



Bryan White &lt;zebrafactcheck@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Why no answers?

---

**Bryan White** <zebrafactcheck@gmail.com>  
To: Enock Nyariki <enyariki@poynter.org>

Tue, Sep 20, 2022 at 8:00 AM

Dear Enock,

I believe I have been quite clear from the start that I sought publishable information about IFCN processes for the explicit purpose of publishing them and improving IFCN transparency.

In the interest of transparency, please explain why you decline to answer emails such as [this](#) and [this](#). The public ought to have a better view of what goes on at the IFCN. Why so much resistance to my inquiries?

Next email (emphasis in the original):

As before, I am asking questions with the aim of improving IFCN transparency. The IFCN publishes too little explaining its processes and activities. **I need answers I am allowed to publish**, and even better if they're attributable.

In another email I sent you helpful instructions on how to designate parts of your email communications off the record if you chose to do so. To sum up, if there's any part of your communications with me (journalist) that you wish to keep private, specify what part you wish to keep off the record and I will honor that request. Anything else I will consider publishable and will publish in accord with the Zebra Fact Check transparency policy.

I publish communications, including my queries of experts, to demonstrate to the public that I do not obtain answers based on the use of leading questions or the like. It's what every fact checker should be doing.

I also ran across this the other day at the Poynter.org [website](#):

### Transparency

We shine a light on our own journalistic processes, explaining how and why we make decisions. We do our best to disclose relevant information that may have influenced or affected our decisions.

*In practice:* We go out of our way to disclose information that our constituents and critics may find relevant, useful and helpful about the way we do business — and publish — at Poynter. We provide readers with sufficient information about who we are, how we work, how Poynter is financed, etc. to provide meaningful context for them to assess and judge the material we publish and teach.

There's more to the "Transparency" section at the link. It's written to suggest that Poynter's published content has all this information effecting transparency embedded as a matter of policy. But I'd say where such information is sketchy the transparency principle should motivate Poynter (and the IFCN) to go out of its way to disclose information constituents and critics may find relevant.

Two or three questions per month is what I'm asking. I'll seek not to overburden you while obtaining information that helps the IFCN and Poynter meet their commitment to transparency.

Okay?  
(it'll help me to have an answer to this question)

Cheers.  
[Quoted text hidden]