

<b>Analysis of complaints</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Standards of service</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Summaries of upheld complaints</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Panorama: Sub Prime Suspects, BBC1, 8 October 2007.....	2
Complaint.....	2
Ruling.....	2
Further action.....	3
The Chief, BBC Wales, 27 November 2007.....	3
Complaint.....	3
Ruling.....	3
Further action.....	3
Saturday Kitchen, BBC1, 15 December 2007.....	3
Complaint.....	3
Ruling.....	3
Resolved.....	4
Kill it, Cook it, Eat it, BBC3, 7 January 2008.....	4
Complaint.....	4
Ruling.....	4
Match of the Day Live, Mansfield Town v Middlesbrough, BBC1, 26 January 2008.....	4
Complaint.....	4
Ruling.....	4
Further action.....	4
News (10pm), Radio 4, 2 February 2008.....	4
Complaint.....	4
Ruling.....	4
Further action.....	5
BBC News (1.00pm), BBC1, 7 February 2008.....	5
Complaint.....	5
Ruling.....	5
Further action.....	5
File on Four, Radio 4, 12 February 2008.....	5
Complaint.....	5
Ruling.....	5
Further action.....	6
BBC News (6.00pm), News 24, 17 February 2008.....	6
Complaint.....	6
Ruling.....	6
Further action.....	6
Newsnight, BBC2, 25 February 2008.....	6
Complaint.....	6
Ruling.....	6
Further action.....	7
EastEnders, BBC1, 21 and 24 March 2008.....	7
Complaint.....	7
Ruling.....	7
Further action.....	7



was unjustified; though the loan in question was in fact unaffordable, this was the consequence of fraud by an intermediary, not mis-selling.

The ECU also found that the allegation of mis-selling in relation to the first loan was put to Britannia too late for a proper opportunity to respond, and that Britannia was at no point given

## **Resolved**

### **Kill it, Cook it, Eat it, BBC3, 7 January 2008**

#### **Complaint**

A viewer complained that the programme contained the erroneous statement that pig farrowing crates had been banned in the UK. Although the error had been acknowledged in correspondence, the complainant believed that it required correction on air.

#### **Ruling**

The error arose from a confusion on the part of an expert contributor between farrowing



### **Further action**

Editors of news programmes were asked to remind teams of need to check claims from any source and to take care that scripting is precise.

### **BBC News (6.00pm), News 24, 17 February 2008**

#### **Complaint**

A viewer complained that a reference to Northern Rock receiving subsidised loans (in an item which covered the announcement of the bank's temporary nationalisation) was inaccurate.

#### **Ruling**

The reporter concluded the item by saying "UK taxpayers are still subsidising the bank in loans and guarantees for up to £55 billion". The terms of the loans were such that there was arguably an element of subsidy, but it was inaccurate to describe the entirety of the financial support package as a subsidy.

#### **Upheld**

### **Further action**

The issues arising from the finding have been drawn to the attention of the reporter in question and the Controller of the BBC News channel (formerly known as BBC News 24). They and their colleagues have been reminded about the requirement for accuracy in descriptions and language, so that incorrect impressions are not given to the audience.

### **Newsnight, BBC2, 25 February 2008**

#### **Complaint**

The ECU received complaints from two viewers in Jersey about an item on the investigation into the Haut de la Garenne children's home. The item included footage of an exchange between Senator Walker, the Chief Minister of Jersey, and Senator Syvret, one of his leading critics. The viewers complained that this footage had been edited in a way which was unfair to Senator Walker, and that further unfairness resulted from his response to Senator Syvret being misquoted by Jeremy Paxman in a live interview with him. One of the viewers complained that the exchange with Senator Syvret had been filmed without Senator Walker's knowledge.

#### **Ruling**

The exchange, as edited and broadcast was as follows:

**Senator Syvret**

*Frank, we're talking about dead children.*

**Senator Walker**

*Yes, Stewart. Exactly. You shouldn't be politicising it. You're trying to shaft Jersey internationally.*

In the view of the ECU, the editing had not materially altered the meaning of the exchange, and did not result in unfairness to Senator Walker. However, because of a mishearing, Jeremy Paxman paraphrased him as having said "We're trying to promote the international image of Jersey", then quoted him as having said "We're trying to show off Jersey internationally", despite his denials. Although, by way of clarification, Senator Walker's actual words were given later in the programme, this did not sufficiently offset an impression of undue preoccupation with Jersey's image which his words did not warrant. As to the filming of the exchange, the ECU found that sufficient steps had been taken to make both Senators aware of the likelihood that filming would still be going on at the point when the exchange took place.

#### **Partly upheld**

**Further action**

Editors in BBC News have been asked to stress to teams the importance of making sure the audience is clear about cases where a presenter's mishearing affects the subsequent discussion, in particular by ensuring that enough has been done as soon as is practical to prevent the audience being left with a misleading impression.

**EastEnders, BBC1, 21 and 24 March 2008****Complaint**

Three viewers complained that the storyline in which the character Max Branning was drugged and buried alive (before finally being released) by his wife Tanya was inappropriate for a pre-watershed drama series which attracts a family audience.

**Ruling**

The potential sensitivity of the storyline had been recognised by the programme-makers, and its presentation had been the subject of extensive consultation before transmission. It involved no explicit physical violence, and the view of the programme-makers was that (in the context of a holiday weekend, when there is an established expectation among viewers that the storylines in soaps will be at their most dramatic, and in the light of experience from previous storylines involving extreme circumstances) it would not exceed the expectations of the audience. However, the nature of the response registered with BBC Information (and with Ofcom) suggested that the emotional impact of the storyline was somewhat stronger than had been considered likely, and that it had caused upset among a segment of the audience which was neither anticipated nor intended.

**Upheld****Further action**

The finding has been discussed amongst the production team and will be taken into account in the development of future storylines.