of a one-off documentary, or one of many contestants in long running reality, game or talent shows. They might give a lengthy formal interview, or a short impromptu “voxpath” filmed in the street. Certain basic editorial principles should be applied to all contributions, which reflect the requirements of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code. These include:

- 1) Fairness – we expect our producers to treat all our contributors fairly.
- 2) Informed consent – when someone is invited to take part in any programme, they should be told the nature of the show, their likely contribution to it, and (in most cases) any potential risks in taking part.
- 3) Changes – if a programme changes significantly in editorial terms between the time they were filmed and before broadcast, it may be necessary to tell them that, to ensure their consent is still properly informed.
- 4) Promises – if producers make promises to contributors to secure their consent to take part (eg anonymity), they should keep them. They should not make promises that cannot be kept.
- 5) Welfare – producers must take due care regarding the welfare of the participant. The steps taken will vary, depending on who the participant is and what the show requires of them; “due care” will be proportionate to the risks involved. The highest degree of care is required when dealing with participants under the age of eighteen. See more detail in the Handbook chapters on children and protecting participants.

Background Checks

Every programme will have different requirements for assessing the suitability of participants and making inquiries about their background. The information that is collected about individuals during that assessment should always be proportionate. A reality show like *Love Island* will need to know much more about the background of participants prior to filming than a daytime quiz show like *The Chase*, in order to properly assess risks to their welfare.

Contestants in non-scripted entertainment shows (such as reality shows, talent shows, dating shows, etc) will inevitably come under close scrutiny from the press and social media. It is important that participants are made aware of this, and likewise that ITV is made aware of anything that might bring the show into disrepute, or might constitute any risk to other participants.

Possession of a criminal record does not of itself mean that people cannot or should not take part in ITV programmes. There are however some circumstances where ITV may take the view that serious previous offences make that person unsuitable to take part.

The extent of the background checks necessary for each production should be agreed in advance between the producers and commissioners. Factors such as the size of the potential applicant pool, the production’s budget and timescale, and the

auditioning process are practical issues to consider. Not all programmes will automatically require criminal records to be checked for all participants.

A senior member of the production team should have responsibility for oversight of the application process, and for ensuring any relevant information regarding prior convictions is conveyed to commissioners prior to confirmation of casting. Background checks mean more than simply past criminal convictions. The production team should use online search tools to confirm the identity and details provided by applicants. Any risks flagged up by searches on potential contributors should be assessed by the producers and discussed with commissioners and compliance. All data obtained throughout this process should be processed in accordance with DPA 2018 and GDPR.

ITV treats very seriously anyone deliberately giving untrue, misleading or incomplete information during their application for our programmes. If at any stage a participant is found to have misled producers, this should be notified to ITV, and they may be withdrawn from the show, or the episode(s) in which they appear may be withdrawn from broadcast. The contestant rules in any reality, game or quiz show should provide for this and for potential forfeiture of any prize won.

Conduct & Inappropriate Behaviour

All participants should be briefed by the production team before the start of the series on the particular rules of the show and what is expected from them during their participation in the series. In fixed rig programmes all participants should be briefed on the location of cameras, and that the production team has an obligation to consider any inappropriate behaviour that is captured on camera, whether or not it is actually broadcast.

Participants may be asked to leave the show if they display inappropriate behaviour that, in the opinion of the producers, might be harmful or distressing to other participants, or might bring the programme into disrepute (for example by causing viewer offence).

Such behaviour may include:

- Bullying or aggressive behaviour or language towards participants or production staff;
- Assault (including any non-consensual touching);
- Use of racist, sexist, homophobic or other discriminatory or offensive language, especially if directed towards other participants;
- Consumption of non-prescribed or illegal drugs;
- Any behaviour which in the opinion of the producers is inappropriate or may be distressing to other participants, eg romantic or sexual advances which are not desired or returned by the subject, or might cause them distress;
- Any other behaviour deemed by the producers to be inappropriate in the circumstances.

Drugs and other Criminal Activities

Participants invited to talk about drug taking, or to unburden themselves about past drug taking or any other criminal activities, should be reminded that making admissions about their past criminal behaviour might have serious repercussions for them after broadcast, and that this would be outside ITV's control.

Libel, Privacy and Fairness

There may be occasions when participants will talk about other people who are not taking part in the programme. The production team must be alert to whether such material could infringe the privacy of others, could be unfair to them, or could be defamatory of them, and take compliance advice accordingly (see the Media Law sections of the Handbook).

Fairness, accuracy and defamation are closely linked. If content is inaccurate, it is more likely to also be unfair to people featured or referred to. If inaccurate content is unfair to someone, it may also damage their reputation.

Programme makers should also consider who the programme is likely to affect, not just those taking part or being referred to, when considering who should be notified about the programme or consulted prior to broadcast.

Consent

Generally we include people in our programmes with their informed consent. Only in certain situations will consent not be required.

A signed release form or on-camera recording of consent is always desirable, and such consent must be “informed” ie the contributor must be given the information necessary for them to make an informed decision. The amount of information given will depend on the nature of the programme, and the contribution itself. Informed consent is likely to be achieved where contributors know:

- the nature and purpose of the programme eg format and subject matter;
- what kind of contribution they are expected to make, and if it will be edited;
- for interviews, the areas of questioning likely to be covered and the nature of other potential contributions;
- any significant changes to the programme as it develops which might affect their consent;
- their contractual rights and obligations and those of the programme maker;
- whether they will be offered a preview and will be able to make any changes;
- when the programme is expected to be broadcast (or made available on-demand);
- the potential risks of taking part which may affect their welfare and and steps the broadcaster/programme maker intends to take to mitigate them.

One common change that could affect informed consent is a change in programme title. Use of the term “working title” at the time of filming is common, but this means participants need to be informed once the actual title is confirmed.

Promises given to contributors should be honoured unless (exceptionally) it is in the public interest to do otherwise (in which case please always seek compliance advice).

If contributors tell producers prior to broadcast that they wish to withdraw their consent to take part, or wish to be edited out of a programme, this should always be discussed urgently with ITV commissioners and compliance. Producers should never withhold this information on the assumption that once consent is given it cannot be revoked. It will be necessary to seek legal advice in light of any stated revocation of contributor consent.

Consent for Children and Vulnerable Adults

If a contributor is under 16 years of age the producer should make sure that the child freely assents to take part, as well as securing the consent of a parent or other person with parental responsibility for the child. If the child or young person is a ward of court, or is involved with social services or in local authority care, then please seek compliance advice.

Likewise, if a contributor is over the age of 16 but does not have the mental capacity to provide informed consent, please seek compliance advice.

Evidence of Consent

Ideally, and particularly where their contribution is significant, producers should obtain from participants a signed release/consent form. This often includes other details of the formal contractual position between producers and contributor (eg ownership of copyright in their contribution etc).

A signed form is desirable, but does not necessarily mean that a person cannot be included without one, if they have in fact been properly informed and have consented by actively taking part in filming in circumstances where they knew the producer was relying on their consent. Examples might include being filmed in a studio, or being filmed knowingly over time on a number of occasions. The signature on a form does not constitute the informed consent itself – it is simply evidence of it, and therefore helpful in any later dispute over consent.

Where it is not possible or practicable to obtain a signed release form at time of filming, informed consent should be recorded “on camera”. Care should be taken to log such consent and keep the relevant rushes.

Entertainment set-ups

There is a long tradition of covert filming for the purposes of entertainment from *Candid Camera* to the present day. In such “set up” or “wind-up” situations it would often defeat the exercise to seek to obtain consent of the subject prior to filming. Unlike investigative covert filming, there is unlikely to be any overriding public interest in such filming. It therefore needs to be carefully considered and planned, to ensure it is unlikely to cause significant annoyance, distress or embarrassment to those involved, and to minimize the risk of incidental breaches of privacy of individuals who are not the main “target” of the set up.

The consent of the subject of the filming needs to be obtained after filming, before any of the footage can be included in the programme. If an individual is not identifiable in the programme or is purely incidental to what is being filmed, it may be possible to broadcast the item without their consent, but compliance advice should always be taken. Proposed set ups for entertainment purposes should be discussed with the relevant Commissioner and Head of Compliance before such filming takes place.

Anonymity

When offering “anonymity”, the programme maker and contributor should agree what level of anonymity they are setting out to achieve, and the methods used to achieve it. It is important that the contributor understands it is very difficult to achieve total

anonymity and still be shown on camera, and there is a difference between not being identified and not being identifiable. Participants may not understand that blurring or darkening their face, or being filmed with their back to camera, may still leave them identifiable to their families and others who know them well. The onus is on the producer to confirm the level of anonymity that the contributor is expecting, and then ensure that these expectations are met by the filming techniques used.

If total anonymity is required, producers need to consider more than just physical characteristics like face and voice. A contributor may still be identifiable to some people by what they say, or what is said about them. Different pieces of information together can create “jigsaw” identification. Identifying people as victims of sexual offences is particularly serious, and will be unlawful unless they have specifically consented in writing to be identified.

Editorial control

When dealing with contributors, programme makers should make clear that final editorial control will rest with the broadcaster ITV. Offers to show a contributor the programme before broadcast (for example to ensure factual accuracy) should not be made without the prior agreement of ITV.

Participant Experience

Television is an unfamiliar world for most people taking part for the first time. In order to give them a clear understanding about the programme-making process, and to ensure they can give fully informed consent, it is recommended that all productions who are casting members of the public should create a Participant Experience document to be provided to participants before filming commences. There is no single template for these documents, and more guidance on preparing them is available at:

<https://www.itv.com/commissioning/articles/production-risk>

March 2024

PROTECTING PROGRAMME PARTICIPANTS

Background

The diversity of content commissioned and broadcast by ITV is constantly evolving. Much of that content involves members of the public taking part in programmes in a variety of genres, formats and situations. ITV has always prided itself as “the heart of popular culture”, where the lives of ordinary people are fully represented, and it is vital that non-celebrities as well as celebrities and professional performers should be able to appear in our programmes. Television remains a central communication medium in our culture, and must properly reflect our modern society and all of its diversity.

Our programmes are enjoyed by millions of viewers, and we have the creative freedom to make the programmes we want. Likewise, people should be able to express themselves or follow their own ambitions by taking part in these programmes if they want to. However, as programmes involving the public have evolved, so have the pressures on those who enter the public eye through appearing in them; from wider media interest, and in particular from the intensity of social media interest.

Whilst the practical detailed processes required to manage participant welfare in each programme must sit with producers to design themselves, ITV as a broadcaster and commissioner of content provides guidance on what we consider to be best practice: in the selection of participants before filming, in supporting them during filming, and in continued support up to and after the broadcast of the programme.

The Ofcom Broadcasting Code

Ofcom consulted on proposed changes to the Broadcasting Code and its related Guidance on protecting participants in programmes during 2019-2020, and these changes came into force from 5 April 2021. The main new Code provisions are set out below. Central to these is the requirement to conduct a risk assessment to identify risk of significant harm to contributors, and to provide a level of care proportionate to the level of risk. ITV expects commissioned producers to be familiar with these new provisions, and our guidance is designed to assist them in making these risk assessments.

Section 7 - Fairness - there are two new "practices to be followed" -

1) Providing information to participants – the Code has always required that participants are told about the nature of the programme when they are invited to take part in it, in order that their consent to take part is informed consent; the new provision states that they should also normally *"be informed about the potential risks arising from their participation in the programme which may affect their welfare (insofar as these can be reasonably anticipated at the time) and any steps the broadcaster and/or programme maker intends to take to mitigate these"*. Many producers will already routinely give this sort of information to participants. There may be exceptions to providing such information if justified in the public interest (for example in news or investigative current affairs programmes).

2) Due care over welfare - broadcasters should take *"due care over the welfare of a contributor who might be at risk of significant harm as a result of taking part in a programme, except where the subject matter is trivial or their participation minor"*. A

risk assessment to identify “any risk of significant harm” should be conducted “... unless it is justified in the public interest not to do so” (for example in relation to news and some current affairs programming). The level of care due will be proportionate to the level of risk. Risk of significant harm might arise for reasons including (but not limited to):

- *They are considered a vulnerable person;*
- *They are not used to being in the public eye;*
- *The programme involves being filmed in an artificial or constructed environment;*
- *The programme is likely to attract a high level of press, media and social media interest;*
- *Key editorial elements include potential conflict, emotionally challenging situations, or requires them to discuss, reveal or engage with sensitive, life changing or private aspects of their lives.*

Again, such risk assessments are already standard practice for many producers.

Section 1 – welfare of participants under 18 - there are some drafting changes to the Rules protecting younger participants, as follows:

Rule 1.28 – Due care must be taken over the welfare and dignity of people under eighteen who take part in or are otherwise involved in programmes. This is irrespective of any consent given by the participant or by a parent, guardian or other person... in loco parentis.

Rule 1.29 – People under eighteen must not be caused unjustified distress or anxiety by their involvement in programmes or by the broadcast of these programmes.

Section 2 - Harm and Offence - Ofcom has also revised Rule 2.3, which concerns causing viewer offence, that must be justified by the context. Participants displaying distress or anxiety in a programme may cause offence to viewers, for example if it is not sufficiently clear to viewers that participants are being properly supported by the programme. The traditional list of types of material that may cause offence (such as language, sex, violence etc) now also includes: “... *treatment of people who appear to be put at risk of significant harm as a result of their participation in a programme. Appropriate information should also be broadcast where it would assist in avoiding or minimising offence*”.

Mental health awareness

ITV’s focus on the mental health of our programme participants is not new; many long running ITV series have had processes in place for many years to assess and support participants’ mental health throughout production. But society is now more concerned and better informed about mental health issues, and about the increasing challenges to mental health that cultural developments such as social media have created, especially for younger people. The television industry is therefore now more focused on the mental as well as the physical health and safety of people who take part in our programmes.

ITV recognises its responsibility for both in-house and independent producers to have in place appropriate procedures to identify risks to participants’ mental health and welfare, and to take steps to properly mitigate those risks; to seek appropriate expert advice where necessary when casting or selecting participants, and in

supporting them whilst taking part in our programmes; and to consider appropriate aftercare, especially if the format of the programme involves participants in challenging situations, or may involve conflict, competition, or other activities with potential psychological impacts.

Informed consent

A central foundation of television programme making and its regulation is the informed consent of participants deciding to take part. Depending on the type of participation, that informed consent may now include being properly informed about potential downsides of taking part, as well as the benefits. Television can provide people with a platform and opportunities to transform their lives (and that of others) for the good. Indeed, many thousands of people apply to take part in ITV programmes every year with these potential positive benefits in mind. It is part of our mission as a broadcaster and programme maker to enable people to have these experiences, whilst ensuring that we properly inform them and manage their expectations, and prepare them for possible negative aspects of sudden fame.

What has changed and intensified in recent years has been the ever-increasing negative, hostile and even hateful comment directly from the public, via the echo chamber of social media. Participants in higher profile programmes therefore need to be made aware that (for example) appearing on TV might lead to intrusive scrutiny of their past lives or their social media history, or that people who know them may provide stories about them (true or otherwise) to the press, or on social media.

ITV's commitment and expectations

Broadcasters and producers both have responsibilities as a matter of general health and safety law towards participants. ITV is committed to having in place in all commissioned programmes suitable processes to protect the mental health and welfare of programme participants, so far as reasonably practicable. These processes must be proportionate to the likely risks, given the programme format and the individuals concerned, and considered at the point of commission.

We therefore expect all producers of our commissioned programmes to have in place appropriate and proportionate procedures to look after the mental health of programme participants as well as their physical safety, so far as reasonably practicable. ITV will seek confirmation from our producers, as part of the commissioning and compliance process, that they have performed an appropriate risk assessment, and have appropriate procedures in place throughout the pre-production, production, and post-production stages.

Producers should consider both the potential impact on participants' welfare of taking part in the programme and the potential impact of the broadcast of the programme. We should consider each participant as an individual; some may have vulnerabilities prior to the programme, some may encounter situations during the making of the programme that might make them more vulnerable.

Risk assessment of participant welfare

This guidance sets out what we (and Ofcom) consider to be examples of best practice in assessing and managing welfare risks to participants. All commissioned producers should of course develop their own processes reflecting best practice and suitable to their particular production and its participants. ITV considers it helpful in medium and higher risk programmes for these processes to be in written form, for

production staff to refer to during production, and where possible records should be retained of support offered and provided. Specialist expert advice may be required at different stages by producers, or to provide independent support directly to participants.

A. Identifying potential risks

The following general factors should be considered during the development of each production and its participant welfare procedures:

Control:

- Are participants being filmed observationally, or directed in staged or “constructed reality” situations?
- Is the participants’ environment being created or largely controlled by production teams, with continuous filming?

Format:

- Will key editorial elements include potential confrontation and conflict, emotionally challenging situations, or disclosure of private or sensitive aspects of their lives?

Profile:

- Are high levels of press/media interest and social media interest in the show and its participants anticipated?

Location/Duration:

- Are participants required to be away from home during filming?
- Will participants not have contact with their usual support network (family or friends) during filming?
- How long are participants required to be separated from their normal lives?

Residence:

- Are participants required to share accommodation for a period of time?
- Do the arrangements include living in close proximity to others? Could they potentially impact on mental health, for example if they impact on participants’ usual sleeping habits?

Type of participant:

- Are participants not used to being in the public eye?
- Are participants considered more likely to be vulnerable, due to disclosed vulnerabilities, or due to the format of the programme involving potential confrontation and conflict, emotionally challenging situations, or disclosure of private or sensitive aspects of their lives?
- Do elements of the programme engage with particular vulnerabilities of any participants?

B. Assessing potential risks

Having considered the factors above, an evaluation of ‘lower’, ‘medium’ or ‘higher’ may be applied by the production team to these risk factors on a programme.

The following table provides guidance by way of illustration of factors producers may consider to be categorised as lower, medium and higher risk in assessing the production overall. This list is not exhaustive.

	Lower	Medium	Higher
Control	Documentary portrayal of a real situation (ie largely observational and unstaged).	Directed or “produced” scenarios or discussions.	Artificial environment (eg location or activity). Producers have near total control of the environment and activities of the participants.
Format	Generally does not include emotionally challenging situations.	May include some emotionally challenging situations or increased anxiety, but these are not central to the format.	Key editorial elements or devices include potential confrontation, emotionally challenging situations, increased anxiety, or disclosure of private or sensitive aspects of participants’ lives.
Profile	Relatively low degree of media interest/social media interest in the programme and individuals in the programme is anticipated.	Some media interest/ social media interest in the programme and individuals in the programme is anticipated.	High level of media interest/social media interest in the programme and individuals in the programme is anticipated.
Location and duration	No need for participants to travel far from home or be filmed for long periods. Filming normal day to day activities of participants.	Participants are required to be away from home, although not in a remote location. Participants able to maintain contact with usual support network.	Participants required to be far away from home, in a potentially “alien” environment. No contact with their usual support network during filming.
Residence	Time away from home is short and not significant (eg a few hours in a studio, or overnight	Filming for a short period away from home. Accommodation is shared, but by a small	24/7 shared accommodation for a sustained period of time. Accommodation could

Participants	in a hotel).	number of people, or people who already know each other.	have a potential impact on participants' sleep.
	<p>Participants are celebrities.</p> <p>Participants already have a public image or a large following on social media.</p> <p>Participants have access to personal management, advice and representation before, during and after the production.</p>	<p>Participants are not used to being widely known in the public eye.</p> <p>Participants may have or used to have some public profile, and are seeking to increase or revive that profile.</p> <p>Participants have disclosed, or are suspected to be, pre-disposed to poor mental health, although currently displaying good mental health.</p>	<p>Participants are not used to being in the public eye.</p> <p>Participants have disclosed recent or current mental health issues.</p> <p>Participants are considered to be vulnerable due to personal circumstances or experiences.</p> <p>Specific elements of a production engage with particular vulnerabilities of participants.</p>

C. Managing the risks

Having identified risks, producers should then consider what measures can reduce those risks (so far as they are reasonably able). Where productions have medium or higher risk elements, producers should discuss participant protection processes with the ITV compliance lawyer or advisor allocated to their programme and their ITV commissioner. The production may require expert psychological advice and support.

Significant risks (those identified as medium or higher) should be recorded, along with the processes in place to manage them. These productions should therefore have a written risk management plan with processes/protocols for protecting the welfare and mental health of programme participants. ITV will require producers to provide written details of their risk management plan and processes, prior to the casting of participants, to ITV compliance and commissioners. Risk management plans and processes will be shared with ITV's risk management team in relation to medium or higher risks. Regular reporting of risk in programmes and the control measures introduced is a key element of risk reporting within ITV.

If the proposed measures are not agreed to be sufficient to mitigate any medium or higher risks, ITV and the producers may need to consider and agree changes to the content, programme set up, casting or format, etc.

The Appendix below provides guidance on the steps that ITV suggests producers should consider, depending on whether the risks identified are lower, medium or higher.

D. Review

Participant risk factors may change in an established programme or series over time, as a result of new features and the evolution of the content, the type of participants that apply, and changes in viewer attitudes.

Participant welfare processes should therefore be reviewed periodically, and in particular when there is a change in the programme set up or format. In the event a returning/re-commissioned programme contains potentially medium or higher risk elements, this review could be annual, or undertaken prior to pre-production/casting.

Further help and guidance for Producers

This guidance is part of ITV's wider risk management framework and health and safety management system, which underpins ITV's Duty of Care Charter.

ITV's compliance team (compliance@itv.com) and the Risk/DOC team (care@itv.com) can provide advice and support to all ITV commissioned productions. For example, they can advise producers on the experience, expertise and qualifications that are desirable for independent expert psychological advisors supporting a production.

Appendix

Lower risk programmes

Producers should consider the following:

Pre-production and casting

- obtain informed consent from participants;
- provide information about the nature and purpose of the programme and their contribution, and potential risks of taking part;
- seek to identify health issues and/or vulnerabilities which might influence ability to give informed consent or to take part, and consider reasonable adjustments, where relevant.

During Filming

- monitor for signs of stress, anxiety or other mental health issues, and act on concerns;
- advise ITV's compliance team and/or central risk team if concerns arise;
- ensure any adjustments identified during casting are in place, and monitored.

Aftercare

- provide participants with a production contact (who will not become unavailable once the production team has dispersed after filming), and a backup contact;
- make clear to participants they can seek advice or support for an appropriate period after broadcast;
- provide advice on handling potential hostile social media comment post-broadcast, if relevant.

Medium risk programmes

Producers should consider the following:

Pre-production and casting

- obtain informed consent from participants;
- provide information about the nature and purpose of the programme and their contribution, and potential risks of taking part;
- seek disclosure of mental or physical health conditions that may be relevant, for example via a health and background questionnaire;
- seek to identify any vulnerabilities which might influence ability to give informed consent, or to take part, and consider reasonable adjustments;
- where mental health issues or other vulnerabilities are identified, refer the assessment of the participant's suitability to an expert psychological advisor.

During Filming

- monitor for signs of stress or other mental health issues, and act on any concerns; this might be achieved by having trained mental health first aiders in the production team, to identify significant changes in behaviour;

- have a single point of contact for participants, and have expert psychological support available and on call during filming (eg by phone);
- seek advice from the expert psychological advisor, and/or ITV's compliance team and/or central risk team, if concerns arise;
- ensure any adjustments identified during casting are in place, and monitored.

Aftercare

- provide participants with a production contact (who will not become unavailable once the production team has dispersed after filming), and a backup contact;
- make clear to participants they can seek advice or support for an appropriate period after broadcast;
- provide advice on potential hostile social media comment post-broadcast, and adjusting to life outside production;
- contact participants immediately before transmission to ask about their post-filming experiences, and after broadcast to check on their wellbeing; this could be achieved by a formal "debrief" with the production team, and/or the expert psychological advisor.

Higher risk programmes

In addition to the medium risk steps above, producers should also consider:

Pre-production and casting

- discuss with potential participants the potential risks of taking part, including potential downsides of participation – for example press intrusion, social media negative comment and "trolling", people they know giving stories to the press about them, examination of their past social media history, etc; record the outcome of these discussions and steps intended to mitigate these risks;
- encourage participants to discuss with their families/ friends/ personal support network before making any final decision to participate;
- give participants appropriate time to consider before committing to take part;
- assessment of suitability of all participants by relevant appropriately qualified experts;
- have a single production point of contact for participants from casting to aftercare.

During filming

- have expert psychological advice accessible 24/7;
- have dedicated individuals (eg a Welfare Producer or team) overseeing the physical and psychological health of participants (including monitoring their sleeping, eating etc);
- consider the programme narrative and whether it is likely to generate negative media or social media comment, and whether any steps can be taken to minimise impact on participants;
- If significant concerns are raised, consider whether the participant should leave the production.

This could be achieved by:

- having a dedicated mental health professional on site or on call with ready access to the site if necessary; and/or
- having a welfare producer who will:
 - oversee participant welfare and provide support throughout production;
 - be a single point of contact for participants, from casting to aftercare;
 - liaise with expert advisors and the production team to ensure adjustments and medical provision are in place.

Aftercare

- provide a psychological debrief;
- provide training to help with transition to home life or increased media presence;
- undertake follow up assessments;
- provide a proactive programme of formal aftercare support eg counselling.

This could be achieved by:

- ensuring all participants undergo a debrief soon after they have finished filming, and before returning home. The debrief should include:
 - a psychological assessment;
 - details of how the participant has been portrayed; and if already broadcast, encouragement to watch the programme or series;
 - details of press and social media interest in the production and the individual;
 - social media training (for example setting privacy controls);
 - financial awareness training.

Ongoing support - this can be tailored to the individual for an appropriate period after broadcast, but a minimum level of support for all participants should be agreed with the expert psychological advisor. This might include access to psychological support, or signposting to public services.

March 2024

CHILDREN IN PROGRAMMES

ITV's Child Protection Guidelines

Introduction

ITV believes children should have the opportunity to take part in television programmes, and that there are clear benefits for them and for our audiences in them doing so.

ITV has a duty to safeguard all children and young people who take part or are otherwise involved in our programmes from harm, and also to protect children that watch our programmes, and interact with them.

ITV is therefore committed:

- To take all necessary steps to protect children and young people who take part or are otherwise involved in ITV programmes or other ITV content;
- To ensure that whenever they are involved in filming, due care is taken over their welfare and dignity, and that they are not caused unjustified distress or anxiety either by their involvement in the programme, or by its broadcast;
- To ensure that children can take part in programmes in a safe, reassuring and welcoming environment, with appropriate supervision at all times;
- To ensure all children are treated with respect as individuals, and offered equality of opportunity;
- To have a single consistent point of contact with whom the child and their parent can liaise throughout the production, as far as this is practicable;
- Where children are "performing" in any programme, to ensure they are licensed and accompanied by parents/guardians or suitably registered and trained chaperones;
- To ensure viewers under 18 are not harmed or misled by programmes aimed at them, particularly when being asked to interact with the programme or take part in online interactivity;
- To hold any personal information obtained from children securely.

Consideration of children's welfare should therefore be at the heart of any production, and should be our priority at all times over other editorial considerations.

There is no single legal definition of a child, although for the purpose of this guidance "child" refers to someone under the age of 16, and "young people" refers to those under the age of 18.

Parental Consent

Generally, before children take part in programmes, consent will need to be obtained from either a parent or guardian, and will usually be obtained in writing. Parents/guardians must sign all releases and contracts on behalf of under 16s. Any

exceptions to this rule should be discussed with Compliance beforehand. Any decision to feature children (other than incidentally) without parental consent is normally only editorially justified on the basis of a clear and overriding public interest.

Young people aged 16 or 17 can consent on their own behalf and sign consent forms themselves, although parental agreement may be desirable (but is not compulsory). Programme makers should make clear to children that it is acceptable for them to disagree with their parent's decision to give consent, and they should not be pressured to participate against their wishes. A child's reluctance to participate should be respected. Meaningful, child-friendly information about the programme should be given to children when discussing their possible participation.

It is not necessary to obtain the consent of two parents, but where producers are aware that one parent consents and another is actively opposed to the child's participation, this should be discussed with Compliance, and any potential impact on the child's welfare considered.

Parental consent is an important pre-condition for children taking part, but it is not a substitute for making our own independent assessment of any potential risks to the welfare of the child, both during filming and after transmission. The ability of the child to give informed assent to taking part, and to understand the likely consequences is important, and not just obtaining the parent's written consent.

Duty of Care and Risk Assessment

ITV is obliged by the Ofcom Broadcasting Code to take due care towards all programme participants under the age of 18. Producers should have regard to the Guidance Notes to Section 1 of the Code. An appropriate risk assessment should be made by the production, whether or not a child's participation is to be licensed by a local authority, to mitigate any risks to children in relation to the activities they will be carrying out. Depending on the type of production, producers may wish to create specific written guidelines for their team for working with children, in addition to this general policy.

Consideration of how best to safeguard a child's welfare will vary depending on the type of programme being made, and the level of care must be appropriate to the circumstances, and to the individual child. Their age, maturity and capacity to make judgments about their participation will all be relevant to the steps taken. Other issues such as cultural, ethnic and religious background, personal circumstances and life experiences may impact on a child's vulnerability and/or resilience. Children are often eager to take part in our programmes, but may lack the maturity necessary to assess any longer-term impact on their lives. We must consider carefully any potential impact and possible consequences to the child of broadcast of the programme, and how much personal information to disclose about them.

In some cases aftercare is important, and it may be necessary to arrange access to appropriate professional help (eg counselling) and for a nominated production team member to keep in contact with the child's family in the period immediately following transmission.

Some genres and formats focus on conflict and crisis and may cause distress and anxiety. We should consider carefully in such circumstances whether those aged under 18 should be involved. The Ofcom Code does not require the elimination of all distress and anxiety, and there are editorial contexts in which a degree of anxiety is inevitable and may be justified.

Compliance advice should be sought in advance of filming where children and young people are interviewed in sensitive situations, or in programmes of a controversial nature, so that safeguards can be agreed and put in place. Children should not be asked for views about matters beyond their capacity or maturity to answer, and parents should be made aware of and consent to interviews and proposed areas of questioning.

Background checks may need to be made on social, family, health and educational circumstances, as part of the risk assessment regarding physical health and safety and emotional and mental wellbeing.

Care should be taken where a child is new to performance, or participating in a production the subject matter of which might exceed their emotional maturity or experience.

Staff should normally avoid initiating physical contact with children, except for reasons of health and safety or normal supervision, and should seek to work in an open environment. Everyone working with children (whether production staff, or on-screen presenters) should behave in an appropriate manner towards and around children and young people at all times.

Expert advice

Many programmes involve some physical or emotional challenges to child participants. Producers may need to take appropriate expert advice (for example from suitably qualified psychologists, social workers, teachers, doctors or counsellors) before, during and after filming. This is particularly so when the programme is dealing with anti-social, harmful or illegal activities (such as crime, drug use, physical and sexual abuse, bullying, etc), or psychological and medical problems (such as eating disorders and self-harm, etc). We may need to seek expert advice about the best way of approaching interviews on sensitive subjects to mitigate the risk of potential distress, and have those experts review the recorded material relating to children prior to broadcast.

Anonymity

Difficult ethical and legal issues arise when we are dealing with children involved in anti-social or criminal behaviour. Queries about whether it is possible to identify a child in these circumstances should be referred to Compliance. We should not normally identify children when featuring such behavior unless there is a clear editorial justification and strong public interest.

The decision to feature children whose parents are engaged in anti-social or criminal activity should only be made where we are satisfied the welfare of the child will not be harmed, and if it is editorially justified. This is particularly important when children may be at risk because, for example, they are living with an alcoholic or drug-abusing parent, or being forced to take part in illegal activities.

Do not assume that simply blurring a child's (or adult's) face will be sufficient to avoid identifying that child. There is a difference between not identifying an individual and rendering them unidentifiable. Advice should be taken from Compliance before carrying out "anonymous" interviews, to ensure that where promises are made to parents or children about anonymity, the techniques employed will achieve the required result.

Child Licensing

A licence will ordinarily be required where a child is performing on television, or participating in a programme where the activity is manipulated or directed for the purpose of entertainment, presenting, modelling, or taking part in sport for payment. A licence may not be required for observational documentaries, news reporting, consumer and current affairs, vox pops, or being filmed as part of an audience.

Where a licence is required, this must be applied for at least 21 days before filming begins (and earlier if possible). The licensing authority may impose conditions on the license, which must be adhered to.

Regulations set out maximum hours per day for which children of certain ages can be present on set, and minimum requirements for breaks depending on the age of the child. Chaperones may in addition request additional breaks or longer periods between performances if the child's welfare demands. Children should not be required to be on set before 7am and must leave the set by 11pm if over 5 years of age, and 10pm if younger, unless the consent of the Licensing Authority has been sought. Specific consent must also be sought for any night work.

Producers must ensure that where licensing is necessary, children have an appropriate performance licence and appropriate supervision, ie by a parent/guardian or a registered chaperone. A registered chaperone means one recognised by the appropriate Licensing Authority. Registered chaperones should have also had Criminal Record checks carried out by their Licensing Authority.

Please refer to ITV's Child Licensing Guidelines, the advice issued in the relevant nation of the UK, and any guidelines that apply to the area in which the child resides:

England: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/child-performance-and-activities-licensing-legislation>

Scotland: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2017/08/young-performers-guide-parents-guardians/documents/00523214-pdf/00523214-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00523214.pdf>

Wales: <https://gov.wales/keeping-young-performers-safe-performance-licences-children>

Northern Ireland: <https://www.eani.org.uk/services/child-employment-children-in-entertainment-and-chaperone-applications>

Children travelling to our production bases should be accompanied by a parent or guardian, or by a chaperone. Any conditions that the Licensing Authority has made relating to travel, accommodation (including facilities available on set) and meals must be observed, as must any requirements relating to the child's education.

ITV expects chaperones to operate in accordance with its Guidelines for Chaperones. See ITV's Guidance on Child Licensing for further details.

Where a licence is required for a child to perform other than on school premises, requirements for permission from the child's school differ for England, Scotland and Wales. See ITV's Guidance on Child Licensing for details. Permission should always be obtained from the head teacher for filming or interviewing on school

premises, whether or not a licence is required.

Competitions

Prizes aimed at children must be appropriate to the age range of both the target audience and the participants. In talent competitions a successful child competitor may win a career opportunity that has a significant cash value. Care should be taken that they are not placed under undue pressure by parents or others to succeed at all costs.

Online Content and Links

We aim to ensure that children and young people taking advantage of new technologies understand the possible risks they face and how to minimise them. The online protection of children in relation to our programmes is a shared responsibility between ITV and parents/guardians.

We should ensure that programme websites or apps likely to appeal to a high proportion of children and young people carry appropriate content. Any material on the website home page must be suitable for a general audience.

When we ask children for personal information online we need to consider what degree of parental consent is appropriate. Online spaces where strangers can routinely meet and exchange personal information will not be suitable for use by children.

Privacy and Consent Online

When we publish any information about children online, we should ensure it is editorially appropriate, and should be sensitive to concerns that publication of too much information could put a child at risk. Combinations of written and visual information are a particularly sensitive area.

- Where we invite children to send us information about themselves, for example a name and email address to enter a competition, we should explain why we need it in language they can understand.
- It is particularly important that younger children should not get into the habit of easily revealing personal details about themselves or their family on the internet.
- Any information children send to us should only be used for the purpose for which it was sent.
- It should be retained securely and only as long as we need it.
- It should not be revealed to a third party. Competitions for children online should include a statement to the effect that children should always get their parent's or guardian's permission before entering their personal details (name, email address, etc) onto the competition entry form.

Abuse

Child abuse is where any child suffers harm because of physical, emotional or sexual abuse or neglect by an adult.

Physical abuse includes deliberate acts causing physical harm and failing to act to protect a child from such harm, or fabricating or inducing illnesses in a child.

Emotional abuse is the persistent emotional ill treatment of a child, which is likely to cause serious harm to their emotional and behavioural development. It may involve suggesting to a child that they are worthless, inadequate or unloved, or placing inappropriate expectations or responsibilities upon them.

Sexual abuse involves forcing or enticing a child/young person to take part in sexual activities, whether or not they are aware of what is happening. It may include physical contact or non-contact activities, including online grooming, or involving children in looking at pornographic material or sexual activity, or encouraging inappropriate sexual behaviour by children.

Neglect is the persistent failure to meet a child's basic physical and psychological needs, which is likely to result in serious impairment to their health and development. It may involve failure to provide adequate food, shelter or clothing, or failure to protect them from physical danger.

If you have a concern

Staff may become concerned through observation of:

- Bruises or injuries that are unusual, for example on a part of the body that is not prone to such injuries.
- Injuries that require but have not received medical attention.
- Cigarette burns or bite marks.
- Unexplained changes in behaviour, for example becoming aggressive or withdrawn.
- Inability to trust certain adults with whom you would usually expect the child to have a close relationship.
- Signs of self-harm or attempted self-harm.
- Age-inappropriate sexual knowledge or behaviour.
- Running away from home.
- Non-attendance at school.

It is not the responsibility of ITV to decide whether or not abuse has taken place. It is the responsibility of staff at ITV to act if there is cause for concern, in order that the appropriate agencies can investigate and take action necessary to protect a child or young person.

If anyone working on a programme with children suspects that a child may be at risk, the situation should be referred to an appropriate senior manager responsible for child protection, who will normally be the relevant Head of Production for the programme, and/or a Designated Safeguarding Officer in ITV's Central Risk Operations Team, and/or the Director of Legal and Content Compliance. They may refer the matter, where relevant, to the HR Department. An internal investigation will be carried under the Disciplinary Policy where any alleged abuse concerns a member of staff.

Children or young persons may disclose to staff that they are experiencing abuse. A third party – parent, relative, or friend - might also share areas of concern. Staff should be clear that they cannot keep such information confidential and must take action if they think the child or young person has been or is being harmed. Staff should make a note as soon as possible of what they have been told, using the child's own words, and report to the relevant senior manager.

If a child makes an allegation of abuse against a member of staff it must be reported as a matter of urgency to the relevant senior manager. The alleged perpetrator should not be made aware of the allegation at this point. ITV may decide to refer the matter to the relevant Social Services department and/or the police. Matters reported and actions taken must be recorded and shared only with staff members (eg Legal and HR) who absolutely need to know.

Relevant Legislation, Regulation and Guidance

Children's Act 1989 and 2004

The Children (Performance and Activities) (England) Regulations 2014, the Children (Performances and Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2014 and the Children (Performances and Activities) (Wales) Regulations 2015

The Ofcom Broadcasting Code and Code Guidance

Ofcom Broadcasting Code: Section 1 key Rules on child participants

1.28 Due care must be taken over the welfare and the dignity of people under eighteen who take part or are otherwise involved in programmes. This is irrespective of any consent given by the participant or by a parent, guardian or other person over the age of eighteen in loco parentis.

1.29 People under eighteen must not be caused unjustified distress or anxiety by their involvement in programmes or by the broadcast of those programmes.

Ofcom Guidance Notes

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0017/24704/section1.pdf

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0030/86781/watershed-on-tv.pdf

July 2023

LIVE PROGRAMMES

Live programming can present many editorial and compliance challenges, which should be addressed by effective planning before broadcast, including effective contingency plans to respond to problems during broadcast.

Pre-broadcast

Producers should discuss the format of live programmes with compliance advisors well in advance of broadcast. Not all live programmes will require a compliance presence in the studio - the likely content, scheduling and participants will determine whether a compliance lawyer or advisor may be required to attend. For a new programme, it may be useful for the producers to have a compliance “kick off” meeting during pre-production. Established and long running programmes should arrange regular compliance refresher courses to ensure that staff are made aware of any recent developments.

Where a programme includes live viewer voting, ITV compliance and interactive personnel will generally attend at the studio or location, to ensure that this element is conducted in accordance with ITV’s Interactive Guidelines. In other cases, producers should ensure that they have direct out of office numbers for compliance advisors who can give advice whilst the programme is on air. All pre-recorded and pre-prepared material (eg V/T inserts, on screen graphics, scripts, etc) should where possible be seen and cleared by compliance before broadcast.

Contingency planning is essential for all live programmes, and should be built into scripts and running orders. For viewer voting programmes a contingency plan should be prepared – see ITV’s Interactive Guidelines for further information.

Producers must ensure that all relevant staff are fully aware of compliance procedures for their programme, and that all compliance advice is properly communicated to relevant members of the production team. Where producers become aware that a programme item may present legal or compliance risks, they should ensure advice is taken from compliance lawyers or advisors before transmission, and that this advice has been acted upon before the item goes ahead.

Producers must ensure that guests and presenters are properly briefed before they appear, for example to avoid making defamatory or unfair statements about identifiable people, using offensive language, or promoting commercial products. Producers should not assume that because a guest is an entertainment or media professional they will always be aware of these requirements without being briefed.

Some content may require information or an explicit warning to be given by the programme presenter immediately before it is shown (eg “some viewers may find this footage upsetting”, or “this report includes flashing lights”).

During broadcast

There should be effective communication between gallery and presenters to respond to any problems that arise during broadcast. Generally presenters will wear earpieces, unless an equally effective method of communication is available and preferred.

Apologies & Corrections – it is very important to address problems immediately if they arise, by way of an appropriate apology or correction from the presenter or commentator. Every incident is different, and some may require advice and discussion, but the most obvious issues are discussed below.

Legal - If any comment is made which is not defensible and could lead to a legal claim against ITV, for example a libel claim, a compliance lawyer should be notified immediately, and where necessary an appropriate apology drafted and given by the presenter on air later in the same programme or at the earliest opportunity in the next episode of the programme.

Language – if offensive language is used unexpectedly, especially before the watershed, an apology should be made as soon as possible by the presenter (eg *“apologies for the language used just now/earlier”*).

Accuracy – in Breakfast and Daytime live news or magazine shows, and in regional news programmes, producers must take reasonable steps to research and check the facts of a story before inviting a guest to discuss it. If significant factual mistakes are made, a factual correction should be made as soon as this is discovered.

When inappropriate content has been broadcast, that content should be edited by blanking for the +1 channel broadcast, via contact with the compliance advisor and the ITV Broadcast Operations Duty Manager (“DMO”), who will liaise with transmission controllers. An edited version must also be created for any broadcast repeat, and for Catch Up on all VOD platforms. It is essential that compliance is alerted to such incidents promptly from the gallery.

Where an invited guest is not known personally to the producers, and is not a celebrity, then adequate identity checks must be made, and documentation proving identity must be provided (eg photo ID such as passport or driving licence).

Where a programme is interviewing a celebrity, it is commonplace for them to wish to promote their latest project/film/record etc. Producers must ensure that when doing so we avoid:

- promotion of products and services
- undue prominence of products and services
- product placement

Promotion – there is greater editorial justification for a celebrity guest to talk about an artistic/creative project than one where a celebrity is simply endorsing a product unrelated to their creative talents or professional career. Interviews will be more likely to be seen to be promotional if there appears to be a “hard sell” of products or services by the guest and/or the presenter.

Undue prominence - is where the product is featured in a way that is not justified by the context, eg calls to action to purchase the product, repeated references to brand names or commercial website URLs etc. The more prominent the references to the product or service, the more likely the programme may be seen to be promotional of it.

Product placement – is where the specific reference to the product is made as a result of a payment to the broadcaster, producer, or connected person.

Celebrity guests should not be invited to appear simply to promote or endorse a commercial product, such as a new perfume or an appearance in a new advert as a brand ambassador. In the context of a broader ranging interview about their creative/artistic activities and career, it may be reasonable editorially to mention *in passing* that they are currently involved in commercial ventures of this kind, but the interview should not focus on such ventures, and should include wider topics such as career history, other things they are currently doing etc. Brief the guest explicitly against repeated name checking of any product or giving out website addresses or any text/phone numbers.

The guests and their agents must understand and agree in advance how we are going to handle the interview. Producers should not negotiate the exact manner of how any product will be featured in the programme as a condition of the guest appearing. If someone is making unreasonable demands, then refer to the programme's Executive Producer or Editor.

Presenters should be briefed to move the interview on if the guest makes repeated references to commercial interests, and should terminate the item early if the guest appears to be intent on undue promotion. They should be instructed by the gallery to terminate the interview if the guest appears to be intent on using offensive language after having been warned, or makes other offensive or defamatory comments.

TV shows/films/DVD releases - If a guest is discussing a new TV show, film or DVD, it is justified to play a clip or clips from it, as long as it is relevant to the guest's involvement. It may be editorially justified to show a new book or CD being talked about but it should not be kept deliberately in shot prominently throughout the interview. If there is any concern about the guest adhering to our guidelines, then rostrum the book or CD cover rather than using a physical copy on set, and run the shot in and out during the chat.

Factual claims (eg that an exercise regime can make you lose a stone a month) need to be independently researched, and presenters need to be briefed to make clear to viewers when unverified claims are not proven. Just because something is previously published in the press, or on the internet, that does not make it true.

Check any statements intended to be made about other people that might defame or be unfair to them or infringe the privacy with a compliance lawyer. Note that people can still be *identifiable* even if they are not named.

Charities – guests can discuss their involvement in charities and their work, but generally do not include formal calls to action to donate involving phone numbers or text details, unless the programme is an ITV charity appeal programme (eg *Soccer Aid*) or when ITV is already supporting the appeal as part of its own Social Purpose objectives. The general exception is an emergency disaster appeal (Tsunami, famine, earthquake, etc) being run by an umbrella organisation such as the Disaster Emergency Committee. It may be justifiable to run direct donation line details in these circumstances. Call cost details must be checked and made clear.

Regular presenters and guests – participants appearing regularly to give advice or commentary (eg doctors, chefs, consumer finance, entertainment correspondents etc) must not promote their own commercial interests. There should be no suggestion they are using their position on the show to influence the editorial or the viewer in favour of their own interests.

Live Sports coverage

Use of offensive language by spectators and players is a common issue, particularly in football and rugby matches. Where ITV has control of the production of the coverage, the following protocols should be followed to minimise the risk of offence:

On arrival at the venue:

- Try to avoid placing microphones near the team benches (where swearing/offensive language is more likely to be picked up) or in parts of the ground where swearing/offensive language is likely to be audible, eg if a particular part of the home end is near to away supporters, and is known as a place where insults are likely to be exchanged.

Pre match production briefing:

- Brief the sound operator to dip the audio on a microphone if a confrontation develops close by it, either involving players or fans, and in particular if any swearing/offensive language occurs.
- Brief everyone in the OB truck that they need to be vigilant about swearing/offensive language, that they must report it immediately to the producer or director if they hear it, and that they should not assume someone else has picked up the language and reported it.

During the match:

- If any swearing/offensive language occurs, it must be reported to the producer or director immediately.
- The producer or director should then:
 - Direct the commentator to apologise immediately to viewers for the language used (eg "*we're sorry for the bad language earlier*"). It is important that we apologise as opposed to simply referring to it or acknowledging it.
 - Contact the compliance contact on call for the match to inform them of the words used and the approximate timecode. The compliance team member will (i) arrange for the word to be dipped by transmission in the +1 programme and (ii) discuss repeats on-air and online with the producer, and what edits need to be made for them.

Interviews post-match:

- Remind all interviewees beforehand that they are being interviewed live and cannot use offensive language.

March 2024

INTERACTIVITY

All producers of programmes and other content for ITV that includes interactivity are required to comply with ITV's Interactive Guidelines, available on the ITV website, which will be included in all commissioning agreements and should also be appended to telephony supplier agreements. Adherence to these guidelines is therefore a contractual requirement. ITV will have the right to monitor adherence to these policies and procedures (whether through on-site oversight, spot check or formal audit).

ITV's Interactive Principles underpin all interactive services delivered by ITV regardless of channel or platform. These principles should be foremost in the considerations of everyone involved in the delivery of interactive elements in programming and should underpin all decision-making. ITV requires:

- **Honesty and integrity:** producers must act honestly at all times, and with integrity and consistency.
- **Transparency, accuracy and fairness:**
 - to offer transparency to the viewer of cost and process;
 - to be accurate in compiling and reporting results;
 - to be fair to our viewers, talent, contestants and to all parties involved in the interactive process.
- **Editorial relevance:** to provide interactive services that are entertaining and appealing to our viewers and aim to be relevant to the editorial context.

Producers of programmes including any interactive elements such as voting or competitions will work closely with ITV Interactive and Compliance to ensure these Principles are adhered to at all times. An ITV Interactive Producer will be assigned to oversee the interactive elements and work with the Producer and Compliance.

ITV Interactive

ITV Interactive is the ITV business division primarily responsible for making sure that our processes are followed. In order to ensure a consistent approach, any interactivity with a broadcast element which is promoted in-show, or where there is a result announced in-show, must be run or approved in advance by ITV Interactive.

For example, this will include:

- All on-air competitions (whether premium rate or free) or off-air competitions where the winner is announced on-air;
- On-air voting (whether premium rate or free) or off-air voting where the result is announced on-air;
- All premium rate services promoted via any ITV platform, including any phone or SMS comment lines;
- Pre-approval of all playalong or similar mobile applications promoted in-show

or where the results are announced in-show;

- Pre-approval of polling software, if poll results are announced or promoted on-air.

References in programmes for viewers to comment on the programme via X/Facebook or similar social media platforms will be at the discretion of the production team, working with Compliance. Before including on air calls to action please ensure that relevant social media platforms include a notice to users that their comments may be used on-air, with a link to standard terms and conditions.

Online & Mobile (including ITV social media pages or applications)

In addition, ITV Interactive will:

- Run all off-air competitions (whether premium rate or free) promoted from ITV platforms;
- Run all off-air voting (whether premium rate or free) promoted from any ITV platforms;
- Approve any polling software used for off air opinion polls. Please inform ITV Interactive of the event (and any paid advertising for it being cleared by Clearcast) so that they can assess and flag any risks.

Please see the ITV Interactive Services Guidelines and the ITV Social Media Guidelines for more detailed guidance on programme interactive elements.

March 2024

COVERT FILMING/RECORDING AND DECEPTION

ITV treats covert recording very seriously, and never undertakes it lightly or without careful consideration.

Covert filming/recording is a powerful weapon in the arsenal of investigative journalism. By its nature, it usually involves the infringement of someone's privacy and is usually broadcast without the consent of those filmed. It can therefore only be used where it is warranted, where its use is proportionate to the public interest in the story under investigation, and this public interest is considered to outweigh other interests such as an individual's right of privacy. Likewise, the use of any deception must only be employed when evidential material could not have reasonably been obtained through other means, and must be proportionate in all the circumstances.

Approval for any sort of deception and for covert filming is required from the Director of Legal & Content Compliance (or an authorised alternate) at two stages: the decision whether to record covertly at all, and then the decision whether to include the material in the programme. The same approval is required for the use of acquired third-party covert recordings, which again generally should reveal matters of public interest.

ITV has strict protocols for prior authorisation for secret recording. Normally, it will only be warranted where the following criteria are all met:

- There is already some prima facie evidence of a story in the public interest in the possession of the producers. It will not be acceptable to secretly record simply in the hope of obtaining evidence, if none currently exists;
- There are reasonable grounds to suspect that further evidence could be obtained by secret recording;
- It is necessary to the credibility and authenticity of the programme.

Before any secret filming/recording is commenced, producers should seek written authorisation from the Director of Legal & Content Compliance (or in their absence from one of the Heads of Legal Compliance), also copied to the compliance lawyer allocated to the programme, setting out in detail the relevant facts supporting the criteria above. There is a standard form available on request for this purpose. The ITV Commissioner responsible for the programme should be made aware of this request. Any requests should be sent at least 48 hours before the intended secret filming/recording is to commence, and need to be approved before filming/recording takes place. Likewise, specific authorisation is required again before the broadcast of any material.

Entertainment set-ups

There is a long tradition of covert filming for the purposes of entertainment from *Candid Camera* to the present day. In such "set up" or "wind-up" situations it would often defeat the exercise to seek to obtain consent of the subject prior to filming. Unlike investigative filming, there is unlikely to be any overriding public interest in such filming. It therefore needs to be carefully considered and planned, to ensure it is unlikely to cause significant annoyance, distress or embarrassment to those

involved, and to minimize the risk of incidental breaches of privacy of individuals who are not the main “target” of the set up.

The consent of the subject of the filming needs to be obtained after filming, before any of the footage can be included in the programme. If an individual is not identifiable in the programme or is purely incidental to what is being filmed, it may be possible to broadcast the item without their consent, but compliance advice should always be taken. Proposed set ups for entertainment purposes should be discussed with the relevant Commissioner and Head of Compliance before such filming takes place.

The Ofcom Broadcasting Code allows for material obtained by deception involving celebrities and those in the public eye to be broadcast without consent, but it should not be used without a public interest justification if it is likely to result in unjustified public ridicule or personal distress. Therefore such material should normally be pre-recorded.

March 2024

Filming With Police and Emergency Services

Introduction

There are two main types of compliance issues to bear in mind when filming with the police and emergency services:

- **Legal** – eg contempt of court, libel, privacy and trespass;
- **Regulatory** - Ofcom Broadcasting Code issues (primarily issues of privacy and fairness – see in particular sections 7 and 8 of the Code at:

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code>

Privacy

Ofcom is required to consider complaints about **unwarranted infringements of privacy in a programme or in connection with the obtaining of material included in a programme.**

Ofcom will consider:

- Whether the particular situation gives rise to a legitimate expectation of privacy?
- Was there an infringement of privacy by filming and/or by broadcasting the footage?
- Was that infringement of privacy consented to, and if not, was it warranted?
- In determining whether an infringement is warranted, a balancing exercise will be carried out between the public interest and the individual's right to privacy.

Filming in the public domain

In general terms there is no legal restriction on filming on the public highways, and we do not require prior consent from an individual or the police to do that.

However, even in a public place there may be circumstances where people will have a reasonable expectation of privacy. Always consider *what* is happening as well as *where* it is happening. For example, this will almost always be the case where someone is being given medical treatment by the emergency services, or is suicidal.

If we are filming events in a public place where there would be an expectation of privacy, then we must weigh the rights of individuals against the public interest in filming and broadcasting that footage.

Where the public interest does not outweigh the right of privacy of individuals, we would generally need to seek consent (where possible) to film and then to broadcast the footage. Such consent must be *informed*. The individual concerned must be made aware not only that they have been filmed, but that they been filmed for a programme to be shown on TV.

Producers should have a system in place to ensure that consent or non-consent is documented, detailing as far as possible for each individual featured:

- full name;

- contact details (eg postal address, email, phone number);
- the date and circumstances in which consent was given;
- the nature of the consent eg written or verbal (and if so was it captured in the rushes?);
- the individual's capacity to give consent at the time of filming (eg whether their capacity was impaired by drinking, drugs or mental health issues); and
- any follow-up calls and correspondence.

Where an individual is arrested and is subsequently convicted of a criminal offence, generally speaking we will not require their consent to broadcast footage of their arrest and police custody (since there is a public interest in reporting on crime). If their behaviour in public is not criminal but still clearly and seriously anti-social, there may be public interest in broadcasting the material without consent being sought.

Where an individual is in a sensitive situation (eg someone receiving medical treatment after a road accident, or someone who is suicidal or otherwise clearly vulnerable) it may not be appropriate or possible to seek their consent at the time. It may be warranted to broadcast footage of the emergency services dealing with the incident, but it is unlikely that footage of the individuals would be broadcast without obtaining their consent after filming. In such circumstances simply obscuring the identities of such individuals may not be sufficient.

Where someone is not suspected of any criminal offence and is simply interacting with police/emergency services in a public place, you should try to ensure they are made aware that they are being filmed for TV broadcast. If someone objects to filming, you should explain politely that you are entitled to film in public places. You should also give them contact details if they wish to complain about being filmed. It is important for the broadcaster to know if someone has complained at the time of filming and why, or may complain following broadcast, or has given consent to be filmed at the time but has subsequently sought to withdraw that consent. ITV expects producers to provide such details when they deliver a rough cut for compliance review.

It may be useful for camera teams to carry pro forma printed notices that can be handed out to people who are being filmed in the public domain and who are curious or concerned about the filming. An example is attached at Annex 1.

Filming on private property

Entering private property, even in the company of the police, without the consent of the owner or occupier, constitutes a trespass (ie a civil wrong). The police may have a legal right to enter the property with a warrant, but a film crew does not have a legal right to accompany them. On police raids it will not usually be practical to seek consent for filming from the occupants before entering the property.

Everyone has the right to respect for their private and family life, their home and their correspondence. Filming someone in their home without their consent and broadcasting that footage is always likely to breach their privacy; the question is therefore whether this is warranted by an overriding public interest in the filming and the broadcast of the filming.

If a TV camera crew does accompany police onto private premises, for example during a raid, they should:

- Make sure the police are happy for the crew to enter with them, and ensure

this is agreed before filming starts;

- If entering premises with police, tell the occupants who you are *and* what you are doing (eg “we’re filming a documentary for ITV”) at the earliest practical opportunity, once the police have secured the premises and any suspects. Make the occupant aware that you *are* filming them, and not just the police officers, and why. In particular, make it clear that you are *not* a police crew. You should capture these exchanges on the rushes in order to secure evidence of the occupants’ explicit or at least tacit consent to being filmed in the property.
- When filming inside a property try to avoid dwelling on any sensitive personal items (eg family photos) to minimise intrusion into the occupants’ privacy. Avoid recording footage that would identify any children.
- If an assurance is given to the occupant that footage of a specific incident (or any part of the footage) will not be used, that assurance should always be honoured and notified to the broadcaster.
- If the occupant asks you to leave or to stop filming, you should usually do so. In the past people have sought injunctions to prevent the broadcast of material recorded inside their homes without their consent, and have also sued for damages. If someone complains about your presence in such a situation, ITV may decide not to use the material recorded within the property in the programme, including footage captured before the objection is made. However, you may still be able to use material recorded from the street outside.
- If you are not allowed in, or the occupant asks you to leave, do not assume you can still include in the programme sound recorded by officers’ radio mikes or footage from cameras they are wearing. If the occupant is unaware of these microphones and/or cameras, this would effectively constitute secret filming, and this may not have the required public interest to warrant broadcast.
- When filming a property exterior, try to obtain either wide shots of the general area or very close up shots of the door, in order to avoid revealing the address or location. Doing so could potentially also identify the occupant, which might be a problem on privacy grounds or possible prejudice to any live proceedings. Mask all door numbers and street signage captured in exterior footage.

Filming in police stations

There is generally public interest in the filming of police dealing with individuals who have been arrested and taken to a police station, particularly if they are subsequently convicted of the offence for which they have been arrested. Generally we do not seek prior consent to film individuals being arrested, at police stations or in police vehicles. However, if they have not been convicted at the time of broadcast, then it will be necessary to obscure their identity.

Police wearing cameras and police footage

Police forces sometimes wear cameras for evidential purposes and may be willing to share this material for use in a TV observational series. Broadcast of footage

recorded in this way will depend on similar factors to those discussed above, but it should always be borne in mind that individuals may not always be aware of police body cameras as they would be aware of a TV camera crew. Use will often be dependent on subsequent conviction. When someone has been found guilty of a serious crime, Ofcom's view, as reflected in various adjudications, is that footage of such individuals, whether recorded on arrest or CCTV footage recorded in police stations or during police interview, is of public interest. A convicted criminal is deemed to have less reasonable expectation of privacy in relation to such footage than an innocent person.

Conversely, where we have footage of suspects who are subsequently not found guilty of any offence, it will be more difficult to justify broadcast of that footage if the individual is identifiable. Blurring their identity may sometimes make it warranted to broadcast, but every situation has to be assessed on its own merits and facts.

It has become commonplace for police to release police interview tapes to the media following trial and conviction. The public interest in broadcasting such material in a 'not guilty' case may be harder to establish.

If police or emergency services are wearing or using cameras supplied by the programme-makers, formal agreement must be reached beforehand as to the copyright in such footage. But the broadcast of such footage will still depend on whether public interest in the footage outweighs any infringement of privacy, irrespective of copyright ownership.

Filming in hospitals and ambulances

You should generally seek prior consent to film people in places such as hospitals or ambulances, where they would normally not expect to be filmed. This applies to patients, visitors and medical staff.

For staff members (eg doctors, nurses etc), general consent from their employers to film in their place of work does not mean that any and all staff can then be shown. Individual consents should be obtained for all staff who are to be featured. If you do not have an individual's consent, it is likely that you will need to obscure their identity. If an individual employee has specifically made you aware that, despite their employer's blanket consent, they personally do not wish to be identified in the programme, that should be respected and their identity should be obscured. If the individual is actively hostile to the filming you should try to avoid filming them at all, since privacy can be breached in the making of a programme as well as by broadcast.

You should be mindful of avoiding where possible capturing footage of people not directly related to the story but appearing incidentally (eg patients waiting in casualty, or in an adjoining hospital bed). In hospitals or police stations we generally cannot justify identifying such individuals simply because they are incidental to the main subject matter, nor can we rely on filming notices for implied consent; those in need of medical treatment, for example, should not have to leave the area to avoid being seen later on television. But if you cannot obtain consent, then as long as their presence is incidental, obscuring their identities should usually be sufficient to protect their privacy.

Filming in other sensitive situations

There is no definitive list of "sensitive" situations, but obvious examples would be

filming after an accident or an assault, where people are being given medical treatment, at a crime scene where victims/witnesses are being questioned, or at the scene of an attempted suicide.

Consent for broadcast should generally be obtained at a later date if, at the time of filming, an individual concerned could not give informed consent because they were injured; or were on medication for pain relief; or were impaired by the use of alcohol or drugs; or were mentally or emotionally disturbed.

Where consent can be sought, consent for filming and for the later broadcast of that filming will generally be sought at the same time ie “We are filming for an ITV programme [title] to be shown [later this/next year] – are you happy to be filmed?”.

Separate consent for broadcast is generally not required if the individual consents to filming at the time and:

- has only a minor injury at the time of filming;
- has subsequently signed a release form;
- has been interviewed later and gave informed consent at that time; or
- will not be identifiable in the programme (although in some circumstances simply obscuring a person’s identity may not be sufficient to protect their privacy).

Where separate consent for broadcast is required, it should where possible be confirmed in writing. If verbal consent is obtained, full notes of the conversation must be kept.

People who are victims in serious incidents (whether accidents or crimes) will be deemed to have a reasonable expectation of privacy. When you arrive at the scene of an incident make a judgment on whether it is appropriate to film them at all, especially if someone has been seriously or fatally injured. If you decide that filming is justified, and do record footage of injured people being treated, you should be careful not to be intrusive or to interfere in any way with the work of paramedics. If an injured person or a professional treating them requests that you stop filming, you should usually do so. If there are “walking wounded”, you should usually try to speak to them and secure consent to film them before doing so.

Under-16s and vulnerable people (eg with mental disabilities) may be unable to give informed consent and you will need to seek permission from a parent or guardian after the event.

Accidents and crimes - informing victims and victims’ families

If the programme references a serious incident, and particularly if there was a fatality, you should take all reasonable steps to inform those involved (or their next of kin, if the victim is deceased) well in advance of the broadcast date. This would apply, for example, if the programme wished to show archive material of a serious car accident, or discuss the victim of a murder case from the past. We should provide the victims or their families with details and let them know that the programme may be repeated or become available on-demand. The aim is to mitigate distress that may be caused if, for example, someone sees a traumatic incident in which they had been involved appearing on television without any prior warning.

We generally do not need to ask for consent to feature the incident itself, and should make clear that we are not seeking permission. However, we may risk breaching an

individual's privacy if we do not take reasonable steps to tell them about the programme before it is broadcast. If they do not want footage of themselves or their loved ones to be broadcast, we should consider whether including it in the programme has a public interest which outweighs potential distress caused by inclusion.

Ask the police for contact details of victims and/or their families if you cannot obtain them at the time of filming. Sometimes it may be preferable for a police officer dealing with the family to contact them on our behalf, but we should always double-check that they have done this, as the responsibility ultimately remains ours.

In the case of fatal road traffic accidents it is always advisable to avoid graphic shots of victims or injuries, to minimise distress.

Filming under-18s

People who are under 18 years old can sometimes be identified in programmes about the police and emergency services. However, always treat their welfare as being of paramount importance.

If someone under 16 is filmed, especially in a vulnerable state (eg drunk or in need of medical treatment), seek consent from parents or guardians to include them in the programme and identify them. Consider carefully whether it is appropriate to interview them about confidential family matters or issues likely to be beyond their judgment.

In some cases, obscuring the identity of an under-16 may suffice if we do not have parental consent and there is some public interest in the material. This may apply, for example, if they are getting a "telling off" from a local police officer for misbehaviour but are not being arrested.

We will normally need to obscure the identity of any under-18 if we show them being arrested or charged with a criminal offence.

Secret filming

Any secret filming (which includes sound recording) must be authorised by the Director of Legal & Programme Compliance or designated alternate before it is carried out (and again before it is broadcast). Secret filming will only be permitted where:

- on the face of it, there is evidence of a story in the public interest;
- there are reasonable grounds to suspect that further material evidence could be obtained via secret filming; and
- secret filming is necessary to the credibility and authenticity of the programme.

If an officer wearing a minicam or microphone takes someone aside or puts them in the back of the police car to talk to them, the material captured is likely to constitute secret filming as the individual may not be aware of this equipment.

If you are filming out of the window from the back of a police car and capture footage of a police officer talking to someone on the roadside, then the individual being spoken to might reasonably claim that they were being secretly filmed. Likewise filming "publicly" but at a significant distance away from the action, using a long lens.

In all of the above situations the key is to consider whether what you are doing constitutes secret filming, and if so whether it is justified.

CCTV

Many factual programmes regularly use CCTV footage. But not all CCTV footage is unproblematic.

The *Peck* case - Mr Peck was caught on local council CCTV in the street wielding a knife and being arrested. It transpired that he was emotionally disturbed and had been trying to commit suicide. Both the BBC and Anglia News broadcast the CCTV footage. The regulators of the time both upheld complaints on the basis that Mr Peck was not obscured at all by the BBC and inadequately by Anglia. The European Court of Human Rights found that the council's disclosure of the CCTV to the media breached his privacy. *Peck* is an extreme case, but it illustrates the issue of a situation that may be "sensitive" even when it takes place in a very public place.

We need to be particularly sensitive towards victims of crime or accidents, and depending on the circumstances, victims may at least need to have their identities obscured. We may also need to inform victims and/or their relatives of the broadcast. If the footage focuses on criminal activity, we may need to obscure the identities even of innocent bystanders, if they are recognisable.

Where CCTV footage is obtained from a private source (eg where a supermarket has provided us with in-store surveillance footage) its use may be subject to conditions. For example, we may need to obscure staff, criminals or even passers by. Many high street stores are now advised (often wrongly) that nobody can be identified for data protection reasons. Where CCTV footage is obtained from the police, we should always check the source and whether any discussions about broadcast have taken place with the people featured or the copyright owners of the footage.

Contracting with police forces

When discussing access agreements, remember that officers' identities might need to be hidden on initial broadcast, or may need to be obscured later for subsequent repeat broadcasts or later availability on-demand, for operational and security reasons. Police may seek contractual requirements on programme-makers to do this in the access agreement. You may also be required to notify the police force in question prior to any repeat broadcasts, to check whether additional editing is required.

Contempt of Court and Reporting Restrictions

Substantial risk of serious prejudice

Where footage refers to matters that are the subject of active criminal proceedings, we must avoid broadcasting material that would create a substantial risk of serious prejudice to those proceedings.

Proceedings usually become active from the moment of arrest or when an arrest warrant is issued. They stop being active when an individual is sentenced, acquitted or released without charge.

In all instances where it is possible that a criminal offence has been committed, we should liaise closely with the police to establish whether contempt is likely to be an issue. The police should be able to clarify whether a suspect is on police bail, for example. If this is the case, proceedings are still active.

Contempt can be an issue in a range of scenarios. If there has been a road accident we should be alert to the possibility that one of the drivers might face criminal charges (eg for dangerous driving). Similarly, if we capture footage of an assault or robbery, we should be aware that someone could be arrested and charged later.

If any footage relates to active proceedings, then some or all of the following measures may need to be taken:

- Not use the material - We may not be able to use the material at all if the case is unique or unusual in some way, or if the police and/or Crown Prosecution Service want to use footage in the case for evidential purposes.
- Obscure identities - we may need to blur defendants' faces, cover their names, and ensure their address is not readily identifiable. We should assume that identification may be an issue in criminal cases, and it may constitute a contempt of court to show the face of someone subject to active proceedings.
- Remove any distinctive features of the case – for example, we may still be able to show drugs recovered in a raid, if the address is not readily identifiable to a juror watching the programme, and the raid is relatively generic. However, any unusual elements of the case that may stick in a juror's mind (eg odd circumstances, rare weapons, unusual identifying marks like tattoos etc) are likely to need to be edited.
- Remove prejudicial statements - This is likely to include a suspect's previous convictions and character, any confessions or admissions of guilt, and any opinions voiced by officers about the individuals involved (eg "they are well known to us", "drugs have been sold here for years", "we nick them every month" etc).
- Obscure identity of witnesses and victims - identifiable innocent onlookers or any obvious victims of crime, such as someone being assaulted or shop staff being threatened, should have identities obscured to protect them as potential witnesses (and also on privacy grounds).

Always obtain from police as soon as possible after filming the following details about any suspects filmed: name, date of birth, offence arrested for, charges, forthcoming court dates, and details of the court in which they are appearing.

Non-identification of under-18s involved in criminal proceedings

Where an under-18 is involved as a defendant or witness in **youth** court proceedings, we cannot broadcast anything that might lead to their identification, unless the court orders otherwise (which is rare). If our footage includes an individual in these circumstances we will, at the very least, need to ensure that their face and name are covered, and that their address and school is not identified.

Where someone under 18 is involved as a defendant or witness in criminal proceedings in an **adult** court, the court can (and often does) order they should not

be identified as such. We should therefore check whether any such orders are in place before identifying someone in this position.

The Ofcom Broadcasting Code obliges us to “pay particular regard” to the vulnerable position of anyone under 18 involved in a pre-trial investigation as a witness or victim before broadcasting their name, address, school, place of work or image. We also require “particular justification” to broadcast the same information relating to someone under 18 involved in such an investigation as a defendant or potential defendant.

Sexual offences

Victims (and alleged victims) of sexual offences benefit from the right to anonymity for life. This anonymity can only be lifted if the victim consents *in writing* to being identified. The victim must be at least 16 to be able to provide this consent.

Teachers

Teachers accused of offences by students at their school have a special statutory right to anonymity until they are charged. The court may allow their identification, and they can be identified by the Education Secretary, or they may waive their right to anonymity in writing.

Vulnerable witnesses

Courts have power to restrict reporting about certain vulnerable adult witnesses (other than the accused) in criminal proceedings. Such orders can prevent broadcast of anything that is likely to identify the individual concerned as being a witness in the proceedings during their lifetime.

Pre-transmission checks

Checks on the status of all active criminal proceedings will need to be made shortly before first transmission.

If a suspect has either pleaded or been found guilty between filming and broadcast then ITV may decide to identify them. However, if we do this, a pre-transmission check will be required to confirm that they are not involved in any other active criminal proceedings.

Also bear in mind that later repeat of the programme will require the same checks to be made. It may sometimes be advisable to create a second “repeat” version at the time of delivery, with all identities hidden.

Scotland

Although contempt of court laws in Scotland are similar to those in England and Wales, they are interpreted more strictly. If a programme involves a Scottish force or case then it is important to seek legal advice from the Compliance team.

Libel and Fairness

Allegations about suspects and others:

A libellous statement is one that is untrue and seriously harms the reputation of an

individual's or company. In addition, as a broadcaster, ITV has a duty to treat individuals and companies in programmes fairly.

Where a programme includes a serious allegation about a particular person, company or organisation we need to verify the accuracy of the allegation and provide the party concerned with an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond. We should reflect any response fairly and accurately in the programme.

Police programmes often include serious allegations about a suspect at the time of arrest. For example, a policeman may say that an arrested individual is a suspected drug dealer. If this is confirmed by conviction at court prior to broadcast, then we are not obliged to provide any right of reply – the allegation was clearly true.

However, the suspect may end up being released without charge, acquitted or convicted on a lesser charge (eg possession of drugs). In this instance the comment may need to be removed from the programme, especially if it constitutes a serious allegation (such as drug dealing) that has since been disproven or remains unconfirmed. In other words, it's not sufficient to rely on the fact that the allegation was based on reasonable suspicion at the time.

Even where no explicit allegations are made about an arrested individual, we may decide to obscure their identity if no charges have been brought. Depending on the circumstances, not doing so could give rise to a libel claim or fairness complaint; the individual concerned could argue that viewers would have assumed he was a criminal.

Generally speaking, for reasons of accuracy and fairness, police programmes should include a neutral factual summary in commentary about the outcome of each incident/story (eg "the man was kept in the cells overnight but no charges were brought", "both men were arrested and are awaiting trial for affray", "no one was arrested following this incident", or "Bob Smith **(pictured) was found guilty of fraud and sentenced to 2 years in prison**" etc).

The general public

We need to be careful where we use GV footage of the public juxtaposed with a voiceover referring to criminal activity. For example, where voiceover says "on a Friday night Oldham city centre sees many street fights" or "police are on hand to stop Cardiff hooligans kicking off", do not use generic street footage of identifiable individuals, as this could give rise to a fairness complaint or a libel claim.

Re-use of old footage

Care is needed when re-using old footage of lesser crimes (eg speeding, petty theft etc). People are entitled to put minor past misdemeanours behind them. Depending on the seriousness of the crime, lesser convictions are deemed to be "spent" after varying periods of time. We should consider whether it is fair to identify someone committing a minor offence many years earlier, particularly when their conviction has been spent.

ANNEX 1

Specimen written notice when filming in public

We are currently filming a TV series [...TITLE....] for ITV, due to be broadcast [later this year/next year].

The programme follows the work of [police officers/the emergency services]. This involves filming them in their work and interacting with members of the public.

We do not generally require prior consent to film members of the public in public places. Nevertheless, we always wish to respect the privacy of individuals in sensitive situations, and to avoid causing any undue distress.

If you have any concerns about having been filmed, or would simply like to find out if you may be featured in the programme, please contact [name] at [email address].

ANNEX 2

Ofcom is required to consider complaints about **unwarranted infringements of privacy in a programme or in connection with the obtaining of material included in a programme.**

There have been a number of privacy adjudications over the years relating to situations that involve filming with the police and emergency services. This summary gives a flavour of Ofcom's approach to such complaints.

UPHELD

2024 – BBC's *The Detectives: Fighting Organised Crime* followed the work of specialist detectives of Greater Manchester Police (GMP); material broadcast in the programme was filmed by body cameras worn by police officers, showing a victim of a violent kidnapping (the complainant) being found by officers on a street in a distressed and disorientated state with significant injuries to his face, head and feet. Some of this material had previously been played in open court. Further police footage showed the complainant in a hospital bed describing, in his own words, the circumstances of his kidnapping and the way in which his injuries had been sustained. This material was used without the complainant's consent and his identity was not completely obscured in the programme. Ofcom found that the broadcaster acquiring the footage from the police constituted "obtaining" it under Section 8 of the Ofcom Code, even though it was not originally recorded for the programme, but in all the circumstances did not uphold the privacy complaint in this regard. However, the complainant had a legitimate expectation of privacy in the footage as broadcast in the programme without his consent. In the circumstances, the complainant's legitimate expectation of privacy outweighed the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression. Therefore, the complainant's privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast.

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0024/284514/Mr-G-The-Detectives-Fighting-Organised-Crime-Adjudication.pdf

2021 - Channel 4's *24 Hours in Police Custody* followed Bedfordshire Police investigating drug supply and violence in Luton. Mr F was filmed during a police raid on his home and being taken into custody, and also gave an interview to camera. Mr F sought to withdraw his consent prior to broadcast and asked not to be identified, but his ID was not concealed. Ofcom found Mr F had a legitimate expectation of privacy with regard to the footage shown of him in the programme. While the programme makers considered they had obtained Mr F's informed consent for the broadcast of this footage in the programme, Mr F withdrew any consent that he had given previously for footage of him in which he was identifiable to be used in the programme. Therefore, the programme makers did not have Mr F's informed consent for the footage to be broadcast as it was, and his expectation of privacy was not outweighed by the public interest in broadcast.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/273441/Complaint-by-Mr-F-about-24-Hours-in-Police-Custody,-Channel-4,-4-October-2021.pdf

2021 – BBC's *Look East* featured a report about NHS waiting times during the Covid 19 pandemic and showed footage of the Health Secretary Sajid Javid visiting Milton Keynes University Hospital. Footage was included of Mr Javid in a hospital waiting room in which the complainant could be seen in the background with her face unobscured. Ms G complained that her privacy was unwarrantably infringed in both the obtaining and subsequent broadcast of this footage in the programme. Ofcom

found that Ms G had a legitimate expectation of privacy both in the obtaining of material and in the programme as broadcast, and that this outweighed the broadcaster's and audience's right to freedom of expression.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0027/238671/Complaint-by-Ms-G-about-Look-East-West,-BBC-1-regional,-10-August-2021,-1830.pdf

2015 – BBC's *Reporting Scotland* examined the impact alcohol-related call outs had on the Scottish Ambulance Service in Glasgow, and the delays this caused to the services' response to "genuine emergency" incidents. The report included footage of Mr F sitting on the pavement outside a pub in Glasgow having injured his head. It also showed close-up footage of blood being washed from his hand and Mr and Mrs F in an ambulance. Both of their faces were obscured. In weighing up the competing rights of the parties, Ofcom took particular account of the sensitive circumstances surrounding the filming of Mr and Mrs F whilst Mr F was receiving medical treatment, as well as his distress and confusion which seemed to be exacerbated by being filmed against his will, and found that the infringement into Mr and Mrs F's privacy was not warranted.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0025/53791/issue_307.pdf

2014 – Channel 4's *999: What's Your Emergency* showed Mr G when 17 years old receiving treatment from paramedics after taking an overdose of valium and smoking cannabis. Mr G consented at the time of filming. Ofcom found that it was not reasonable to assume that Mr G had provided *informed* consent to be filmed, but the programme makers were justified in assuming that such consent had been obtained from Mr G's mother and/or step-father (who were also present at the time). However, Ofcom also found that informed consent *for broadcast* had not been obtained from Mr G or his mother and/or step-father. Ofcom said that although broadcasting the footage served the public interest to some extent (by highlighting the challenges faced by emergency workers when dealing with drug-related incidents) doing so in circumstances where the subject was young, vulnerable and clearly identifiable represented an unwarranted infringement of privacy. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0023/46652/obb247.pdf

2014 – BBC's *Cherry Healey: Old Before My Time* showed Miss M, a nurse in a hospital, where the hospital had permitted the filming and prominent notices had been displayed to show that it was taking place. Miss M had notified her employers that she did not wish to participate, and had been assured by both them and a cameraman that she would not be included in the programme. However, when it was broadcast she was briefly shown unobscured on a number of occasions. Ofcom found that Miss M's privacy had been infringed unwarrantably and that her identity should have been obscured, even though the footage did not show her engaged in any conduct that could reasonably be regarded as particularly private, sensitive or confidential in nature.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0027/47475/obb249.pdf

2012 – Channel 5's *The Candy Bar Girls* showed Ms B-R, who had consented to take part, filmed outside a nightclub arguing loudly with her girlfriend. Ofcom upheld her complaint that her privacy had been infringed unwarrantably because although the argument had happened in a public place, Ms B-R had asked the camera crew "for some space", and had been given an assurance by them that the footage would not be broadcast.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0027/47718/obb206.pdf

2006 – ITV's *Crime Secrets* examined the murder of Ms E's sister, Susan Watts, in 1997 and the subsequent police investigation. The police had told ITV they would

contact Mrs Watts' family, but had failed to do so. Ofcom concluded that the broadcast of the programme unwarrantably infringed the privacy of Mrs E and her family, because the programme makers did not take sufficient steps to confirm with the police that the family had been informed about it prior to broadcast.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0025/47293/issue59.pdf

2004 – BBC's *Traffic Cops: Fatal Attraction* included clearly identifiable footage of an accident victim without her consent. Those involved in the accident had a legitimate expectation of privacy while receiving treatment from a paramedic at the accident scene. The broadcast of the accident footage (as well as the recording of it) was deemed an unwarranted infringement of privacy. Ofcom stated that blanket consent from the emergency services to film did not mean that express consent from those involved in the accident was not necessary. See: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20080713005333/http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/pcb_06/f_p/

2004 – BBC's *Frontline* included footage of the aftermath of an accident involving Ms H and two of her daughters, one of whom died. The footage of the aftermath was filmed in a public place, but showed the victims in pain and distress. Although the accident was a matter of public knowledge, the fact that one of the victims had died meant that the accident was particularly horrific for Ms H and her surviving daughter, and they had a legitimate expectation of privacy. Neither Ms H nor her daughter had consented to their inclusion in the programme but both were identifiable in the footage shown, and accordingly Ofcom said their privacy had been infringed unwarrantably. Ofcom added that the public interest could have been served without including the footage in question, and as there had been a death the situation called for particular sensitivity. See: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20080713001637/http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/pcb_16/f_p_a/

NOT UPHELD

2023 – Channel 4's *Despatches: Undercover Ambulance – NHS in Chaos* investigated some of the challenges faced by the ambulance service during the winter of 2022. It included undercover filming by an Emergency Medical Technician ("EMT") to show the difficulties experienced by ambulance crews in responding to emergencies and dealing with hospital handover times, and the impact on patients and their families. Mrs C complained that her daughter's privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the obtaining and subsequent broadcast of surreptitiously filmed footage of her arriving at a hospital in a car following an accident, because an ambulance had not arrived. The daughter was shown receiving treatment but her identity was obscured. Ofcom found she had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the footage, but in the particular circumstances of this case this did not outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in including the material broadcast. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0028/266707/Dispatches-Undercover-Ambulance-NHS-in-Chaos,-Channel-4,-9-March-2023.pdf

2023 – C5's *Motorway Cops: Catching Britain's Speeders* included footage of Mr H being stopped, questioned, and arrested on suspicion of theft of a motor vehicle, driving while disqualified, and refusal to take a breathalyser test. It also included footage of him at a police station. He was convicted of various driving offences. Mr H complained that his privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast because unobscured footage of him was included without his consent.

Ofcom found that he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the broadcast of the footage without his consent, but in the particular circumstances that did not outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression, and the public interest in including the material in the programme. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/271731/Complaint-by-Mr-Graham-Herschell-about-Motorway-Cops-Catching-Britains-Speeders,-Channel-5,-8-May-2023.pdf

2022 - C5's *Police: Hour of Duty* followed the work of the Derbyshire Police, and included footage of the complainant being questioned, breathalysed, and arrested on suspicion of drink driving. He was subsequently convicted. Mr M complained that his privacy was unwarrantably infringed in both the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without his consent. Ofcom found Mr M had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of the footage of him without his consent. This did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in including the material in the programme. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0038/249698/F-and-P-Adjudication-Complaint-by-Mr-M-about-Police-Hour-of-Duty.pdf

2021 – C5's *Motorway Cops: Catching Britain's Speeders* included footage of Ms H being pulled over, questioned, breathalysed, and arrested on suspicion of drink driving, and in the police station. She later pleaded guilty to drink driving. Ms H complained that her privacy was unwarrantably infringed in both the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without her consent. Ofcom found that Ms H had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of the footage of her without her consent. This did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in including the material in the programme. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/240592/Complaint-by-Ms-H-about-The-Motorway-Cops-Catching-Britains-Speeders.pdf

2020 – C5's *Police Interceptors* included footage of Mr M being arrested for being in charge of a motor vehicle while over the prescribed legal alcohol limit, and in the police station. He was later convicted of drink driving. Mr M complained that his privacy was unwarrantably infringed in both the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without his consent. Ofcom found that Mr M had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of the footage. This did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in the material broadcast. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/223743/Complaint-by-Mr-M-about-Police-Interceptors,-Channel-5,-30-March-2020,-2000.pdf

2019 – Channel 4's *24 Hours in Police Custody* followed the work of Bedfordshire Police as they investigated suspected insurance fraud committed by the complainant, and included footage of the interior and exterior of his house and the house of his late parents (including personal possessions) during the police search of these properties. He was later found guilty of fraud and perverting the course of justice. Mr M complained that his privacy had been unwarrantably infringed in the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without his consent. Ofcom found that he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the obtaining and subsequent broadcast of the footage of the interior of his house without his consent. This did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in the material broadcast. Mr M did not have a legitimate expectation of

privacy in relation to the footage of the exterior of his house, or the interior or exterior of his late parents' house. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0023/229154/Complaint-by-Mr-Anthony-McGrath-about-24-Hours-in-Police-Custody,-Channel-4,-8-April-2019,-2100.pdf

2019 – Channel 4's *24 Hours in Police Custody* followed the work of Bedfordshire Police in its investigation into suspected financial fraud committed by Ms X's then husband. The programme included footage of a police search at Ms X's house in Luton, in which she lived with her four children at the time. The programme included footage of the exterior and interior of the home, including personal belongings, as well as footage of Ms X inside her home. Ms X complained that her privacy, and that of her four children, had been unwarrantably infringed in the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without her consent. Ofcom found that she had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of footage of her and the interior of her home without her consent. This did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in the material broadcast. Ms X and her children did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the footage of the exterior of their home. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0028/227656/24-Hours-in-Police-Custody,-Channel-4,-29-July-2019,-2100.pdf

2019 – C5's *Police Interceptors* included footage of the complainant as he was arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. He later pleaded guilty to drink driving. Mr N complained that his privacy was unwarrantably infringed in both the filming and subsequent broadcast of this footage without his consent. Ofcom found he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of the footage of him without his consent. However, this did not, on balance, outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in the material broadcast. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0034/197638/Complaint-by-Mr-Sabeel-Nawaz-about-Police-Interceptors,-Channel-5,-23-October-2019,-2000.pdf

2019 - Channel 4's *999 What's Your Emergency?* followed the work of Northamptonshire's emergency services and focused on the increase in knife crime. Footage was included of the complainant's son being arrested for possession of a knife, his house being searched, and in the police station. He was found guilty of a public order offence. Mrs E complained that her son's privacy was unwarrantably infringed in connection with the obtaining of material included in the programme and in the programme as broadcast. Ofcom found that he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in connection with the obtaining of material included in the programme. However it was reasonable for the broadcaster to consider that they had obtained informed consent from him for the filming and, in any case, his legitimate expectation of privacy did not outweigh the broadcaster's and audience's right to freedom of expression rights and the public interest in the filming and the broadcast of the footage. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0037/195778/Complaint-by-Mrs-E-made-on-behalf-of-Mr-F-about-999-Whats-Your-Emergency.pdf

2017 – ITV's *The Detectives* showed the work of police in Lancashire as they investigated a case of alleged rape. Details surrounding Ms T's relationship with the main suspect in the case, Scott Lazenby, were included in the programme without her consent. Mrs T was not named in the programme. Lazenby was later convicted. Ofcom found that, in the circumstances of this case, Ms T did not have a legitimate

expectation of privacy in relation to the material included in the programme as broadcast. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0024/108915/issue-344-broadcast-on-demand-bulletin.pdf

2017 – C5's *Police Interceptors* followed the work of police interceptor units across the UK, included footage of police officers searching Mrs W's house in a raid and discovering Class A drugs. Her husband was later convicted of possession. Ofcom found that she had a legitimate expectation of privacy in connection with the obtaining of material and in the programme as broadcast with regards to the footage of her in her home. However, on balance, and in the particular circumstances of this case, the public interest in filming and broadcasting the material, which showed the work of the police investigating crime, outweighed Mrs W's right to privacy. She did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the broadcast of the footage of the outside of her house. See:

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/107433/issue-340-broadcast-on-demand-bulletin.pdf

2016 – *Channel 4 News* reported on the rise in gang attacks, stabbings and youth violence in London. CCTV footage was shown of an incident at an ice cream parlour where knives were brandished. Ms G's son (a minor) was visible, although the footage of him was fleeting. He was not named or referred to during the report, his facial features were not clear, and there was nothing else distinctive about his appearance. Ofcom decided he would only have been identifiable to a small number of people who knew him and had knowledge of the incident, and did not uphold the complaint.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0031/88708/Issue_312_of_Ofcoms_Broadcast_and_On_Demand_Bulletin.pdf

2016 - In Channel 5's *Undercover: Nailing the Fraudsters*, Mr and Mrs F were filmed in their home as it was being searched by the police. Footage of this search and of Mrs F being arrested for fraud was subsequently broadcast in the programme. Ofcom found that in the circumstances of the case, the public interest in filming and broadcasting the material, which showed the work of the police investigating crime, outweighed the complainants' right to privacy.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0021/102567/issue-330-broadcast-on-demand-bulletin.pdf

2016 – ITV's *Rookies* included footage of Mr B after his arrest for suspicion of attempted murder, aged 17 at the time. He was shown sitting on the ground speaking to police officers about the incident and as he was led away to the police van. Mr B was not named in the programme and his face was blurred. His voice was heard in the programme, but its pitch was altered. He later pleaded guilty to GBH with intent and possession of an offensive weapon. Ofcom found that Mr B had a limited legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming and subsequent broadcast of the footage of him without his consent. However, on balance, this did not outweigh the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in the particular circumstances of the case.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0014/100148/Issue-326-of-Ofcoms-Broadcast-and-On-Demand-Bulletin.pdf

2015 – ITV's *Meridian News* reported on new developments in the police investigation into the murder of Claire Tiltman in 1993. As part of the investigation, the police searched Mrs A's house and car. The report included footage of Mrs A's house, referred to as the former home of her son Colin Ash-Smith, who has since

been convicted of Ms Tiltman's murder. The full address of the property was disclosed and footage of Mrs A's car registration number was shown. Ofcom found that Mrs A did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in connection with either the obtaining or the broadcasting of this material. Ofcom took into account that the filming took place openly and from a public place, that the cameras had not focused particularly on Mrs A's house number or car registration number, that the investigation was of particular local interest and that the family (and property) had previously been connected to the case.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0012/51132/obb270.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Britain's Crime Capitals* concerned the work of the West Midlands Police's Gang Task Force in tackling criminal gangs in Birmingham, and included footage of a police raid on Ms M's house. Ms M, whose son was the police's target, was not identified in the programme but her voice was heard. Ofcom found that Ms M had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the filming of the raid and the recording of her voice (carried out from Ms M's garden without her knowledge) as well as the broadcasting of this material. However, Ofcom stated that this was outweighed by the public interest in making a programme using real-life examples about how a specialist police unit was trying to eradicate gang-related crime. As Ms M was only identifiable to a limited extent, the invasion of privacy was also limited.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/50582/issue_278.pdf

2015 – Channel 4's *Confessions of a Copper* explored police practices since the 1960s and the changes encountered by the police over that time. The programme included archive footage of Mrs E, a former police officer who has since re-trained as a teacher, holding up a "Stop and Search" form. Mrs E said she had deliberately kept her previous employment private, as she now worked in an area where many families hold negative views about the police. Ofcom found that Mrs E did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the footage. Ofcom took into account that Mrs E was shown only briefly doing nothing particularly sensitive, that she had not objected to being filmed for the original Channel 4 News report, and that it was already in the public domain that she had previously been a police officer.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0025/47932/obb279.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Left for Dead By The Yorkshire Ripper* included accounts of the experiences of surviving victims of Peter Sutcliffe. Ms O, the daughter of Wilma McCann, one of Mr Sutcliffe's victims, did not appear in the programme. However, her brother, Richard McCann, did appear and he explained the effect their mother's murder had had on the family. A photograph featuring Mr McCann, Ms O and their two other siblings as children was shown twice during the programme. Their faces were not obscured. Ofcom found that Ms O had a legitimate, albeit limited expectation of privacy with regard to the photograph, but that the infringement of privacy was warranted because it enabled Mr McCann to illustrate his important story. Ofcom said the broadcaster should have taken steps to inform Ms O about its plan to make and broadcast the programme, to reduce any potential distress. But the broadcaster's failure to do this did not itself constitute an unwarranted infringement of Ms O's privacy, given that her privacy had not been unwarrantably infringed in the programme itself.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0037/49699/issue_283.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Muggings and Mayhem: Caught on Camera* focused on how CCTV is used by the emergency services, and included footage of police officers rescuing Ms T, her mother and her sister from the River Thames. The faces of the women were either indistinct or had been obscured by the broadcaster. Ofcom stated

that although the incident took place in public and was witnessed by onlookers, the extremely sensitive nature of the situation meant that Ms T had a legitimate expectation of privacy with regards to the footage. However, Ofcom felt that this was outweighed by the public interest in demonstrating how CCTV cameras can assist the police in rescuing people in danger. Ofcom said the broadcaster should have asked the police to contact Ms T about the programme to reduce any potential distress. However, the broadcaster's failure to do this did not constitute an unwarranted infringement of Ms T's privacy, given that her privacy had not been unwarrantably infringed in the programme itself.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/50436/issue_284.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Muggings and Mayhem: Caught on Camera* focused on how CCTV is used by the emergency services and included footage of the complainant being assaulted at night in a street in west London. Ms D's face was not shown. Ofcom decided that Ms D had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the footage, taking in account the sensitive nature of the situation. Ms D was unaware of the filming and the material was not captured for broadcast. However, Ofcom felt that this was outweighed by the public interest in demonstrating how CCTV cameras can assist the police in combating crime.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/50436/issue_284.pdf

2015 – Channel 4's *24 Hours in Police Custody* followed the work of police officers and civilian staff at Luton Police Station as they dealt with arrested suspects held in police custody. This particular episode was about domestic disputes, and one of the cases under investigation related to an allegation of theft and harassment made by Mr S against his former wife. Mr S was not named or otherwise identified in the programme. Ofcom found he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the material about his relationship with his former wife and the complaint he had made to the police about her. However, Ofcom considered that the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in illustrating the work of the police outweighed Mr S's expectation of privacy.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/50436/issue_284.pdf

2015 – Channel 4's *24 Hours in Police Custody* followed the work of police officers and civilian staff at Luton Police Station as they dealt with arrested suspects held in police custody. This particular episode was about domestic disputes and one of the cases under investigation related to an allegation of theft and harassment made by the complainant's friend against his former wife, "Sharon". Miss R was referred to by her first name in the programme. Ofcom found that Miss R had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the details of her relationship with Sharon's former husband that were included in the programme. However, Ofcom considered that the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in illustrating the work of the police outweighed Miss R's expectation of privacy.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/50436/issue_284.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Countdown to Murder: Killer Schoolgirl* provided a detailed account of the events leading up to the murders in 2009 of Rosalyn Hunt and Desmond Thorpe. Mrs B and Mr C, two of Desmond Clarke's siblings, complained that Channel 5 did not inform them of the programme, that they were therefore unprepared for the "shocking scenes" in it, and that no account had been taken of their feelings. Ofcom decided that as the programme revealed nothing sensitive or private about Mrs B or Mr C, and all the information about Richard Thorpe's murder was already in the public domain, the complainants had no legitimate expectation of privacy. Ofcom stated that distress alone was insufficient to engage their privacy rights.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0018/50436/issue_284.pdf

2015 – Channel 5's *Countdown to Murder: Diced to Death* provided an account of the murder of Samantha Medland by Mr Medland, her husband, in 2013. Footage of Mr Medland receiving medical treatment in hospital following a suicide attempt was shown in the programme without his consent and with his face unobscured. Ofcom found that Mr Medland had a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to this footage due to his vulnerable state, the sensitive nature of the situation and the fact that it had not been published previously. However, Ofcom stated that this was outweighed by the public interest in broadcasting material showing Mr Medland's behaviour in the aftermath of the murder.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0027/49626/issue_286.pdf

2015 – Channel 4's *The Murder Detectives* followed police officers as they undertook a murder investigation. The programme broadcast details of Mr S's stabbing and subsequent injuries. Ofcom decided that it was not necessary to consider whether infringement to his privacy was warranted, as the information was already in the public domain.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0035/49796/issue_304.pdf

2015 – BBC's *Council House Crackdown* followed investigations into suspected social housing fraud and showed footage of Mr L speaking with council officials about his housing situation. Mr L's voice was heard, part of his body was shown, but his face was obscured. Ofcom decided that the public interest in broadcasting an investigative programme about the work of social housing fraud investigators outweighed any legitimate expectation of privacy Mr L had, especially considering the limited extent to which he may have been identifiable in the programme.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0035/49796/issue_304.pdf

2014 – Channel 5's *Police Interceptors* and *Stop! Police Interceptors* included Miss M being abusive in a police station following her involvement in two traffic accidents. The footage was included without Miss M's consent and with her face unblurred. Miss M did not object to the original broadcast, but later complained that her privacy had been infringed because the footage had been repeated on multiple occasions. Ofcom decided that the legitimate expectation of privacy that Miss M had due to her vulnerable state and the sensitive nature of the situation was limited by the fact that, by the time of the first broadcast, she had been convicted of driving with no insurance whilst over the alcohol limit and failing to stop at the scene of a collision. Ofcom said that her privacy was outweighed by the public interest in showing the challenges faced by the police and the serious consequences of drink-driving. Ofcom did note that broadcasters should periodically review their justification for breaching privacy in subsequent broadcasts.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0022/45805/obb259.pdf

2014 – Channel 5's *Criminals: Caught on Camera* included Miss C captured on CCTV behaving in a drunk and disorderly fashion and receiving assistance from two passers-by, before being arrested by police and led away. Miss C had been fined £90 due to her behaviour. This footage was included without Miss C's consent and with her face unobscured. Ofcom found that she had a legitimate expectation of privacy due to her vulnerable state, but this was limited because filming had been conducted in a public place, and was outweighed by the public interest in broadcasting footage showing the work of the CCTV Control Room operators and the police.

See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/46394/obb252.pdf

2008 – ITV’s *The Truth About Binge Drinking* included Mr N filmed in the street whilst drunk with his face unblurred. Ofcom found that because Mr N was filmed openly on a public street, and there was nothing particularly sensitive or private about his behaviour, he did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy.

See:

https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20080710153625/http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb112/

2007 – BBC’s *Shops, Robbers and Videotape* included Mr J filmed against his wishes by the roadside being arrested for drink-driving, and then at the police station. Mr J’s face was blurred and his name was not given. Mr J had requested “can you get the camera off me please” to which a police officer answered “no”. Ofcom considered that Mr J had a heightened expectation of privacy when in the police station, a place where the general public does not have unrestricted access. Being arrested and taken to a police station was a sensitive situation in which Mr J could have legitimately expected a certain degree of privacy, especially when he had requested not to be filmed. However, Ofcom considered that in being engaged in activity resulting in arrest, Mr J’s expectation of privacy was diminished and in the circumstances of this particular case he did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy. See:

https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20080710154531/http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb89/

2006 – BBC’s *Traffic Cops* included Mr C filmed against his wishes being arrested by the roadside for drink-driving, and then being breathalysed in a police station. Mr C was subsequently convicted of drink-driving. Mr C’s face was not blurred in the programme. Ofcom found that although Mr C would have expected a degree of privacy, the filming of him and broadcast of the footage was justified, because it showed the work of the police and exposed his criminal conduct. See:

https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20080710153911/http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/pcb43/

Pre-Ofcom Decisions

2000 – Granada’s *Motorway Life* showed the aftermath of a car crash, including shots of Ms C receiving medical attention for injuries. The BSC recognised the broadcaster’s right to film at the scene of accidents, but stated that such filming needs to be sensitive and discreet for the victim’s reasonable expectation of privacy to be respected. It was considered that the proximity of the camera crew and their recording equipment intensified Ms C’s distress, to the extent that her privacy had been unwarrantably infringed in the recording of the footage. There was a dispute of interpretation over a subsequent phone conversation with the producer, but Ms C was found to have refused permission for the footage of her to be included in the programme. The programme included it but obscured her identity. The BSC deemed this insufficient to prevent her from being identified. The BSC found no overriding public interest to justify broadcasting the footage, and broadcast constituted a further unwarranted infringement of Ms C’s privacy.

2000 – Carlton’s *Motorway* included footage of Mr K receiving medical attention for injuries he sustained in a road traffic accident, without his consent. The BSC said that Mr K had a justifiable expectation of privacy, and the extensive close-up shots of him receiving medical treatment could not be justified on public interest grounds. The BSC concluded that this amounted to an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

1999 – Granada’s *Motorway Life* included footage of Mr S talking from his car window to a police officer in a sequence illustrating the effects of traffic congestion, filmed without his knowledge or consent. The Broadcasting Standards Commission (BSC) concluded that there was no legitimate public interest in broadcasting the private conversation and that doing so represented an unwarranted infringement of Mr S’s privacy.

May 2024

COMMERCIAL REFERENCES, SPONSORSHIP AND PRODUCT PLACEMENT

Key Principles and Issues

- Control - ITV must maintain editorial independence and control over programming, including sponsored content;
- Distinction - editorial content and advertising must remain separate;
- Transparency - audiences must be protected from surreptitious advertising;
- Consumer Protection - audiences must be protected from the risk of financial harm;
- Promotion - products or services cannot be promoted in programmes, other than in limited circumstances (eg programme related material, cross-promotions and some premium rate telephony services);
- Undue prominence - of products, services and brands in programmes is not allowed; references must be justified by the editorial requirements of the programme;
- Sponsorship - unsuitable sponsorship must be avoided; sponsorship cannot involve any editorial control by the sponsor, and cannot lead to the creation of content that is a vehicle for promoting the sponsor and its interests. Sponsorship credits cannot contain advertising messages or calls to action;
- Product placement - is permitted in certain programme genres and for certain products/services/brands. Programmes cannot become a vehicle for the purpose of featuring placed products, services or brands. Programmes cannot contain promotional or unduly prominent references to placed products/services/brands.

1. Commercial references in programmes

Promotion and undue prominence of products and services

Promotion - Products, services and trademarks are an intrinsic part of everyday life, and can be referred to in programmes. But programmes cannot promote them. Generally speaking, products and services can be mentioned or shown visually, but inclusion should always be editorially justified, and should not be referred to in unduly favourable or superlative language.

Undue prominence – this is a difficult judgment, and may often require compliance advice prior to filming, to avoid difficulties when editing. Undue prominence may result simply from the presence of a product/service/brand in a programme without sufficient editorial justification, or from the frequency and manner in which it appears in the programme visually or verbally (eg the number of times it appears, or the tone in which it is discussed). If a reference creates the impression that there has been any external commercial influence on the editorial process (ie if it looks artificially prominent or distracting, rather than having a “natural fit” within the programme) then it is likely to be unduly prominent. Lingering shots of products or logos should therefore be avoided.

Consumer advice programmes – in programmes or programme items that involve product reviews or consumer tips, a greater degree of information about products (including pricing and availability) and favourable references to them may be editorially justified. In consumer items, reference to a range of products/brands is usually preferable to focussing on one brand/product.

Chat shows - Ofcom recognises that guests on chat/magazine programmes will often appear to promote their latest venture. If this is a creative endeavour linked to their profession or talent (eg an actor discussing their latest film, or a musician discussing their latest release or tour) it is likely to be acceptable, as long as references are not unduly prominent and within the context of a wider interview. Where the venture is not directly linked to the guest's profession or creative talents (eg an actor or singer paid to be the brand ambassador for a product in which they have had no real creative input), it may be harder to justify.

Competition prizes – competition V/Ts may feature some product information about the prize, to assist the viewer in deciding whether to enter, but this should not be unduly promotional in tone.

Clothing - presenters should not wear prominently branded clothing. Interviewees and guests should generally also not wear branded clothing, although this may be more acceptable where the broadcaster does not fully control the environment of the filming (eg sporting events).

Events - Prominent branding positioned for the purpose of media coverage should be avoided where possible. When covering events such as awards ceremonies or sporting events, the inclusion of incidental branding in the background of shot and outside programme-makers' control should not raise undue prominence issues.

Programme-related material

Programme-related material (PRM) is defined as “products or services that are both directly derived from a programme and specifically intended to allow viewers to benefit fully from, or interact with, that programme”. Examples include directly related editorial content available on programme websites and apps, downloads or streaming of music performances from a programme, DVDs or downloads of the programme or series, or CDs or downloads of the soundtrack music. PRM can only be promoted during or around the programme it is derived from, where it is editorially justified.

PRM can be free or paid for by viewers. Where it is paid for, any promotion must be kept “distinct” from the rest of the programme, eg via a text strap or V/T, rather than announced by presenters.

Premium rate services (PRS)

PRS can only be promoted where they:

- Enable viewers to participate directly in or contribute to the editorial content of programme; or
- They fall within the definition of programme-related material.

The primary purpose of the programme must be clearly editorial, and the promotion of PRS must be clearly subsidiary to that purpose. A talent or reality show where viewers can pay to vote for their preferred winner is the most obvious example of

this. But programmes that are effectively promotional vehicles for premium rate services are not acceptable as editorial content. The cost of using the PRS must be made clear to viewers (and text used must be legible) and use of PRS must comply both with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code and the Phone-paid Services Authority Code of Practice.

Generally, a viewer can only be charged to participate or interact with programmes by means of premium rate telephone services, or other telephony services based on similar revenue-sharing arrangements.

Programme Apps can be promoted where they allow audience participation in programmes or otherwise qualify as PRM.

Reference to social networking sites (e.g. Facebook, X, Instagram) in programmes

Such references may be editorially acceptable, provided:

- Use of the site must attract no charge to viewers;
- References should not result from product placement;
- References, including use of logos for ease of identification, should not be unduly prominent.

Credits for suppliers of goods and services for a programme

A brief basic credit for the supplier may be included in the end credits of the programme where their contribution has been substantial. End credits should not contain logos other than those of ITV and/or the production company.

Brand references in viewer competitions

References to brands within viewer competitions must be brief and secondary. Competitions cannot be used as advertising platforms for the prizes or prize donors. The content of a viewer competition (scripts, questions, reference to prize etc) cannot be guaranteed or negotiated with the prize provider.

Use of adverts in programmes

Extracts from advertisements, both recent or historic, can appear in programmes, if their inclusion is editorially justified, but must not be the result of any payment or other valuable consideration to the broadcaster or programme-maker. Generally logos, contact details and straplines should be avoided.

2. Sponsorship

What is sponsorship?

A sponsored programme is one that has some or all of its costs met by a sponsor with a view to promoting its own or another's name, brand, product or service.

This includes advertiser-funded programming.

Advertisers who cannot advertise on television also cannot sponsor programmes or channels, eg any political body, tobacco brands, etc.

Identification of sponsorship and sponsor credits

Sponsored programmes must be clearly identified by reference to the name of the sponsor and the fact they are sponsoring the programme, at the beginning and/or end of the programme. A sponsored programme must therefore have either a front or end credit, and will usually have both. It may also have credits at the end and start of each part. Sponsorship credits may include separate sponsor “bumpers” (which do not form part of the programme’s running time) or integrated title sequences and credits within the programme.

In a sponsorship credit, the relationship between the sponsor and the sponsored programme must be transparent. The sponsorship arrangement must be the primary focus of the credit, and advertising messages and calls to action for the sponsor’s products are not allowed. Acceptable sponsorship messages include “sponsored by X”, “in association with X”, and “supported by X”. “Brought to you by X” is also permitted, but is generally only used by ITV for advertiser-funded programmes.

Sponsorship credits within programmes are permitted, as long as they are not unduly prominent, and the sponsor is not prohibited from product placing in the programme (see “product placement” below). Credits within programmes can only contain a brief, neutral visual or verbal statement identifying the sponsorship arrangement and a static graphic of the name, logo or any other distinctive symbol of the sponsor.

References to the sponsor in sponsored programmes

Whenever the programme contains a reference to the sponsor or its products/services/brands/interests, this may create a presumption of editorial influence by the sponsor.

Sponsored or advertiser-funded programmes are commissioned by ITV and producers must bear in mind that they are being made for ITV, not for the sponsor/advertiser. The content of the sponsored programme cannot be a vehicle for the purpose of promoting the sponsor, its products, services, brands or interests. The ultimate arbiter of all programme content is ITV.

There are limited circumstances in which a sponsor (or its products, services or interests) may be referred to in the sponsored programme:

- A sponsor can place products in the programme. Placement will be subject to the rules on product placement (see below) and in particular the prohibition of promotional and unduly prominent references. In an AFP, where the sponsor has been involved in the creation of the programme, any reference to it or its interests are likely to be considered as product placement.
- Where an incidental reference to the sponsor is made that is not the result of the commercial arrangement, the reference will be subject to the general rules on commercial references (see above) in particular regarding promotion and undue prominence.

3. Product placement

Product placement is the inclusion in a programme of a product, service or trade mark or a reference to it, where the inclusion is for a commercial purpose and is in return for payment or other valuable consideration to ITV, the producer or anyone

connected with them. Payment for inclusion of references by a non-commercial organisation (eg a charity) will also be product placement.

The placement of products, services and trademarks is now allowed, with some exceptions. However, paid-for placement of references to a funder's aims, objectives, beliefs etc (sometimes called "thematic placement") is not.

Prop placement is different to product placement. Prop placement is the inclusion of a product, service or trademark in a programme without any payment to ITV, the producer or any person connected with them. Both prop and product placement can be used in the same programme.

Any proposed product placement arrangement must be notified to ITV Commercial and compliance in advance of filming.

Which programmes cannot include product placement?

Product placement is not allowed in the following genres - news, current affairs, children's programmes, religious programmes, consumer advice programmes (or consumer advice items in other programmes).

Magazine shows may contain product placement even where the show includes elements of restricted genre content (eg news bulletins/items, consumer affairs strands) provided that the restricted genre content does not form the majority of the content and any product placement does not influence that content.

Which products/brands cannot be placed?

Cigarettes/tobacco products and brands, medicinal products, alcohol, foods and drinks high in fat, salt or sugar (HFSS), gambling, infant formula (baby milk, includes follow-on formula), electronic or smokeless cigarettes, cigarette lighters, cigarette papers or pipes intended for smoking, and any product, service or trademark that cannot be advertised on television.

References to placed products/brands in the programme

Product placement must not influence the content or scheduling of a programme in a way that affects the responsibility and editorial independence of ITV. Programmes must not be created or distorted to become a vehicle for the purpose of featuring placed products, services or trademarks.

References to placed products, services and trademarks must not be:

- Promotional – the following are likely to be considered promotional: encouragement to purchase, advertising claims, price or availability information, references to positive attributes or benefits of the product, slogans associated with the product and endorsements (whether explicit or implicit). Great care is required if a presenter/actor has an existing relationship with a placed brand. The rule on promotional references also means that:
 - Product placement of competition prizes in viewer competitions is unlikely to comply with the rule.

- Any product placement of programme-related material will mean the promotion for it has to sit outside the main body of the programme (eg during or after the end credits) or within a distinct short VT within it.
- Unduly prominent – the extent and nature of references will need to be judged against the editorial requirements of the programme.

Signalling of product placement

Product placement in a programme needs to be signalled clearly to viewers by the universal neutral “P” logo for three seconds at the beginning of the programme, when the programme resumes after a break and at the end of the programme. The logo used must conform to Ofcom’s specifications.

March 2024

ITV OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE GUIDELINES

The Ofcom Broadcasting Code requires that broadcasters apply “generally accepted standards” to offensive language in programmes, to ensure that:

- material that may cause offence is justified by context
- children are protected from unsuitable material by appropriate scheduling

There are no “banned” words in the Code, and there is no absolute right for viewers not to be offended by language used in TV programmes. Ofcom’s most recent research on audience attitudes suggests viewers accept offensive language being used for dramatic impact, for humour, to reflect real life, or to inform and educate. The research also shows increasingly relaxed attitudes about the use of swear words, as long as the strongest language is only broadcast after the watershed, and parents are given sufficient information to inform decisions about what their children watch. But they are increasingly concerned about discriminatory language, particularly around race.

Context is all-important, and the use of offensive language must be justified by its context, eg why it appears in the programme, the nature of the likely audience given the scheduling, what warnings were given, who is speaking and who is being spoken to, the perceived intention or purpose of programme-makers, presenters or contributors, and what the audience expectations are for the schedule slot, the genre of programme, and the channel.

Offensive language is a part of British culture, and ITV is proud that its programmes are at the heart of that culture, and reflect British society. This guidance is informed by research on viewer attitudes published by Ofcom, and by previous Ofcom adjudications. It provides general guidance for all programmes on ITV channels, and the examples of offensive words are not exhaustive – within the last decade some words have largely dropped out of use, whilst new ones are constantly arriving.

Any use of offensive language is always both an editorial and a compliance issue, and should be considered carefully and discussed with commissioners and compliance advisors. Producers should not assume that a post-watershed slot of itself makes *any* amount of offensive language acceptable. After 21:00, the transition to more adult material must not be too abrupt, so focus should be given especially to the early part of those programmes starting at 21:00.

Producers should also not assume that any offensive language can be dealt with for pre-watershed broadcast simply by “bleeping” or “dipping” that language. Excessive or repeated language, even masked, may still render the tone of some programming unsuitable for pre-watershed broadcast, and further editing (ie completely removing some dialogue or images) may be required.

Ofcom’s research suggests three broad groupings of words –

Mild – unlikely to concern audiences in most circumstances and requiring limited context

Moderate – greater potential for offence, and a higher level of context required, based on audience reasonable expectations

Strong – highly offensive, and clear contextual justification required.

In summary, ITV’s expectations pre- and post-watershed are as follows:

Pre-watershed

- The strongest language (see below) should not appear in any programme, and other offensive language only exceptionally
- Moderate and mild language (see below) should only be used where editorially justified by the context
- No offensive language should appear in children’s programmes

Post-watershed

- The strongest language should generally be avoided in programmes likely to still attract a significant "family" audience (eg *I’m a Celebrity Get Me Out Of Here*, *Britain’s Got Talent*)
- For programmes starting at 21:00, the strongest language should generally be avoided in pre-title and recap sequences, and in the early part of the programme
- Offensive language should only be included if editorially justified by context

Post Watershed only (21:00)

<p>Motherfucker, Cunt</p> <p>Fuck, Fucking</p>	<p>These words are regarded as the “strongest” offensive language, and should never be used before the watershed. They require clear editorial justification even post-watershed.</p> <p>In programmes starting at 21:00, “fuck” and “fucking” should generally be avoided in pre-titles sequences and recaps, and used only sparingly in early scenes.</p> <p>Specific advice should be sought from a senior compliance manager for the use of “cunt”.</p>
<p>Gash, Flaps, Beef-curtains, Punani, Pussy Hole, Jap’s eye, Cocksucker, Cum, Nonce, Prickteaser, Slut</p> <p>Beaver, Clunge, Fanny, Milf, Minge, Ho, Pussy, Slag, Slapper, Skank, Snatch, Whore, Sket, Bloodclaat, Bumberclat, Cock, Dick, Dickhead, Wanker, Prick, Knob, Knob-head, Shag, Tosser, Tool, Twat, Bukkake, Dildo, Jizz, Spunk, Rapey</p>	<p>These words are regarded as “strong” and are generally unacceptable before the watershed.</p> <p>These words are regarded as “moderate” but are generally inappropriate before the watershed (unless there was particularly strong editorial and contextual justification).</p>

Discriminatory Language (generally Post Watershed)

<p>Nigger, Paki, Chink, Chinky, Ching Chong, Slope, Pikey, Gippo, Gyppo, Raghead, Towelhead, Coon, Darky, Dago, Wog, Golliwog, Golly, Coloured, Negro, Sambo, Spade, Choc Ice, Nig-nog, Gook, Honky, Jap, Kraut, Spic, Wop, Taff, Fenian, Prod, Taig, Polack, Sheeny, Kike, Yid, Heeb, Kafir/Kuffar, Papist, Half-Caste, Jungle Bunny, Uncle Tom, Chinaman, Bud bud, Coconut, Curry Muncher, Monkey, Paddy, Sheep-Shagger, Tinker, Cracker, Freshy, Jock, Nazi, Oriental, Taff, Uppity, Bible Basher, Hun, Muzzie, TARRIER, Jew</p> <p>Faggot, Homo, Queer, Poof, Ponce, Batty Boy, Nancy, Pansy, Fairy, Bender, Bent, Shirt Lifter, Queer, Queen, Bum Boy, Bumclat, Bummer, Faggot, Fag, Fudge-Packer, Chi-Chi Man, Butt Bandit, Mincing, "that's Gay"</p> <p>Lezzie, Lezza, Lesbo, Dyke, Muff Diver, Carpet Muncher, Rug Muncher</p> <p>Tranny, Gender Bender, He-She, Chick with a Dick, Shemale, Transsexual</p> <p>Retard, Mong, Schizo, Spastic, Spaz, Spakka, Cretin, Cripple, Special, Window-licker, Vegetable, Div, Mental, Loony, Nutter, Moron, Psycho, Invalid, Deaf and Dumb, Dwarf, Midget, Flid, Handicapped, Mentally Challenged, Tone Deaf, "Wheelchair bound"</p>	<p>Derogatory racial and religious terms, or those derived from historical racial terms, or those about LGBT or disabled people, require strong editorial and contextual justification at <u>any</u> time.</p> <p>Specific advice should be sought from a senior compliance manager for any inclusion of "Nigger".</p> <p>Pre-watershed, the use of discriminatory language is acceptable only exceptionally with strong editorial and contextual justification (eg in factual or drama programmes dealing with racism, homophobia or disability as a discussion topic or theme).</p> <p>Some terms may cause more or less offence depending on the user, and the purpose/context. Some language may be deemed less offensive if used in a "reclaimed" context, rather than as a derogatory term eg "Queer" or "Dyke" as used by some LGBT people.</p> <p>Some terms (eg "mental", "nutter", "loony") may cause less offence if used lightheartedly and/or without intention to insult, but not if applied to people with learning difficulties.</p>
--	--

Pre-Watershed

<p>Frigging, Frickin', Shit, Shite, Bullshit</p> <p>Shag, Screw, Tits, Bollocks</p> <p>Arsehole, Bastard, Bellend, Tart, Munter, Slapper, Son of a Bitch, Twat</p>	<p>This language is considered "moderate" but compliance advice should always be sought on inclusion pre-watershed.</p> <p>Some terms may be less acceptable where there is less audience expectation of this language appearing in the particular genre of programme.</p>
<p>Arse, Ass, Balls, Bawbag, Bum, Boobs, Bloody, Bugger, Crap, Damn, Goddamn, Piss, Pissed, Pissed off, Sod, Sod off, Effing, Feckin', Feck</p> <p>Bint, Bitch, Cow, Minger, Git, Old Bag, Ginger, Coffin Dodger, Chav</p>	<p>There is more viewer tolerance towards occasional use of this mild language before 21:00.</p> <p>Note repetition and cumulative effect – one-off use of a mild term may be acceptable, but repeated uses in the same programme may not be.</p>
<p>Gammon, Karen, Boomer, Remoaner, Snowflake</p>	<p>These "political" derogatory terms are generally regarded as mild.</p>

God, Goddamn, OMG, Jesus, Jesus Christ	<p>“God”, “Oh My God” or “OMG” are generally seen as innocent and inoffensive expressions of emotion or surprise.</p> <p>“Jesus” or “Christ” used as exclamations may still offend some religious people, but are generally viewed as acceptable pre-watershed where the use by the speaker is spontaneous and not intentionally offensive.</p> <p>Religious names combined with other expletives are more offensive, and unlikely to be editorially justified.</p>
--	---

March 2024

INTERNET MATERIAL

The internet is an invaluable resource for information and video material, but it is essential that all programme makers take the greatest care when obtaining material from it. Producers should always consider the following issues:

- Is it true? - Material and information on the internet may be untrue, defamatory or even malicious. It may be inaccurate, unconfirmed or simply repeating speculation. **Producers should be alert to the possibility that images and video material have been created using synthetic media such as “DeepFake” software or other AI technology.**
- How credible is the source? – What is the source and who is posting the material? A major public service broadcaster or a broadsheet newspaper is likely to carry reports subject to journalistic processes; tabloid or gossip websites are less reliable; YouTube and social media is entirely unreliable.
- Can you verify the content? - Try and corroborate the content of the material with at least one reliable source and with what is in the public domain and has been reported in the past elsewhere. If the material purports to be a version of another piece of material – or you think it is - always cross-check it with the original material.
- Remaining concerns about authenticity – after following the above checks, if any concerns remain over the authenticity or veracity of the material, make those concerns (and the source of the material) known to the commissioner and compliance. Sometimes unverified material might still be included with suitable qualification or warnings. This needs to be judged on a case-by-case basis.
- Copyright - There is a common misconception that because something is available and free to access online, it is therefore free to reproduce. Material online is still protected by copyright, and therefore use in our programmes needs to be cleared with the copyright owner by the production team, unless fair dealing or another copyright defence is available. Always seek advice if you wish to use any material without prior clearance of copyright or other rights (eg music or performance rights).

All producers of ITV current affairs and “hard” factual programmes should complete an Archive Source List to be submitted to the ITV compliance lawyer with the programme script, prior to delivery of the final version of the programme.

March 2024

CHARITY RELATED CONTENT

Our programmes give us the opportunity to raise awareness of social topics, and to champion good causes to millions of viewers.

Many programmes refer to particular charities in passing, when justified editorially by the context (for example chat shows where guests reference their involvement with particular good causes).

However, producers who wish to include a direct call to action onscreen for viewers to donate to charities must comply with ITV's governance process around charity related content.

Producers must also be aware of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code Rules on Charity appeals – see in particular Rules 9.33 and 9.34. A range of charities should benefit from broadcast appeals over time. Charity appeals must be broadcast free of charge (ie charities cannot offer consideration for the inclusion of an appeal on their behalf). Broadcasters have to consider evidence of the status of the charity or emergency fund.

Therefore, no charitable donation routes or platforms eg text codes, telephone numbers etc, should be promoted either on air or online (ie on ITV's programme websites) unless this has been approved by ITV Social Purpose and ITV Interactive, as well as ITV Compliance.

If your programme is supporting an ITV approved appeal and has been provided with approved donation platforms, then please make your relevant Compliance contact aware.

For more information see ITV's Charities and Causes Policy:

<https://www.itvplc.com/~media/Files/I/ITV-PLC/download/itv-charities-and-causes-policy-for-production-companies.pdf>

For further information on how ITV supports communities and causes see:

www.itvplc.com/socilpurpose

March 2024

REFERRAL UP

Many compliance decisions inevitably overlap with editorial decisions, and are a matter of careful judgment and risk assessment. On the very rare occasions when agreement cannot be reached between the compliance team, producers and commissioners, or where content related issues arise that require high level management decision making, there is a clear referral up process. The diagram below describes how these issues should be escalated within ITV's organisation, which includes compliance issues involving programme interactivity.

CEO						
General Counsel & Company Secretary						
<i>If still not agreed, escalate up</i>						
Director of Legal & Content Compliance	<agree>	MD ITV Studios or MD/CEO of independent producer	<agree>	MD, Media & Entertainment	<agree> <i>(for interactive issues)</i>	Director of Interactive and Viewer Services
		<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>		<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>		
Director of Legal & Content Compliance	<agree>	Creative Director of ITV Studios or Independent Producer management	<agree>	Head of Genre Commissioner	<agree> <i>(for interactive issues)</i>	Director of Interactive and Viewer Services
<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>		<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>		<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>		<i>If not agreed, escalate up</i>
Compliance Head or Compliance Lawyer or Compliance Advisor	<agree>	Executive Producer or producer	<agree>	Programme Commissioner	<agree> <i>(for interactive issues)</i>	Interactive Operations Manager or Interactive Producer
COMPLIANCE		PRODUCTION		COMMISSIONING		INTERACTIVE

March 2024

OFCOM BROADCASTING CODE AND GUIDANCE

All ITV producers are expected to be familiar with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code (the Code). This Handbook is no substitute for reading the Code and the Guidance on the Code available at ofcom.org.uk. The summary below is simply to provide a very brief outline reminder of the main areas covered in the Code.

Ofcom regulates most content on UK television and video on-demand services (other than commercial advertising content, which is regulated by the Advertising Standards Authority). This editorial content subject to the Code includes programmes, trailers and continuity announcements for programmes, and sponsorship messages around programmes. The On-Demand Programme Service Rules set out the statutory administrative and editorial requirements for on-demand services.

ITV is licensed by Ofcom to broadcast material that must comply with the Code, and so programme makers commissioned by ITV have contractual requirements to comply with the Code.

The Code has 9 sections setting out setting out basic “Principles”, some more detailed “Rules” and definitions, and some “Practices to be followed” in relation to fairness and privacy. Ofcom publishes Guidance on the interpretation of each section of the Code, and a Bulletin which reports the outcome of investigations into alleged breaches.

Section 1 - Protecting the Under Eighteens

Principle - that people under 18 are protected from harmful material. This is achieved by appropriate scheduling, including adherence to the 21:00 watershed, and appropriate content information. Before 21.00, content in general should be suitable for children. Even after the watershed, the transition to more adult material after 21:00 should not be too abrupt.

“Appropriate scheduling” depends on the nature of the content, the likely number and age of children in the audience, the start and finish time of the content, the nature of the channel and the likely expectations of the audience for that channel and time of day.

Rules in this section with a view to protecting children include:

Use of illegal drugs, smoking, solvents and misuse of alcohol – pre-watershed these must be generally avoided and must not be condoned, encouraged or glamourised, unless there is editorial justification.

Violence and dangerous behaviour – must be appropriately limited pre-watershed. Whether verbal or physical, violence or dangerous behaviour that is easily imitable by children in a manner that is harmful should be avoided, unless there is editorial justification.

Offensive language – the most offensive language cannot be broadcast pre-watershed, and other offensive language must be justified editorially. (Please see the detailed guidance notes in the Handbook).

Sexual material – intercourse cannot be represented pre-watershed unless there is a serious educational purpose. Discussion and portrayal of sexual behavior must be appropriately limited.

Nudity – must be justified by the context.

Exorcism, the occult and the paranormal – demonstrations (which purport to be real) must not be shown pre-watershed. Paranormal practices for entertainment purposes (other than in drama, film or comedy) should not be shown when significant numbers of children can be expected to be watching.

Under 18s taking part or involved in programmes – due care must be taken regarding their welfare and dignity, irrespective of the consent of parents or guardians. Programmes must not cause them unjustified distress or anxiety. (Please see Ofcom's Guidance on Section 1, and ITV's Child Protection Guidance in the Handbook).

Section 2 - Harm and Offence

Principle – that generally accepted standards are applied to provide adequate protection from harmful and/or offensive material.

The Rules in this section outlines these standards to protect viewers (ie both adults and children) from harmful or offensive content.

“Generally accepted standards” must be applied, and material that may cause offence must be justified by the context. “Context” includes the content of the programme, the channel, the scheduling, the degree of harm or offence likely to be caused, the likely size, composition and expectations of the audience, and the information given to viewers about the content (through continuity announcements etc).

Potentially offensive material may include – offensive language, violence, sex, sexual violence, humiliation, distress, violation of human dignity, discriminatory treatment or language (eg on grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership), and treatment of people who appear to be put at risk of significant harm by taking part in the programme.

Appropriate information - should be broadcast where it would assist in minimizing offence – hence the importance of giving continuity announcements immediately before and sometimes during programmes.

Factual programmes – must not materially mislead the audience.

Violence and dangerous behavior – programmes must not include material which condones or glamorises violent, dangerous or seriously anti-social behaviour and is likely to encourage copying.

Suicide – methods of suicide and self-harm must not be included except where editorially justified and justified by the context.

Exorcism, the occult and paranormal – demonstrations that purport to be real must be treated with due objectivity. If included for entertainment purposes, this must be

made clear. No life changing advice (about health, finance, employment or relationships) to be directed at individuals.

Hypnotism – cannot be directed at the viewing audience ie hypnotists cannot perform straight to camera and the programme should not include their full routine.

Simulated news – the viewer must not be misled by simulated news in drama or documentaries into believing they are watching actual news.

Subliminal messages – must not be used.

Flashing lights and patterns – broadcasters must take precautions to maintain a low level of risk to viewers with photosensitive epilepsy. Where it is not reasonably practical to follow Ofcom's technical guidance, but editorially justified to include flashing lights/patterns, viewers should be given adequate warning.

Competitions and voting – must be conducted fairly and must not materially mislead viewers. Rules must be clear and significant conditions must be stated on air. Competition prizes must be described accurately. (For more information see the Guidance on Sections 2 & 9, and ITV's Interactive Guidelines).

Section 3 – Crime, Disorder, Hatred and Abuse

Principle – to avoid encouragement or incitement of crime.

Programmes must not encourage or incite crime, disorder, engagement in terrorism, or include hate speech likely to encourage crime or disorder.

They must not include hate speech or abusive and derogatory treatment of individuals, groups, religions or communities, except where justified by context.

This does not mean that such material can never be broadcast. Reporting on people stating controversial views may be in the public interest, but not giving them an uncritical platform to advocate criminal activity. Contextual factors may include the genre and content of the programme (eg drama, comedy or satire), and whether sufficient challenge is provided.

Criminal techniques – descriptions or demonstrations must not be included, unless editorially justified. Editorial justification might include the protection of viewers from such crime, by showing them how it works and how to avoid becoming victims.

Payments – criminals may not be paid for contributions relating to their crime, unless it is in the public interest to do so. Factors may include the benefit to viewers of seeing the interview; the purpose of the interview; the seriousness of the crime; and the likely feelings of the victim. Payment includes payments in kind or indirect payments, for example to friends or family members.

Criminal proceedings – if active, no payment can be made to a witness or someone who may reasonably be expected to be called as a witness for a programme contribution.

Kidnappings/hijacks – broadcast material must not endanger lives or prejudice attempts to resolve such a situation.

Section 4 - Religion

These Principles & Rules only apply to “religious programmes” ie those dealing with matters of religion as the central subject or significant part, as opposed to references to religion in other types of programme. Broadcasters must exercise the proper degree of responsibility, and ensure programmes do not involve improper exploitation of viewers’ susceptibilities, or abusive treatment of the religious views of others. They must not promote religious views by stealth, seek recruits, and must treat claims for special powers of living people or groups with due objectivity.

Section 5 - Due Impartiality, Due Accuracy and Undue Prominence of Views and Opinions

Principles - to ensure due accuracy and due impartiality in news, and statutory “special impartiality” requirements.

News - must be reported with due accuracy and presented with due impartiality. Significant mistakes should be acknowledged and corrected quickly.

News and programmes other than news - due impartiality is required for “matters of political or industrial controversy” and “relating to current public policy”. These matters could be local, regional or national matters being debated by politicians, industry and/or the media.

“Major matters” – (eg matters of national/international importance, or of equal significance within a small broadcast area) - an appropriately wide range of significant views must be included and given due weight in each programme or in clearly linked and timely programmes.

Due impartiality – means not favouring one side over another. “Due” does not mean giving equal time to every view or argument, but adequate or appropriate to the subject and nature of the programme. Context is important, including the type of programme and channel, the expectations of the audience, and the extent to which the content and approach is signalled to the audience.

Undue prominence of views and opinions – broadcasters should not give undue prominence to views of particular individuals on matters of political or industrial controversy, and matters relating to current public policy. This relates to their programmes taken as a whole, and means a “significant imbalance” in the views aired.

Linked programmes – due impartiality may be achieved within a programme or across several programmes. Where programmes are linked, this must be made clear to the audience.

Presenters & reporters – any personal interests which may call in to question due impartiality must be made clear. They can (other than news reporters/presenters) express their own views on matters of controversy/public policy, but alternative viewpoints must be adequately represented. A “personal view” or authored programme must be clearly signalled to the audience as such. Politicians cannot be used as a news reader, interviewer or reporter in news programmes unless exceptionally justified, but they can present current affairs programmes, provided due

impartiality is maintained on matters of political and industrial controversy and public policy.

Section 6 - Elections and Referendums

Principle – that statutory impartiality requirements are applied at the time of elections and referendums.

The rules in Section 5 on matters of major political or industrial controversy and major current public policy apply to coverage of elections and referendums.

During election periods:

- Due weight must be given to coverage of parties and independent candidates. Account must be taken of evidence of past electoral support and current support. Broadcasters must also consider giving appropriate coverage to parties and candidates with significant views.
- Discussion and analysis of election issues must stop when polling stations open, and no opinion poll results broadcast on polling day until the poll closes.
- Election candidates cannot act as news presenters, interviewers or presenters of any programme during the election period, but appearances on non-political programmes scheduled prior to the election period can go ahead.

Rules for constituency/electoral area coverage during elections:

- When a candidate takes part in an item about their constituency/electoral area, all candidates with significant past or current support must be offered the chance to take part. The item can still proceed if they refuse, or are unavailable to participate;
- The item must include a list of all candidates/parties standing after nominations close;
- If a candidate is appearing they must not be given opportunity to make constituency/electoral area points when no other candidates would have a similar opportunity.

Section 7 – Fairness

This Section and Section 8 on privacy are different from other sections of the Code, dealing with how broadcasters treat those “directly affected” by programmes, who can bring complaints under these sections, rather than the general public who can bring complaints under other sections. Occasionally Ofcom may investigate possible breaches even without a complaint being made by someone directly affected.

Principle – to avoid unjust or unfair treatment of individuals or organisations in programmes.

The single Rule in this Section states that broadcasters must avoid unjust or unfair treatment of individuals or organisations in programmes. The section then sets out various “Practices to be followed”.

Informed consent – consent to take part in a programme should be informed. Participants should therefore normally be told:

- the nature and purpose of the programme
- when and where it is likely to be first broadcast;
- is their contribution live, pre-recorded, interview, discussion, edited, unedited etc;
- areas of questioning and other likely contributions;
- any significant changes to the programme as it develops which might reasonably affect their original consent;
- their contractual rights and obligations;
- if offered a preview, whether they will be able to make any changes;
- potential risks to their welfare arising from their participation in the programme and steps to mitigate these.

Children – consent from a parent should normally be obtained from participants under 16. They should freely assent to take part, irrespective of parental consent. They should not be asked for views on matters likely to be beyond their capacity to answer.

Editing – contributions should be edited fairly. Common examples of unfair editing are omitting relevant key points from an interview, unfair juxtaposition of pictures with commentary or other contributions, or using footage obtained for an earlier programme for a different purpose.

Opportunity to Contribute (“Right of Reply”) – if a programme alleges wrongdoing or incompetence or makes other significant allegations, those concerned should normally be given an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond. It is a cornerstone of professional journalism to offer an opportunity to respond to those against whom significant allegations are made. It is also often a requirement for the legal defence of a libel claim (see the Media Law chapter).

There is no requirement to provide a copy of all of the actual evidence collected before broadcast, for example covertly filmed footage. It is required to give a full and accurate summary of the allegations to be made, and a full explanation of the evidence you have supporting them.

There is no specific period of time for response that is considered “timely”, which will depend on:

- the nature of the allegations – whether or not they are of a complex nature or might require investigation before responding;
- whether they are addressed to an individual or a large organisation – the latter has greater resources to prepare a response more quickly;
- the type of programme – whether it is a topical news story (where timescales for response are generally much shorter) or a factual programme that has been many weeks or months in production.

Programmes must consider whether any material facts have been presented, disregarded or omitted in a way that is unfair. Seeking responses is often part of this fact-checking process, and programmes will sometimes change as a result of the responses received. Producers should therefore not send out “right of reply” letters too late in the production process. Where a response has been provided, that response should be reflected fairly in the programme. That does not mean the response has to appear verbatim, or that material irrelevant to the issues raised needs to be included. Where an invitation to respond is declined, this and any

explanation given should be made clear in the programme. It may still be necessary to reflect fairly any known material facts, such as previous denials.

Guarantees - promises given to contributors must be honoured unless, very exceptionally, it is in the public interest to do otherwise (in which case please seek compliance advice).

When providing promises as to anonymity, the programme maker and contributor should discuss and agree what level of anonymity they are setting out to achieve, and the methods best used to achieve it. They may not understand, for example, that blurring or darkening their face might not identify them to strangers, but they may well still be identifiable to their families or others who know them well. The onus is on the producer to ensure that the contributor understands the level of anonymity that will be achieved, and that their expectations are met. There is an important distinction between being identified and being identifiable. A contributor may be identifiable by what they say or what is said about them, either on its own, or when different pieces of information are put together (“jigsaw” identification).

Deception - employing deception (including covert recording) must generally be warranted in the public interest. The most common form of deception employed in factual programmes is secret/covert/undercover filming. (Please see the Covert Filming guidance in the Handbook).

Set-ups and wind-up calls – programmes that employ set-ups purely for entertainment purposes necessarily cannot seek consent of the subject prior to filming. Consent should however be obtained from the individual concerned after filming and prior to broadcast. If an individual is not identified and/or incidental in such footage it may be possible to broadcast the item without their consent.

Where the person set-up is a celebrity or someone in the public eye, it may be justified to broadcast such an item without their consent, but only if it will not result in unjustified public ridicule or personal distress.

Due care - Broadcasters should take due care over the welfare of a contributor who might be at risk of significant harm as a result of taking part in a programme, except where the subject matter is trivial or their participation minor. A contributor might be regarded as being at risk of significant harm for reasons including (but not limited to):

- they are considered a vulnerable person;
- they are not used to being in the public eye;
- the programme involves being filmed in an artificial or constructed environment;
- the programme is likely to attract a high level of press, media and social media interest;
- key editorial elements of the programme include potential confrontation, conflict, emotionally challenging situations; or
- the programme requires them to discuss, reveal, or engage with sensitive, life changing or private aspects of their lives.

“Vulnerable” – this may include those with learning difficulties, mental health problems, the bereaved, those with brain damage or forms of dementia, those who have been traumatized or are sick or terminally ill.

Broadcasters should conduct a risk assessment to identify any risk of significant harm to the contributor, unless justified in the public interest not to do so. The level of care due to the contributor will be proportionate to the level of risk associated with their participation.

Section 8 – Privacy

Principle – to avoid unwarranted infringement of privacy in programmes and in connection with obtaining material included in programmes.

The single Rule in this Section is that any infringement of privacy in programmes or in connection with obtaining material included in programmes must be warranted. The section then sets out various Practices to be followed.

There is a good deal of overlap between Code obligations and the law of privacy. If Ofcom finds a breach of this section of the Code following broadcast, it is possible that a legal claim may also follow, hence it is particularly important for producers to take legal advice on privacy issues throughout the production process.

Any infringement of privacy in programmes must be warranted ie the broadcaster must be able to demonstrate why, in the circumstances, it was justified. Usually that will involve arguing that the public interest in the broadcast of the programme outweighs the individual's right to privacy. Examples of public interest are revealing crime, protecting public health or safety, exposing misleading claims, or disclosing incompetence that affects the public.

Expectations of privacy – these will vary, according to the place where people are filmed, the nature of the activity in which they are involved at the time, and whether they are already in the public eye. Note that people can still expect privacy even in public places in some circumstances, if the activities being filmed are of a private nature.

Homes – generally the location of someone's home or family should not be disclosed without permission, unless it is warranted.

Newsworthy events - even people caught up in newsworthy events (such as natural or man-made disasters) have a right of privacy at the time, and in later programmes revisiting these events.

Consent – if material that would infringe a person's privacy is being broadcast without their consent, the infringement must be warranted. If someone asks that filming be stopped, the producer should do so, unless it is warranted to continue (eg in a doorstep interview – see below).

Places – filming in institutions requires permission from the relevant authority unless it is warranted to film without permission. Sensitive places, eg hospitals, ambulances, schools, prisons, police stations, etc, normally require consent for filming, although if the individual will not be identifiable then separate consent for broadcast may not be required. Often obtaining individual's consent will be a pre-requisite of access to institutions in any event.

Doorstepping – this means an attempted interview without prior warning. It should not be attempted unless:

- A prior request for interview has been made and refused, or
- It has not been possible to request an interview, or
- There is good reason to believe an investigation will be frustrated if the subject is approached openly beforehand.

However generally broadcasters can approach people in the news (eg politicians) when in public places without notice.

Surreptitious filming or recording – this includes long lens filming from public property and leaving unattended cameras on private property. Normally this will only be warranted if:

- There is prima facie evidence of a story in the public interest, and
- There are reasonable grounds to suspect that further material evidence could be obtained, and
- It is necessary to the credibility and authenticity of the programme.

ITV has compliance and editorial processes governing covert filming and recording (Please see the relevant chapter of the Handbook).

Set ups for entertainment purposes – should not cause significant annoyance, distress or embarrassment, and should only be broadcast with the consent of the subjects obtained after filming.

Suffering and distress – broadcasters should not record or broadcast footage or audio of people caught up in emergencies, victims of accidents or those caught up in personal tragedies without their consent, unless it is warranted to do so. People in distress should not be pressured to take part or provide interviews, unless it is warranted. The identity of people who have died or victims of accidents or violent crimes should not be revealed before next of kin have been informed.

Past events – broadcasters should try to reduce potential distress to victims and relatives when programmes such as factual dramas and documentaries examine past events. Surviving victims and families of those featured should be informed of plans for the programme and intended broadcast details.

Under 16s and vulnerable people – particular attention should be paid to their privacy. They should not be questioned about private matters without the consent of a parent, guardian or other person with primary responsibility for their care, unless it is warranted to do so.

“Vulnerable people” – may include those with learning difficulties, mental health problems, the bereaved, people with brain damage or dementia, and those who are traumatized, sick or terminally ill.

Section 9 – Commercial References in Programmes

This is one of the most complex sections of the Code, and the Guidance to it is around 60 pages long. Please See the Handbook chapter on commercial references and sponsorship. Set out below is a brief summary of the main Principles and Rules.

- Broadcasters must maintain editorial independence and control over programming.

- There must be a distinction between editorial content and advertising.
- Audiences must be protected from surreptitious advertising.
- Audiences must be protected from the risk of financial harm.
- Products or services cannot be promoted in programmes (other than in very limited circumstances).
- Products, services and brands cannot be given undue prominence, and any reference to them must be justified by the editorial requirements of the programme.
- Unsuitable sponsorship must be avoided. Sponsorship cannot involve any editorial control and cannot lead to the creation of content that is the vehicle for the purpose of promoting the sponsor and its interests. Sponsorship credits cannot contain advertising messages or calls to action.
- Product placement is permitted except in certain programme genres and for certain products/services/brands. Product placement cannot influence the content and scheduling of a programme, and programmes cannot be created or distorted so that they become a vehicle for featuring placed products/services/ brands.
- Programmes cannot contain promotional or unduly prominent references to placed products/services/brands.

Programme-related material (PRM) - is defined as “products or services that are both directly derived from a programme and specifically intended to allow viewers to benefit fully from, or interact with, that programme”. PRM can be promoted during or around the programme it is derived from, where it is editorially justified. PRM can be free or paid for. Where it is paid for, any promotion must be kept “distinct” from the rest of the programme (eg via a text strap or V/T).

Premium rate services (PRS) - can only be promoted where they enable viewers to participate directly in or contribute to the editorial content of programme; or fall within the definition of programme-related material. The primary purpose of the programme must be clearly editorial and the promotion of PRS must be clearly subsidiary to that purpose. The cost of using the PRS must be made clear to viewers and use of PRS must comply with the Phone-paid Services Authority Code of Practice.

Sponsorship - a sponsored programme has some or all of its costs met by a sponsor with a view to promoting its name, brand, product or service. This includes advertiser-funded and advertiser-supplied programming, and programmes that are “deficit funded” by a third party. Sponsorship is allowed for a programme or a series, for programme strands or segments, or for a themed block of programming, or whole channels.

News and current affairs - cannot be sponsored, although short specialist reports (eg weather, travel and sport) can be as long as they are distinct from the rest of the news.

Advertisers who cannot advertise on television also cannot sponsor programmes or channels, eg any political body, tobacco brands, etc. An advertiser cannot sponsor a programme or channel at a time in the schedule when it could not advertise. TV sponsorship must comply with the Ofcom/BCAP advertising content and scheduling rules. Detailed rules exist regarding what times these brands can sponsor programmes, and what their sponsorship credits can contain, and the proposed sponsorship needs to be assessed against the programme’s audience index.

Identification - sponsored/advertised programmes must be clearly identified as such, at the beginning and/or end of the programme. A sponsored programme must have either a front or end credit, and will usually have both. It may also have credits at the end and start of each part. Sponsorship credits include bumpers and integrated title sequences. The relationship between the sponsor and the programme must be transparent via a sponsorship message included in every credit. The sponsorship arrangement must be the primary focus of the credit, and advertising messages and calls to action for the sponsor's products are not allowed.

Sponsorship credits within programmes are permitted, as long as they are not unduly prominent, and the sponsor is not prohibited from product placement in the programme (see "product placement" below). Credits within programmes can only contain a brief, neutral visual or verbal statement identifying the sponsorship arrangement and a static graphic of the name, logo or any other distinctive symbol of the sponsor.

Sponsorship credits are permitted in programme trailers as long as the credit is "brief and secondary". Brief and secondary credits for the sponsors of PRM are also permitted, when details of how to obtain the PRM are given, but any such credits need to be separate from any credit for the programme sponsor.

References to the sponsor in sponsored programmes - the sponsor cannot influence the content or scheduling of the sponsored programme/channel in such a way as to affect the responsibility and editorial independence of the broadcaster. The content of the sponsored programme cannot be a vehicle for the purpose of promoting the sponsor, its products, services, brands or interests. The ultimate arbiter of all programme content is the broadcaster.

There are limited circumstances in which a sponsor (or its products, services or interests) may be referred to in the sponsored programme:

- A sponsor can place products in the programme. Placement will be subject to the rules on product placement (see below) and in particular the prohibition on promotional and unduly prominent references. In an AFP, where the sponsor has been involved in the creation of the programme, any reference to it or its interest is likely to be considered as product placement.
- Where an incidental reference to the sponsor is made that is not the result of the commercial arrangement, the reference will be subject to the general rules on commercial references (see above) and in particular regarding promotion and undue prominence.

References to the sponsor or its products which are not the result of a product placement deal, may nevertheless be deemed to be product placement, without evidence to the contrary and unless those references are incidental. This is particularly problematic if the sponsor or its products are in a category that cannot be product placed.

Product placement - is the inclusion in a programme of a product, service or trade mark or a reference to it, where the inclusion is for a commercial purpose and is in return for payment or other valuable consideration to the broadcaster, producer or anyone connected with them.

Prop placement is different to product placement. Prop placement is the inclusion of a product, service or trademark in a programme without any payment to the

broadcaster, producer or any person connected with them. Both prop and product placement can be used in the same programme.

Product placement is not allowed in:

- news
- children's programmes
- religious programmes
- consumer advice programmes, and
- current affairs programmes.

Magazine shows may contain product placement even where the show includes elements of restricted genre content (eg news bulletins/items, consumer affairs strands) provided that restricted genre content does not form the majority of the content and any product placement does not influence that content.

Products/brands that cannot be product placed:

- cigarettes/tobacco products and brands
- medicinal products
- alcohol
- foods and drinks high in fat, salt or sugar (HFSS)
- gambling
- infant formula (baby milk, includes follow-on formula)
- electronic or smokeless cigarettes, cigarette lighters, cigarette papers or pipes intended for smoking, and
- any product, service or trademark that cannot be advertised on television.

References to placed products/brands – product placement must not influence the content or scheduling of a programme in a way that affects the responsibility and editorial independence of the broadcaster. There must always be sufficient editorial justification for the placement, and programmes must not be created or distorted to become a vehicle for the purpose of featuring placed products, services or trademarks. The “natural fit” of the placement to the editorial should be considered.

References to placed products, services and trademarks must not be:

- Promotional – the following are likely to be considered promotional – encouragement to purchase, advertising claims, price or availability information, references to positive attributes or benefits of the product, slogans associated with the product and endorsements (whether explicit or implicit). Care is required if a presenter/actor has an existing relationship with a placed brand. The rule on promotional references also means that:
 - Product placement of competition prizes in viewer competitions is unlikely to comply with the rule.
 - Any product placement of programme-related material will mean the promotion for it should sit outside the main body of the programme (eg during or after the end credits) or within a distinct short VT within it.
- Unduly prominent – there should be clear and sufficient editorial justification for the inclusion of placed products, especially where they are integral to a storyline/theme of a new programme or format. The extent and nature of references will need to be judged against the editorial requirements of the programme.

Signalling of product placement - product placement needs to be signalled clearly to viewers, by a universal neutral “P” logo for three seconds at the beginning of the programme, when the programme resumes after a break, and at the end of the programme. The logo must conform to Ofcom’s specification.

May 2024

OFCOM ON DEMAND PROGRAMME SERVICE RULES AND GUIDANCE

Editorial rules

The editorial Rules for programming on video on demand services (“ODPS”) are relatively limited and reflect statute law. Below is a very brief summary.

Rule 10: Harmful Material: Material Likely to Incite Hatred

An ODPS must not contain any material likely to incite violence or hatred based on sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation and nationality.

Rule 11: Harmful Material: Prohibited Material

An ODPS must not contain any prohibited material. “Prohibited material” refers to:

- i) terrorism or child pornography material, the inclusion of which would be punishable as a criminal offence;
- ii) racist and xenophobic material that would not be suitable for a classification certificate on video release.

Rule 12: Harmful Material: Protection of Under-18s (Specially Restricted Material)

An ODPS must not contain any “specially restricted material” unless made available in a manner which secures that persons under the age of 18 will not normally see or hear it.

“Specially restricted material” means:

- a) a video work in respect of which the video works authority has issued a R18 classification certificate;
- b) material whose nature is such that it is reasonable to expect that, if the material were contained in a video work submitted to the video works authority for a classification certificate, the video works authority would issue a R18 classification certificate; or
- c) other material that might seriously impair the physical, mental or moral development of persons under the age of 18.

Rules 13 & 14: Sponsorship & Product Placement

The Rules on Sponsorship and Product Placement are broadly similar (but not in all respects identical) to those in Ofcom’s Broadcasting Code.

March 2024

MEDIA LAW

Introduction

Producers are not expected to be lawyers, but they are expected to recognise when they need to take legal advice. The ITV Legal & Content Compliance team includes specialist lawyers who can advise producers of all programmes made for ITV at every step of the production.

The main areas of law that affect programmes most regularly are:

- **Libel:** protects the reputation of individuals and companies, and provides legal remedies to those whose reputation has been damaged by a publication or broadcast without justification. The law (in England and Wales) derives primarily from the Defamation Act 2013 and case law.
- **Privacy:** protects individuals against unjustified intrusions into their private life and misuse of private information. The law derives primarily from the Human Rights Act 1998, which incorporated the European Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”).
- **Contempt of court:** protects the administration of justice, and seeks to ensure that defendants in criminal proceedings can receive a fair trial that is not prejudiced by media reporting. The law derives primarily from the Contempt of Court Act 1981.
- **Copyright:** protects the creators of artistic works such as film footage, photographs, books and artworks by preventing others from copying and exploiting these works without permission. The law derives primarily from the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988.
- **Data Protection:** protects the use of personal data. The law derives primarily from the Data Protection Act 2018 and the GDPR.
- **Confidentiality:** protects against disclosure of confidential information. The law derives primarily from case law.

All producers are required to have Media Liability insurance in place for productions commissioned for ITV (sometimes referred to as E&O insurance) relating to legal claims made after broadcast. This insurance cover is usually predicated on competent specialist media lawyers (such as ITV’s in-house lawyers) having advised and cleared the production before broadcast.

Independent producers making programmes for ITV can of course always take their own legal advice if they wish. But all final decisions relating to legal and compliance matters will be taken by ITV and its compliance lawyers, whatever other advice has been taken.

DEFAMATION

Introduction

Defamation includes libel and slander. A libel is a statement in writing or other permanent form, a slander is a statement by word of mouth. TV broadcast and on demand programmes are treated as publications in permanent form.

A defamatory statement is one that tends to lower the reputation of a living person or a company, by making reasonable people think less of them. If the statement is untrue, or cannot be otherwise defended, it gives rise to a claim for damages (money) to provide vindication and compensation.

Individuals and companies can sue for defamation. Dead people, the Government, political parties and other public bodies cannot, but individual officers or employees of such bodies might seek to sue as individuals.

Libel actions in England and Wales are usually complex, and usually now heard by a judge. Defending a libel action is expensive, whichever side is eventually successful, and very demanding and time consuming for the producers, reporters and participants involved in the programme, who may be called to give evidence. The burden of proving the truth of defamatory allegations is on the defendants, which in a TV case is usually the broadcaster (as publisher) and the production company (as author).

The law in England and Wales was significantly revised in the Defamation Act 2013.

Definition

A statement is defamatory if:

- It would be likely to make reasonable people think less of an identifiable person or company; and
- It has caused or is likely to cause serious harm to their reputation. Companies are required to show that the statement has caused or is likely to cause serious financial loss. This threshold is intended to prevent trivial claims.

Meaning

Many libel actions turn on the meaning attributed to the words complained about. Authorial intention is irrelevant, and the meaning attributed by the court to the programme may be very different to the meaning intended by the author.

Care should be taken to avoid accidentally defaming an innocent person, for example showing their image juxtaposed with spoken words or commentary that do not apply to them. A headline or strap in the wrong place may give a totally different meaning to a story. An inference or innuendo understood by the viewer can make a statement defamatory, even though the bare words themselves are not. Repetition of a rumour can be defamatory, where the meaning conveyed is there is “no smoke without fire”.

It is possible to defame a person even if they are not expressly identified, if they are identifiable, for example by referring to a small group of unnamed people without specifying a particular individual. It is possible to defame a real person by the

depiction of a fictional character in a drama, if reasonable people would believe that character to refer to or be based upon a real person.

Tone is often important – serious critical terms like “*con*”, “*rip-off*”, “*dangerous*”, etc, should not be employed loosely if the underlying facts do not justify them.

When reporting a dispute, it is important to consider whether the programme is adopting allegations made by others as true, or merely reporting that they have been made and also reporting that they are denied. Simply repeating a libel made elsewhere can render the programme liable to a claim, especially if the programme itself does not have all the information or evidence on which the allegation was based.

Defences

There are several possible defences to a libel action, and usually a defendant may seek to rely on more than one of them:

Truth

This is the most common defence to an action for defamation, ie that the statements made are true or substantially true. This is the statutory defence replacing the previously used term “justification”.

The burden is on the Defendant (the author/publisher/broadcaster of the defamatory words) to prove that on the balance of probabilities the allegations are true, not for the claimant to prove that they are false. The more serious the allegation, the more convincing the evidence should be. Where a programme relies on witnesses, it is important to consider whether the witness is willing to give evidence at court in the event of a claim, whether their evidence is corroborated, whether the witness is credible, and whether they “have an axe to grind” or their own agenda or motive.

Honest Opinion

This defence (previously known as “fair comment”) may be used where a statement is:

- A statement of opinion (not fact);
- Indicates in general or specific terms the basis of that opinion (eg the facts on which the opinion is formed); and
- An honest person could reasonably hold that opinion on the facts existing at the time; and
- The person who makes the comment did hold the opinion.

Note that the line between statements of fact and statements of opinion is not easy to draw.

Privilege

The defence of privilege is available for reporting some areas of public life, which allows for freedom of speech without risk of defamation proceedings, even when what is said turns out to be untrue.

There are two forms of privilege:

- absolute privilege - which provides a complete defence, and
- qualified privilege - which only applies if the report is made without malice (malice meaning some improper motive, or that the publisher did not believe what was published).

Absolute privilege applies to a fair and accurate report of judicial proceedings held in public and published contemporaneously, or of Parliamentary proceedings.

Qualified privilege applies to a fair and accurate report of information given in various specific circumstances (such as public meetings). The defence can be defeated by “malice” ie that the publisher had an improper purpose for publishing or did not believe what was published.

Public Interest

Since the *Reynolds* case in 1998 the court has recognised that journalists, where they are reporting a story of public interest, and are performing that function responsibly, should enjoy a defence to an action for libel, even if the story turns out not to be true. This concept of “responsible journalism” now underlies a statutory defence in the Defamation Act 2013.

The defence requires the defendant to show that:

- the statement complained of was, or formed part of, a statement on a matter of public interest; and
- the defendant reasonably believed that publishing or broadcasting the statement was in the public interest

If the statement was an accurate and impartial account of a dispute (or “neutral reportage”), the court will not require the defendant to have sought to verify the truth of the imputation conveyed in the statement.

The court must make allowance for editorial judgment when deciding whether the defendant’s belief in the public interest of publication was reasonable.

An important principle of responsible journalism is that if a defamatory allegation is made, the subject is given an opportunity to respond. If relying on the public interest defence, a broadcaster must show that a response from the claimant was sought before broadcast, and that the response was fairly reflected in the programme.

Live Programmes

There is a defence, where someone makes an unexpected defamatory statement during a live programme, if:

- the broadcaster/producer had no effective control over the statement being made; and
- they took “reasonable care”, and did not know or have reason they were contributing to the statement being made.

Limitation Period

A claimant has one year after the first broadcast in which to bring an action for libel. So it is very important for producers to preserve all evidence relied on after broadcast (eg documents, statements from witnesses, notes and rushes), which may have to be disclosed to the claimant during the proceedings.

March 2024

PRIVACY

The Human Rights Act 1998 incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) into English law. In particular, the right to freedom of expression in Article 10 of the Convention is balanced against Article 8, the right to a person's private and family life. Neither right is absolute.

The case of *Naomi Campbell v MGN Ltd* effectively created a new cause of action of "unjustified disclosure of private information". The courts apply a two-stage test:

1. Is the information private? ie is it information about which the individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy?
2. If so, in the circumstances, does the public interest in the broadcasting of this information outweigh the right to privacy of the individual?

The court will carry out a balancing exercise between the right of the media to impart and the public's right to receive information, and the right of an individual to privacy.

A key question is therefore whether there is a sufficiently strong public interest in the publication of private information to warrant an infringement of privacy. It has been much debated in different judgments that what may be of interest to the public is not the same as what is in the public interest.

Unlike libel, it is possible to seek to restrain publication on grounds of privacy, whether or not the information to be published is true. When considering an injunction to prevent broadcast, the court takes into account whether the broadcaster has complied with the privacy requirements of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code.

When filming in public places (eg in the street, on public roads) express consent will generally still be required from people making a significant contribution to the programme, but not from those merely passing by or in the background of shot. Depending on context, some individuals may need to have their identities obscured, and advice should be taken during editing.

But even when events are occurring in public places, individuals may still have a reasonable expectation of privacy, for example if they are in distress due to involvement in an emergency or accident, or a personal tragedy or mental health crisis. ITV compliance can provide more detailed advice on filming with the police or emergency services.

When filming on private property (such as in shops and shopping malls) consent to film should usually be obtained from the owners unless there is public interest justification not to do so. If the owner or occupant requests filming to stop, this should normally be complied with, unless there is public interest justification not to do so. Some semi-public spaces are more sensitive and will attract a greater expectation of privacy, such as hospital wards, ambulances, schools, and prisons, and obtaining general permission to film there does not mean that any individuals can then be filmed without also obtaining individual consent.

"The public interest" can be broadly categorised as contributing to an important public debate of general interest. Examples would include a report which:

- Promotes or protects public safety or health

- Prevents or exposes serious wrongdoing, injustice, antisocial behaviour, public disorder or crime
- Discloses significant incompetence, negligence or dereliction of duty in public life
- Prevents the public being misled by lies or misrepresentations
- Discloses information the public is entitled to know, such as dangerous or exploitative behaviour that could harm others

The extent to which information is already in the public domain may also be significant. The more widely the information has already been published, the less likely further broadcast will amount to a breach of privacy. However, the mere fact that information has at one time been made public somewhere does not mean that it is incapable of breaching privacy when republished.

For example, material that has been shared with only a few individuals on social media may still infringe privacy if broadcast to millions of people without consent, particularly if it relates to tragic or distressing events.

Everyone is entitled to privacy. This includes individuals and private companies. A public figure such as a politician or celebrity who has placed their private life in the public domain by talking about it publicly may have less justification to claim a breach of privacy than a member of the public who has not sought any publicity. But even celebrities may have a reasonable expectation of privacy in some circumstances – the recent case of *Sir Cliff Richard v BBC* is an example of this basic principle.

Particular regard should be had to the privacy of those under 16. The children of celebrities do not lose their right to privacy just because their parents are famous.

In addition to privacy, the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 as amended by the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 protects individuals from certain types of conduct that can amount to the crime of harassment. There are no specific defences for journalists. A person can also make a civil claim seeking damages and an injunction restraining the defendant from pursuing conduct which amounts to harassment.

Privacy law is now complex and many situations will require legal advice. Actions which might be problematic include: use of long lens photography, doorstepping, continuing to contact someone after they have declined to comment, and continuing to film someone after they ask filming to stop.

Please also see the relevant guidance on covert filming in this Handbook before embarking on any kind of secret recording.

March 2024

CONTEMPT OF COURT AND REPORTING RESTRICTIONS

The law of contempt applies to both criminal and civil legal proceedings in the courts. Its aim is to ensure that the court and juries decide a case only on the evidence presented in court, not on information published in the media. But contempt is more likely to be an issue in criminal cases in the Crown Court where a jury will determine the outcome, or in inquests where the coroner may be hearing evidence with a jury. A jury made up of random members of the public is more likely to be influenced (and thereby prejudiced) by what they have seen in the media than a judge, coroner or magistrate.

The law seeks to avoid “trial by media” and to ensure that jurors decide cases with an open mind on the evidence presented at court, not with preconceived opinions or prejudices about a defendant or case.

In criminal cases contempt usually becomes an issue from the moment of an arrest or when a warrant for arrest is issued, and it remains an issue until a verdict is given.

The most common contempt is the publication of information that causes a “substantial risk of serious prejudice” or impediment to active proceedings. This can lead to a criminal prosecution of the media organization responsible, and of individual editors or journalists.

The possible consequences of contempt are therefore very significant, and could include the collapse or delay of a criminal trial, and significant fines for the publisher. Where a trial has been adversely affected, the court also has the power to order the legal costs of the abortive trial to be paid by the publisher.

“Common law” contempt applies even before an arrest has taken place or a warrant for arrest has been issued, but when criminal proceedings are “imminent”. Common law contempt requires proof that the media organisation intended (or was recklessly indifferent) as to whether the publication prejudiced the proceedings. Prosecution for common law contempt is rare.

“Strict liability” contempt is governed by the Contempt of Court Act 1981. “Strict liability” means that the lack of intention to prejudice the trial is irrelevant. What matters is whether publication creates a substantial risk that the course of justice will be seriously impeded or prejudiced.

After arrest or the issue of a warrant for arrest, proceedings are deemed to be “active”, and ignorance of the active proceedings or simple error is not a defence. From that point on until the end of the trial (or discontinuance of the proceedings), it is a criminal offence to publish or broadcast anything that creates a substantial risk of serious prejudice or impediment to the proceedings.

Danger areas when criminal proceedings are active:

Previous convictions - A jury will not normally be told about a defendant’s previous convictions during the trial. Therefore, as a rule, no reference should be made to any previous convictions, until the verdict has been given.

Photographs when identity is in issue - A suspect’s photograph must not be published where identity is in issue, for example where a witness identity parade may have been held, or a defendant is being identified from video footage and denies that

he is the person in the footage. If identity remains an issue at trial, a defendant's photograph should not be published during the proceedings.

Prejudicial information – Generally the following information should not be published before the trial is completed, unless it is in the context of a contemporaneous report of evidence that has already been heard by the jury in court:

- A motive for the crime
- Detailed eye witness accounts of what a suspect did
- Details of a defendant's bad character
- A detailed description of the evidence against the defendant
- Images of the defendant that may be prejudicial
- Whether or not the defendant has made admissions or a confession

Commenting on evidence or predicting the outcome of a trial - This must be avoided, since it is for the jury not the media to decide what evidence is relevant, to interpret the evidence given in court, and to consider whether it should lead to conviction.

Interviews with witnesses - The media should not interview a witness or the defendant) before the witness or defendant has given their evidence at trial. In some cases this could amount to contempt, even if it was only intended for publication after the proceedings have concluded.

Legal argument in court in the absence of the jury (eg on the admissibility of particular evidence) - should not be reported until after trial.

Jury deliberations – the law prohibits soliciting, publishing or broadcasting the deliberations of a jury even after a trial has finished ie anything said in the jury room or the reasons why the jury reached the verdict should remain confidential. Soliciting such information is an offence, even in the absence of any publication.

Civil cases - Civil proceedings are also covered by the law of contempt, and contempt becomes a live issue when the date of a trial has been fixed. However, most civil cases are now heard by judges without a jury, with a very few exceptions. In these cases similar considerations to those in criminal proceedings will apply.

Filming court proceedings and at court - The law prohibits the filming or taking of photographs of any juror, witness, party or judge in the court or its precincts, or recording proceedings in court. The courts do now sometimes allow contemporaneous written reporting by journalists in court via social media.

Reporting restrictions

There are many different types of reporting restrictions. Some apply automatically, and some apply if a court decides to impose them. A breach of most reporting restrictions is a criminal offence and can result in criminal convictions and fines. The most common restrictions are:

Restrictions that automatically give anonymity to complainants regarding certain criminal offences:

- Sexual offences (section 1 Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992)
- Female genital mutilation (section 71 of the Serious Crime Act 2015)
- Human trafficking and slavery (Schedule 5 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015)

- Forced marriage (Schedule 6A of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014)

In each case, a victim can waive their anonymity by consenting in writing to being identified as a victim.

Restrictions that give anonymity to under-18s and witnesses involved in court proceedings:

Under 18s involved in youth court proceedings receive automatic anonymity until they reach 18 (section 49 Children and Young Persons Act 1933), except in those proceedings relating to applications for or breaches of anti-social behaviour injunctions or criminal behaviour orders (where restrictions are discretionary).

Under 18s involved in current family proceedings also receive automatic anonymity (section 97 Children Act 1989).

Where under 18s are involved in adult courts, the court has the power to grant them anonymity until they reach 18 (section 45 Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999 for criminal cases, section 39 Children and Young Persons Act 1933 for other cases). Where they are a victim or witness in a criminal case, the court has the power to grant them lifelong anonymity (section 45A Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999).

Restrictions that give anonymity to adults involved in proceedings:

In criminal cases, the court can restrict reporting about certain adult witnesses other than the accused (section 46 Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999). In all cases, where the court has allowed a name or other matter to be withheld from the public in proceedings, it may prohibit the media from reporting that detail (section 11 Contempt of Court Act). This can be used to protect victims, witnesses or others involved in the case.

Section 13 of the Education Act 2011 gives anonymity to teachers regarding allegations from a pupil at their school until they are charged, they consent to being identified or they are identified by the Secretary of State for Education or the General Teaching Council of Wales.

Broadly speaking, where people are given anonymity, it means no matter can be broadcast that is likely to identify them as the complainant, accused, witness or person involved in the proceedings (as the case may be). The media also needs to be mindful of “jigsaw” identification and of reporting that – taken together with reporting elsewhere – risks identifying the person.

Restrictions that postpone reports of certain matters heard in open court:

Under section 4(2) of the Contempt of Court Act 1981, the court can postpone such reports if it is necessary to avoid the substantial risk of serious prejudice.

Restrictions that limit what can be reported about certain parts of criminal proceedings:

These are found in various different pieces of legislation. They limit what can be reported in preliminary and pre-trial hearings in the magistrates and Crown courts to

specified basic facts, including the name of the accused and a summary of the charges against them. This is to avoid prejudicing a later trial.

Restrictions that prevent reporting about certain types of proceedings held in private:

Section 12 of the Administration of Justice Act 1960 makes it a contempt to broadcast a report of certain proceedings held in private. These include proceedings relating to national security, wardship or the maintenance and upbringing of children; or those that fall under the Children Act 1989, the Adoption and Children Act 2002, the Mental Capacity Act 2005 or the Mental Health Act 1983.

March 2024

COPYRIGHT AND FAIR DEALING

Introduction

Copyright protects any original literary, dramatic, artistic or musical work, sound recording, film, broadcast or typographical arrangement, including photographs and graphics. A copyright owner has the right to prevent use of a substantial part of their work by third parties without their permission, except where there is a statutory “fair dealing” defence.

Infringement of copyright

Copying a substantial part of a copyright work is likely to be an infringement of copyright unless permission has been obtained from the copyright owner. What constitutes a substantial part depends on the quantity and quality (ie significance to the work as a whole) of the extract used.

Just because material is accessible (eg it appears somewhere on the internet), that does not mean it is freely usable as “public domain” material. **There is no such thing as “public domain” in this context** – the copyright in all footage and photographs on YouTube or social media belongs to someone, unless it is so old that copyright has expired. Some material may have been widely distributed and used many times before by third parties without clearance or payment (eg photos of criminals or victims released by police at the time of a trial), and can therefore usually be re-used with a low risk of a copyright claim. But an advertisement is not “public domain” just because you can see it everywhere on billboards or the internet – the copyright still belongs to the owner.

Multiple copyrights

Multiple copyrights attach to some copyright works, eg films and television broadcasts, where there will be rights in the whole work, but also in the sound recording, music, script, etc. Extra care should be taken when dealing with these works to ensure that all relevant permissions have been obtained.

Duration of copyright

In general terms copyright lasts for a period of 70 years after the author’s death.

Fair Dealing

“Fair dealing” is a statutory exception to the general need to obtain permission for use of copyright material.

It covers all sorts of copyright works (eg tv programmes, films, literary and musical works, photography) subject to certain restrictions.

Different countries have different versions of the fair dealing or “fair use” defence, and some countries do not have the defence at all. It is therefore important to bear this in mind for programmes being distributed abroad.

You should avoid using non-cleared copyright material in stings, title sequences, promos or teases, as a fair dealing defence is less likely to cover such uses.

In the following circumstances a fair dealing defence may be relied upon for UK broadcast or publication:

- for the purpose of **criticism or review**;
- for the purpose of **reporting current events**;
- for the purpose of **caricature, parody or pastiche**;
- for the purpose of **quotation**.

Note that in all cases you must use no more of the material than is needed for the purpose. The length of each extract and the number of extracts used will need to be justified in every case.

There is no requirement to inform the copyright owner in advance of your intention to fair deal material.

Fair Dealing for the Purposes of Criticism or Review

This is the type of fair dealing most often invoked in factual programmes – documentary, current affairs, arts, factual entertainment etc.

Definition - S. 30(1) Copyright Designs and Patent Act 1988:

"Fair dealing with a work for the purpose of criticism or review, of that or another work or of a performance of a work, does not infringe any copyright in the work provided that it is accompanied by a sufficient acknowledgment."

Fair dealing is using an extract of the material to illustrate some point you are making **about** that material or another work. It protects a reviewer or commentator who wants to quote from a copyright work in the course of his review.

This comment can be reviewing/criticising the copyright work itself – eg talking about the quality of the acting, performance, lighting, directing, editing, etc. It could also be some other relevant criticism, such as the theme or philosophy behind the work.

Examples:

Clockwork Orange - Criticism of the treatment of violence in the film *A Clockwork Orange*, and discussion of director Stanley Kubrick's decision to withdraw its release in the UK. Channel 4 successfully used numerous extracts of the movie in a TV documentary about the film (*Time Warner Entertainment Company LP v Channel Four Television Corporation PLC*).

Pro Sieben - Criticism of "chequebook journalism" and the treatment by the media of a story about a woman's multiple pregnancy. Carlton successfully used a 30 second clip from German footage of a woman who lost eight babies, on the basis it was illustrative of the media treatment of her case (*Pro Sieben Media A.G. v Carlton UK Television Ltd and Twenty Twenty Television Ltd*).

But a warning – the Carlton case went to the Court of Appeal – the costs and the management time required defending a copyright action can vastly exceed the original cost of clearing the clip, or in most cases the editorial value of the clip to the programme.

Fair Dealing is not a copyright amnesty or 'get out of jail free card'

Fair dealing should not be seen simply as a way of saving money on clearance costs. Clips are less likely to be fair dealt if they are used merely as illustration or as 'wallpaper' in stings, montages or title sequences. The criticism or review they are illustrating must be clear and obvious. As a minimum, your use must satisfy all the tests below:

1. That the intention was to criticise or review the material

The court considers the programme as a whole ie does the programme create the impression that we genuinely included the clips for the purposes of criticism or review?

It is *not* fatal to a fair dealing defence to seek clearance from the owner, to be refused, and then to go on and use the material anyway. If you are refused on non-monetary grounds (ie the owner simply doesn't want to licence the clip to you) – then you could still rely on fair dealing later on. But if you have spent time negotiating for the clearance of material, and you were simply not willing to pay the reasonable price asked, this may weaken your "intention to fair deal" argument.

There is **no** general "public interest" defence for breach of copyright. For example, the Sun used grabs of Princess Diana and Dodi el Fayed taken from a timecoded security video belonging to Mohammed el Fayed, as evidence to dispute his claims about their visit to a property on the day of their death. The court found against their claimed "public interest" copyright defence (*Hyde Park Residence Ltd v Yelland and Others*).

2. That the use of the material was fair

To be judged as fair dealing the use must be 'fair'.

This is partly, but not solely, judged on the amount of the copyright work which is used. If you are using practically all of a work then this is likely to be unfair. You must use only "*the minimum amount necessary to convey the full flavour of the work*". The use should also not "*adversely affect the normal exploitation of the work*".

The manner in which we obtain the material is also important. We should not use deception, or misrepresent our intentions when obtaining a copy from the copyright owner or from a third party. Note also that the work must have been published, broadcast or performed in public before.

3. That the material is actually being criticised or reviewed

A work is not 'reviewed' when it is reproduced without any comment or merely described.

eg "Frank Sinatra often performed at Madison Square Gardens [play clip]" – this is not fair dealing; but

"Frank's live performances were dramatic and unpredictable, as this performance in 1972 at Madison Square Gardens shows [play clip with acknowledgment of author]" – this might qualify as fair dealing.

The key is *how* the clip is used in the programme - how the commentary or other contributors' comments refer to the footage or performance it records.

"Criticism of a work need not be limited to criticism of style. It may also extend to the ideas to be found in a work and its social or moral implications" – so said the judge in *Pro Sieben* when finding the use in Carlton's programme was "made for the purpose of criticism of works of cheque book journalism in general". So the use of the clip there was therefore acceptable as fair dealing in the context, notwithstanding the lack of specific criticism of the actual clip itself. But the clip must have more than a tenuous connection to the matters under discussion.

4. Or used to criticise or review another Work

The criticism or review does not have to be of the fair dealt copyright work itself, ie you could use an extract from work A in order to criticize or review work B.

5. Sufficient acknowledgment

You must always identify the work by its title and its author. The acknowledgment must be unequivocal and readily understood eg either via an aston on screen, long enough to be read by the viewer, or verbally in commentary when the material appears on screen. In exceptional circumstances, where this is impracticable, acknowledgment should at least appear in the end credits. This should of course NOT be stated as a "thanks to", since the owner has not given permission for its use.

Where a clip has a broadcaster's logo embedded, and they are the owners, this will usually be sufficient to identify them, and an additional aston is not required.

The '**author**' for these purposes will usually also be the copyright owner, but not in every case eg directors of feature films should always be acknowledged as well as the title of the film and the company that owns the copyright in the film.

Editing

A clip can be edited for the purposes of criticism or review, or shown in slow motion, or paused to illustrate a point. But no adaptations or manipulations should be made to change the character of the work eg by adding a soundtrack, special effects or modifying the clip for comic effect.

Beware Contractual Liability

Fair dealing does not absolve you of all contractual liabilities. How did you get the material in the first place? In most instances where audiovisual material has been obtained other than by recording it directly off air or buying a retail DVD, an agreement will exist (even if only a verbal agreement).

So for example: you obtain programme footage from source A. That footage includes footage from B (a clip contained in A's programme). An implied or express term of the agreement to supply you with the footage will usually be that you will get separate permission from the copyright owner B or any other relevant third parties before using the clip. Source A will therefore look to you to indemnify them if B complains to A about having provided the clip. Always check the terms of the agreement with A.

Further Exploitation

Also consider fair dealing in the context of the cleared rights you are required to deliver, and not just for first UK transmission or publication. Different countries have different copyright laws. Some international sales would not be able to proceed if key material is only included on the basis of fair dealing, unless you are planning an international version without that material.

Fair Dealing for the purpose of reporting Current Events

"Current events" covers **recent** news items. But archive news footage of an incident that happened years, months or even weeks ago might no longer qualify to be fair dealt for reporting "current" events.

Still photographs do not qualify for fair dealing for reporting current events.

Sports footage is regulated for broadcast purposes by an agreed broadcasters' code of practice, which only allows certain clips to be used in regularly scheduled news programmes.

There is **no** general "news access" provision, as is often (wrongly) assumed.

The clip must have some direct relevance to the current event being reported. So if David Beckham is in the news this week for a specific reason, this doesn't mean you could "fair deal" any old footage of David Beckham playing football in reporting this latest story.

Fair dealing for the purpose of Caricature, Parody or Pastiche

This is a relatively new and largely untested defence in UK law, and so should be used with caution. The defence only applies where the usage does not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work, and does not unreasonably prejudice the interests of the copyright owner.

A caricature: is a picture, description or imitation of a person in which certain striking characteristics are exaggerated in order to create a comic or grotesque effect, or a ludicrous or grotesque version of someone or something.

A pastiche: is an artistic work in a style that imitates that of another work, artist or period, or an artistic work consisting of a medley of pieces taken from various sources.

A parody: is a work, such as a literary composition, music, painting or film, modelled on and imitating another work, especially a composition in which the characteristic style and themes of a particular author or genre are satirised by being applied to inappropriate or unlikely subjects, or are otherwise exaggerated for comic effect.

European court precedent suggests that a parody must:

- evoke an existing work
- be noticeably different from that work
- contain an element of humour or mockery

There is no express requirement to acknowledge the source work, but the parody must either relate to the source work or else must mention the source work.

A European decision (*Deckmyn v Vandersteen*) required the court to strike a fair balance between the broadcaster of the parody and the legitimate interests of the author.

Fair dealing for the purpose of quotation

There is a relatively new exemption for the purpose of quotation, which is again largely untested. The use of quotations is not limited to criticism or review, or reporting current events.

But the intention of the new defence is to permit uses that cause minimal harm to copyright owners.

The work must have been made available to the public, and the use of the quotation must be fair. The extent of the quotation should be no more than is required by the specific purpose for which it is used, and the author of the quotation and the title or other description of the work should be acknowledged so far as practicably possible.

March 2024

DATA PROTECTION

1. Background

The new Data Protection Act came into force on 25 May 2018. It replaces the 1998 DPA and enacts the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) into domestic law.

Sanctions now available to the ICO (the regulator for information rights) include greatly increased fines of up to €20M or 4% of turnover.

This is a complex area of law, and these guidelines are only designed to be a starting point for programme producers to understand their obligations to protect the personal data of individuals, and the legal penalties and reputational damage that could result from unlawful disclosure or data breaches.

2. Data Protection – the basics

The 2018 Act gives the “**data subject**” (a living individual) more rights – of access (i.e. what data have we got?), of rectification and of erasure of their data - and it gives “**data controllers**” and “**data processors**” more responsibilities.

We need to collect and use personal data only when there is a clear reason for doing so, and be transparent with people about what their data is being used for. It applies to all data where a person is identifiable – contributors, contacts, contractors, employees, members of the public, and colleagues.

We should take steps to ensure data is kept secure, is only shared with appropriate people, is not retained unless necessary, and is deleted safely.

The jargon

Personal data: information relating to a living individual who can be identified from that information - either directly or indirectly in conjunction with other information ('jigsaw'). Examples: address, phone number, date of birth, IP address, e-mail address, social media profiles, employment details, still or moving images of that person.

Data subject: the identified or identifiable person to whom the data relates.

Special category data: personal data about an individual's racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade union membership, sex life or sexual orientation, physical or mental health matters, genetic and biometric data.

Criminal offence data: includes data about arrests, charges, proceedings and convictions - and also includes personal data related to security measures.

Processing personal data: means any operation such as collecting, recording, storing, broadcasting, organising, altering, transferring to someone else, erasing and destroying the data.

Data Subjects' Rights include:

Right to Information: to know who is processing their data, what kind of data, the legal basis for the processing, who it is being sent to, and other information needed

to establish the data is being processed fairly and transparently, and to be informed about decision making.

Right of Access: to seek disclosure of the personal data that ITV or the production company holds about them via a **Subject Access Request**.

Right to Object to processing.

Right to Rectification: if the information is inaccurate.

Right to Erasure: to have the information removed - sometimes referred to as a right to be forgotten.

The Data Protection Principles – these include that personal data must be:

- Processed fairly, lawfully and transparently;
- Obtained only for lawful purposes and not used for any conflicting purpose;
- Adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to lawful purposes;
- Accurate and kept up-to-date;
- Kept no longer than necessary in a form where individuals are identifiable;
- Processed in a secure manner;
- Processed in accordance with the rights of data subjects;
- Not transferred outside the European Economic Area unless adequate safeguards are in place.

3. The 'Special Purposes' Exemption

This exemption protects freedom of expression in journalism, academia, the arts and literature. It applies if the processing is being carried out **with a view to publication** of journalistic, academic, artistic or literary material; the controller **reasonably believes** that the publication of the material would be in the **public interest**; and the controller **reasonably believes** that the application of the data protection law provisions would be **incompatible** with journalism, etc.

Taken together with art and literature, the special purposes as a whole potentially covers everything broadcast on television, not simply documentaries, news and current affairs. But this exemption does not necessarily apply to all activities, and journalists and producers must still comply with the Act unless doing so would be in conflict with the purpose of publication of journalistic material in the public interest.

It is the data controller who has to demonstrate a reasonable belief, not just an individual programme maker. Data controllers should take account of the special importance of the public interest in the freedom of expression and information. The controller must have regard to any of the codes of practice, such as the Ofcom Broadcasting Code, and in particular its rules on fairness and privacy.

But the exemption does **not** include simple breaches of data security. Programme makers and journalists are not exempt from the basic legal obligation to make sure personal data is kept securely.

4. Processing Different Types of Personal Data

Personal Data - processing is **only** lawful if certain conditions are met. Most likely to be relevant to TV producers are:

Legitimate Interests – ie processing is **necessary** for the purposes of legitimate interests. “Legitimate interests” captures many of the reasons ITV and its programme-makers would lawfully process personal data. ITV considers it has a legitimate interest in commissioning programmes for commercial exploitation, and in journalism. Processing personal information about individuals is therefore necessary to this activity. This legitimate interest would extend to retaining rushes, clips and unused material, archiving, dealing with complaints, and retaining contacts and information in the interests of programme making. Legitimate interests must be balanced against the rights of the individual.

Consent - The data subject has given consent to the processing of their data for a specific purpose.

Contract – Processing is necessary for performance of a contract. This may for example apply if a participant has signed a consent & release form.

Special Category Data - processing is **only** lawful if certain conditions are met. Most likely to be relevant are:

Consent – In most cases, contributors will have consented to sharing personal information by agreeing to take part in a programme and signing a consent & release form. It is important to have evidence of their consent to broadcast/publish if they are being interviewed about SCD. In most cases, a Special Category Privacy Notice should be provided to the contributor. Please seek legal advice on the wording of release forms and privacy notices.

Where personal information about X is provided by Y, we still need X’s consent to broadcast, unless another condition or the ‘special purposes’ exemption applies, or the information is trivial and broadcast would be harmless.

Already Public - where the information has already manifestly been made public by the individual.

Archiving - where processing is necessary for archiving in the public interest.

Journalism in connection with unlawful acts - Similar to the journalism exemption, but specifically when connected to revealing matters such as an unlawful act by a person, dishonesty, malpractice, incompetence, a failure in services etc. This is where processing is necessary for reasons of substantial public interest, it is carried out with a view to publication of the personal data, and the controller reasonably believes publication of the data is in the public interest.

The special purposes exemption - may mean that it is lawful to process a person’s special category personal data even if it runs counter to their other data protection rights. The data controller will need to have a reasonable belief that it is not possible to comply with the person’s rights under the Act.

A data subject can withdraw consent to processing of their data. If they do, we need to assess (i) whether we can lawfully continue to process their data under another condition and/or the journalism exemption and (ii) whether we can still use the person’s contribution/data in the programme. Please notify ITV and take legal advice if consent is withdrawn by a contributor.

Criminal Offence Data - this includes data about criminal allegations, proceedings or convictions. Processing is **only** lawful if certain conditions are met. Most likely to be relevant to journalists are:

Journalism in connection with unlawful acts – see above. This is likely to be relevant in court reporting and investigative journalism.

Unlawful act - processing is necessary for the purposes of preventing or detecting an unlawful act. This might overlap with some investigative journalism.

Consent - in most circumstances reporting criminal charges and convictions does not need consent, as one of the other conditions will apply. If we do need consent it is important to have evidence of that consent to our use of their data.

Already public – many criminal convictions are reported publicly and are a matter of public record. Advice should be taken on whether those convictions are now spent.

The broader journalism exemption may also apply.

Criminal Background Checks

In most instances we will seek a contributor's explicit consent and ask them to cooperate in obtaining a record of their unspent criminal convictions.

Please take legal advice before carrying out criminal background checks, as an appropriate agreement may need to be in place with a suitable check provider.

In some circumstances it may not be possible or appropriate to get the individual's consent. In that case, we might seek to rely on one of the other exemptions in the Act. For example, background checking is necessary for a reason of substantial public interest.

5. Privacy Notices

Transparency is a cornerstone of the new data protection law. We should be clear and open with contributors about how we are processing personal information. Generally, we don't necessarily need the consent of the individual for processing their data, but do need to make them aware of how their information is being used, by providing them with a Privacy Notice. This sets out how their data is processed, and their rights.

Where we are processing contributors' special category or criminal offence data - eg interviewing them about sensitive personal information (mental health, sexual orientation, etc) or criminal matters - we should provide them with a Special Category Privacy Notice.

There many are circumstances particularly in location filming where it will be difficult or impractical to provide individuals with a paper release form, a PN and/or an SCPN before filming. However, a privacy notice can be referred to in physical filming notices put up at locations, in release forms, or in email correspondence following up after filming.

Take legal advice if you have identified a situation where providing a hard copy PN or SCPN would be problematic. It may be that an exemption applies, or there is an alternative approach.

Sharing information with third parties

The potential sharing of personal data should also be set out in a Privacy Notice – another reason PNs are so important. If you have any concerns about the particular wording in a PN, relevant to your production, take legal advice.

Children

GDPR gives children specific protection because they may be less aware of their rights and the risks involved in sharing their personal data.

We should explain to a child their rights in language they will understand, and allow them to exercise their rights if they wish to do so. Normally we will obtain parental permission to obtain any personal information from under 16s, just as the Ofcom Broadcasting Code already generally requires us to obtain parental consent where we feature an under-16 in a programme.

6. Practical Issues

Withdrawing consent

Under the GDPR, data subjects have the right to withdraw consent at any time. However, a withdrawal of consent does not necessarily mean we are then legally obliged not to include the contribution in the programme. When we are processing contributors' personal data we may be relying on legitimate interest or contract. Where a contributor seeks to withdraw their consent to be featured, we would consider our legitimate interest (such as freedom of expression) against the individual's privacy and DP rights.

Legitimate interest does not apply to special category or criminal offence personal data, but if a person withdraws consent to the use of that material, we may rely on another exemption in the public interest. Such withdrawals of consent should therefore be referred to an ITV lawyer immediately if the intention is to still include the contributor in the programme.

Requests for rectification

Individuals have the right to request that inaccurate personal data about them is rectified. If you receive such a request, you should take reasonable steps to satisfy yourself that the data is accurate, and then correct it if necessary. If we wish to consider rejecting a request, please refer to an ITV lawyer before responding.

Requests from the public to take down online reports

Often these relate to a person's previous convictions, and the person often wants to exercise what they believe to be their 'right to be forgotten'. Please refer to the ITV compliance legal team for advice on these requests.

Subject Access Requests

Subject Access Requests (DSARs) - if you receive a Subject Access Request, send it to Viewer Services who will log it and send it on to the Privacy Team to consider. Normally, there is one month to comply with the request, so prompt reporting is important.

Requests from police and other authorities for personal details relating to individuals in programmes

ITV receives these requests frequently. Please refer any requests to the compliance legal team for advice.

7. Unlawful Obtaining of Personal Data

It can be a criminal offence for a person knowingly or recklessly to **obtain or disclose** personal data without consent. This is similar to the previous offence under s55 of the DPA 1998. This section is most often relevant to private or confidential information obtained (eg through a source or a private investigator) without the permission of the relevant data controller.

Defences include: obtaining, disclosing, procuring or retaining the material was necessary for the purposes of preventing or detecting crime; or was justified in the public interest; or the person acted (a) for the special purposes of journalism (b) with a view to the publication by a person of any journalistic, academic, artistic or literary material, and (c) in the reasonable belief that in the particular circumstances the obtaining, disclosing, procuring or retaining was justified as being in the public interest.

Always seek legal advice if a claim is made that personal data has been obtained unlawfully, or if the complainant says they have referred their complaint to the ICO.

8. Data Security

“Personal data breach” - means a breach of security leading to the accidental or unlawful destruction, loss, alteration, unauthorised disclosure of, or access to, personal data transmitted, stored or otherwise processed.

Appropriate security measures must be taken against unauthorised or unlawful access to personal data and against accidental loss, destruction or damage to personal data. These security obligations apply to all personal information processed for journalistic purposes, including personal information gathered for news and programmes, and on social media, by email and online.

Personal data, and especially any Special Category Data or Criminal Offence Data – **must** be held securely, eg encrypted, or on password-protected files or computers, or in locked cupboards etc.

Disposal of data

Personal data should not be retained for any longer than necessary, and should be disposed of securely (eg shredding, deletion of files, disposal in a ‘confidential waste’ bin).

There may be instances (relating to controversial or major stories) where it is warranted to retain data for longer than usual under the journalism exemption. Refer to the compliance legal team for advice as necessary.

March 2024

CONFIDENTIALITY

The law of confidentiality protects confidential information, such as internal company records or documents, draft accounts, private correspondence, medical records, trade secrets, and private personal information between spouses or partners.

Where journalists are given confidential documents or information, the person or company who owns that confidential information can seek an injunction from the court to prevent publication. If confidential documents are to be used or referred to in a programme, there is always a danger that there will be an application to the court before broadcast for an injunction to stop the broadcast and retrieve the documents.

However, if the confidential documents disclose wrongdoing or information that is in the public interest, this may be relevant as to whether or not an injunction is granted, on the principle that “there is no confidence in iniquity”. An interim injunction granted against one media organisation will apply to all media organisations.

There are certain circumstances where a duty or obligation of confidence will apply because of the nature of the relationship between the parties, eg between doctor and patient, or employer and employee, or where parties have agreed not to disclose information (such as a non-disclosure agreement). But the courts have also inferred a duty of confidence to exist in circumstances where this obligation of confidence is not so obvious, eg in preventing publication of “kiss and tell” stories.

The owner of confidential documents might also complain to the police that the document has been stolen. Asking someone to carry out an unlawful act could be viewed as aiding and abetting, incitement or even as a conspiracy to commit crime. Always take advice from the compliance legal team when potentially confidential documents or information have been or are about to be obtained.

March 2024