

APPENDIX 1 : ANNOTATIONS TO DRAFT ARTICLE

The test in addressing each of the annotations was “Do the comments made by Ms Boon, question the article’s accuracy, /highlight material misrepresentations / non-compliance with the Standards Code?”

I have stated “personal opinion / comment” where the annotation is principally a matter of Ms Boon’s opinion or a general comment/critique but which doesn’t provide evidence of inaccuracy or specify a non-compliance with the Standards Code.

Page 1

1. No - Title – personal opinion / comment
2. No – personal opinion / comment
3. No – personal opinion / comment

Page 2

4. No - from interview with Men neither had been approached for a comment on the poster. The “Men’s Group” was unresponsive to questions. The comments re: police reports are historical and not pertinent to the poster in question and therefore the article.
5. No – it is a matter of fact that Ms Boon’s name is in the Doc properties – this is objectively verifiable from the prime source document.
6. No - personal opinion / comment
7. No – draft was changed re: SUTR, and point of pedantry re: VAWG name
8. No – her initial email did not show concern about the prospect of having been framed.

Page 3

9. No – analysis that she personally obtained i.e. “personal analysis” – point of pedantry
10. No – she does “claim that she received an email on the 12th.” – it is a matter of fact. It is a moot point whether “claim” implies that it might not have been received.
11. No – it was a “letter of concern” clearly following some level of “investigation” – point of pedantry
12. No – a matter of opinion as to whether something that is “less probable” is/is not “unlikely” – point of pedantry. It’s noted that on her subsequent FB post (Appx 2) that she misreports the Digital Analyst’s position.
13. No - See main letter for detailed response – critical point (“The original link...”)
14. No - See main letter for detailed response – critical point
15. No - See main letter for detailed response – critical point
16. No – she does not know if I accurately replicated it – speculation
17. No - when asked about Ms Boon’s evidence Canva confirmed that it was incorrect in this particular circumstance. The article is supported by a statement from Canva
18. No – Ms Boon moves from “editing a pdf” to “adding in a textbox”. The pdf would have to have been read through a specific pdf editor not directly from the Canva download.
19. No - See main letter for detailed response – critical point

20. No – the metadata confirms that it was a pdf created by Canva and not modified.
21. No - personal opinion / comment
22. No - personal opinion / comment
23. No - personal opinion / comment – point of pedantry
24. No - personal opinion / comment
25. No - personal opinion / comment
26. No - personal opinion / comment (“conventional processes”)
27. No – having read emails from VB, issued at the time, it was clearly one-sided and not welcomed by Man A
28. No - personal opinion / comment
29. No - personal opinion / comment “an output” does mean that it was part of many outputs
30. No - personal opinion / comment
31. No - personal opinion / comment
32. No - personal opinion / comment – Messenger is part of Meta/Facebook – point of pedantry.

Page 4

33. No - personal opinion / comment
34. No - personal opinion / comment – the letter could not be considered anything other than damaging.
35. No – asking whether someone condoned an action is not a loaded question. My statement in the article was a true representation of the discussion. I was fair in the article by representing her position.
36. No – correctly represented in the article that she claims that she didn’t author the 2021 email.
37. No – speculation
38. No – complete misunderstanding of the point made.
39. No – complete misunderstanding of the point. I have seen emails from the “Men’s group” that are written in a very similar style to Ms Boon and include content only known to the “Survivor’s Circle”
40. No - personal opinion / comment (“venomous”)
41. No - personal opinion / comment
42. No - personal opinion / comment
43. No - personal opinion / comment
44. No - personal opinion / comment
45. No -Police cases are unrelated to this article
46. No - personal opinion / comment
47. No - personal opinion / comment – the “evidence” is circumstantial and largely implausible, objectively.
48. No - personal opinion / comment
49. No – I have seen emails however they are anonymous and single sourced and of limited reliability
50. No - personal opinion / comment – hear say
51. No - personal opinion / comment - speculation
52. No - personal opinion / comment

- 53. No - personal opinion / comment
- 54. No - personal opinion / comment
- 55. No - personal opinion / comment – anonymous input
- 56. No - personal opinion / comment – I am not required to rely on her evidence
- 57. No - personal opinion / comment
- 58. No - personal opinion / comment
- 59. No - personal opinion / comment
- 60. No - personal opinion / comment
- 61. No - personal opinion / comment