



House of Commons
Broadcasting Committee

The Rules of Coverage

First Report of Session 2002–03



House of Commons
Broadcasting Committee

The Rules of Coverage

First Report of Session 2002–03

*Report, together with formal minutes and
appendices*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 11 June 2003*

The Broadcasting Committee

The Broadcasting Committee is appointed to consider the broadcasting of proceedings of the House and matters ancillary thereto.

Current membership

Mr David Lepper MP (Brighton Pavilion)(Chairman)
Mrs Helen Clark (Peterborough)
Mr Roger Gale MP (North Thanet)
Mr James Gray MP (North Wiltshire)
David Hamilton MP (Midlothian)
Mr Iain Luke MP (Dundee East)
Mr John Lyons MP (Strathkelvin and Bearsden)
Mr Khalid Mahmood (Birmingham Perry Bar)
Mr Alan Reid (Argyll and Bute)
Jim Sheridan (West Renfrewshire)

Mr Brian Jenkins MP (Tamworth) was also a Member of the Committee during the period of this inquiry.

Powers

The Committee is one of the Domestic Select Committees and its powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Order No. 139. The Standing Orders are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/broadcasting_committee.cfm.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Gordon Clarke (Clerk), and Lynda Young (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Broadcasting Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3275; the Committee's email address is clarkeg@parliament.uk.

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
1 Introduction	3
Previous recommendations and progress to date	4
2 Rules of Coverage	5
Historical background to the rules of coverage	5
The case for change	5
Rules for the chamber	8
<i>Shots of reaction in the Chamber</i>	8
<i>The public gallery</i>	8
<i>Providing a context</i>	9
Rules for Westminster Hall	9
Rules for Committees	9
Guidelines for use of signals	9
The impact of new developments	10
<i>Webcasting</i>	10
<i>Live inject points</i>	11
<i>Other innovations</i>	11
3 Conclusion	12
Conclusions and recommendations	13
Annex 1	14
RULES OF COVERAGE	14
Annex 2	17
USE OF THE SIGNALS	17
Annex 3	18
GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF ARCHIVE MATERIAL FOR NON-BROADCAST PURPOSES	18
Formal Minutes	19
List of written evidence	20
Previous Reports by the Broadcasting Committee	21

1 Introduction

1. The rules of coverage were devised to ensure that the House retained control over how it was portrayed on television.¹ They are essentially guidelines for the camera operators and the television director setting out which shots may and may not be used, and what may and may not be shown. They provide specific guidelines for picture direction and instruction on how specific events, such as disorder, are to be treated.

2. The rules of coverage establish the broad principles the television director is expected to follow in selecting shots. They include a broad statement of objectives, intended to underpin any approach to televising the proceedings of the House. That says that the television director should have regard to the dignity of the House and to its function as a working body rather than a place of entertainment. The Director of Broadcasting is responsible for ensuring that the rules are observed as far as is possible.

3. In 1999, the broadcasters suggested to us changes to the rules of coverage. We made some minor changes to the rules in our First Report, Session 1999-2000.² In 2002, we decided to re-examine the issue and have drawn on the evidence taken for our inquiry in 1999. The broadcasters were invited to update their evidence on rules of coverage and the BBC submitted a further memorandum.³ We also visited the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh and the Houses of the Oireachtas in Dublin where we had an opportunity to discuss their rules of coverage with parliamentarians, officials and broadcasters. We are grateful to all those who gave so freely of their time and expertise.

1 Select Committee on Televising of Proceedings of the House, First Report, Session 1988-89, Televising of Proceedings of the House, HC 141-1

2 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642

3 Ev 1

Previous recommendations and progress to date

4. Good progress has been made on the recommendations we made in 2000.⁴ The recommendations in our Report covered a wide range of issues relating to parliamentary broadcasting.

- We were concerned that membership of both the Broadcasting Committee and the PARBUL⁵ Board could lead to a conflict of interest.⁶ *The necessary changes have now been made to the membership of the PARBUL Board to prevent such a conflict of interest arising.*
- We noted that the Information Committee was considering providing coverage of the devolved legislatures on the internal video network.⁷ *Progress has been made in making the proceedings of the devolved legislatures available but at present there is no cost-effective means of providing coverage of the Scottish Parliament.*
- We recommended that the broadcasting facilities in Westminster Hall be put on a more permanent footing if the sittings in Westminster Hall were made permanent.⁸ *A new camera system and control units were installed in Westminster Hall in 2001.*
- We noted that the Administration Committee had approved an experiment that provided a live interview point within the Palace.⁹ *The number of live inject points¹⁰ has since been increased and they are now available across the Parliamentary Estate. There has been a very positive reaction by Members, broadcasters and the viewing public to this innovation and we hope the arrangements will be made permanent.*
- We also examined developments in webcasting.¹¹ *A trial of webcasting has recently been completed and we look forward to this service being established on a permanent basis. We feel that webcasting has an important part to play in an integrated, interactive set of information services providing access to the general public.*

5. Against these positive developments we must record a level of disappointment that access to a dedicated parliamentary channel is still limited.¹² *We welcome the fact that the BBC Parliament service, formerly available only via satellite and cable, is also now carried on the new free digital terrestrial television service. However, we remain concerned that broadcasters continue to over-emphasise sound-bites and confrontation.*

4 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642

5 Parliamentary Broadcasting Unit Ltd

6 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642, paragraph 30

7 *Ibid*, para 54

8 *Ibid*, para 57

9 *Ibid*, para 65

10 An inject point is a connection where broadcasters can connect their cameras and microphones and send the signals directly to their studios.

11 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642, paragraph 101

12 *Ibid*, para 77

2 Rules of Coverage

Historical background to the rules of coverage

6. The Select Committee on Televising of Proceedings of the House first introduced rules of coverage in 1989.¹³ The rules were initially framed in a fairly restrictive way, mainly because it would be easier to relax them than to tighten them. Changes since then have allowed the television director greater flexibility in the selection of shots. In its First Report, Session 1989-90, the Select Committee on the Televising of Proceedings of the House noted that broadcasters were broadly happy with the rules of coverage, save for some minor reservations about the prohibition on reaction shots.¹⁴ The rules were amended shortly after the experiment to televise proceedings began and several minor changes have been made since.

7. In 1990, the arrangements for televising the House's proceedings were put on a permanent footing. The First Report from the Select Committee on Broadcasting, &c, Session 1990-91, examined what changes were needed to the experimental arrangements. The Committee made a number of recommendations on the administrative and financial arrangements but said that:

We make no recommendation at this stage for further modifications to the rules of coverage, though we remain ready to consider any reasonable representations on the subject from broadcasters and others.¹⁵

8. The Select Committee on Broadcasting, &c produced a consolidated version of the rules of coverage, incorporating the modifications they had agreed in 1990.¹⁶ A guide was drawn up at the same time by the Supervisor of Broadcasting, as the post was then called, to assist in the interpretation and application of the rules.

9. The small changes that have been made to the rules over several years have made little difference on their own but collectively have had a significant impact on how the House is portrayed. **We now believe that there is a case for some further minor changes in the rules. We see this as part of an evolutionary and incremental process of change that has continued since the House was first televised and rules of coverage were first introduced. We do not, however, believe that there needs to be wholesale change in the rules or any lessening of the control that the House has over the way it is portrayed.**

The case for change

10. In November 1999, Anne Sloman, the BBC's Chief Political Adviser, argued that the rules of coverage were out of date and that there was sufficient trust and confidence

13 Select Committee on Televising of Proceedings of the House, First Report, Session 1988-89, Televising of Proceedings of the House, HC 141-1

14 Select Committee on the Televising of Proceedings of the House, First Report, Session 1989-90, Review of the Experiment in Televising the Proceedings of the House, HC 265-I, paragraphs 80-81

15 Select Committee on Broadcasting, &c, First Report, Session 1990-1991, The Arrangements for the Permanent Televising of the Proceedings of the House, HC 11

16 *Ibid*, Appendix

between the broadcasters and Parliament for the rules to be relaxed.¹⁷ She noted that the Scottish Parliament was developing the “gallery surrogate model”;¹⁸ this was something we discussed with MSPs, broadcasters and officials when we visited the Scottish Parliament earlier this year. Anne Sloman argued that the rules of coverage in Westminster made the parliamentary material static compared to other serious outside broadcast events, such as the party conferences. She said that Parliament should be televised in a similar manner to the televising of other serious events. She stressed that the BBC was not asking for any relaxation of the rules governing the use of parliamentary material.

11. In 1999, David Lloyd, Head of News and Current Affairs, Channel 4, said that the rules on close-ups and use of cut-aways should be relaxed.¹⁹ He argued that the coverage was distant and unexciting and lacked the dynamic a visitor to the public gallery would feel. He said that the need for the rules had passed and that relaxing the rules would allow a more accurate and full portrayal of the House. David Lloyd noted that there was no role for zoom shots, as these would be out of keeping with the occasion. In response to these concerns, our predecessor Committee recommended, in its First Report, Session 1999-2000, that the restriction on the use of reaction shots of named or identifiable Members during Question Time, Ministerial Statements and Private Notice Questions be relaxed.²⁰

12. In updating the evidence she gave in 1999, Anne Sloman argued that the shot-by-shot rule book should be abandoned and that the spirit of trust between broadcasters and Parliament should allow directors to reflect the mood of the House without artificial restrictions. In particular she asked that:

- the rule on filming someone the Speaker was addressing be relaxed;
- more use be allowed of panning shots to reflect the back benches on either side of the House;
- a greater number of shots during divisions be allowed;
- the entry of the Speaker and prayers be used to make sense of the day’s proceedings;
- appropriate use of close-ups be allowed; and,
- in certain limited circumstances, such as in and out of divisions or at the close of business, mixes be allowed.²¹

She reiterated that broadcasters were not asking to show the public gallery and were not asking for the rules on use of parliamentary material to be relaxed.

17 First Report from the Broadcasting Committee, Session 1999-2000, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, HC 642, p56

18 The gallery surrogate model would allow viewers to observe any aspect of proceedings at any time as though they were present in the public gallery

19 First Report from the Broadcasting Committee, Session 1999-2000, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, HC 642, p56-57

20 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642, paragraph 41

21 Ev 1

13. We cannot accept all of these suggestions. A single set of cameras provides a clean feed, which is used for a number of purposes, and it would be inappropriate for that feed to contain mixes. We see no barrier to broadcasters mixing between the clean feed and any context material they are providing. We also believe that there is nothing to be gained from a greater variety of shots during divisions—people milling around waiting to vote will look much the same from any angle. In fact, the introduction of additional shots during divisions would mean that the television director would be forced to make editorial decisions about who was shown. The entry of the Speaker and prayers have always been, and should remain, private proceedings. A head and shoulders shot is already permitted and we do not feel that introducing close-ups would add sufficient value to justify a change.

14. We do not think that the surrogate gallery model is attainable. The experience for television viewers can never be the same as for visitors in the public gallery, because viewers can see only what the director allows them to see; they will not have the visitors' freedom to choose. The director could offer a more varied visual experience than at present but this would not approach being in the public gallery. Comparisons with other parliaments show that even where there are significant differences in the rules of coverage the actual coverage does not vary much. This is a function of the nature of the work that parliaments and parliamentarians perform and not of the rules of coverage. We do not believe that Parliament needs to be covered in a similar manner to other large scale political events; party conferences cannot be compared with the daily work of the House.

15. The major domestic television channels pay an equal share of the cost of parliamentary broadcasting regardless of how much use they make of the material provided and as a consequence have equal status. The clean feed provided by the House must satisfy those channels who wish to use extended coverage, such as BBC Parliament, and those who want a short clip of a particular speech, such as the television news channels. A channel carrying extended live coverage might welcome a more relaxed style of coverage. However, a news outlet would be very unhappy if the only clip they wanted was unavailable because a cut-away had been used to add variety to the live feed. The television director has to make split second decisions about which shots to use. The rules of coverage help to ensure that the shots they choose to use provide a reasonable balance between the competing demands of the various channels.

16. There is indeed much more to do to make the work of the House understandable and accessible; this applies not only to the television viewer but also the visitor in the gallery, someone looking at a webcast, and those reading Hansard or following the proceedings through newspaper reports. There are many other factors that affect accessibility other than the rules of coverage. We think that it is right that the House of Commons Commission has made improving access and understanding a priority in the House Administration's strategic plan.²² We note that the Group on Information for the Public (GIP) has been working for some time to improve the public understanding and knowledge of the work of the House in support of the Commission's objectives.

22 A strategic plan for the House of Commons Administration 2002-2007, as adopted by the House of Commons Commission on 24 June 2002

17. In considering changes to the rules of coverage, we are conscious that the rules need to be clear and unambiguous if they are to be of use to the television director and enforceable by the Director of Broadcasting. Decisions have to be made quickly by the television director about the shots offered by the camera operators. Vague rules do not help. **All of the recommendations on the rules of coverage made in this Report are shown in a consolidated list of the rules of coverage as an annex to this Report.**²³ **Under the authority the Committee has from the Speaker, we have agreed that these minor changes will be made with immediate effect.** For convenience, guidelines on the use of signals and guidelines for the use of archive material for non-broadcast purposes are reproduced as separate annexes.²⁴

Rules for the chamber

Shots of reaction in the Chamber

18. Currently, reaction shots are limited to named or identifiable Members. General reaction shots are not permitted. A balance must be struck between the need to maintain an uninterrupted record of the proceedings and the need to make the coverage visually appealing by showing reaction to what is happening. **The maintenance of a proper record of proceedings remains a primary objective of parliamentary broadcasting and, as the rules of coverage clearly state, “the camera should normally remain on the Member speaking until he or she has finished”.** It is also vital to protect the right of backbenchers to be seen on television when they are speaking and to have their contribution recorded in full in the archive without cut-aways to ministerial or backbench reaction. We believe there is a danger that broadcasts would tend to focus on a few individuals and that this in turn might reward exaggeration. Our colleagues in the Scottish Parliament, where a greater range of reaction shot is permitted, suggested that this was inevitable. However, they drew a distinction between general debate, where greater coverage seemed to moderate behaviour, and set pieces where Members were more likely to play to the cameras. Officials and broadcasters in Edinburgh told us that reaction shots added atmosphere and quality to the broadcasts. However, they did acknowledge that there was a risk that a vital statement might be missed; for significant events they recorded, on tape, entire statements uninterrupted by cut-aways, while providing a clean feed to broadcasters with cut-aways.

19. In the event of disorder in the Chamber the rules of coverage state that the television director should normally focus on the Chair. We feel that this should remain the case and that the reaction of the Member being reprimanded or that of other Members present should not be shown. If the television director were to cut away from the Speaker, there is a risk that statements with procedural significance could be missed.

The public gallery

20. In certain circumstances, reaction shots of the visitors’ gallery are permitted in the Scottish Parliament. The broadcasting arrangements in Scotland are to some degree an accident of the speed with which arrangements there were made and the geography of their chamber. Given the size of the gallery and the shape of the Chamber, it would have been

23 See Annex 1

24 See Annexes 2 and 3

impossible not to have the gallery in shot. While in Scotland, we had a lengthy discussion with MSPs and officials about the treatment of disorder in the public gallery. They argued that showing the public gallery had not led to a great number of incidents of disorder. However, **we do not feel that there is any case for relaxing the restrictions placed on showing the public galleries at Westminster.**

Providing a context

21. Some of the suggestions Anne Sloman made seek to provide a better context for parliamentary broadcasts.²⁵ We agree that viewers need a context, but we feel that the broadcasters themselves could do more to provide it. The rules of coverage must provide a single feed to the broadcasters that satisfies a variety of different needs. Within a single feed, there is a risk that context material provided at the request of one channel would be at the expense of the requirements of another. This conflict does not arise where broadcasters provide their own context. We believe that the excellent coverage of the first debate on the crisis in Iraq on 18 March 2003, when broadcasters supported their coverage of events in the chamber with live interviews and studio discussions, shows that this can be done and that it can work extremely well. This clearly demonstrated that the demand for coverage that focused on the proceedings and the Member speaking was not incompatible with the demand for televisually interesting pictures.

Rules for Westminster Hall

22. There are no rules of coverage specifically for Westminster Hall; the rules of coverage for the Chamber are applied. Now that the arrangements in Westminster Hall have been put on a permanent footing, we believe that the rules of coverage should be amended to make clear that the rules of coverage for the Chamber apply. However, we recognise that given the layout of the room there will be circumstances in which the public gallery will unavoidably be in shot.

Rules for Committees

23. There are no rules specifically for Select Committees. We believe reaction shots in Committee should be restricted to Members to whom a clear reference had been made or who had asked a question of a witness. Wider reaction shots should not be permitted as, given the nature of the rooms, they will be impractical and televisually unappealing. There are no circumstances in which the reaction of the public gallery should be shown. Reaction shots of witnesses are permitted in Select Committees. Ideally, committee staff, the press, and shorthand writers should not be shown. There should be no close-up shots of Members' or officials' papers. In Standing Committees, the rules of coverage for the Chamber should be applied. Officials attending ministers should not be shown.

Guidelines for use of signals

24. The nature of broadcasting has changed dramatically since the guidelines on the use of signals were drafted. New programme formats are being introduced and styles of presentation have changed. We are aware that news departments and light entertainment

²⁵ See paragraph 11

departments are collaborating on programmes. We are also conscious that great efforts are being made to re-engage the general public in politics, to tackle voter apathy and in particular to interest young people in politics. We recall that improving accessibility and public understanding are core objectives for the House Administration.²⁶ The Modernisation Committee has also stressed the importance of making the House more accessible and said in its Second Report, Session 2001-02:

It is ... important that the House makes maximum use of the TV media to convey a sense of the Commons as a working environment and a forum of serious and challenging debate.²⁷

25. We believe that there is a case for re-examining the rules on the use of signals. There are strong links here with the modernisation agenda and we feel that there is scope for the Broadcasting Committee and the Modernisation Committee jointly to look at how programming has changed. The Committees may wish to discuss with programme makers the kinds of issues they face and the types of programmes they would like to make. Such a discussion could help to formulate guidance for the Director of Broadcasting, who has increasingly to apply her discretion in dealing with applications from programme makers who wish to use parliamentary material.

The impact of new developments

Webcasting

26. Webcasting is an exciting development. We believe that webcasting has an important part to play in the modernisation agenda and in helping to reconnect with the public. Webcasting will make the work of the House, and particularly of Standing and Select Committees, much more accessible than has so far been possible through traditional media. We believe webcasting should become a core part of an integrated, interactive Parliamentary information system providing information to Members and the public, alongside the redesigned Internet site and the Parliamentary Information Management Service that is being developed. Webcasting offers a real opportunity to extend coverage of the work of Committees. A permanent webcasting service will begin later this year. This will include audio coverage of all Committees meeting in public and there are plans to install webcams in a number of Committee Rooms at a later stage. The webcams are likely to be capable of giving only an unchanging overview of a Committee Room. The fixed nature of webcams means that most of the rules of coverage will not apply. However, the direction of the shot for a webcam might need to be defined in the rules of coverage and there should be further discussion on whether the public gallery should be shown in webcasts. Any shot of witnesses would be likely to include part and possibly the entire public gallery. Any shot of the Chairman and the Committee will show only the back of the witnesses' heads. Given the constraints of the cameras, a balance will need to be struck between the risks associated with showing the public gallery, which in some cases might encourage disorder, and the need to show the witnesses. On balance, we feel the cameras

26 See paragraph 16

27 Modernisation Committee, Second Report, Modernisation of the House of Commons: A Reform Programme, Session 2001-02, HC 1168

should be positioned so as to give an overview of the room, showing the witnesses, but should limit, as far as is possible, how much of the public gallery is shown.

Live inject points

27. We welcome the current experiment to allow broadcasters access to six live “inject points” around the Parliamentary Estate for interviews or short pieces to camera that introduce a proceeding in the House. We believe that this has done much to improve the image of the House. The Administration Committee has already defined some rules for the use of these access points, limiting use to interviews and introductions to parliamentary issues rather than political issues. We believe that, once the trial is over and experience reviewed, rules should be devised for any permanent arrangement.

Other innovations

28. Innovation is important in generating and maintaining interest and we welcome two other innovations that have proved to be popular with broadcasters:

- the introduction of a question session on cross-cutting issues in Westminster Hall
- the Liaison Committee’s evidence sessions with the Prime Minister.

3 Conclusion

29. The rules fulfil a necessary function by ensuring that broadcasters and indeed the House itself are provided with visual and audio coverage that focuses on the proceedings and protects the right of the backbencher to be seen. We have proposed some modest changes and these are detailed in an Annex 1 to this Report. There is no case for wholesale changes to the rules. Such change would not anyway deliver radically different television images; content is a function of the nature of the work and not of the rules of coverage. The broadcasters can do much more to help provide a context for the material they use. This could help to divert attention from sound-bites and confrontation and give the public a better and deeper understanding of the role and function of the House and their elected representatives. There are clear links with the strategic objectives that the House of Commons Commission has agreed, the agenda of the Modernisation Committee and initiatives aimed at re-engaging the public in politics and political debate. The House must do all it can to help the broadcasters provide a context. Constructive innovations, such as the introduction of the live inject points or the introduction of cross-cutting questions in Westminster Hall, will do more to engage the interest of the broadcasters and the public than any changes to the rules of coverage.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. We now believe that there is a case for some further minor changes in the rules. We see this as part of an evolutionary and incremental process of change that has continued since the House was first televised and rules of coverage were first introduced. We do not, however, believe that there needs to be wholesale change in the rules or any lessening of the control that the House has over the way it is portrayed. (Paragraph 9)
2. All of the recommendations on the rules of coverage made in this Report are shown in a consolidated list of the rules of coverage as an annex to this Report. (Paragraph 17)
3. Under the authority the Committee has from the Speaker, we have agreed that these minor changes will be made with immediate effect. (Paragraph 17)
4. The maintenance of a proper record of proceedings remains a primary objective of parliamentary broadcasting and, as the rules of coverage clearly state, “the camera should normally remain on the Member speaking until he or she has finished”. (Paragraph 18)
5. We do not feel that there is any case for relaxing the restrictions placed on showing the public galleries at Westminster (Paragraph 20)

Annex 1

RULES OF COVERAGE

The following is a revised version of the rules of coverage, showing the impact of the recommendations made in this Report. Changes to the consolidated version of the rules reproduced in our last report²⁸ are shown in ***bold italics***.

1. STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The director should seek, in close collaboration with the ***Director*** of Broadcasting, to give a full, balanced, fair and accurate account of proceedings, with the aim of informing viewers about the work of the House.

{Note: In carrying out this task, the director should have regard to the dignity of the House and to its function as a working body rather than a place of entertainment.}

2. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR PICTURE DIRECTION

- a) Restriction of Filming Certain Parts of Chamber, etc.
 - i) The press and public galleries, the officials' and visitors' boxes, and the area behind the Speaker's Chair, not being directly related to proceedings, should not be shown, other than unavoidably as part of wide-angle or other authorised shots of the Chamber.
 - ii) Great care should be exercised in showing the occupant of the Chair. Shots designed to show the Speaker receiving advice from a Clerk at the Table should not be used. Officers of the House and Doorkeepers attending in the Chamber should not normally be shown, unless they are taking an active part in the proceedings.
 - iii) During Divisions, a wide-angle shot of the Chamber may be used. In addition, the following events relating to Divisions may be shown using the standard format described in sub-paragraph II (b)(i): the putting of the Question, both initially and after the two minute interval; the announcement of the names of the Tellers; any points of order which may arise, together with any response by the Chair; and the announcement by the Tellers and the Chair of the voting figures.
 - iv) In no circumstances should close-up shots of Members' or Officers' papers be taken.
- b) Style and Presentation
 - i) The standard format for depicting the Member who has the floor should be a head and shoulders shot, not a close-up.

28 Broadcasting Committee, First Report, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, Session 1999-2000, HC 642, Appendix 1

- ii) Subject to sub-paragraphs (iii) to (vii) below, the camera should normally remain on the Member speaking until he or she has finished.
 - iii) Wide-angle shots of the Chamber may be used from time to time: for example, while the director is seeking a closer shot of a Member who has just been called, at times when no single Member has the floor, and to establish the geography of the House for the benefit of viewers.²⁹
 - iv) As a matter of general practice, the director should switch to a picture of the occupant of the Chair whenever he or she rises; this principle should be applied all the more strictly during incidents of disorder or altercations between Chair and other Members.³⁰
 - v) Occasional cut-away shots to illustrate individual reactions are allowed, but only to show a Member who has been referred to by the Member speaking.³¹
 - vi) Medium-angle shots, including over-the-shoulder shots, are permissible where the director wishes to show both the Member who has the floor and another Member intervening or seeking to do so.
 - vii) Occasional group shots — mid-way between the standard head and shoulders shot and the wide-angle shot — are permitted; such shots may be used either for the purposes of showing the reaction of a group of Members, or in order to establish the geography of a particular part of the Chamber.
- c) Special Camera Techniques
- i) In no circumstances are split-screen shots to be used.
 - ii) Panning shots along the benches should not normally be used.
 - iii) Occasional zoom shots are permitted.

3. TREATMENT OF DISORDER

- a) Disorder in the Galleries
- iv) Neither interruptions from, nor demonstrations in, the galleries are “Proceedings”, and as such they should in no circumstances be televised.
 - v) If an incident of the sort described in sub-paragraph (i) above occurs in such a way as to interfere with an otherwise permissible shot, the director should cut either to a wide-angle shot of the Chamber which does not show the offending incident, or to the occupant of the Chair.

²⁹ A second feed, showing a continuous single wide-angle shot from the end of the Chamber, is made available. This feed may be used only for editing purposes: it may not be used for separate live transmission, nor for mixing electronically with the main feed for live transmission. The second feed is time-coded, and extracts from it may only be employed in their correct chronological sequence within the proceedings of the House. During incidents of disorder when the director is required to focus on the Chair, the second feed is withdrawn

³⁰ See guidelines regarding the treatment of disorder

³¹ It is not necessary for the Member's constituency or, in the case of a Minister his office, to be specifically mentioned. So long as it is clear to the director which Member is being referred to, a reaction shot is permitted.

d) Disorder on the Floor of the House

Televising may continue during incidents of grave disorder or unparliamentary behaviour for as long as the sitting continues, but only subject to the following guidelines:

- i) On occasions of grave disorder, the director should normally focus on the occupant of the Chair for as long as proceedings continue, or until order has been restored. (By “grave disorder” is meant incidents of individual, but more likely collective, misconduct of such a serious disruptive nature as to place in jeopardy the continuation of the sitting.)
- ii) In cases of unparliamentary behaviour, the director should normally focus on the occupant of the Chair, and should certainly do so if he or she rises, but occasional wide-angle shots of the Chamber are acceptable. (The phrase “unparliamentary behaviour” is intended to signify any conduct which amounts to defiance of the Chair but which falls short of grave disorder.)

4. WESTMINSTER HALL

The rules of coverage for the Chamber shall be applied.

5. SELECT COMMITTEES

The rules of coverage for the Chamber shall be applied, except that:

- i) Reaction shots should be limited to Members to whom a clear reference has been made or who have asked a question of a witness.*
- ii) Reaction of the public gallery should not be shown.*
- iii) Committee staff, the press, and shorthand writers should not be shown other than unavoidably as part of another authorised shot.*
- iv) No close-up shots of Members’ or officials’ papers should be taken.*

6. STANDING COMMITTEES

The rules of coverage for the Chamber shall be applied.

Officials attending Ministers should not be shown.

Annex 2

USE OF THE SIGNALS³²

The guidelines for the use of the signals are:

- a) no extracts of Parliamentary proceedings may be used in any light entertainment programme or in a programme of political satire;
- b) subject to paragraph (a) above, extracts of Parliamentary proceedings may be included in broadcast “magazine” programmes which also contain music or humorous features, provided that the different types of item are kept separate;
- c) extracts from Parliamentary proceedings may not be used in party political broadcasts;
- d) no extracts of Parliamentary proceedings may be used in any form of advertising, promotion or other form of publicity, except in the form of trailers for programmes which use extracts within the requirement of these guidelines and where the trailers also comply with those requirements; and

The user shall at all times comply with all the rules of coverage, guidelines and directives laid down from time to time by the relevant select committee of each House in reports issued by them and otherwise.

³² Extract from First Report of the Select Committee on Televising of Proceedings of the House, Session 1988-89, HC 141-I

Annex 3

GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF ARCHIVE MATERIAL FOR NON-BROADCAST PURPOSES³³

Archive material should not be used in any way likely to lower the dignity or damage the reputation of the House, or of any individual Member.

- a) Archive material should not be used in any way which infringes the legitimate rights of individual Members, in particular by purporting, without their authority, to enlist their support for, or endorsement of, any product, organisation, cause or political party.
- b) That, in the case of compilations or summaries of proceedings distributed in video— or audio-cassette form, there may be no internal editing of extracts such as to distort the timing of events or the meaning of any words spoken; that there should be a clear indication of subject and time changes; and that due regard must be had to the requirements of political balance.
- c) That no archive material should be used in any form of advertising or publicity.

³³ Extract from First Report of the Broadcasting Committee, Session 1999-2000, The Development of Parliamentary Broadcasting, HC 642

Formal Minutes

Wednesday 11 June 2003

Members present:

Mr David Lepper, in the Chair

Mrs Helen Clark
Mr Roger Gale
Mr David Hamilton

Mr Iain Luke
Mr Jim Sheridan

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (The Rules of Coverage), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 29 read and agreed to.

Annexes agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the First Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

A paper was ordered to be appended to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendix to the Report be reported to the House.—(*The Chairman.*)

[Adjourned till a date and time to be fixed by the Chairman.]

List of written evidence

1 Anne Sloman, Chief Political Adviser, British Broadcasting Corporation

Ev 1

Previous Reports by the Broadcasting Committee

Session 1999-2000

First Report

The Development of
Parliamentary Broadcasting

HC 642