



Commissioner's Report

2022-2023

Foreword from the Commissioner



The Code of Conduct for Councillors is designed to ensure public trust in local democracy through the promotion of good standards in public life. When debated and adopted by the Northern Ireland Assembly in 2014, the Code was seen as underpinning the additional powers and responsibilities given to local councillors and ensuring that a framework was provided to build public trust. As such my office was entrusted with that framework of accountability to ensure alleged breaches of the Code were independently investigated and adjudicated as appropriate. While slightly different in administration, this brought Northern Ireland in line with the other jurisdictions of the UK in both providing a clear code for local councillors and a means of public accountability for any proven breaches of that code.

The Code sets out the standards of behaviour expected from our local representatives and aims to ensure that those taking essential decisions for citizens in Northern Ireland are clear on the principles and actions which should underpin public life. The Code makes reference to the key principles of public life, the Nolan principles including leadership, selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, duty and respect. It also goes further and provides greater guidance for Councillors including their duties not to bring either themselves or their councils into disrepute, the need to give full consideration to declaration of interests and ensuring public debate remains both compliant with the law and respectful.

In my role as Commissioner I think it is important that my office engages with both councillors and senior council staff to promote an understanding of the Code and to provide support and training.

It is equally important that the public are aware of the Code and understand how to bring a complaint or allegation that it has been breached. To this end, during the last year my office undertook a number of surveys with councillors, senior council staff and complainants to understand their experience of the Code and of being subject to or bringing an allegation. I was encouraged that approximately one third of councillors responded, as well as over 40% of council senior staff and while the response from complainants was lower there was nonetheless important lessons for us. The detail of responses and issues are laid out in this report.

The Code, its relevance and impact remains a matter of importance for public life and my office has been particularly active in the current year in ensuring that newly elected local councillors understand their duties and responsibilities under it.

I understand that being subject to an allegation under the Code and to any subsequent investigation and adjudication is stressful and my office has worked hard to make this process more timely. I want to thank those councillors who have been subject to a complaint for their co-operation during the process.

I would further like to thank my staff at the Local Government Ethical Standards team for their hard work during the year as well as those who ensure the smooth running of adjudications. I would further thank both my assistant Commissioners for their dedication in ensuring that adjudications continue to run in a timely and independent manner.

Margaret Kelly
Commissioner

Introduction

As part of the reform of local government in Northern Ireland and the transfer of powers and function including planning to councils, a new standards regime including a mandatory Code of Conduct for councillors was introduced. The Code sets out standards of conduct and behaviour with the aim of ensuring confidence in local democratic decision making. The Local Government Commissioner for Standards provides guidance to assist councillors ensure they understand and comply with the Code and with the aim of improving ethical standards at local government level.

Where written allegations are made against a councillor that their conduct or behaviour has or may have breached the Code, the Commissioner has the authority to investigate and where appropriate adjudicate on those allegations.

The Commissioner has put in place a four-stage process for dealing with written allegations against a councillor to ensure a proportionate use of resources.

Where there is insufficient evidence of a breach of the Code, cases may be closed at either the assessment or investigation stage. In cases where an investigation indicates that there may have been a breach of the Code alternatives to an adjudication are considered prior to referring a case to the Commissioner.

The Commissioner has no role in the investigation of complaints and exercises her role separate to that of the investigation function, which is delegated to the Local Government Ethical Standards team. The separation between the investigation and adjudication functions ensures that should a case be referred to the Commissioner and she accepts it, that the issues raised as part of the investigation report are considered fairly and independently.

Only the Commissioner, after an Adjudication, can decide whether there has been a breach.

This report covers both the investigation and adjudication functions.

SECTION ONE

Investigations

Investigations

In 2022-23 the number of allegations raised against councillors remained broadly in line with the long-term trend. There were **45** written allegations that councillors may have breached rules within the Code of Conduct in 2022-23 compared to **42** written allegations received in 2021-22, and the five year mean of **47** allegations.

Cases determined in 2022-23

In addition to the **45** allegations received during the year, **63** cases were carried forward from 2021-22 giving a caseload of **108** allegations. A total of **63** allegations were determined in year, leaving **45** cases carried forward into 2023-24. This continues the improvement in the number of decisions made and in removing the backlog of cases.

The Investigation team seek to ensure that decisions are taken on allegations as early as possible with consideration given to whether there is the opportunity to resolve allegations by alternative action thereby avoiding the time and expense of an adjudication. The breakdown of the stage of closure was as follows:

- **14** were closed at the Initial Assessment Stage, which looks at whether the allegations relate to conduct covered by the Code.
- **16** were closed at the Assessment Stage which looks at whether there is evidence of conduct which, if proven, indicates a breach of the Code.
- **29** were closed at the Investigation Stage, where it was decided that there was no evidence of any failure to comply with the Code.
- **4** cases were closed by Alternative Action.

In addition 4 cases were referred to the Commissioner with a request that she consider an Adjudication on the issues raised.

Caseload

	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20
Written complaints received in year	45	42	48	41

Closed Cases

	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20
Closed at Initial Assessment stage	14	12	4	9
Closed at Assessment stage	16	11	10	13
Closed at Investigation stage	29	16	9	10
Closed by Alternative Action at investigation	4	5	0	10

Issues Raised

Similar to previous years the largest area of concern raised in the allegations received related to the behaviour of councillors towards others. A total of **26** issues were raised about councillors' behaviour. This compared to **29** issues about behaviour towards others being raised in 2021-22.

The standards of behaviour towards others are covered in Section 4.13 of the Code, which states that councillors must:

- Show respect and consideration for others;
- Not use bullying behaviour or harass any person; and
- Not do anything which compromises, or which is likely to compromise the impartiality of those who work for, or on behalf of, the council.

Politics at a local level can lead to robust debate and the Code of Conduct does not prevent this, however there is an expectation that debates are respectful and should focus

on the issues and not involve comments regarding political opponents. Concerns raised about the behaviour of councillors include comments made both at council meetings and on social media.

The second largest area of concern (**21**) raised in the allegations related to the sections of the Code of Conduct relating to obligations as a councillor.

This section requires councillors to act lawfully, in accordance with the Code, and not to act in a manner which could bring their position as a councillor, or their council, into disrepute.

Other issues of concern related to use of position (**6**), issues around disclosure and declaration of interests, issues related to planning, and decision making.

It should be remembered that more than one person may make the same or similar complaint, and a complainant may allege that more than one area of the code has been breached.

Written Allegations Received - by Basis of Complaint

	2022-23	2021-22
Obligations as a Councillor (requirement to act lawfully and not bring council/position of councillor into disrepute)	21	22
Behaviour towards other people (requirement to show respect and consideration for others)	26	29
Use of position	6	6
Disclosure of information	1	0
Decision-making	1	3
Use of council resources	1	0
Registration of Interests	0	0
Disclosure & Declaration of Interests	1	4
Lobbying and access to councillors	0	0
Planning matters	12*	5
Total issues	69	69

*One person made the same allegation against 12 councillors who were members of the Planning Committee

Written Allegations Received by Council Area

	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21
Antrim & Newtownabbey Borough Council	4	6	4
Mid and East Antrim Council	12	17	6
Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon Borough Council	0	1	2
Belfast City Council	2	0	3
Causeway Coast and Glens Council	1	2	17
Derry and Strabane Council	0	0	2
Fermanagh and Omagh Council	8	6	11
Mid Ulster Council	2	1	2
Newry, Mourne and Down Council	14	5	1
Ards and North Down Council	0	0	0
Lisburn and Castlereagh Council	2	4	0
Total	45	42	48

Performance

The Commissioner has established two Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) for the Investigation team. The first KPI establishes a target for the timeframe within which a decision should be made on whether an allegation should progress to investigation. The second target sets a timescale for completion of the investigation and reporting to the councillor on the outcome of that investigation.

The target for the decision on whether to conduct an investigation is that within 4 weeks of a valid allegation being received to tell the person making the allegation and the relevant councillor whether it will be investigated in 85% of cases.

In 2022-23 this KPI was met in **93%** of complaints, against the target of 85%. This marked a considerable improvement from the position in 2021-22 where achievement against this target was 69%.

In the second KPI the team aim in **60%** of cases to complete the investigation within 40 weeks of the complaint being received. In 2022-23, **86%** of investigations were completed within this timeframe.



Case Summaries

Complaint about 'sectarian rant' comment not accepted for investigation

A councillor claimed that another councillor had breached the Code of Conduct by referring to his comments at a committee meeting as 'a sectarian rant.'

He said the councillor refused to retract his comments, which he believed were insulting, malicious, and defamatory.

The phrase 'sectarian rant' was made in response to the councillor's statement about the council favouring certain organisations when it came to the allocation of money.

The complaint was considered against the Code of Conduct and the Commissioner's Guidance on the Code. The latter states:

'Challenges to ideas and opinions are part of the political landscape. It is unlikely that the lawful expression of such political views would lead to a finding of a breach of the Code for failing to show respect and consideration for others.'

The assessment of the complaint also took into account whether the comments were unlawful or highly offensive, and whether the conduct complained of was likely to diminish the trust and confidence the public places in a councillor or the council.

Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights also gives enhanced protection to comments which relate to political issues. As councillors or other politicians knowingly lay themselves open to close scrutiny of their words and deeds, they are expected to possess a thicker skin and greater tolerance than ordinary members of the public.

This means that in the political context councillors are expected to tolerate a degree of provocative, emotive, or even aggressive language that would not be acceptable elsewhere.

The assessment concluded that as the phrase 'sectarian rant' was used in a public debate at a council meeting it attracted the protection of political speech. The complaint was not accepted for investigation.

Complaint settled with apology from councillor

A council employee complained that a councillor's conduct towards him during a training session was intimidating and aggressive.

He also said on a separate occasion the councillor had referred to a confidential matter about him in front of others, leaving him feeling threatened and undermined.

It was decided that the complaint should be dealt with under the Commissioner's Alternative Action Policy, which states that complaints can be considered in this way if the Deputy Commissioner thinks it may be the most efficient, effective and proportionate means of finding a resolution. It can also be used if a councillor is likely to be found in breach of the Code but it is not likely to result in the Commissioner applying a significant sanction.

After looking at the evidence it was decided that the councillor should apologise to the man in writing for the comment made at the training session, and for breaching confidentiality at a later event.

The councillor also agreed to undertake training in relation to behaviour towards other people, and on disclosure of information.

Councillor apologises for 'liking' offensive Facebook post

A councillor alleged that another councillor had breached the Code of Conduct by 'liking' what he described as a 'vulgar, offensive and degrading' post about him on Facebook.

Screenshots of the relevant posts were provided as evidence.

The councillor explained to the investigating officer that he 'liked' the post but said this was unintentional. He said that once he became aware what he had done he 'unliked' it.

The Deputy Commissioner decided that, given the cost and resource implications of further investigation, Alternative Action was the most effective and proportionate way of resolving the complaint.

The councillor was therefore asked to apologise for liking the comment, and the case was closed.

Investigation finds no conflict of interest breach by councillor

A man complained that a councillor failed to declare a conflict of interest when voting against his planning application at the council's Planning Committee.

The man said that the councillor objected to the application because he was a party colleague of a former councillor who had also previously opposed the plans.

The allegation was assessed and forwarded for investigation.

Paragraph 6.4 of the Code states: "You must declare any significant private or personal non-pecuniary interest in a matter as soon as it becomes apparent. You must then withdraw from any council meeting (including committee or sub-committee meeting) when the matter is being discussed. It is your own personal responsibility to determine, having regard to council advice and guidance, whether you have any such interest."

The Commissioner's Guidance on the Code also states that councillors must declare an interest in non-financial issues if others might reasonably believe they would benefit from a decision on the matter.

The Investigating Officer reviewed the minutes and audio of the planning meeting as well as the documents on the Planning Portal relating to two applications on the site. It was found that while the former councillor did object to a related planning application several years earlier, he did not lodge any objection to the one which gave rise to the complaint.

The councillor whose actions were complained about failed to appear for interview to explain whether he had discussed the application with the former councillor. The Deputy Commissioner therefore reminded him of his obligations under the Code to participate in the investigation process.

However, the investigation concluded that the councillor was not aware of any issues between the former councillor and the man who made the complaint.

The case was therefore closed as there was no evidence of a failure to comply with the Code.

Surveys

We carried out three surveys during the reporting year. They aimed to help us develop our role in promoting and regulating the Code and the best ways of sharing learning from our case work.


1. The first survey was issued to councillors in each of the 11 local councils.
2. The second survey was sent to individuals who made an allegation about a councillor breaching the Code within the preceding 5 years.
3. The third survey was sent to council CEOs, senior council staff, and other relevant local government agencies with an interest in the Code.

Overall a third of those invited to participate in the survey (181 individuals) took the time to respond, providing us with some useful insights. The key findings from the three surveys are outlined below:

1. Councillors

148 (32%) councillors responded to the survey and all 11 councils were represented.

In terms of training and support, although over 80% of the councillors surveyed were aware of the Commissioner's Guidance, they felt that participating in information sessions was the most useful way to learn about the Code and the role of the Commissioner.



Councillors reported that going forward, refresher training sessions and sharing the learning from case work would help with their understanding of the Code. Others asked for more face-to-face interaction with the Office and increased engagement.

Not every councillor who responded had experience of the assessment and investigation process. Those who did asked for more communication throughout the process, more timely investigations, and highlighted that being the subject of a complaint can be stressful.

There were mixed responses from councillors who had experience of the early resolution process, which aims to resolve a complaint without an investigation. Some councillors said it worked satisfactorily while others would have liked a more detailed process.

Some used the survey to express their dissatisfaction with some requirements of the Code itself, although responsibility for the Code rests with the Department for Communities.

None of the councillors who responded offered comments on the adjudication process.

2. Individuals who made allegations of a breach.

15 people who made allegations about breaches of the Code responded to this survey.

There was mixed feedback about the process of making a complaint. Whilst many found it relatively straightforward, a few people did highlight difficulties with the form and asked that it be made more user-friendly.

The survey showed a low awareness of the need for investigations to be carried out in private, leading to raised expectations of the amount of information that can be provided.

3. Council CEOs and staff/other relevant agencies

The response rate for this survey was 44%, the majority of whom were council CEO's and senior council officers. In addition 3 responses were also received from other organisations in the local government sector.

Most of the organisations surveyed provided some form of support for councillors on the Code of Conduct. This included in-house training, commissioning, or hosting training from an outside organisation, in-house legal support, and access to other resources.

84% said engagement with councils and councillors was the best way of raising awareness and understanding of the Code. Others suggested training sessions on specific issues (79%), and engagement with political parties (74%).

Key findings

Overall, respondents said that the staff they had come into contact with were helpful, professional, and easy to contact. However some commented that the process was too slow and needed to be more user-friendly.

Respondents highlighted the need for more communication with those raising the allegation, along with clearer explanations of decisions and outcomes.

The Commissioner's Guidance and induction training were identified as useful resources for understanding the Code, but there was also a demand for more bespoke training on specific issues (e.g., social media, conflicts of interest and the Code itself).



There was a clear demand for more direct engagement between the office with councils and councillors and more in-person interaction with people who make an allegation, instead of the use of email or letter.

Next Steps

The surveys were a valuable exercise in helping us to understand where we are doing things well and where we need to improve.

We are developing a range of resources to help councillors understand the Code of Conduct, including redesign of our website, a re-issued guide to the use of social media, and a refreshed Commissioner's Guide.

As part of our engagement plan we will also continue to meet with elected members and senior Council officials to promote better awareness and understanding of the Code.



SECTION TWO

Adjudications

When an investigation is completed by the Deputy Commissioner and the evidence indicates a breach of the Code of Conduct, the Deputy Commissioner can request that that the Commissioner consider adjudicating on the issues. Having reviewed the referral from the Deputy Commissioner the Commissioner decides what action needs to be taken including whether she should adjudicate on the alleged breaches included in the Deputy Commissioner's report. The Commissioner can decide not to proceed with an adjudication or take other action to resolve the matter as she considers appropriate.

Adjudication Caseload

	Totals
Cases ongoing at start of year	7
Cases referred in year	0
Cases accepted in year	0
Cases ongoing at year end	3
Pre-Hearing Reviews completed	33
Adjudication decisions	4

Adjudication decisions

Decision	Total
No breach	0
Breach – No Further Action	0
Breach – Alternative action	1
Breach – Censure	0
Breach – Suspension – full or partial	2
Breach – Disqualification	1
Total decisions	4

Councillor suspended over abusive Tweets

Councillor Marc Collins (Mid and East Antrim Borough Council), was suspended from his role as a councillor for 8 months following an Adjudication Hearing held on 24 June 2022.

Councillor Collins was found to have breached the Councillor's Code of Conduct by posting a Tweet on 18 November 2019, and a re-tweet the following day, which included reference to John Finucane, Sinn Féin's Westminster election candidate for North Belfast at the time.

Councillor Collins' Tweet claimed that Mr Finucane supported and promoted the IRA. His re-tweet was of a message promoting banners erected in the Shankill area of Belfast which contained allegations against several members of the Finucane family.

The sanction was imposed after allegations about the Tweets was received by the Local Government Ethical Standards team, and an investigation report was completed and provided to the Commissioner.

Although the Adjudication Hearing was re-scheduled twice as a result of Councillor Collins' unavailability, he did not attend.

The mitigating factors were considered in this case, including that Councillor Collins had no previous record of breaching the Code. He also wrote a letter saying that he did not intend to harm Mr Finucane or his family, and apologised for not engaging with the investigation and adjudication process.

However, the Hearing found that Councillor Collins's Tweets contributed towards a toxic atmosphere in North Belfast at the time of the General Election. They also resulted in Mr Finucane believing that his own and his family's safety were in jeopardy. It concluded that the councillor's activity went beyond the acceptable bounds of proper political debate and was unnecessary and personally abusive.

A further aggravating factor was the councillor's failure to engage in the investigation and adjudication process, which resulted in unnecessary costs to the public purse.

Having regard to previous decisions and the seriousness of the breaches, a suspension of 8 months was considered a necessary and proportionate response to the breaches found.

Councillor suspended over Facebook post

Alderman John Carson (Mid and East Antrim Borough Council), was suspended from his role as councillor for 3 months following an Adjudication Hearing held on 10 October 2022.

The Alderman was found to have breached the Councillor's Code of Conduct by making an abusive comment on Facebook in April 2021.

The comment was a reference to Ms Michelle O'Neill, Deputy Leader of Sinn Féin, and at the time the Deputy First Minister of Northern Ireland.

The sanction was imposed after a complaint was received by the Local Government Ethical Standards Directorate, and an investigation report sent to the Commissioner for consideration.

It was found that the wording used by the Alderman amounted to an unreasonable personal attack on Ms O'Neill, with a 'misogynistic' tone. It did not agree with his description that the comment related to political issues.

As such, his choice of words was found likely to diminish the trust and confidence the public placed in his position as an elected representative.

The mitigating factors in this case included a statement issued on Facebook by Alderman Carson saying, 'In hindsight I realise I have caused offence by a robust comment made

in anger. I retract the comment and apologise accordingly'. He also had no previous record of breaching the Code.

However, the apology was found to be 'half-hearted' and not a personal one to Ms O'Neill.

Having regard to previous decisions and to the need to uphold confidence in the standards regime, it was decided that suspension of 3 months was a necessary and proportionate response to the breach found.

Social media comments a breach of the Code

At an Adjudication Hearing held on 28 November 2022 former Councillor Ruth Wilson (Mid and East Antrim Borough Council) acknowledged that a comment she made on Facebook in 2018 was a breach of the Local Government Code of Conduct for Councillors.

The post in question stated:

'PRIDE DAY!! Pouring Rain Incessantly Dropping Everywhere', followed by a biblical quotation. In her comment, former Councillor Wilson posted: "Hopes it soaks them through to the skin".

She agreed that in making it she had breached the Local Government Code of Conduct for Councillors by bringing her position as a councillor into disrepute, and by failing to treat others with respect and consideration.

The Hearing found the former councillor displayed little foresight as to her words and posts, and that she had failed in her duty to understand and comply with the Code.

However, as it was in the wider public interest to deal with this case in a proportionate manner and that on the basis of Ms Wilson agreeing to follow the Code in the future, it was agreed that no further action should be taken against the former councillor.

Contributing to this decision was the fact that this was not a case which would have merited disqualification, and, as Ms Wilson was not a sitting councillor, the sanction of suspension would also not be relevant.

Former councillor disqualified for 3 years

Former Councillor Jolene Bunting was disqualified from holding the office of councillor for 3 years following an Adjudication Hearing held on 8 February 2023.

The Hearing found that Ms Bunting wrongly claimed she had been fined by Belfast City Council for a 'stunt' involving the then Deputy Leader of Britain First being filmed in ceremonial robes and sitting in the Lord Mayor's chair.

It also found that she had altered her Council payslip to make it appear as though a deduction of over £500 was for the fictional fine, when in fact it related to deductions for her use of a council mobile phone.

The complainant on the case, who had agreed to pay Ms Bunting's 'fine' in full, made two payments on separate dates amounting to £115 before realising that there was no fine.

The Hearing concluded that Ms Bunting's actions had breached the Local Government Code of Conduct and that she had brought her and her position as councillor into disrepute.

Having considered the sanctions available and taking account of the need to uphold confidence in the standards regime, a disqualification for a period of 3 years was considered to be a necessary and proportionate sanction.

Councillor suspended for 2 months

Councillor Padraig McShane (Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council) was suspended for two months following an Adjudication Hearing held on 3 March 2023.

The suspension related to Councillor McShane's arrest in the Diamond area of Ballycastle, Co Antrim on 12 July 2016. Prior to his arrest Councillor McShane had been at a protest at Altananam Park, Ballycastle in respect of an Orange Order Parade which marched through the town on that day.

Following Councillor McShane's conviction and subsequent appeal, he was convicted of the offences of resisting police (for which he was fined £100), disorderly behaviour in a public place (for which he received a conditional discharge), and taking part in an un-notified protest meeting (for which he was fined £100).


The Hearing found that a member of the public, in possession of the facts, would reasonably consider that Councillor McShane's conduct was such that it brought his position as a councillor into disrepute.

However it also found that that his actions had not brought his Council into disrepute.

In considering what sanction to apply, the Hearing noted the aggravating factors in this case, including that the councillor had been convicted of criminal offences, and that he had previously been found to have breached the Code of Conduct in November 2016.

However, the mitigating factors included Councillor McShane's co-operation with the investigation and adjudication process, and the recent role he had played in governance issues relating to the Council.

Taking account of the need to uphold confidence in the standards regime, the Hearing believed that suspension for a period of 2 months was a necessary and proportionate sanction.



Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners

Margaret Kelly – Commissioner

Margaret Kelly took up the post of Local Government Commissioner for Standards in August 2020. Margaret has worked extensively in the voluntary and community sector for over 30 years and gained a range of experience in leading and managing services, developing policy and working in partnership with the public sector.



Ian Gordon OBE QPM LL.B – Assistant Commissioner

Ian Gordon is a retired Deputy Chief Constable of Tayside Police. Seconded to HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for 3 years, he was the lead police officer on the annual statutory inspection of five UK police forces. Mr Gordon was a Convener for the Standards Commission for Scotland between 2010 and 2017 and led a focused improvement, to awareness of the Codes of Conduct, for elected members and Boards of Public Bodies.



Katrin Shaw – Assistant Commissioner

Katrin was admitted as a Solicitor in 1996 and worked as a local government lawyer before she joined the Welsh Ombudsman's office as an Investigator in 2001. Since then, Katrin has held managerial roles in the office and is now the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales's Chief Legal Adviser & Director of Investigations overseeing casework, including investigations under the ethical standards framework for local government members in Wales.



Appendix

Funding and Expenditure

The Local Government Ethical Standards (LGES) directorate is funded from a separately identified portion of the overall annual budget for the Northern Ireland Public Services Ombudsman (NIPSO). The LGES budget is proactively managed by NIPSO over the course of each financial year to ensure that any emerging funding pressures are identified and addressed.

This is in accordance with normal in-year financial monitoring procedures, after which DfC pay the released funding back to Local Councils. Where applicable a final end of year adjustment must also be returned directly to DfC. In all cases the amounts returned are made available for redeployment within Local Government, thus ensuring that any unspent amounts are able to be utilised fully and effectively.

Similarly, where reduced requirements arise, under established arrangements with the Department for Communities (DfC), any such amounts are released back to DfC by NIPSO by means of a mutually agreed in-year transfer.

All £k	2022-23	2021-22
Staff costs	461	386
Other administration costs	153	148
Total expenditure	614	534



Northern Ireland

Local Government

Commissioner for **Standards**

The Northern Ireland Public
Services Ombudsman

Progressive House
33 Wellington Place
Belfast, BT1 6HN

E: nipso@nipso.org.uk

T: 028 9023 3821

Freephone: 0800 34 34 24

Text Phone: 028 9089 7789

www.nipso.org.uk