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When the first Chairman of the Press Council of Ireland, Professor Thomas Mitchell, relinquished his responsibilities in mid-2010, he left for me, as his successor, an organisation which has achieved much, and which has learned much, in its first three years in existence. That this is the case has been due in large measure to his commitment, his energy, and his vision, not just during the three years of his chairmanship, but for the protracted period before then when, as a key member of the Press Industry Steering Committee, he played a vital role in ensuring that the project of the establishment of the Press Council and the Office of the Press Ombudsman reached its successful conclusion. The members of the Council, the industry and the public generally, owe him a considerable debt of gratitude. A similar debt is owed to Professor Kevin Boyle, who with Dr Marie McGonagle played a pioneering role in this field under the auspices of National Newspapers of Ireland. Professor Boyle’s recent untimely death has deprived scholarship and press freedom alike of the energy and insights of a wise and powerful advocate.

The past year has been notable for the formal recognition of the Press Council of Ireland and the Press Ombudsman by the Oireachtas under the terms of the 2009 Defamation Act. This has been no mere formality, but a significant and public recognition of the degree to which these new structures, since their institution in 2007, have met the exacting requirements laid down for recognition in the Act, and have contributed to the climate of enhanced accountability and public service within which our press industry operates.

Despite the improvements under the new Act, some recent jury awards have demonstrated that taking the legal route is still fraught with substantial risk – and potentially considerable expense – for plaintiffs and publications alike. This continues to be the case even when, as provided for in the new legislation, proceedings are taken at Circuit Court level and the remedies sought do not involve financial compensation. In this context, it is important to emphasise that the mechanisms available for the resolution of many such issues through the Office of the Press Ombudsman and the Press Council avoid both the risk and the expense of court proceedings for everyone involved. These still provide the speediest, most cost-effective, least hazardous and often by far the most appropriate methods of dealing with the often complex and sensitive issues relating to the coverage of individuals and society in general in the print media.

It is worth noting, in particular, that the most substantial of the recent jury awards in a defamation action was taken under the former legislation – now substantially replaced by the 2009 Act – and that this extraordinary award did not even involve a newspaper or other publication. It is to be hoped that this unprecedented event represents the end of an era, and that, where issues about press coverage arise in the future, all the parties concerned will more frequently have recourse to the procedures and structures of the Press Council and the Press Ombudsman, and will avail of the benefits that these procedures confer both on individuals and on the press itself.

The role of the press as a core institution in the development and maintenance of standards in public life, and in the democratic system generally, has rarely been more in evidence than during the past year. The consistent and valuable support of the press industry for, and its engagement with, the Press Council and the Office of the Press Ombudsman is symptomatic of its equally strong belief in the importance and value of media accountability as an integral component of the freedom of the press itself, and as a vital building block in achieving those standards of credibility and authority which are essential to its role of public service. In this, as it begins its second term of office, the Press Council will continue to play its full part.
The year 2010 saw the end of the term of office of the first Press Council of Ireland. This was accompanied by the retirement of its first Chairman, Professor Thomas Mitchell, and of two of its public interest members - Peter O’Mahony and Mary Kotsonouris - who did not put themselves forward for re-appointment at the expiry of their three-year terms.

The new Chairman is Dáithí O’Ceallaigh, whose term of office commenced on 1 August 2010. Mr O’Ceallaigh retired from the diplomatic service in 2008 after a career spanning more than 35 years, which included serving as Ambassador to London for six years from 2001. He was subsequently appointed Ambassador to the UN, the World Trade Organisation and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, and, in 2008, headed the Irish team which negotiated the Convention to Prohibit Cluster Munitions.

The two new public interest members of the Press Council are Professor Áine Hyland and Éamonn Mac Aodha. Professor Hyland has an extensive background in education, and has served as Vice-President of University College, Cork. She is also a member of the Irish Bar Council’s Tribunal of Complaints against Barristers. Mr Mac Aodha is a public servant who was Director of the Human Rights Unit of the Department of Foreign Affairs from 2004 – 2007, and is currently serving as Chief Executive of the Irish Human Rights Commission.

During the year, the Press Council welcomed the decision of both Houses of the Oireachtas, on foot of resolutions proposed by the Minister for Justice, Mr Dermot Ahern TD, in March 2010, to recognise the Press Council of Ireland under the terms of the 2009 Defamation Act. This formal recognition by the Oireachtas represents the successful conclusion of a process initiated almost a decade ago. It confers important privileges on the Press Council and Press Ombudsman, and enhances the rights and responsibilities of all publications that are members of the Press Council and adhere to its Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines.

Annual General Meeting and Extraordinary General Meeting

The Press Council held its Annual General Meeting on Friday, 26 March 2010. The meeting approved the financial reports for the company, and re-appointed Messrs Grant Thornton as the company’s auditors. At an Extraordinary General Meeting held on the same day, members approved a special resolution to alter the company’s Memorandum and Articles of Association in a number of respects.

At its meeting in July, the Press Council decided unanimously to offer the Press Ombudsman, Professor John Horgan, a three-year renewal of his contract, with effect from 1 September 2010, in line with the provisions of the Articles of Association. Professor Horgan accepted this offer.

Code Committee

The Code Committee of the Press Council met on 10 March 2010. Members of the Committee discussed the relationship between Principles 5 (Privacy), 7 (Court Reporting) and 9 (Children) of the Code of Practice.
A seminar on privacy and the media held in January generated a challenging and very informative exchange of views between media and other professionals and members of the public. Two very important aspects of privacy and the press were discussed: privacy, the public interest and the press; and privacy and the internet.

**Privacy, the public interest and the press**

The businessman Ben Dunne explored the power and complexity of the media. At the end of the day, he said, it was a form of organised gossip and, while gossip was hard to live with, sometimes it was essential. He stated that apart from its role as organised gossip, the media was also the banner of freedom in a democratic society and without a free media, freedom had far less meaning. In his opinion the media was the conduit between ordinary people and the powers that be: it exposed mistakes, it probed actions and it presented alternatives.

He spoke about some of his experiences during his 30 years of dealing with the media, indicating that he never had a problem talking to the media. He expressed concern in relation to privacy laws that unduly restricted the media from doing their job, and said he believed that the common good was best served by an independent and principled media. But he warned that the universal right to personal privacy had to be acknowledged and protected.

Professor Chris Frost of Liverpool John Moores University presented an overview of how the Press Complaints Commission in the UK deals with an average of 400 complaints per annum relating to privacy. His presentation highlighted several identifiable trends in privacy decisions of the Press Complaints Commission, including identity, intrusion, surreptitious filming and the use of web video, and coverage of details of personal health.

Tightening privacy laws was a recipe for “non-accountability, secrecy and duplicity”, the seminar was told in a paper presented on behalf of the editor of the Irish Daily Mirror, John Kierans. In reference to the Privacy Bill published by the Government, he said he was wary of any proposal to legislate for increased privacy rights.

**Privacy and the internet**

The Data Protection Commissioner, Billy Hawkes, told the seminar that the phenomenal development of the internet posed challenges to traditional ideas of privacy and data protection. From a press perspective, he said, this had resulted in a seismic shift in the potential implications for a person whose story appeared in print in their local newspaper, for instance, but was also published on the web. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the article, the internet would not allow it to be forgotten, or the person to move on. He acknowledged that these aspects of the web posed particular challenges for our system of personal privacy protection.

Damien Mulley of Mulley Communications spoke about the privacy element of material appearing on social networking sites, and whether or not people had the right to complain if photos which they had uploaded onto such sites were taken and used by a third party. In a world where everyone was connected, news and lies could spread in the backchannels and there was not much that could be done about it. While the press and bloggers could be strongly influenced by defamation laws, it was unclear where the jurisdiction lay for people who just copied and pasted 140 characters from one private message to another. He believed that it remained unclear whether the responsibility lay with the final person in the pass-me-along chain, the originators (if they could be identified), every person that re-sent the information, or the people who had the most contacts.

A paper by Fran Bissett of Youth Work Ireland outlined the work his organisation had done in relation to the publication of guidelines, including guidelines on “safe-surfing”, for users of social networking sites. He highlighted a number of very basic rules on social networking, as promulgated and available on the website of his organisation.
Referrals to the Press Council by the Press Ombudsman

The Press Ombudsman can, at his discretion, decide to refer a significant or complex complaint directly to the Press Council of Ireland for its consideration and decision. Such referrals take place at the end of the conciliation process carried out by the Office of the Press Ombudsman, and when it has become clear that the complainant and the publication concerned are not able to agree on a resolution of the complaint. The referral takes place without any decision being made by the Press Ombudsman, and the Press Ombudsman does not make any recommendation to the Press Council on the matter or participate in its deliberations.

Two such complaints were referred by the Press Ombudsman to the Press Council in 2010.

**Ryanair and The Irish Times**

The article complained about was headlined “The subsidies that keep Ryanair profits airborne”. It stated that Ryanair had received “huge subsidies” from European airports, and outlined in some detail why it believed this to be the case. Ryanair complained that the article breached Principles 1 (Truth and Accuracy), 2 (Distinguishing Fact and Comment) and 3 (Fairness and Honesty) of the Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines.

The Press Ombudsman decided to refer the case to the Press Council as it was a complex one, which involved the interpretation of a judgement of the European Court of First Instance (which both parties used to defend their respective positions).

The newspaper had earlier accepted that the headline did not reflect the contents of the article. It offered to publish a correction, and did so, but Ryanair did not consider this to be a satisfactory response. After the company complained to the Office of the Press Ombudsman the newspaper offered to publish, in addition, a right of reply from Ryanair, either in a letter to the editor or in an article. Ryanair did not accept the offer, and requested that a formal decision be made as to whether or not the article breached the Code of Practice.

The Press Council decided that the original headline had breached the Code of Practice, but that the subsequent correction of the headline by the newspaper sufficiently remedied the matter under the alleged breach of Principles 1 and 2. In relation to the alleged breach of Principle 3, the Council noted that Ryanair was offered an opportunity to respond to the article in advance of publication and that its comments were included in the article. It therefore concluded that the subsequent right of reply offered by the newspaper was sufficient to resolve the complaint.

**Mrs Máire Begg and the Sunday Independent**

Mrs Begg complained that the publication of a photograph of her home, together with details of the security arrangements relating to it and statements about its market value and mortgage status, in an article about the residences of some senior union officials, breached her privacy under Principle 5 (Privacy) of the Code of Practice.

The Press Ombudsman decided to refer this complaint to the Press Council in the light of the important issues relating to privacy and the public interest in the case.

The Press Council decided that the public remarks of a prominent trade union leader in which reference was made to “trophy houses” raised a matter of significant public interest bearing on the taxation of the better-off, including taxes on so-called trophy homes. It recognised, however, that the matter had to be treated with due regard for a reasonable balance between the right of the public to know and of newspapers to inform them and the right of every person to privacy.

The Press Council decided that the publication of the photograph of Mrs Begg’s home, together with details of its location and a reference to the security arrangements applicable to it, was not essential to achieving the purposes of the story, and did not add any public benefit proportionate to the level of intrusion on the right to privacy as set out in Principle 5 of the Code of Practice, which requires that “The private and family life, home and correspondence of everyone must be respected.” It decided that the article breached Principle 5 of the Code of Practice and therefore upheld the complaint.
Appeals to the Press Council

After the conclusion of a conciliation process which has not produced agreement between a complainant and a publication on the resolution of a complaint, a decision is made by the Press Ombudsman on whether or not the article concerned is in breach of the Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines. Any such decision by the Press Ombudsman can be appealed, by either party, to the Press Council of Ireland.

Any appeal against a decision made by the Press Ombudsman on a complaint about a breach of the Code of Practice must be made to the Press Council within ten working days of the decision being made. Mere disagreement with a decision is not sufficient to reverse a decision of the Press Ombudsman, and all appeals are required to state the grounds on which the Ombudsman's decision is being appealed, and the reason or reasons why the appellant believes that the appeal should be upheld. All appeals are considered by the Press Council in accordance with these procedures, and there is no appeal from any decision of the Council.

Of the 53 decisions made by the Press Ombudsman in 2010, 27 were appealed to the Press Council. In three cases, both the complainant and the publication appealed the Press Ombudsman's decision.

Twenty-two appeals were submitted by complainants and eight by publications. Sixteen appeals were not admitted by the Press Council as the appellants did not meet the requirements noted above. Nine appeals were admitted (four by publications and five by complainants) and five other appeals (all by the complainants) were, at time of writing, with the Press Council for consideration.

Of the nine appeals admitted by the Press Council in 2010, eight (three by publications and five by complainants) were not upheld. One appeal, by a publication, was upheld.

The appeal that was upheld related to a complaint about two articles published in the Irish Daily Star covering the death in tragic circumstances of the complainant's father. The complainant's father had previously come to public attention after a high-profile incident involving a public figure. He had been hospitalised with a mental illness, and had subsequently taken his own life. The complainant maintained that the articles had not taken the feelings of the grieving family into account, as provided for in Principle 5.3 of the Code of Practice, particularly as the articles were published the day after the man was buried, and the family had not been contacted in advance of publication.

The Press Ombudsman’s decision was that while newspapers are entitled to inform the public of newsworthy but tragic events, Principle 5.3 of the Code provides that the feelings of grieving families should be taken into account when publishing such information in situations of personal grief or shock, and that this Principle was especially relevant in circumstances involving the extremely sensitive issues of mental health and suicide. He therefore upheld this part of the complaint.

The newspaper appealed the Press Ombudsman’s decision to the Press Council. The Press Council decided that the coverage was largely factual in nature and that it did not treat the tragic death unsympathetically. It therefore decided that while the timing of the report was unfortunate from the point of view of the family, the story was a current one, and the Council therefore upheld the publication’s appeal against the decision of the Press Ombudsman.
In December the Press Council of Ireland and Office of the Press Ombudsman hosted a one-day seminar on children and the media. A range of speakers outlined how newspaper reporting can impact on young children.

In his leading address, renowned Norwegian child psychologist, Professor Magne Raundalen, referred to the front pages of a newspaper as the “children’s pages”, because children were constantly exposed to them. Children, he said, were frightened by startling headlines, particularly those involving child deaths, and children who had suffered trauma in their lives could be particularly susceptible to long-term reactions “after seeing only one frightening front page”. In a wide-ranging address, he said that the brains of children subjected to long-term, low-grade fear are damaged by high levels of the cortisone hormone which may reduce their IQ by up to 10 per cent, and suggested that front pages of newspapers that scare children could breach Article 17 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which recognises the effects of the media on children.

The Children’s Ombudsman, Ms Emily Logan, responding to Professor Raundalen’s address, said that his presentation had been very useful in helping towards the creation of international standards of best practice where children and the media were concerned. She outlined five principles which she believed were particularly important in this regard: a recognition of the power that the media had to play a more positive role on issues relating to the violation of children’s rights; the role of the media as an educational force; the importance of children’s integrity, particularly issues surrounding the publication of names and family histories where this was unnecessary or even harmful; the need to protect children, especially vulnerable children, against exposure to harmful information; and finally, in the light of Article 12 of the Declaration on the Rights of the Child, the importance of children participating in matters that affected their own welfare.

Catherine Ghent, a solicitor with wide experience of children’s legal issues, commented on what she saw as the failure of the legal system to adequately vindicate the rights of some of the most vulnerable children coming before the courts. She spoke passionately about her criminal defence and child care work on behalf of children, outlining instances where child protection services were badly under-resourced, to the detriment of the most vulnerable of children. She said it was inexcusable that vulnerable children who were abused or neglected did not get sufficient intervention either at an early stage or throughout the court process, and that Gardaí and social workers often expressed their frustration in dealing with children in circumstances where lack of resources put the safety and welfare of children at risk.

The Legal Editor of the *Irish Independent*, Dearbhail McDonald, argued for the need to change the current in-camera rules that apply to family law cases in a way that would strike a balance between protecting children and the public interest. She called for the veil of secrecy to be lifted from family law cases to enhance public confidence in the family law courts, to enable scrutiny of the wide powers of discretion given to judges, and to promote proper public debate that will in turn lead to better-informed social and legal policies in this area. She said that reporting of family law cases could be done without jeopardising the anonymity and privacy of those involved.

Maria Corbett of the Children’s Rights Alliance discussed a number of children’s rights under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. She outlined how the media could help raise public awareness of a hidden issue or a violation of children’s rights, and consequently help to exert public and political pressure for change in these areas. She said the media’s portrayal of children could have a profound effect on the general attitude towards children, and that caution should be exercised not to demonise, patronise or sensationalise the reporting of stories involving children.
Dr Paul Connors of the Health Service Executive (HSE) agreed that the media played a crucial role in the reporting of children’s stories, but he said he believed there was sometimes a conflict between the privacy that is owed to children and children’s rights. He said that 90 per cent of children within the HSE’s care were in foster care, and that perhaps insufficient media attention was being given to how the system is working positively in this and a lot of other areas. He questioned the benefit to young and vulnerable children in care of some media reporting, and expressed a fear that some young people might not come forward if they think that they will get publicity of this kind. He said that, when reporting on children in care, the media should ascertain what the impact would be on the child, on the child’s family, on foster parents and on health care employees. He said that in all reportage on children’s issues, the benchmark before publishing should be “what is in the best interests of the child”.

Fergus Finlay, CEO of Barnardos, said the needs of children might demand more publicity, but the needs of the child might not. For instance, he said, in their fundraising campaign they needed to use real stories about children, but of course they did not allow media access to the families concerned, because families were vulnerable and not prepared for the consequences. Public policy had failed children who had been abused in institutions, but the abuse would never have come to light but for campaigners who refused to lie down, and for the media who had covered their stories. He argued that a proper system of standards and inspections was required for children in care, and that the media were not there to protect the integrity of the system, but to highlight failures in it. He said that if failures were not highlighted in public, and if the media ignored matters such as child poverty, things would remain hidden and change would not take place.
The year under review showed a degree of consistency, in terms of activity, with previous years.

Although the number of complaints received, at 315, was similar to previous years, more complaints were formally investigated, and there was an increase in the number of complaints on which the Press Ombudsman had to make a decision.

There are always difficulties in assessing or analysing figures like these. A decrease in complaints could be interpreted as evidence that people are more satisfied with their newspapers and magazines – or that the public is insufficiently aware of the existence of the Press Ombudsman. An increase in complaints, on the other hand, could be interpreted as evidence that the public is more aware of the Press Ombudsman – or that standards may have slipped. There are many significant and unmeasurable variables: in time, some discernible patterns may begin to emerge.

It is important to remember that the Office of the Press Ombudsman will always endeavour to resolve complaints through a process of conciliation between the editor of the publication and the complainant. This might be done in a number of ways – for instance, by the publication of a correction, clarification or apology, by the publication of a right of reply, by the publication of a letter to the editor or a private letter of apology. A decision as to whether or not the Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines has been breached is made only where a conciliation of this kind cannot be reached. This is in line with much current legal thinking on the value of mediation and conciliation in conflict resolution.

In one-third of the 53 complaints that were the subject of decisions by the Press Ombudsman, the publication took, or offered to take, sufficient remedial action to resolve the complaint. It is important to recognise that when the Press Ombudsman decides that an editor has made an offer of sufficient remedial action to resolve a complaint under the Code of Practice, this involves a recognition by both the editor and the Press Ombudsman that – even though no formal decision is made about a possible breach of the Code – the complaint had merit.

Where a formal decision is made that there have been breaches of the Code of Practice, the editors concerned must publish that decision: this is a substantial sanction.

The fact that issues related to accuracy and privacy continue to be reflected in a very substantial number of complaints, as has been the case in previous years, offers at least some evidence of the high value that members of the public place on such matters. Where accuracy is concerned, it should also be noted that newspapers and other publications frequently and without difficulty publish corrections of factual inaccuracies drawn to their attention by those about whom they write, but without the need for any involvement by this Office – which is as it should be. It should not be forgotten, however, that the factual content of most member publications, representing a great deal of material published on a daily, weekly or monthly basis, is, by and large, unchallenged.

Privacy is an equally complex area, and one in which no two situations are identical. This is why the relevant Principles of the Code of Practice, particularly Principle 5, are necessarily general in tone. It is also an area in which cultural considerations are very relevant: what is considered an appropriate protection for privacy in Ireland might be considered unduly restrictive in a different culture or tradition, and different cultures have different degrees of protection for individual privacy. The important aspect of the Code of Practice, in this context, relates to the exceptions that can be made, particularly in relation to privacy, for the disclosure of information that is demonstrably in the public interest but which would, otherwise, be a breach of the Code. Interpreted realistically and with common sense, this qualification of the right to privacy, as defined in the Code, also embodies an important defence of the freedom of the press, which the Press Ombudsman, as well as the Press Council of Ireland, is committed to uphold.
The function of the Press Ombudsman is primarily one of investigating and making decisions about complaints from members of the public relating to articles in newspapers and magazines that are members of the Press Council of Ireland. It is worth remembering, however, that he does so not only in the light of the ten Principles of the Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines, but also in the context of the Preamble to the Code. The Preamble states that while members of the press have a duty to maintain the highest professional and ethical standards, the freedom of the press “includes the right of a newspaper to publish what it considers to be news, without fear or favour, and the right to comment upon it.” The Press Ombudsman is therefore entrusted with the task of balancing the rights of the press as expressed in the Preamble to the Code of Practice against the rights of the individual as expressed in the Principles of the Code itself.

The highest percentage of complaints received during the year were about Principle 1 (Truth and Accuracy) and Principle 5 (Privacy) of the Code of Practice.

**Principle 1 (Truth and Accuracy)**

While the huge volume of information presented by the print media generally on a daily, sometimes even hourly, basis (i.e. via their websites) reflects a high level of factual accuracy, mistakes inevitably occur. When publications publish significantly inaccurate statements about individuals, even though the publication of the statements may have been inadvertent and may not have been the result of any failure to take reasonable care in checking facts before publication, the question of a breach of the Code of Practice arises.

In cases where a proven factual inaccuracy has been published as something said by or attributed to a third party, it is reasonable for the complainant to be offered an opportunity to set the record straight.

However, where such an inaccuracy is not attributed to a third party but has been published with the full authority of the publication itself, both the letter and the spirit of the Code imply strongly that there is a requirement for the publication to acknowledge publicly that a mistake was made, and to make the necessary correction itself with the same degree of authority. Offering merely to publish something which could be interpreted by the public as nothing more than an alternative version of reality that the publication does not necessarily accept, could in some situations fall considerably short of the unambiguous requirement of Principle 1. The Code also implies that, when appropriate, a correction, retraction or an apology might also be expected.

A number of decisions during the year underlined the primary responsibilities of publications under Principle 1 of the Code of Practice.

Principle 1.2 states that “where a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report or picture has been published, it shall be corrected promptly and with due prominence.” The significant word here is “corrected”. A clarification is the appropriate remedy for something that was ambiguous or unclear. A correction is the appropriate remedy for something that was inaccurate.

In “Geraghty and the Sunday Independent,” the complaint was made about an article that contained a significant factual inaccuracy. The newspaper did not dispute the complainant’s view that the article was factually incorrect in one key respect, and a “clarification” that it offered to publish included a substantial part of a wording suggested by the complainant. However, the complainant declined to accept the proffered clarification as an adequate response to his complaint. The complaint was upheld by the Press Ombudsman on the grounds that the newspaper’s offer represented an inadequate response to a complaint about the prominent publication of a significant factual error.

**Principle 5 (Privacy)**

Some of the decisions on privacy made during the year were in response to a number of complaints relating to the circumstances surrounding a murder trial, and the media attention given to a particular witness in that trial. Much of this media attention, although unwelcome to the person involved, was an inevitable concomitant of the trial itself and, in that specific context, was adjudged not to amount to a breach of the complainant’s privacy under the Code of Practice.
In the decision “Treacy and the Sunday World” the Press Ombudsman set out his reasoning for not upholding the complaint as follows: “Outside the immediate context of the criminal trial, the complainant was, and remains, a private citizen. However, in the immediate context of this trial, the personal information published about her in this article was generally inconsequential and of a type that can reasonably be regarded as a legitimate subject for journalistic enquiry.”

This decision, and other similar decisions, leave open – as they must – the question of whether press coverage of the same individual at a different time or in different circumstances, could also be regarded as a legitimate subject for journalistic enquiry, or whether the application of Principle 5 of the Code of Practice might, in a different context, lead to a different decision. For instance, in the decision “Treacy and the Irish Daily Mail” the Press Ombudsman made it clear that the freedom of the press, as defined in the Code, is not a blank cheque, and this complaint was upheld on the grounds that the amount of detail published about the complainant’s working life and the address where she worked was, despite her public involvement in the trial, in breach of Principle 5.

**Privacy and sympathy and discretion**

Although Principle 5 is concerned primarily with the privacy rights of living persons, sub-section 3 of that Principle enjoins “sympathy and discretion” on publications seeking or publishing information in situations of personal grief or shock. This has an obvious bearing on reports of death in tragic circumstances, or when the bereaved family may feel that publication of some details about the deceased is an unwarranted reflection on his or her character. At the same time, the freedom of the press, as emphasised in the Code of Practice, and its right to report matters that are of public record or in the public interest, may on occasion tip the balance the other way.

One significant example of this was the case of “A Woman and the Western People”, where a complaint was made by a family member about a report of a person’s death that recalled that person’s serious criminal conviction of some decades earlier. This was the subject of a decision by the Press Ombudsman that the publication’s offer to meet relatives of the deceased and discuss their concerns (which was rejected by the complainant) was sufficient action on its part to resolve the complaint.

Nonetheless, the complaint underlined the fact that, in the age of digitised publications and electronically searchable archives, the public record can on occasion stretch back far beyond the normal span of human memory. Even where the information retrieved from such archives is correct, and is publishable under the provisions of the Code of Practice, editorial judgment and discretion will always be involved, as it is in all significant editorial decisions.

**Privacy and photographs**

Privacy considerations also arise in relation to the publication of photographs. People who are in the news, however briefly and for whatever reason, may regard the publication of any photograph of them to be a breach of their privacy. The Code of Practice, however, is quite clear on this. If the photograph has not been obtained by misrepresentation or harassment, and has not been taken of a person in a private place and without their consent, its publication is not, of itself, evidence of a breach of the Code. However, the Code also states that the right to privacy should not prevent publication of matters of public record or in the public interest.

In the case “O’Donoghue and the Sunday World”, the publication of photographs of the complainant taken from the internet were found not to be a breach of Principle 5 of the Code.

**Privacy and the internet**

The internet itself is coming more to the fore, as publications mine its riches in their ceaseless quest to add value to news stories and features. In two instances, blogs featured prominently in articles that were the subject of complaints.

In one case, “Schregardus and Irish Mail on Sunday”, use was made by a reporter of a complainant’s blog in a way that evidently embarrassed the complainant. The newspaper subsequently published a clarification which, in the opinion of the Press Ombudsman, was sufficient remedial action on its part to resolve the complaint.
Similar considerations were involved in another complaint “Bopp and the Irish Mail on Sunday,” but in this case there was a different outcome: the complaint was not upheld. This was because, in the opinion of the Press Ombudsman, much of the material complained about had been adequately sourced by the newspaper from the complainant’s public Facebook page and his Twitter account.

Both of these complaints, and their outcomes, underline the risks run by members of the public who blithely put material into the public domain, heedless of the potential consequences of media interest in their activities. The web is, by and large, rarely a private space.

Other determinations

Of course, it is not always immediately obvious that a breach of the Code of Practice has taken place, although a complaint may have merit and therefore may warrant investigation. Publications which, at their discretion, respond to such complaints by offering space for the publication of views opposing their own editorial stances or those of their columnists – and not only in the “letters to the editor” page – enhance the freedom of the press generally.

A noteworthy example of this was in the case of “Irish Stem Cell Foundation and The Irish Times”, where a complaint was made about an article on stem cell treatments, which the complainant maintained was an inaccurate reflection of contemporary scientific research. As the Press Ombudsman is not equipped to make an informed determination on such highly complex scientific matters, the offer made by the newspaper to the complainant of space for an article to express a different point of view to that advanced by the newspaper’s columnists was adjudged to be a sufficient response on its part to resolve the complaint.

Similarly, in the case of “A Doctor and the Irish Daily Mail”, where a complaint was made about the newspaper’s coverage of a medical conference which the complainant had attended, the newspaper’s offer to publish a letter from the complainant expressing his disagreement with what he felt were the unflattering implications of its report about events at the medical conference was also deemed to be a sufficient response to resolve the complaint, even though it was not acceptable to the complainant.

In some cases in which there are irreconcilable differences between complainants and publications about the presentation of certain information, about emphasis, or about contested claims, it is simply not possible, in the absence of persuasive corroborative evidence, for the Ombudsman to come to a firm decision on the evidence available, especially as he is reliant on evidence made available by the parties concerned on a voluntary basis.

The Press Ombudsman decided, for this reason, that he was unable to make a decision about a complaint in the case of “O’Donoghue and the Irish Daily Star.” This complaint claimed that a statement in the article was inaccurate, but no decision could be made because there was insufficient evidence available to demonstrate the accuracy or otherwise of the statement concerned.

The above examples represent only a small fraction of the 53 complaints that were the subject of formal investigation and decision by the Press Ombudsman in the course of 2010. Full details of these, of conciliated complaints, and of the other determinations made are available on the website of the Office of the Press Ombudsman at www.pressombudsman.ie. Each of them marks, in its own way, a stage in the evolution of the application of the Code of Practice for Newspapers and Magazines. In the three years that have elapsed since the Office of the Press Ombudsman registered its first formal complaint, the Code has shown itself to be a remarkably well-designed instrument for dealing with a wide range of complex situations, for defending the rights of individuals, and for upholding the freedom of the press.
In 2010 the Press Council of Ireland and Press Ombudsman continued to seek as many opportunities as possible to engage with the public so as to ensure that their services are as well known as possible across the country. The Office is committed to publicising its services as widely as possible, and to expanding its outreach programme to as many people and areas as its limited resources will allow.

The Press Council and Press Ombudsman held two very important public seminars, one at the beginning of the year on privacy and the media and one towards the end on children and the media. These seminars resulted in very lively debates on two very important current topics in the Irish media. Admission to Press Council and Press Ombudsman seminars is free, and all members of the public are welcome to attend.

Some of the principal engagements undertaken by the Press Ombudsman, and others where specified, in 2010 were:

**January**
Seminar on privacy and the media, Cork

**February**
Lecture to Journalism Society, Dublin City University

**March**
Guest lecture, University College Dublin
Guest lecture to journalism students, Griffith College, Cork
Speaker at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Conference in Montenegro on press freedom and regulation

**May**

**June**
Address to members of Magazines Ireland, Dublin (Case Officer, Bernie Grogan)

**August**
Parnell Summer School, Wicklow

**September**
Panellist on “Press Regulation”, International Press Institute World Congress, Vienna
Address to the National Union of Journalists (NUJ) Regional Forum, Westmeath (Case Officer, Bernie Grogan)
Delegate to the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OCSE) Conference in Baku, Azerbaijan (Martin Fitzpatrick, member, Press Council of Ireland)

**October**
Guest lecture to journalism, media and law students, National University of Ireland, Galway
Cleraun Media Conference, Dublin
Hosted visit from group of Norwegian journalists to Dublin

**November**
Delegate to Conference of Alliance of Independent Press Councils of Europe (AIPCE), Amsterdam (Case Officer, Bernie Grogan, and Chairman, Dáithí O’Ceallaigh)
Chaired Atlantic Philanthropies Seminar, Dublin

**December**
Seminar on children and the media, Dublin

Guest lecture on Irish media to students from Augusta State 2009 Annual Report launch, Dublin
Complainants often cite more than one Principle of the Code of Practice when making their complaint, which is why the number of Principles cited is higher than the number of complaints received.

As in previous years, the largest number of complaints were submitted under Principle 1 of the Code in relation to truth and accuracy, followed closely by complaints under Principle 5 about privacy.

The full text of the Code of Practice is printed on page 19.
Resolved informally
Complaints resolved informally are those complaints where, on the advice and with the assistance of the Office, the complainant contacted the editor of the publication directly and the complaint was resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant without the necessity for the Office to become formally involved.

File closed
During the year, two files were closed as legal proceedings had been initiated about the subject-matter of the complaint, and five files were closed as the complainant decided, after the Office had contacted the editor of the publication, not to pursue the matter any further.

Appeals received
Three complaints were appealed by both the complainant and the publication. Two of these were in respect of complaints upheld by the Press Ombudsman, and one in respect of a complaint that was not upheld.
Complaint not pursued beyond preliminary enquiry by complainant
While 98 complainants who received advice and assistance from the Office of the Press Ombudsman did not pursue their complaint beyond a preliminary enquiry, it is not possible to establish the exact number of these complaints that would have been satisfactorily resolved, as all complainants are advised to contact the editor directly in the first instance, and there is evidence that a number of complaints have been resolved satisfactorily through such contact (see figure for complaints resolved informally in the chart on page 16).

No prima facie evidence of a breach of the Code of Practice
When submitting their complaint, complainants must indicate how and why they believe the article under complaint breached the Code of Practice. If the complaint does not present sufficient evidence that the Code may have been breached, the complaint will not be considered.

Unauthorised third party
Unauthorised third party complaints were mainly from people who complained about an article where another person or persons were named, but who did not have the required consent of that person or persons to make a complaint.

Miscellaneous complaints
Miscellaneous complaints included complaints about the non-publication of letters to the editor, the non-publication of an article submitted to a newspaper, a complaint that a newspaper might publish certain material and the non-reporting of a local court case.
While the highest proportion of complaints were made about national newspapers, this is not surprising, as it reflects their frequency of publication and their substantial circulation figures.

All member publications are listed on pages 21 to 25. The Press Council is continuing its strong campaign to encourage all newspapers and magazines published on a regular basis to become members.

The majority of complaints received claimed a breach of the Code of Practice.

Complaints that fell outside the remit of the Office are outlined on page 17.

When submitting a complaint, complainants are asked to outline how and why they believe the Code of Practice was breached. Where a complainant cannot provide adequate prima facie evidence of a possible breach of the Code of Practice, the complaint will not be considered by the Office. This could be the case, for example, where somebody complains about the views expressed in an article which is published as an opinion piece and the views are quite obviously expressed as those of the writer, or where somebody complains about a court report but there is no evidence that the material complained about is unfair or inaccurate.

---

### Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National newspaper</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated by complainant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional newspaper</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member publication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of complaint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Complaint</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Code</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside remit</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruled out on first reading</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member publication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the highest proportion of complaints were made about national newspapers, this is not surprising, as it reflects their frequency of publication and their substantial circulation figures.
Preamble

The freedom to publish is vital to the right of the people to be informed. This freedom includes the right of a newspaper to publish what it considers to be news, without fear or favour, and the right to comment upon it.

Freedom of the press carries responsibilities. Members of the press have a duty to maintain the highest professional and ethical standards. This Code sets the benchmark for those standards.

It is the duty of the Press Ombudsman and Press Council of Ireland to ensure that it is honoured in the spirit as well as in the letter, and the duty of publications to assist them in that task.

In dealing with complaints, the Ombudsman and Press Council will give consideration to what they perceive to be the public interest. It is for them to define the public interest in each case, but the general principle is that the public interest is invoked in relation to a matter capable of affecting the people at large so that they may legitimately be interested in receiving and the press legitimately interested in providing information about it.

Principle 1 – Truth and Accuracy

1.1 In reporting news and information, newspapers and magazines shall strive at all times for truth and accuracy. 1.2 When a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report or picture has been published, it shall be corrected promptly and with due prominence. 1.3 When appropriate, a retraction, apology, clarification, explanation or response shall be published promptly and with due prominence.

Principle 2 – Distinguishing Fact and Comment

2.1 Newspapers and magazines are entitled to advocate strongly their own views on topics. 2.2 Comment, conjecture, rumour and unconfirmed reports shall not be reported as if they were fact. 2.3 Readers are entitled to expect that the content of a publication reflects the best judgment of editors and writers and has not been inappropriately influenced by undisclosed interests. Wherever relevant, any significant financial interest of an organisation should be disclosed. Writers should disclose significant potential conflicts of interest to their editors.

Principle 3 – Fairness and Honesty

3.1 Newspapers and magazines shall strive at all times for fairness and honesty in the procuring and publishing of news and information. 3.2 Publications shall not obtain information, photographs or other material through misrepresentation or subterfuge, unless justified by the public interest. 3.3 Journalists and photographers must not obtain, or seek to obtain, information and photographs through harassment, unless their actions are justified in the public interest.

Principle 4 – Respect for Rights

Everyone has constitutional protection for his or her good name. Newspapers and magazines shall not knowingly publish matter based on malicious misrepresentation or unfounded accusations, and must take reasonable care in checking facts before publication.

Principle 5 – Privacy

5.1 Privacy is a human right, protected as a personal right in the Irish Constitution and the European Convention on Human Rights, which is incorporated into Irish law. The private and family life, home and correspondence of everyone must be respected. 5.2 Readers are entitled to have news and comment presented with respect for the privacy and sensibilities of individuals. However, the right to privacy should not prevent publication of matters of public record or in the public interest. 5.3 Sympathy and discretion must be shown at all times in seeking information in situations of personal grief or shock. In publishing such information, the feelings of grieving families should be taken into account. This should not be interpreted as restricting the right to report judicial proceedings. 5.4 Public persons are entitled to privacy. However, where a person holds public office, deals with public affairs, follows a public career, or has sought or obtained publicity for his activities, publication of relevant details of his private life and circumstances may be justifiable where the information revealed relates to the validity of the person’s conduct, the credibility of his public statements, the value of his publicly expressed views or is otherwise in the public interest. 5.5 Taking photographs of individuals in private places without their consent is not acceptable, unless justified by the public interest.

Principle 6 – Protection of Sources

Journalists shall protect confidential sources of information.

Principle 7 – Court Reporting

Newspapers and magazines shall strive to ensure that court reports (including the use of photographs) are fair and accurate, and are not prejudicial to the right to a fair trial and that the presumption of innocence is respected.

Principle 8 – Prejudice

Newspapers and magazines shall not publish material intended or likely to cause grave offence or stir up hatred against an individual or group on the basis of their race, religion, nationality, colour, ethnic origin, membership of the travelling community, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, illness, or age.

Principle 9 – Children

9.1 Newspapers and magazines shall take particular care in seeking and presenting information or comment about a child under the age of 16. 9.2 Journalists and editors should have regard for the vulnerability of children, and in all dealings with children should bear in mind the age of the child, whether parental or other adult consent has been obtained for such dealings, the sensitivity of the subject-matter, and what circumstances if any make the story one of public interest. Young people should be free to complete their time at school without unnecessary intrusion. The fame, notoriety or position of a parent or guardian must not be used as sole justification for publishing details of a child’s private life.

Principle 10 – Publication of the Decision of the Press Ombudsman / Press Council

10.1 When requested or required by the Press Ombudsman and/or the Press Council to do so, newspapers and magazines shall publish the decision in relation to a complaint with due prominence. 10.2 The content of this Code will be reviewed at regular intervals.
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Finance Report

The finances of the Press Council of Ireland and the Office of the Press Ombudsman are provided, under the terms of its Articles of Association, by the Administrative Committee of the Press Council, which is chaired by an independent member of the Council.

The Administrative Committee is charged with making full provision for the administrative needs of the Press Council and of the Office of the Press Ombudsman including funding, premises, and staffing.

It meets six times a year, approves funding arrangements and budgets, and monitors expenditure.

The Press Council and the Office of the Press Ombudsman are fully funded by the print media in Ireland and each member title of the Council sold in the country is levied in accordance with its circulation.

The costs in 2010 of the Press Council and the Office of the Ombudsman together with the comparative figures for 2009 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll costs</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and establishment costs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications costs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>559</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Administrative Committee includes representatives of National Newspapers of Ireland, Irish editions of UK titles, Regional Newspapers and Printers Association of Ireland, Magazines Ireland, and the National Union of Journalists. Its current members are: Seamus Boland (Chairman), Seamus Dooley, Paul Cooke, Oliver Keenaghan, Geraldine Kennedy, Johnny O’Hanlon, Grace Aungier, Richard Hannaford, and Frank Cullen.
Member Publications 2010 – National Newspapers

Evening Herald
Independent House
27-32 Talbot Street, Dublin 1
T + 353 (0)1 705 5333
www.independent.ie

Irish Daily Mail
Associated Newspapers (Ireland)
3rd Floor Embassy House
Herbert Park Lane, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4
T + 353 (0)1 637 5800
www.dailymail.ie

Irish Daily Mirror
Park House, 4th Floor, 191-197 North Circular Road
Dublin 7
T + 353 (0)1 868 8600
www.mirror.co.uk

Irish Daily Star
Independent Star Ltd, Level 5, Building 4
Dundrum Town Centre, Sandyford Road
Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 490 1228
www.thestar.ie

Irish Daily Star Sunday
Independent Star Ltd, Level 5, Building 4
Dundrum Town Centre, Sandyford Road
Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 490 1228
www.thestar.ie

Irish Examiner
Examiner Publications (Cork) Ltd
City Quarter, Lapps Quay, Cork
T + 353 (0)21 427 2722
www.irishexaminer.ie

Irish Farmers Journal
Irish Farm Centre, Bluebell, Dublin 12
T + 353 (0)1 419 9599
www.farmersjournal.ie

Irish Independent
Independent House, 27-32 Talbot Street, Dublin 1
T + 353 (0)1 705 5333
www.independent.ie

Irish Mail on Sunday
Associated Newspapers (Ireland)
3rd Floor Embassy House
Herbert Park Lane, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4
T + 353 (0)1 637 5800
www.mailsonsounday.ie

Irish News of the World
4th Floor, Bishop’s Square
Redmond’s Hill, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 479 2500
www.newsoftheworld.co.uk

Irish Sun
4th Floor, Bishop’s Square
Redmond’s Hill, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 479 2579
www.thesun.ie

Irish Sunday Mirror
Park House, 4th Floor
191-197 North Circular Road, Dublin 7
T + 353 (0)1 868 8600
www.mirror.co.uk

Sunday Business Post
80 Harcourt Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 602 6000
www.sbbpost.ie

Sunday Independent
Independent House
27-32 Talbot Street, Dublin 1
T + 353 (0)1 705 5333
www.independent.ie

Sunday Tribune
15 Lower Baggot Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 631 4300
www.tribune.ie

Sunday World
5th Floor, Independent House
27-32 Talbot Street, Dublin 1
T + 353 (0)1 884 8973
www.sundayworld.ie

The Irish Times
The Irish Times Building
PO Box 74, 24-28 Tara Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 675 8000
www.irishtimes.com

The Sunday Times
4th Floor, Bishop’s Square
Redmond’s Hill, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 479 2424
www.sunday-times.ie
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Confetti 25 Real Weddings
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 416 7900 www.dyfin.ie

Construct Ireland - for a sustainable future
Temple Media Limited, PO Box 9688 Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 210 7512

Construction
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 416 7900 www.dyfin.ie

Construction Annual
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 416 7900 www.dyfin.ie

Co-op Ireland Directory
IFP Media, 31 Deansgrange Road
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 289 3305 www.ifpmedia.com

Decorate Extend and Renovate
Self Build Ireland Ltd
119 Cahard Road, Saintfield Co. Down, BT24 7JQ
T + 353 (048) 975 10790 www.decoratoreireland.ie

Dublin Port Yearbook
Tara Publishing Co. Ltd
Poolbeg House, 1-2 Poolbeg Street
Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 241 3000 www.retailnews.ie

Dundrum
Harmonia Ltd, Rosemount House
Dundrum Road, Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 240 5300 www.harmonia.ie

Easy Food
Zahra Publishing Ltd, 1st Floor
19 Railway Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 654 4015 www.easyfood.ie

Easy Health & Living
Zahra Publishing Ltd, 1st Floor
19 Railway Road, Dalkey, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 654 4015 www.easyhealth.ie

Eat Out Magazine
Harmonia Ltd, Rosemount House
Dundrum Road, Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 240 5300 www.harmonia.ie

Euro Times
ESCRS, Temple House, Temple Road Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 209 1100 www.eurotimes.org

FAL Guide to Euromac League
IFP Media, 31 Deansgrange Road
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 289 3305 www.ifpmedia.com

Flashback
Clubs And Soho Office
Dublin City University, Dublin 9

Food & Wine Magazine
Harmonia Ltd, Rosemount House
Dundrum Road, Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 240 5300 www.harmonia.ie

Food Ireland Yearbook & Directory
Tara Publishing Co. Ltd, Poolbeg House
1-2 Poolbeg Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 241 3000 www.retailnews.ie

Forage & Nutrition Guide
IFP Media, 31 Deansgrange Road
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 289 3305 www.ifpmedia.com

Franchise & Business Options
Mount Media Ltd
45 Upper Mount Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 661 1660

Gay Community News
Unit 2, Scarlet Row
Essex Street West, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 671 9076 www.gcn.ie

Golf Digest Ireland
Walton Media Ltd
2B Calmount Office Park
Ballymount, Dublin 12
T + 353 (0)1 645 1500 www.waltonmedia.com

Health Manager
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 416 7900 www.dyfin.ie

Hotpress
13 Trinity Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 241 1500 www.hotpress.ie

House and Home
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 416 7900 www.houseandhome.ie

HOUSE/architecture/design/garden/advise
Novan Publishing
19 Upper Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 295 9266 www.architectureireland.ie

Icarus
DR Publications, House Six
Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2
www.icarusmag.com

Image
Image Publications
Crofton Hall, 22 Crofton Road
Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 280 8415 www.image.ie

Image Interiors
Image Publications, Crofton Hall
22 Crofton Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 280 8415 www.image-interiors.ie

Ireland of the Welcomes
Harmonia Ltd, Rosemount House
Dundrum Road, Dundrum, Dublin 16
T + 353 (0)1 240 5300 www.harmonia.ie

Irish Auto Trade Yearbook & Diary
Glencree House, Lanesborough Road
Roscommon, Co. Roscommon
T + 353 (0)190 662 5676 www.autotrade.ie

Irish Bathrooms
Bayview Publishing, Horse House
57a Prospect Road, Bangor, BT20 9AR
www.bayviewpublishing.net

Irish Bodyshop Journal
Walton Media Ltd
2B Calmount Office Park
Ballymount, Dublin 12
T + 353 (0)1 645 1500 www.waltonmedia.com

Irish Farmer’s Monthly
IFP Media, 31 Deansgrange Road
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 289 3305 www.irishfarmersmonthly.com

Irish Food
IFP Media, 31 Deansgrange Road
Blackrock, Co. Dublin
T + 353 (0)1 289 3305 www.ifpmedia.com

Irish Hairdresser International
MOHH Publishing Ltd, P.O. Box 28
An Post Mail Centre, Athlone Co. Westmeath
T + 353 (0)187 998 9771 www.irishhairdresser.ie

Irish Kitchens
Bayview Publishing, Horse House
57a Prospect Road, Bangor, BT20 9AR
www.bayviewpublishing.net

Irish Kitchens and Bathrooms
Dyfin Media Ltd
First Floor, Cunningham House
130 Francis Street, Dublin 8
T + 353 (0)1 240 5300 www.dyfin.ie

Irish Marketing Journal
Media Team Ltd
45 Upper Mount Street, Dublin 2
T + 353 (0)1 661 1660 www.irishmarketingjournal.ie