

Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin

**Issue number 274
2 March 2015**

Contents

Introduction	3
Broadcast Licence Conditions cases	
<u>Resolved</u>	
Provision of service <i>Turkish Gold Radio (North London), September 2014</i>	5
Fairness and Privacy cases	
<u>Not Upheld</u>	
Complaint by Miss Kerrie Newcombe <i>Champneys, ITV, 10 July 2014</i>	7
Investigations Not in Breach	24
Complaints Assessed, Not Investigated	25
Investigations List	38

Introduction

Under the Communications Act 2003 (“the Act”), Ofcom has a duty to set standards for broadcast content as appear to it best calculated to secure the standards objectives¹. Ofcom must include these standards in a code or codes. These are listed below. Ofcom also has a duty to secure that every provider of a notifiable On Demand Programme Services (“ODPS”) complies with certain standards requirements as set out in the Act².

The Broadcast Bulletin reports on the outcome of investigations into alleged breaches of those Ofcom codes below, as well as licence conditions with which broadcasters regulated by Ofcom are required to comply. We also report on the outcome of ODPS sanctions referrals made by ATVOD and the ASA on the basis of their rules and guidance for ODPS. These Codes, rules and guidance documents include:

- a) [Ofcom’s Broadcasting Code](#) (“the Code”).
- b) the [Code on the Scheduling of Television Advertising](#) (“COSTA”) which contains rules on how much advertising and teleshopping may be scheduled in programmes, how many breaks are allowed and when they may be taken.
- c) certain sections of the [BCAP Code: the UK Code of Broadcast Advertising](#), which relate to those areas of the BCAP Code for which Ofcom retains regulatory responsibility. These include:
 - the prohibition on ‘political’ advertising;
 - sponsorship and product placement on television (see Rules 9.13, 9.16 and 9.17 of the Code) and all commercial communications in radio programming (see Rules 10.6 to 10.8 of the Code);
 - ‘participation TV’ advertising. This includes long-form advertising predicated on premium rate telephone services – most notably chat (including ‘adult’ chat), ‘psychic’ readings and dedicated quiz TV (Call TV quiz services). Ofcom is also responsible for regulating gambling, dating and ‘message board’ material where these are broadcast as advertising³.
- d) other licence conditions which broadcasters must comply with, such as requirements to pay fees and submit information which enables Ofcom to carry out its statutory duties. Further information can be found on Ofcom’s website for [television](#) and [radio](#) licences.
- e) rules and guidance for both [editorial content and advertising content on ODPS](#). Ofcom considers sanctions in relation to ODPS on referral by the Authority for Television On-Demand (“ATVOD”) or the Advertising Standards Authority (“ASA”), co-regulators of ODPS for editorial content and advertising respectively, or may do so as a concurrent regulator.

[Other codes and requirements](#) may also apply to broadcasters and ODPS, depending on their circumstances. These include the Code on Television Access Services (which sets out how much subtitling, signing and audio description relevant

¹ The relevant legislation is set out in detail in Annex 1 of the Code.

² The relevant legislation can be found at Part 4A of the Act.

³ BCAP and ASA continue to regulate conventional teleshopping content and spot advertising for these types of services where it is permitted. Ofcom remains responsible for statutory sanctions in all advertising cases.

licensees must provide), the Code on Electronic Programme Guides, the Code on Listed Events, and the Cross Promotion Code.

It is Ofcom's policy to describe fully the content in television, radio and on demand content. Some of the language and descriptions used in Ofcom's Broadcast Bulletin may therefore cause offence.

Broadcast Licence Conditions cases

Resolved

Provision of service

Turkish Gold Radio (North London), September 2014

Introduction

Turkish Gold Radio is an AM local commercial radio station licensed to serve the Turkish community in North London. The licence is held by Panjab Radio London Ltd (“PRL” or “the Licensee”). The licence was transferred from the station’s previous owners Kirmizi Beyaz Kibris Ltd (“KBK”) to PRL in April 2014. Owing to financial problems, KBK had entered into liquidation, and therefore the station (at that time known as London Turkish Radio) had been off the air for a number of months¹ prior to the licence being transferred to PRL.

Ofcom was aware that PRL experienced a number of initial technical difficulties after it inherited London Turkish Radio’s transmission arrangements at Lea Bridge Road, London. However, by the summer of 2014 we understood that these problems had been resolved by the Licensee, who had re-launched the service as Turkish Gold Radio, and that there were no longer any significant breaks in transmission occurring.

However, following some routine monitoring to establish that the early problems had been resolved, Ofcom’s engineers found that Turkish Gold Radio was off the air on a number of different occasions during September 2014.

We considered that this raised issues warranting investigation under Condition 2(1) contained in Part 2 of the Schedule to PPL’s licence, which states that:

“The Licensee shall provide the Licensed Service specified in the Annex for the licence period and shall secure that the Licensed Service serves so much of the licensed area as is for the time being reasonably practicable.” (Section 106(2) of the Broadcasting Act 1990).

We therefore sought formal comments from the Licensee on its compliance with this licence condition.

Response

PRL confirmed that it had encountered various logistical transmission difficulties since taking the London Turkish Radio licence over in April 2014 from its previous owners. In particular, the existing landline connecting the former London Turkish Radio studios with the transmitter at Lea Bridge Road had been removed, and there was a delay in the installation of a replacement (broadband) line due to cabling faults in the street.

The Licensee stated that the new broadband line had developed a fault, resulting in intermittent service breaks which caused the breaks in transmission during September 2014. However PRL said that it was only advised by its transmission

¹ This breach of KBK’s licence was published in issue 249 of the Broadcast Bulletin: <http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/binaries/enforcement/broadcast-bulletins/obb249/obb249.pdf>

company that there was a problem with the new line a week prior to Ofcom's initial correspondence with PRL on the matter.

PRL explained that, following its identification of this problem, it had now installed a satellite broadband delivery system to replace the existing broadband line. The Licensee also said that a transmission monitoring system had been installed at its studios to ensure the output of the transmitter can be properly monitored at all times.²

Decision

Ofcom has a range of duties in relation to radio broadcasting, including securing a range and diversity of local radio services which are calculated to appeal to a variety of tastes and interests, and the optimal use of the radio spectrum.

Provision by a Licensee of its licensed service on the frequency assigned to it is the fundamental purpose for which a commercial radio licence is granted. This is reflected in the licence condition requiring the provision of the specified licensed service. Where a licensed service is not being provided in accordance with the licence, none of the required commercial radio programme output is provided. In addition, choice for listeners is reduced.

In this case, the Licensee confirmed to us that there were a number of breaks in transmission during September 2014 due to a fault with the broadband line that connected the studio with the transmitter.

PRL clearly failed to provide the licensed service on these occasions during September 2014. However we recognised that some of the factors which had led to this situation arising were beyond the Licensee's control, and were linked to the circumstances in which PRL took over the licence. We took into account that, once PRL became aware that its initial solutions to the transmission problems had proved unreliable, it took action to introduce an alternative means of delivering the studio output to the transmitter. Our understanding is that there have not been any subsequent recurring issues with Turkish Gold Radio's transmission.

In view of this, Ofcom considered the matter to be resolved.

Resolved

² PRL's studios are located – with Ofcom's consent – in Hayes, outside of the licence's transmission area, meaning that PRL was unable to monitor the station's output directly from the AM radio band.

Fairness and Privacy cases

Not Upheld

Complaint by Miss Kerrie Newcombe

Champneys, ITV, 10 July 2014

Summary

Ofcom has not upheld Miss Kerrie Newcombe's complaint of unjust or unfair treatment or of unwarranted infringement of privacy in the programme as broadcast.

The programme was a documentary about Champneys, one of England's oldest hotel health spas, which followed the owner Mr Stephen Purdew and his staff's efforts to make improvements to the hotel, including a major refurbishment and an overhaul of key departments. Various staff members were shown carrying out their day to day tasks. One of the staff members featured in the programme was the Housekeeping Manager, Miss Kerrie Newcombe, the complainant.

Ofcom found that:

- The programme makers had not been unfair in their dealings with Miss Newcombe as a potential contributor because it was reasonable for them to consider that they had her informed consent to film her, and, up until the 25 June 2014 (at the very latest), to include footage of her in the programme.
- Despite Miss Newcombe informing the programme makers after the filming had taken place that they did not have her consent to include footage of her in the programme, in the particular circumstances of this case, Ofcom did not consider that the broadcaster had been unfair to Miss Newcombe by including footage of her in the programme without her consent.
- Miss Newcombe had a limited legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the broadcast footage of her in her workplace. However, we considered that, in the particular circumstances of this case, the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression outweighed Miss Newcombe's limited expectation of privacy. Therefore, including footage of Miss Newcombe without her consent was warranted.

Introduction and programme summary

On 10 July 2014, ITV broadcast an hour long documentary programme about Champneys, one of England's oldest hotel health spas. The programme, filmed over a four month period, focused on the owner Mr Stephen Purdew and his staff's efforts to make improvements to the hotel, including a major refurbishment and an overhaul of key departments. Various staff members were shown carrying out their day to day tasks. One of the staff members featured in the programme was the Housekeeping Manager, Miss Kerrie Newcombe, the complainant.

During the programme, footage was shown of Mr Purdew inspecting some of the rooms at the hotel. He stated: "*I think we've got an issue with housekeeping*".

Further on in the programme, the programme's narrator explained:

"By now they are four weeks into the refurbishment and things are certainly beginning to change. But, there is one area that still seems to be causing problems – housekeeping – the state of some of the rooms just isn't up to scratch...Complaints to do with the state of the bedrooms are the responsibility of Kerrie, the housekeeper".

At this point, footage was shown of Miss Newcombe inspecting a room as she explained what she was doing. The narrator commented: *"Kerrie has just been made manager of housekeeping"*. Miss Newcombe then explained her general policy for recruiting new staff:

"Now, everyone I've hired has to have at least two years' experience as a room attendant, in a four or five star property, if possible, because I don't have the resources to spend training everyone from the beginning. We do do a lot of training, but not from basic. They need to have the basics and then we teach them the Champneys' way".

The programme then showed interview footage of Mr Purdew in which he said:

"I think we've got a good housekeeper, but she's young and she needs some more experienced help, and that's what we need to find there".

The narrator then stated:

"So, enter Irena. Irena has lots of five star experience and has been brought on to help Kerrie transform the department".

Later in the programme, Miss Newcombe was shown in a meeting with Operations Manager "Lee". The narrator explained that Lee had employed the services of a "secret shopper", an individual used to *"...test the standards of hotels without staff knowing"*. He said that: *"...and this report does not make for easy reading"*. Lee then read out some of the issues raised by the secret shopper regarding the state of the rooms. The narrator stated: *"Oh dear, another blow for housekeeping"*.

Miss Newcombe was later shown in another meeting with several staff and the hotel's General Manager, "Thomas". Thomas explained that he was not seeing enough improvement across departments. In particular, he said that:

"Housekeeping is flat – it's not going up, it's not going down – but at the level that it is, it should really go up and that is not happening".

Further on in the programme, the narrator explained that:

"Irena, with her five star background, is trying to make a difference to housekeeping...She has already got concerns that cleaning staff are not up to scratch. Irena then goes over her boss Kerrie's head to complain about two members of staff to Operations Manager, Lee".

The narrator commented: *"It sounds like housekeeping needs to get its house in order"*.

The narrator then explained that Irena's criticism had led to two of the cleaning staff threatening to resign. He said: *"Young manager Kerrie has asked to see Lee about*

the matter". Miss Newcombe was then shown in a meeting with Lee discussing her concerns about Irena and staffing issues. She said: "*She [Irena] needs to respect what I say. I can't afford to lose any more staff for the sake of one person*". Lee then suggested that the matter needed to be discussed with Irena. The narrator stated: "*It can't happen soon enough. The fall out is now between the two managers, Kerrie and Irena, and all the staff are talking about it*".

Later in the programme, the programme makers asked Irena:

"Irena, I know also that not everything's been right between you and Kerrie has it?...I know that you haven't been getting on".

Irena responded:

"It's just that everybody's stressed".

Further in the programme, the narrator explained:

"It's the day of Kerrie and Irena's meeting, but they have chosen to have it behind closed doors...Kerrie and Irena are trying to reduce tension in their department and smooth out their differences".

After the meeting, Miss Newcombe was shown sitting at a desk in an office. She said:

"I apologise if my make-up's run because I've been crying. We both aired our thoughts and views. Not all of them were so pleasant, but we've cleared the air. Finally, they're resolved now and moving forward we've already arranged to go out for dinner next week".

Later in the programme, the narrator explained that it had been four months since the refurbishment and improvement process had begun and that Irena had decided to leave Champneys. Irena stated her reason for leaving was: "*Because I am not happy*". In response to the question put to her by the programme makers about whether she respected her manager. She responded: "*I respect the person, but I cannot look up to my manager because we cannot get to the same – we don't have the same opinions*".

The narrator summed up the situation: "*Benita [a hotel receptionist] and Irena were brought in to change Champneys, but perhaps the real lesson is that Champneys is not ready to change very much*".

The programme concluded without any further references to Miss Newcombe.

Summary of the complaint and the broadcaster's response

The complaint

Unjust or unfair treatment

- a) In summary, Miss Newcombe complained that the programme makers had not been fair in their dealings with her as a contributor to the programme. She said that she was treated unjustly or unfairly in the programme as broadcast because she did not give consent for the footage of her to be broadcast. On 1 April 2014, before the programme's broadcast, Miss Newcombe said she informed the

production company that she did not want to be included in the programme. She said that she was asked at that stage to sign a contributor release form (which she had been provided with before filming began), but had refused.

Unwarranted infringement of privacy

- b) In summary, Miss Newcombe complained that her privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast in that she did not give consent for the footage of her at work to be broadcast. On 1 April 2014, before the programme's broadcast, Miss Newcombe said she informed the production company that she did not want to be included in the programme. She said that she was asked at that stage to sign a contributor release form (which she had been provided with before filming began), but had refused.

By way of background to her complaint, Miss Newcombe said that due to "feeling uncomfortable with the filming", she began looking for another job and resigned from Champneys.

The broadcaster's response

Background and Miss Newcombe's informed consent

Before addressing the specific heads of Miss Newcombe's complaint, ITV explained the background to the making of the programme and the issue of informed consent which was common to both heads of complaint.

The broadcaster said that the programme had been filmed between October 2013 and February 2014 and that Miss Newcombe had been the Head of Housekeeping at Champneys throughout this time. It said that it understood that Miss Newcombe had resigned from Champneys towards the end of March 2014, after filming had been completed and prior to the programme being broadcast.

The broadcaster said that the programme makers had worked with Champneys' senior management to ensure that all employees were fully informed about the filming and given the opportunity to raise any concerns about being included in the programme. It said that all employees, including Miss Newcombe, attended briefings in October 2013 with Champneys' Director of Marketing, to explain the nature and purpose of the programme. All employees were advised that if they did not want to be filmed for inclusion in the programme, that they should make this known. ITV said that at this time, several staff members had said that they did not want to be included in the programme and that their decision was respected. It said that Miss Newcombe had every opportunity to decline to be filmed or to ask not to be included but did not do so.

ITV said that all employees, including Miss Newcombe, were spoken to again when filming commenced and it was explained to them what the programme's aims were. They were told that the programme would show Champneys as it went through a period of change and its attempts to improve its customer service in areas such as the restaurant, housekeeping and reception. ITV said that, therefore, Miss Newcombe, as Head of Housekeeping, would have been in no doubt from these discussions that her department was one of the areas of particular interest.

ITV also explained that all employees, other than those who had indicated that they did not want to be filmed for inclusion in the programme, were given contributor release forms to sign before filming began. It said that the employees were not told

that signing the form was a requirement for inclusion in the programme, but were told that obtaining signed contributor release forms was a routine part of the television production process. While most employees returned their signed forms promptly, Miss Newcombe did not return her form. However, ITV said that Miss Newcombe:

“...gave no indication to either Champneys’ management or to the production team during the filming period that her failure to return the form signified any lack of consent to be filmed or to be included in the programme, or indeed that she had any concerns about the filming or her inclusion in the programme”.

In relation to Miss Newcombe’s contribution to the programme, ITV said she had been filmed on 22 days and that on several of these occasions she had agreed to wearing a radio microphone. It said that she took part in at least eight filmed interviews where she spoke directly to camera. ITV therefore considered that:

“Her participation in the programme was therefore far more than simply passive acceptance of being included in filming going on at her workplace, but active co-operation with the filming process”.

ITV gave examples of the various duties Miss Newcombe was filmed completing, such as taking part in various meetings, inspecting rooms and working at her desk in her office. It said that she appeared to be completely comfortable with the filming process and did not express any concerns about the filming, or her inclusion in the programme to either the production team or to Champneys’ senior management.

ITV said that filming had been completed on 7 February 2014 and that Miss Newcombe had been interviewed on that day. It said that she had not mentioned any plans to leave Champneys and had appeared to the programme makers to be “...entirely happy with her involvement in the filming process”.

The broadcaster said that it understood that Miss Newcombe resigned from Champneys towards the end of March 2014 and that she had told the programme’s director that she was leaving Champneys because she had found a better paying job closer to where she lived. It said that she did not give any indication to either Champneys or the director that her reason for leaving was because she had felt “uncomfortable with filming”, as suggested in her complaint to Ofcom.

ITV said that the programme makers had noted that Miss Newcombe had not returned her signed contributor release form by the end of filming, and that Champneys’ General Manager emailed her on 28 March 2014 asking her to return it. He received no response and so followed up his email with a reminder on 31 March 2014. Miss Newcombe responded on 1 April 2014 stating that she had not signed the form because she was “slightly worried about doing so now I am leaving the company”. The General Manager spoke with Miss Newcombe and advised her to discuss the programme with the director.

ITV said that on 10 April 2014, the programme’s director had returned to Champneys to take some publicity photographs for the programme and that Miss Newcombe consented to be photographed for this purpose. The broadcaster stated that this was further evidence that “...even at this point she fully understood and actively consented to being included in the programme”. ITV explained that Miss Newcombe had spoken with the programme director and had asked to see the completed programme prior to broadcast, saying that she wanted to make sure that she was happy with it before she would sign the contributor release form. It said that Miss Newcombe had told the director that she was “99% certain” she would be happy with

the programme, but wanted to view it before signing the form. The director explained to her that it was not ITV's policy to provide all contributors with the opportunity to view such programmes before broadcast. However, he also explained to Miss Newcombe the nature of certain scenes which had been included and the fact that at times her department had been shown under scrutiny and the subject of some criticism from management. The programme's director had assumed that Miss Newcombe had been satisfied with his description of her contribution and had been reassured by their discussion as he heard nothing further from her.

ITV said that it disputed Miss Newcombe's account of her conversation with the programme's director on 1 April 2014 (as stated in email correspondence between Miss Newcombe and the programme makers). It said that the director believed that the conversation in question took place on 10 April 2014 (as above) and that he denied that Miss Newcombe had told him at this time that she did not want to be included in the programme. It considered that:

"It is entirely inconsistent with the complainant's position that she would have agreed to be photographed for publicity for the programme, if she had already decided on 1 April 2014 that she did not want to be in the programme itself, and had communicated that wish to the programme team".

ITV said that the programme makers first became aware of Miss Newcombe's request not to be included in the programme on 25 June 2014, 15 days before the programme was due to be broadcast, when she wrote to the programme's director asking to be "taken out" of the programme "as requested". ITV said that this was the first time that Miss Newcombe had made this request. Miss Newcombe's request was declined. ITV said that even the terms in which Miss Newcombe had made her request (i.e. to be "taken out") suggested that prior to this she had understood that she would feature in the programme.

ITV considered that having consented to take part Miss Newcombe then sought to rescind her consent on 25 June 2014. It said that:

"...by that time the producers had relied on her informed consent and had filmed extensively with her, and had constructed and edited part of the narrative of the programme to feature her extensively".

It said that it would have been very difficult to produce the programme if it had felt it necessary to discard all the footage that featured Miss Newcombe and to re-edit the programme at a very late stage in the process. The broadcaster said that it was entirely satisfied that it was not obliged to do this and had explained this to Miss Newcombe in writing before the broadcast of the programme.

Unjust or unfair treatment

- a) ITV stated that it considered that it had properly complied with Rule 7.1 of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code ("the Code") and in particular with Practices 7.2 and 7.3 (as set out in detail in Ofcom's "Decision" section below).

It said that the programme makers treated Miss Newcombe fairly in their dealings with her. As set out above, Miss Newcombe was told the nature and purpose of the programme at an appropriate stage, what the programme was about, and given a clear explanation of why she was being asked to contribute. She was also told that her house keeping department was one of the areas that the programme would focus on.

ITV explained that Miss Newcombe was told about the kind of contribution she was expected to make and that it was made clear to her that she would be filmed as she went about her daily activities at work. It said that she was aware that any footage of her would be recorded and then edited for possible inclusion in the programme. ITV also said that there were no significant changes to the programme as it developed which may have reasonably affected her original informed consent to participate.

ITV pointed out that the programme included a good deal of footage of Miss Newcombe and explained the various types of scenes in which she featured. In particular, it said that the programme followed the relationship between Miss Newcombe and Irena who had been employed to help Miss Newcombe and her department. ITV said that conflict developed between the two women and that this relationship was depicted in the programme. The broadcaster considered that the complaint entertained by Ofcom did not include any specifics as to the potential unfairness in the programme, and that it was its view that none of the material in the programme featuring or referring to Miss Newcombe was unfair to her, or misrepresented events as they occurred.

ITV said that while Miss Newcombe did not sign a contributor release form, although she had been asked to do so, she was not the only contributor who did not return their form. It said that the absence of the form was not considered significant because a “signed consent form is desirable as evidence of informed consent, but it does not constitute that consent”. It also said:

“The release form is a standard industry practice, to provide the producer with evidence of consent having been obtained. But it is not and has never been a pre-requisite of a participant’s inclusion, where consent has clearly been obtained and is evidenced by conduct recorded on film”.

ITV said that Miss Newcombe’s informed consent to be filmed for inclusion in the programme was displayed throughout the filming and was evidenced in the footage of her that appeared in the programme, where it pointed out she was shown actively participating in the filming. ITV said that at one point she told the programme’s director that she was really enjoying the filming process.

ITV said that the programme makers insisted that Miss Newcombe did not inform them on 1 April 2014 that she did not want to be included in the programme (as stated in her email of 29 June 2014), and it pointed out that the email correspondence did not support her assertion in this regard. It said that Miss Newcombe had informed the programme makers that she did not want to be included in the programme for the first time on 25 June 2014. ITV said that the refusal by ITV to remove all footage of Miss Newcombe from the programme did not constitute unfairness to her in the programme.

Unwarranted infringement of privacy

- b) ITV stated that it considered that it had properly complied with Rule 8.1 of the Code and in particular with Practice 8.6 (as set out in detail in Ofcom’s “Decision” section below).

Again, ITV said that Miss Newcombe freely gave her informed consent throughout the four month filming period to be filmed for the purpose of inclusion in the programme. Therefore, it said that Miss Newcombe had no reasonable

expectation of privacy in relation to the footage of her included in the programme. The broadcaster also pointed out that the filming had taken place in Miss Newcombe's place of work and did not involve any particularly sensitive or private circumstances or events. It therefore said that none of the broadcast footage of Miss Newcombe infringed her privacy. ITV further said that there was also no requirement on the programme makers in these circumstances to obtain separate consent for the filming and subsequent broadcast of the material.

ITV said that even if Ofcom was to find that there was some infringement of Miss Newcombe's privacy in the broadcast of the footage, based on the fact that Miss Newcombe had requested that she not be included in the programme, it considered that any such infringement was warranted because of the consent previously given by Miss Newcombe to being filmed for the purpose of inclusion in the programme over a lengthy period.

Representations on Ofcom's Preliminary View

Ofcom prepared a Preliminary View in this case that Miss Newcombe's complaint of unjust or unfair treatment and of unwarranted infringement of privacy in the programme as broadcast should not be upheld. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary View. Miss Newcombe did not submit any representations.

In summary, ITV stated that while it agreed with Ofcom's Preliminary View, it suggested revising Ofcom's wording relating to the use of contributor release forms, which it considered would make what Ofcom considered best practice clearer to programme makers.

Ofcom considered ITV's suggestions and they are reflected in the decision where appropriate.

Decision

Ofcom's statutory duties include the application, in the case of all television and radio services, of standards which provide adequate protection to members of the public and all other persons from unjust or unfair treatment and unwarranted infringement of privacy in, or in connection with the obtaining of material included in, programmes in such services.

In carrying out its duties, Ofcom has regard to the need to secure that the application of these standards is in the manner that best guarantees an appropriate level of freedom of expression. Ofcom is also obliged to have regard, in all cases, to the principles under which regulatory activities should be transparent, accountable, proportionate and consistent and targeted only at cases in which action is needed.

In reaching its decision, Ofcom carefully considered all the relevant material provided by both parties. This included a recording of the programme as broadcast and transcript, both parties' written submissions, email correspondence between Miss Newcombe and the programme makers, and a copy of the contributor release form Miss Newcombe was asked to sign.

Unjust or unfair treatment

- a) Ofcom considered Miss Newcombe's complaint that the programme makers had not been fair in their dealings with her as a contributor to the programme and that

she was treated unjustly or unfairly in the programme as broadcast because she did not give consent for the footage of her to be broadcast.

When considering and deciding complaints of unjust and unfair treatment, Ofcom has regard to whether the broadcaster's actions ensured that the programme as broadcast avoided unjust or unfair treatment of individuals and organisations, as set out in Rule 7.1 of the Code. It is important to note that where there appears to have been unfairness in the making of the programme, this will only result in a finding of unfairness, if Ofcom concludes that it has resulted in unjust or unfair treatment to the complainant in the programme as broadcast.

In this case, Ofcom considered whether the programme makers were fair in their dealings with Miss Newcombe as a potential contributor to the programme, as outlined in Practice 7.2 of the Code which states that: "Broadcasters and programme makers should normally be fair in their dealings with potential contributors to programmes, unless, exceptionally, it is justified to do otherwise". In particular, we considered whether Miss Newcombe gave her informed consent to participate in the programme, as outlined in Practice 7.3. Practice 7.3 sets out that in order for those invited to contribute to a programme to be able to make an informed decision about whether to take part, they should be given sufficient information about: the programme's nature and purpose; their likely contribution; the areas of questioning and wherever possible, the nature of other likely contributions; and, any changes to the programme that might affect their decision to contribute. Taking these measures is likely to result in the consent that is given as being informed consent.

We noted from the parties' submissions that the parties agreed that Miss Newcombe did not sign the consent form that the broadcaster provided her with. Ofcom recognised that central to Miss Newcombe's complaint was her belief that not signing this form meant that the programme makers did not have her consent to be included in the programme.

While we acknowledge that contributor release/consent forms can be a useful means of obtaining evidence of a contributor's willingness to be filmed and for footage of them to be included in a programme, they are not the only means of obtaining informed consent. Practice 7.3 sets out what measures programme makers should take in order to satisfy themselves that informed consent has been obtained (as outlined above). It is a matter for the programme makers to decide how best to ensure that they have obtained any necessary consent from contributors.

If a broadcaster does choose to use contributor release/consent forms they should be aware that if they are not used carefully and their purpose fully explained to potential contributors, there is a potential for confusion and the creation of an expectation on the part of contributors that by not signing the form they are withholding their consent to be filmed and/or included in any subsequent broadcast programme. Therefore, where potential contributors are offered consent forms to sign, Ofcom considers it best practice that programme makers should make reasonable efforts to ensure that they collect signed forms from contributors promptly at the time of, or soon after, filming takes place or is completed. If they do not receive a signed form back from a potential contributor promptly, they should seek to contact the individual to discover the reason behind the failure or reluctance to return the form. If a third party is involved in the collection of forms and cannot collect all signed forms promptly, the programme makers should investigate the reason for the delay.

Therefore, in this case, having provided Miss Newcombe with a contributor release form, Ofcom considered that the responsibility was on the programme makers to collect the signed contributor release form back from Miss Newcombe, or make reasonable efforts to contact her once it was realised that her signed consent form had not been received, in order to investigate the reason for the delay in its return. Ofcom considered that this was especially important in the circumstances of this case, since Miss Newcombe was being asked to be filmed in her workplace and we acknowledge that it may be difficult for potential contributors to object to being filmed if the request has come from both the film makers and the potential contributor's employer.

We noted that Miss Newcombe stated in an email dated 29 June 2014 to the programme makers: "That I continued to allow filming refusing to sign a consent form would indicate that I felt pressured whilst working for Champneys to be filmed". Ofcom acknowledged that Miss Newcombe may have felt pressured to some extent by her employer into agreeing to participate in filming. However, from the information available to Ofcom, it also appeared that Miss Newcombe at no point raised her concerns about the filming with the programme makers, or indicated her belief that the lack of her signed consent form invalidated her consent to appear in the programme, until after the filming had been completed and she had resigned from her position at Champneys. The programme makers therefore could not have known that (as Miss Newcombe has since asserted) she was feeling "uncomfortable with the filming". This further demonstrated the importance of ensuring that, where reasonably practical, if consent forms are provided, that they are collected promptly at the time of, or soon after, filming takes place.

Broadcasters must gain informed consent from all potential contributors, unless there is justification to do otherwise (for example, a public interest). In this case, it appeared to Ofcom that the programme makers attempted to ensure that good practice was followed in using contributor release/consent forms, but failed to follow through on their own procedures. However, Ofcom considers that informed consent does not rest necessarily on the signing of a consent or release form alone.

Ofcom therefore considered the information that was available to Miss Newcombe with regards to the nature, likely content of the programme and her likely contribution in advance of agreeing to participate, and also whether there were any significant changes to the programme as it developed which may have altered Miss Newcombe's willingness to be involved. In doing so, Ofcom took account of ITV's response to the complaint (set out in detail above) which argued that the complainant had been fully informed from the beginning about the filming. In particular, Ofcom noted the following points made by ITV:

- Miss Newcombe attended a briefing with Champneys' Director of Marketing in October 2013 to explain the nature and purpose of the programme.
- Miss Newcombe was spoken to again when filming commenced and was told that the programme would show Champneys as it went through a period of change and its attempts to improve its customer service in areas such as the restaurant, housekeeping and reception. Miss Newcombe, as Head of Housekeeping, therefore would have been in no doubt from these discussions that her department was one of the areas of particular interest.

- Miss Newcombe was given a clear explanation of why she was being asked to contribute and was told about the kind of contribution she was expected to make.
- There were no significant changes to the programme as it developed which may have reasonably affected Miss Newcombe's original informed consent to participate.

Ofcom noted that Miss Newcombe did not set out in her complaint to Ofcom any specific information with regards to what information she was provided with by the programme makers about the nature of the programme and her likely contribution. However, Ofcom noted that in an email sent from the complainant to ITV dated 4 July 2014, she stated:

"The production team did not clearly explain the focus of the programme at any stage, I was originally told that the first few months of filming would be reviewed before any decision was made. I was led to believe that Platform Productions had to show ITV some footage to ensure they would commission the programme before any final decisions would be made regarding the focus and length of the television series".

In response, ITV wrote back to Miss Newcombe on 8 July 2014 stating:

"Platform say the focus of the programme was clearly explained to you, and that your department would be one of the subjects, and you were happy with that. I also understand that no doubts were expressed by Platform about the programme being commissioned, and that you were aware that a 'taster' tape had already been filmed".

Ofcom noted the disparity between the recollections of Miss Newcombe and the programme makers in this regard. However, Miss Newcombe did not provide Ofcom with any specific information regarding her recollections which led Ofcom to doubt the information provided by ITV regarding the information given to potential contributors to the programme. Therefore, based on the information provided by ITV in response to the complaint above, and in the absence of any specific evidence to the contrary, Ofcom considered that Miss Newcombe had been provided with detailed information about the nature and purpose of the programme and her likely contribution to it. Also, from the information available, it appeared to us that there was no suggestion that there were significant changes to the programme as it developed which may have invalidated Miss Newcombe's informed consent to participate.

It is also important to note that, in Ofcom's view, consent and whether it remains valid is an issue that continues to be relevant from the commencement of a contributor's participation through to when their involvement is concluded. Therefore, in assessing whether a contributor has given informed consent for their participation, Ofcom will not only look at the information that was provided to the contributor prior to the recording of the contribution, but, where possible, Ofcom will also consider the contribution itself.

In doing so, Ofcom took account of ITV's response to the complaint (set out in detail above) which argued that the complainant's "...participation in the programme was far more than simply passive acceptance of being included in filming going on at her workplace, but active co-operation with the filming process". In particular, Ofcom noted the following points made by ITV:

- Before filming started all potential contributors were advised that if they did not want to be filmed for inclusion in the programme, that they should make this known. Miss Newcombe did not raise any concerns about the filming or her potential inclusion in the programme.
- Miss Newcombe was filmed on 22 days and on several of these occasions she had agreed to wearing a radio microphone. She took part in at least eight filmed interviews where she spoke direct to camera.
- Miss Newcombe appeared to be completely comfortable with the filming process and did not express any concerns about the filming, or her inclusion in the programme to either the production team or to Champneys' senior management.
- Miss Newcombe was interviewed on the final day of filming (7 February 2014). She did not mention any plans to leave Champneys and appeared to the production team to be "...entirely happy with her involvement in the filming process".
- After filming had been completed, Miss Newcombe consented to be photographed for publicity photographs for the programme on 10 April 2014, which ITV said was further evidence that "...even at this point she fully understood and actively consented to being included in the programme".

Ofcom watched the programme carefully in order to take into account Miss Newcombe's contribution to the programme (see "Introduction and programme summary" section above). In particular, we noted that Miss Newcombe was featured in her role as Housekeeping Manager throughout the programme. She was shown fully engaging with the programme makers as she went about her day to day duties and talking directly to camera about for example, her recruitment policy and how she went about inspecting rooms. Miss Newcombe was also shown attending various work meetings, including a meeting with Lee, the Operations Manager, in which she freely discussed her concerns about her Irena and staffing issues.

We also noted that Miss Newcombe was filmed being interviewed on a one to one basis with the programme makers. For example, after her meeting with Irena to try to resolve their differences, Miss Newcombe was interviewed by the programme makers and part of that interview was included in the programme. While Miss Newcombe was shown visibly upset, she did not appear to Ofcom to be uncomfortable or concerned about talking to the programme makers while being filmed about what had happened in the meeting and how she felt it had gone.

In these circumstances, and after carefully considering Miss Newcombe's contribution to the programme, we considered that Miss Newcombe had been aware that she was being filmed and that she appeared at ease with this. She was shown engaging fully with the programme makers as she went about her day to day duties and freely providing her views and opinions to them. Given this, on balance, Ofcom considered that it was reasonable for the programme makers to consider that they had Miss Newcombe's informed consent throughout the filming process to film her and include footage of her in the programme.

Given all of the above, Ofcom considered that Miss Newcombe had given her informed consent up until the 25 June 2014 (at the very latest) for the purposes of Rule 7.1 and Practices 7.2 and 7.3. The fact that she did not sign and return the consent form to programme makers did not invalidate that consent.

Having established that the programme makers had Miss Newcombe's informed consent up until this date, Ofcom then considered whether they had been unfair to her by including footage of her in the programme after she had withdrawn that consent.

Ofcom noted that Miss Newcombe had informed the broadcaster and the programme makers some time before the broadcast of the programme that she withdrew any consent that she had given previously. It was unclear to Ofcom exactly when this occurred; Miss Newcombe informed Ofcom that it was 1 April 2014, although this is disputed by the broadcaster. We also noted that on 10 April 2014, Miss Newcombe took part in a photography session designed to promote the programme, which, in our view, suggested that she was still consenting to the broadcast of the footage at that time. However, what was clear to Ofcom was that by 25 June 2014, Miss Newcombe had indicated to the broadcaster that she had withdrawn her consent. In an email sent to ITV on 25 June 2014, Miss Newcombe stated:

"I was recently involved in some filming taken [sic] place at Champneys Health Resort in Tring by Platform Productions however, I have made it clear that I did not want to be involved in the production when it is aired...under no circumstances am I happy to be involved in the airing of this documentary".

Also, in an email to the programme makers on 29 June 2014, she said:

"I made it clear to the Senior Management of Champneys in an email on 1st April that I would not be signing [the contributor release form] and did not wish to be included in the series".

While we noted that it was disputed exactly when Miss Newcombe withdrew her consent for footage of her to be included in the programme, it was clear from these emails that she informed the programme makers sometime in June 2014 (a couple of weeks before the broadcast of the programme) that she did not want to be included in the programme.

Therefore, given the fact that Miss Newcombe had withdrawn her consent to include footage of her in the programme, Ofcom next considered whether the programme makers were unfair to Miss Newcombe by deciding to include her without her consent. In considering this aspect of the complaint, we took into account the broadcaster's competing right to freedom of expression and that of the other participants in the programme.

Ofcom recognises that programme production would be difficult, and in some cases impossible, if any contributor was entitled to withdraw their consent to be included in the programme at any point between the recording of their contribution and the date of broadcast. Once an individual has given his or her informed consent to be filmed for inclusion in a programme and that footage has been recorded, that individual, normally, does not have any automatic right to compel the broadcaster not to include their contribution, or present it in any particular way. The broadcaster may edit and transmit that contribution when and how it wishes, provided that the broadcast complies with the Code.

Where a contributor has indicated that they no longer wish to be included in a programme, either part way through the filming process or at the end, Ofcom may, where appropriate, take into consideration a significant change that has occurred in the contributor's personal life since filming commenced, which if they had known about prior to giving consent, they would not have given this consent. However, in this particular case, and for the reasons already given above, Ofcom considered that Miss Newcombe had been provided with sufficient information about the nature and purpose of the programme and had engaged fully in the programme making process. We also considered that no significant changes had been made to the programme. We noted the reason given by Miss Newcombe for her change of mind was because she had changed jobs since the filming. However, she did not explain why this particular change in her personal circumstances amounted to a significant change that could reasonably be regarded as invalidating her informed consent that the programme makers believed they had secured.

Ofcom also took account of the fact that it was not until after filming had been completed and after Miss Newcombe had resigned from Champneys that she informed the programme makers that she did not want to be included in the programme (whether on 1 April 2014 or 25 June 2014).

In considering whether Miss Newcombe had been treated unfairly, we also considered her contribution to the programme. In this case, Miss Newcombe was shown in the programme carrying out her day to day tasks as the Housekeeping Manager of the hotel, as described in detail above. In Ofcom's view, there was nothing included of her in this footage that was likely to materially and adversely affect viewers' opinions of Miss Newcombe in a way that was unfair to her. We also noted that Miss Newcombe did not make out a sustainable case to Ofcom that she had been in any way misrepresented in the programme or, for example, edited in such a manner that portrayed her in an unfair way.

Given all of the above, Ofcom considered that Miss Newcombe had given her informed consent for the programme makers to film her for inclusion in the programme and that the fact that the programme makers included footage of her in the programme despite her later withdrawing that consent was not unfair to her for the purposes of Rule 7.1.

Therefore, Ofcom's decision is that Miss Newcombe was not treated unjustly or unfairly in the programme as broadcast by the inclusion of footage of her in the programme after she had withdrawn her consent.

Unwarranted infringement of privacy

- b) Ofcom considered Miss Newcombe's complaint that her privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast as she did not give consent for the footage of her at work to be broadcast.

In Ofcom's view, the individual's right to privacy has to be balanced against the competing rights of the broadcasters to freedom of expression. Neither right as such has precedence over the other and where there is a conflict between the two, it is necessary to intensely focus on the comparative importance of the specific rights. Any justification for interfering with or restricting each right must be taken into account and any interference or restriction must be proportionate.

This is reflected in how Ofcom applies Rule 8.1 of the Code which states that any infringement of privacy in programmes, or in connection with obtaining material included in programmes, must be warranted.

Ofcom also had regard to Practice 8.6 which states that if the broadcast of a programme would infringe the privacy of a person, consent should be obtained before the relevant material is broadcast unless the infringement of privacy is warranted.

In considering whether or not Miss Newcombe's privacy was unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast, Ofcom first considered the extent to which Miss Newcombe had a legitimate expectation of privacy in the footage broadcast of her.

We noted that Miss Newcombe had been filmed in her workplace while carrying out her duties as the hotel's Housekeeping Manager. We recognise that an individual may have a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to activities that they are carrying out in the course of their employment. In this case, we acknowledged that while some areas of a hotel are publicly accessible, much of the footage of Miss Newcombe included in the programme showed her in areas of the hotel that were not open to the public and where she would not ordinarily be expected to be observed by others. For example, Miss Newcombe was shown in hotel rooms and staff meeting rooms. We therefore considered that the circumstances in which she was filmed could amount to Miss Newcombe having a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the broadcast footage of her in the programme.

However, we then went on to consider whether anything was revealed about Miss Newcombe which was of a particularly private and sensitive nature.

We recognise that an individual may have a legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to activities of a private nature that are undertaken in the individual's workplace which need protection from unwanted intrusion (for example, a discussion about personal matters with a colleague, or carrying out a business function in a workplace to which the public do not have open access). We noted that, in this case, Miss Newcombe was shown in the programme carrying out her day to day tasks as the Housekeeping Manager of the hotel, including an interview with the programme makers where she appeared upset following a meeting with her colleague, Irena. Ofcom considered that the footage of Miss Newcombe did not reveal any conduct or action that could be regarded as being particularly private to Miss Newcombe or disclose anything about her personal life. Ofcom also took into account the fact that: Miss Newcombe was clearly aware that she was being filmed for inclusion in the programme and that she actively participated throughout the filming process (as set out in detail in head a)); she freely took part in a promotional photograph shoot (even after she said she had informed the programme makers that she no longer wanted to be involved in the programme); and, she did not withdraw her consent until the filming had been completed. We therefore considered that Miss Newcombe's expectation of privacy was reduced in these circumstances.

Given all of the factors above, we therefore considered that while Miss Newcombe had a legitimate expectation of privacy, it was limited in the circumstances of this case.

Having established that Miss Newcombe had a limited legitimate expectation of privacy in relation to the broadcast footage of her in her workplace, Ofcom then considered whether the programme makers had secured Miss Newcombe's consent for the footage to be broadcast.

As set out in detail above in head a), Ofcom considered that Miss Newcombe had been provided with detailed information about the nature and purpose of the programme and her likely contribution to it and that there had not been any significant changes to the programme as it developed which may have affected Miss Newcombe's informed consent to participate. Therefore, Ofcom concluded that it was reasonable for the programme makers to consider that they had secured Miss Newcombe's informed consent throughout the filming process to film her and until the 25 June 2014 (at the very latest) to include footage of her in the programme.

However, Ofcom noted that Miss Newcombe had informed the broadcaster and the programme makers some time before the broadcast of the programme that she withdrew any consent that she had given previously. As outlined in detail above in head a), it was disputed exactly when Miss Newcombe withdrew her consent for footage of her to be included in the programme. However, it was clear that she had informed the programme makers by at least 25 June 2014 (a couple of weeks before the broadcast of the programme) that she did not want to be included in the programme. Therefore, the programme makers did not have Miss Newcombe's consent for the footage to be broadcast at the time of the broadcast itself.

As acknowledged in head a) above, programme production would be difficult, and in some cases impossible, if any participant was entitled to withdraw their consent at any point between the recording of their contribution and the date of broadcast. However, any broadcast programme including footage of an individual who has subsequently withdrawn their consent after their contribution was recorded must comply with the Code. Ofcom therefore considered whether the programme makers were warranted in including the footage of Miss Newcombe in the programme without her consent.

In considering this, we took into account the competing rights of the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and Miss Newcombe's right to privacy. As set out above, Miss Newcombe's expectation of privacy was limited.

Ofcom also recognises that there is a public interest in creating and broadcasting factual programmes of this nature; in this case, an informative documentary showing viewers how a large hotel operated on a daily basis.

Given all of the factors above, on balance, Ofcom considered that, in the particular circumstances of this case, the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in broadcasting an informative documentary programme, outweighed Miss Newcombe's limited expectation of privacy in relation to the footage of her included in the programme and that the inclusion of this material was warranted.

Ofcom's decision is therefore that Miss Newcombe's privacy was not unwarrantably infringed in the programme as broadcast.

Therefore, Ofcom has not upheld Miss Newcombe's complaint of unjust or unfair treatment or of unwarranted infringement of privacy in the programme as broadcast

Investigations Not in Breach

Here are alphabetical lists of investigations that Ofcom has completed 3 and 16 February 2015 and decided that the broadcaster did not breach Ofcom's codes, licence conditions or other regulatory requirements.

Investigations conducted under the Procedures for investigating breaches of content standards for television and radio

Programme	Broadcaster	Transmission date	Categories
Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles	Channel 5	08/11/2014	Scheduling

For more information about how Ofcom conducts investigations about content standards, go to: <http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/standards/>.

Complaints Assessed, Not Investigated

Here are alphabetical lists of complaints that, after careful assessment, Ofcom has decided not to pursue between 3 and 16 February 2015 because they did not raise issues warranting investigation.

Complaints assessed under the Procedures for investigating breaches of content standards for television and radio

For more information about how Ofcom assesses conducts investigations about content standards, go to:

<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/standards/>.

Programme	Broadcaster	Transmission Date	Categories	Number of complaints
UK Hot 40	4Music	24/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Celebrity Big Brother ¹	5*	08/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Celebrity Big Brother	5*	18/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Celebrity Big Brother	5*	19/01/2015	Nudity	1
Celebrity Big Brother	5*	26/01/2015	Nudity	1
Movies at 9 (trailer)	5*	16/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Get The Perfect Beach Body	Bay TV Liverpool	11/02/2015	Materially misleading	1
BBC News	BBC 1	15/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
BBC News	BBC 1	n/a	Due impartiality/bias	2
BBC News	BBC 1	n/a	Television Access Services	1
BBC News at One	BBC 1	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
BBC News at One	BBC 1	04/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
BBC News at Six	BBC 1	30/01/2015	Scheduling	1
BBC News at Six	BBC 1	11/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Bluestone 42	BBC 1	30/01/2015	Animal welfare	1
Breakfast	BBC 1	30/01/2015	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Breakfast	BBC 1	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Call the Midwife	BBC 1	01/02/2015	Animal welfare	1
EastEnders	BBC 1	26/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
EastEnders	BBC 1	10/02/2015	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
EastEnders (trailer)	BBC 1	30/01/2015	Scheduling	1

¹ Ofcom carefully assessed all complaints about this series of Celebrity Big Brother and has decided they do not raise issues warranting further investigation under our rules. We were satisfied that Channel 5 had broadcast clear and appropriate warnings about the potentially offensive content, and that it intervened in heated exchanges and situations at appropriate times. We also took into account audience expectations for this reality format and the fact that the series was broadcast after the watershed.

EastEnders (trailer)	BBC 1	01/02/2015	Scheduling	1
EastEnders (trailer)	BBC 1	02/02/2015	Scheduling	1
EastEnders (trailer)	BBC 1	07/02/2015	Scheduling	1
EastEnders (trailer)	BBC 1	09/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Last Tango in Halifax	BBC 1	11/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Last Tango in Halifax	BBC 1	11/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Last Tango in Halifax	BBC 1	01/02/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Look North	BBC 1	03/02/2015	Animal welfare	1
Match of the Day	BBC 1	08/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Match of the Day - FA Cup Highlights	BBC 1	24/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Match of the Day - FA Cup Highlights	BBC 1	25/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	3
Match of the Day Live	BBC 1	04/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	2
Panorama	BBC 1	12/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Question Time	BBC 1	15/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Question Time	BBC 1	05/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	17
Regional News and Weather	BBC 1	30/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Regional News and Weather	BBC 1	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Room 101	BBC 1	16/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Silent Witness	BBC 1	07/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	4
Silent Witness	BBC 1	13/01/2015	Suicide and self harm	1
South East Special	BBC 1	n/a	Due impartiality/bias	1
The Big Questions	BBC 1	25/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	3
The British Academy Film Awards	BBC 1	08/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	5
The British Academy Film Awards	BBC 1	08/02/2015	Materially misleading	1
The Casual Vacancy	BBC 1	15/02/2015	Offensive language	4
Reporting Scotland	BBC 1 Scotland	22/12/2014	Generally accepted standards	2
Reporting Scotland	BBC 1 Scotland	11/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Horizon Special	BBC 2	14/01/2015	Product placement	1
Match of the Day 2	BBC 2	08/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
The Motorway: Life in the Fast Lane	BBC 2	08/02/2015	Offensive language	1
The Motorway: Life in the Fast Lane	BBC 2	15/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Top Gear	BBC 2	01/02/2015	Animal welfare	1
Top Gear	BBC 2	01/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Top Gear	BBC 2	01/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Top Gear	BBC 2	02/02/2015	Animal welfare	1

Top Gear	BBC 2	02/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Top Gear	BBC 2	08/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	5
Top Gear	BBC 2	08/02/2015	Transgender discrimination/offence	2
Top Gear	BBC 2	n/a	Generally accepted standards	1
Wolf Hall	BBC 2	04/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Planet Oil	BBC 2 Scotland	10/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Don't Tell the Bride	BBC 3	13/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Pop's Greatest Dance Crazes	BBC 3	25/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Top Gear	BBC 3	14/02/2015	Crime	1
Top Gear	BBC 3	14/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Waterloo Road	BBC 3	02/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Most Dangerous Man in Tudor England	BBC 4	04/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
BBC News	BBC News Channel	30/12/2014	Fairness & Privacy	1
BBC News	BBC News Channel	11/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Paper Review	BBC News Channel	16/01/2015	Offensive language	1
News	BBC News Channel / Sky News	09/01/2015	Crime	1
Programming	BBC Radio 1	n/a	Commercial communications on radio	1
Scott Mills	BBC Radio 1	11/02/2015	Offensive language	1
The Radio 1 Breakfast Show with Nick Grimshaw	BBC Radio 1	04/02/2015	Offensive language	1
The Radio 1 Breakfast Show with Nick Grimshaw	BBC Radio 1	05/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
News	BBC Radio 2	19/01/2015	Fairness & Privacy	1
News	BBC Radio 2	04/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Steve Wright in the Afternoon	BBC Radio 2	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Chris Evans Breakfast Show	BBC Radio 2	13/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Any Questions	BBC Radio 4	14/11/2014	Generally accepted standards	1
From Our Own Correspondent	BBC Radio 4	17/01/2015	Animal welfare	1
The Today Programme	BBC Radio 4	04/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Jungle Bunch (trailer)	Boomerang	n/a	Outside of remit / other	1
Rugby Tonight	BT Sport 2	29/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1

Programming	Castle FM	08/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Operation Ouch	CBBC	27/01/2015	Scheduling	1
In the Night Garden	CBeebies	02/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Show Me Show Me	CBeebies	13/02/2015	Materially misleading	1
Brainiac: Science Abuse	Challenge	24/01/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	1
The Crystal Maze	Challenge	15/02/2015	Offensive language	1
24 Hours in Police Custody	Channel 4	13/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	2
8 Out of 10 Cats Does Countdown	Channel 4	23/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
8 Out of 10 Cats Does Countdown	Channel 4	25/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
8 Out of 10 Cats Does Countdown	Channel 4	30/01/2015	Materially misleading	1
Advertisement	Channel 4	28/01/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	Channel 4	02/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	Channel 4	11/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Banana (trailer)	Channel 4	14/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Catastrophe	Channel 4	19/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Catastrophe	Channel 4	19/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Channel 4 News	Channel 4	26/11/2014	Under 18s in programmes	1
Channel 4 News	Channel 4	02/12/2014	Generally accepted standards	1
Channel 4 News	Channel 4	30/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Channel 4 News	Channel 4	10/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Channel ident	Channel 4	26/01/2015	Animal welfare	1
Cucumber	Channel 4	05/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	5
Cucumber	Channel 4	05/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Cucumber	Channel 4	05/02/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Cucumber	Channel 4	12/02/2015	Sexual material	4
Cucumber (trailer)	Channel 4	02/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Cucumber, Banana, Tofu (trailer)	Channel 4	n/a	Scheduling	1
Deal or No Deal	Channel 4	11/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Film 4: Love and Sex Season (trailer)	Channel 4	09/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Hollyoaks	Channel 4	26/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Hollyoaks	Channel 4	13/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Homebase's sponsorship of food on 4	Channel 4	09/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Indian Summers	Channel 4	15/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Specsavers' sponsorship of Films on Four	Channel 4	31/01/2015	Materially misleading	1

Ted	Channel 4	31/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Hotel	Channel 4	11/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
The Jump	Channel 4	01/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Jump	Channel 4	01/02/2015	Offensive language	1
The Jump	Channel 4	08/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
The Jump	Channel 4	08/02/2015	Scheduling	1
The Romanians Are Coming (trailer)	Channel 4	12/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
The Romanians Are Coming (trailer)	Channel 4	13/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
The Undateables (trailer)	Channel 4	02/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Cucumber, Banana, Tofu (trailer)	Channel 4 / E4	n/a	Outside of remit / other	1
10,000 BC	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Animal welfare	6
10,000 BC	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Advertisement	Channel 5	03/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	Channel 5	04/02/2015	Advertising content	2
Benefits: 19 Kids and Counting the Cost	Channel 5	29/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Botched Up Bodies	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	07/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	07/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	52
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	07/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	08/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	08/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	08/01/2015	Offensive language	5
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	08/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	09/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	3
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	09/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	10/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	10/01/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	10/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	13
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	10/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	262
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	10/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	11/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	11/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	12/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	58

Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	12/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	12/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	3
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	12/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	13/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	49
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	13/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	13/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	5
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	7
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Sexual material	6
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	12
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	59
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Offensive language	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	16/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	91
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	16/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	16/01/2015	Sexual material	715
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	16/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	4
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	17/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	17/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	14
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	18/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	215
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	18/01/2015	Voting	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	19/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	3
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	19/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	20/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	5
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	20/01/2015	Sexual material	3
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	21/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	17
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	21/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	3
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	22/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	33
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	23/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	23/01/2015	Nudity	7
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	23/01/2015	Voting	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	24/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	25/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	119

Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	26/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	12
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	26/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	39
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	26/01/2015	Voting	52
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	27/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	28/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	103
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	28/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	4
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	28/01/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	29/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	18
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	29/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	6
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	29/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	6
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	30/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	30/01/2015	Sexual material	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	31/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	480
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	31/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	8
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	01/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	29
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	01/02/2015	Sexual material	2
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	24
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	30
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	7
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	03/02/2015	Offensive language	18
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	04/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	05/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	30
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	06/02/2015	Advertising minutage	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	06/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	06/02/2015	Voting	23
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	n/a	Generally accepted standards	8
Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	n/a	Outside of remit / other	1
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	07/01/2015	Offensive language	2
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	13/01/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Sexual material	1

Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	23/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	4
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	30/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	126
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	02/02/2015	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	04/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	12
Celebrity Big Brother's Bit on the Side	Channel 5	06/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	7
Cowboy Builders	Channel 5	28/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Cucumber (trailer)	Channel 5	05/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Gum Tree's sponsorship of Celebrity Big Brother	Channel 5	11/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Hellboy II: The Golden Army	Channel 5	01/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Movies at 9 (trailer)	Channel 5	04/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Movies at 9 (trailer)	Channel 5	07/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Movies at 9 (trailer)	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Scheduling	1
NHS Crisis - The Live Debate	Channel 5	19/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
NHS Crisis - The Live Debate	Channel 5	19/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	4
Suspects (trailer)	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles	Channel 5	09/11/2014	Scheduling	1
Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles	Channel 5	06/12/2014	Scheduling	1
Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles	Channel 5	04/01/2015	Scheduling	1
The Hotel Inspector	Channel 5	14/01/2015	Offensive language	2
The Hotel Inspector	Channel 5	15/01/2015	Offensive language	2
The Mentalist (trailer)	Channel 5	05/02/2015	Scheduling	1
The Wright Stuff	Channel 5	13/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
The Wright Stuff	Channel 5	28/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Wright Stuff	Channel 5	12/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Advertisement	Channel 5 +24	04/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement for Grand Reception Suluk Miah	CHSTV	13/12/2014	Political advertising	1
Ultimate Spiderman	CITV	11/01/2015	Offensive language	1
News	CNN	11/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
I Live With Models (trailer)	Comedy Central	10/02/2015	Scheduling	1
I Live With Models (trailer)	Comedy Central	11/02/2015	Sexual material	1
Impractical Jokers	Comedy Central	24/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Short Circuit 2	Comedy Central Extra +1	25/01/2015	Offensive language	1

8 Out of 10 Cats	Dave	13/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
NFL Superbowl (trailer)	E4	n/a	Crime	1
The Undateables (trailer)	E4	31/01/2015	Offensive language	1
Lingerie Football League (trailer)	Extreme Sports Channel	16/01/2015	Scheduling	1
The First Hour	Ginx	25/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Dave	Halfords' sponsorship of motoring on Dave	02/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Heart Breakfast with Matt & Caroline	Heart FM Plymouth	09/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Saturday Breakfast With JK and Lucy	Heart FM Scotland West	31/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Programming	Irvine Beat FM 107.2	n/a	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Advertisement	ITV	02/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV	03/02/2015	Advertising content	2
Advertisement	ITV	07/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV	10/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV	11/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV	12/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV	n/a	Advertising content	2
Aunt Bessie's sponsorship of The Chase	ITV	29/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Aunt Bessie's sponsorship of The Chase	ITV	n/a	Crime	1
Bad Builders: Bang to Rights	ITV	03/02/2015	Crime	1
Birds of a Feather	ITV	05/02/2015	Materially misleading	1
Broadchurch	ITV	02/02/2015	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Car Crash Britain	ITV	12/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Comparethemarket.com's sponsorship of Coronation Street	ITV	n/a	Generally accepted standards	1
Coronation Street	ITV	30/01/2015	Product placement	3
Coronation Street	ITV	02/02/2015	Product placement	1
Coronation Street	ITV	02/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Coronation Street	ITV	04/02/2015	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Coronation Street	ITV	06/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Coronation Street	ITV	13/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Coronation Street	ITV	13/02/2015	Product placement	1
Coronation Street	ITV	n/a	Outside of remit / other	1

Emmerdale	ITV	04/04/2014	Generally accepted standards	1
Emmerdale	ITV	22/01/2015	Under 18s in programmes	1
Emmerdale	ITV	29/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Emmerdale	ITV	05/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Emmerdale	ITV	06/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Emmerdale	ITV	n/a	Generally accepted standards	2
Emmerdale	ITV	n/a	Offensive language	1
Foxy Bingo's sponsorship of The Jeremy Kyle Show	ITV	n/a	Gambling	1
Foyle's War	ITV	18/01/2015	Advertising minutage	1
Good Morning Britain	ITV	16/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Good Morning Britain	ITV	03/02/2015	Due accuracy	1
Good Morning Britain	ITV	03/02/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	1
Harry Hill's Stars in Their Eyes	ITV	31/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Harry Hill's Stars in Their Eyes	ITV	31/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Harry Hill's Stars in Their Eyes	ITV	07/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
ITV News and Weather	ITV	30/01/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	1
ITV News and Weather	ITV	03/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Loose Women	ITV	13/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	290
Loose Women	ITV	16/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Loose Women	ITV	30/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Loose Women	ITV	05/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Loose Women	ITV	09/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	11
Mel and Sue	ITV	15/01/2015	Scheduling	3
Mel and Sue	ITV	23/01/2015	Sexual material	2
Midsomer Murders	ITV	04/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	13
Planet's Got Talent	ITV	31/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Stars in their Eyes	ITV	n/a	Outside of remit / other	1
The Chase	ITV	23/01/2015	Transgender discrimination/offence	1
The Chase	ITV	09/02/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
The Jeremy Kyle Show	ITV	15/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
The Jeremy Kyle Show	ITV	15/01/2015	Offensive language	1
The Jeremy Kyle Show	ITV	n/a	Scheduling	1

The Jonathan Ross Show	ITV	24/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
The Jonathan Ross Show	ITV	31/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Jonathan Ross Show	ITV	07/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Kyle Files	ITV	15/01/2015	Scheduling	2
The Wonder of Britain	ITV	25/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
This Morning	ITV	02/02/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
This Morning	ITV	02/02/2015	Sexual material	2
You've Been Framed!	ITV	24/01/2015	Sexual material	1
You've Been Framed!	ITV	31/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
You've Been Framed!	ITV	07/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	2
Advertisement	ITV / Channel 4	08/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITV / Channel 4 / Channel 5	n/a	Advertising content	1
ITV News Central	ITV Central	14/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News Central	ITV Central	04/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
ITV News London	ITV London	03/02/2015	Scheduling	1
ITV Wales Website	ITV Wales	12/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Judge Rinder	ITV+1	16/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
118118.com's sponsorship of movies on ITV	ITV2	11/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Ibiza Weekender (trailer)	ITV2	15/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Loose Women	ITV2	13/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
The Chase	ITV2	06/02/2015	Offensive language	1
The Keith Lemon Sketch Show	ITV2	12/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Advertisement	ITVBe	10/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	ITVBe	14/02/2015	Advertising content	1
The Real Housewives of Orange County	ITVBe	15/01/2015	Animal welfare	1
Duncan Barkes	LBC 97.3 FM	12/11/2014	Generally accepted standards	1
James O'Brien	LBC 97.3 FM	09/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
James O'Brien	LBC 97.3 FM	13/01/2015	Harm	1
James O'Brien	LBC 97.3 FM	28/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
James O'Brien	LBC 97.3 FM	05/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Shelagh Fogarty	LBC 97.3 FM	04/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Steve Allen	LBC 97.3 FM	02/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1

Steve Allen	LBC 97.3 FM	10/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	4
London Burning	London Live	13/02/2015	Offensive language	1
Advertisement	Motors TV	15/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	n/a	01/01/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisement	n/a	14/02/2015	Advertising content	1
Advertisements	n/a	n/a	Advertising content	1
Subtitling	n/a	n/a	Television Access Services	1
Subtitling of advertisements	n/a	n/a	Television Access Services	1
Programming	National Geographic	n/a	Television Access Services	1
Morning Show	Norwich 99.9 FM	13/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Q Breeze	Q106 FM	01/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Radio Clyde Football Show	Radio Clyde	17/01/2015	Gender discrimination/offence	1
Sabbs in the Studio	RaW 1251 AM	22/01/2015	Format	1
Obsessive Compulsive Cleaners	Really	18/01/2015	Disability discrimination/offence	1
News	RT	27/01/2015	Due accuracy	1
Volvo's sponsorship of Blue Bloods	Sky Atlantic	03/12/2014	Advertising content	1
Desi Rascals	Sky Living	20/01/2015	Outside of remit / other	1
Dreams Beds' sponsorship	Sky Living	27/01/2015	Animal welfare	1
In the Margins (trailer)	Sky Living	08/02/2015	Crime	1
Four Weddings	Sky Livingit	07/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Sky News	Sky News	22/12/2014	Generally accepted standards	4
Sky News	Sky News	15/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Sky News	Sky News	29/01/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Sky News at 11 with Mark Longhurst	Sky News	25/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Sky News Tonight with Adam Boulton	Sky News	27/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	6
Sky News with Colin Brazier &...	Sky News	30/01/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Sky News: Breaking News	Sky News	22/12/2014	Generally accepted standards	48
Sunrise	Sky News	14/01/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Sunrise	Sky News	26/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Sunrise	Sky News	27/01/2015	Due accuracy	1
Sunrise	Sky News	31/01/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Sunrise	Sky News	03/02/2015	Race discrimination/offence	1
Sunrise	Sky News	05/02/2015	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1

Programming	Sky Sports	01/02/2015	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Programming	Sky Sports	06/02/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
Mersyside Derby (trailer)	Sky Sports 1	07/01/2015	Due impartiality/bias	1
NFL	Sky Sports 2	28/12/2014	Generally accepted standards	1
Sunday Supplement	Sky Sports 3	08/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Soccer Saturday	Sky Sports News	07/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Futurama	Sky1	02/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Sun Perks' sponsorship of The Simpsons	Sky1	09/02/2015	Generally accepted standards	1
Programming	Star Plus / Zee TV / SET Asia	04/02/2015	Scheduling	1
Subtitling	SyFy	n/a	Television Access Services	1
Live Football	Talksport	08/02/2015	Commercial communications on radio	1
My Little Pony	Tiny Pop	18/01/2015	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Martin Lowes	Tower FM	25/01/2015	Commercial communications on radio	1
Advertisements	True Movies	06/01/2015	Advertising content	1
Muhammed - The Best of Creation	Ummah Channel	07/12/2014	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Paddy McGuinness	West FM	18/01/2015	Scheduling	1
Advertisement	Wish FM 102.4	n/a	Advertising content	1

Complaints assessed under the General Procedures for investigating breaches of broadcast licences

For more information about how Ofcom conducts investigations about broadcast licences, go to: <http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/general-procedures/>.

Licensee	Licensed service	Categories
Ambur Community Radio Limited	Ambur Radio	Key Commitments
Celador Radio (South West) Limited	The Breeze (Frome and West Wiltshire) 107.5 FM	Format

Investigations List

If Ofcom considers that a broadcaster may have breached its codes, a condition of its licence or other regulatory requirements, it will start an investigation.

It is important to note that an investigation by Ofcom does not necessarily mean the broadcaster has done anything wrong. Not all investigations result in breaches of the licence or other regulatory requirements being recorded.

Here are alphabetical lists of new investigations launched between 5 and 18 February 2015.

Investigations launched under the Procedures for investigating breaches of content standards for television and radio

Programme	Broadcaster	Transmission date
UKIP: The First 100 Days	Channel 4	16 February 2015
The Angels' Share	Film4	15 October 2014
Next Stop	Holiday and Cruise Channel	23 October 2014
This Morning	ITV	3 February 2015
Guru Sounds' sponsorship of Boshonto Batashe	NTV	29 December 2014
Profesia reporter	NTV Mir Lithuania	2 November 2014
Destroyed in Seconds	Quest	28 January 2015
Crosstalk	RT	23 December 2014
Advertising minutage	Sikh Channel	24 December 2014
That's Music	That's Solent TV	24 January 2015
Box of Truth	VATV	3 December 2014

For more information about how Ofcom assesses complaints and conducts investigations about content standards, go to:

<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/standards/>.

Investigations launched under the Procedures for the consideration and adjudication of Fairness and Privacy complaints

Programme	Broadcaster	Transmission date
Granada News	ITV	19 December 2014

For more information about how Ofcom considers and adjudicates upon Fairness and Privacy complaints, go to:

<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/fairness/>.

Investigations launched under the General Procedures for investigating breaches of broadcast licences

Licensee	Licensed Service
Angel Radio Limited	Angel Radio

For more information about how Ofcom assesses complaints and conducts investigations about broadcast licences, go to:

<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/guidance/complaints-sanctions/general-procedures/>.