

Dear Mr Jones,

Thanks for your reply.

ONS's attempts to identify the individual/s in question were for our own management purposes, as the comments made were not representative of ONS and Civil Service values. We have since published comprehensive guidelines for staff on the responsible use of social media, reminding them of the core values of integrity, honesty, objectivity and impartiality. The guidelines emphasise that any contributions made should be respectful of others, make it clear who is being represented, and that people are accountable for their contributions, as well as reminding staff of their legal obligations.

The comments made in this case were anecdotal and don't constitute a breach of the Data Protection Act, Statistics and Registration Services Act or the Census Act. If an individual been identifiable from the comments, a breach of the law would have taken place.

A serious offence doesn't appear to have been committed, so we'll take no further action unless you can provide additional evidence to suggest this is not the case.

Best regards,

Jackie

Jackie Byard
Room 1.101 | Ystafell 1.101
Office for National Statistics | Swyddfa Ystadegau Gwladol
Government Buildings | Adeiladau'r Llywodraeth
Cardiff Road | Heol Caerdydd
Newport | Casnewydd
NP10 8XG
Telephone: 01633 455959 | Ffôn: 01633 455959

[Communication Matters | Materion Cyfathrebu](#)
[Communication Division | Is-adran Gyfathrebu](#)

Dear Ms Byard,

Thank you for your response of October 4th to my response of September 25th to your response of September 24th to my complaint of earlier in that month reminding the ONS of my original complaint of March 2009. Phew! Now where are we?

In your response of September 24th this year, you wrote: **“Please be assured that ONS takes confidentiality very seriously and every effort has been made to resolve this matter since you first brought it to our attention in 2009.”**

However, in your most recent communication, you say: **“The comments made in this case were anecdotal . . . A serious offence doesn't appear to have been committed, so we'll take no further action . . .”**. “Further action”? I doubt if the ONS took any action whatsoever.

‘Mapexx’, an employee of the ONS, wished to suggest that fewer people actually speak Welsh than claim to be able to on their census forms. Truth is, because ‘mapexx’ is an anti-Welsh bigot putting the boot into the Welsh language it's acceptable, you don't really care. Had ‘mapexx’ commented on some other issue it might have stirred the ONS into action.

Another consideration – I would have thought - is that ‘mapexx’ was calling into question the veracity of the figures produced by the Office for National Statistics. Because if people returning census forms lie about their fluency in Welsh, then who’s to say they don’t lie about many other matters? This is not just a matter of the ONS’ reputation, for you sell these figures to many commercial organisations, so people like ‘mapexx’ could be costing the ONS money. I would have thought this would have been regarded as a very serious offence. (Though that may be the very reason you brushed ‘mapexx’ under the carpet!)

I am now satisfied that the Office for National Statistics made no serious effort to identify ‘mapexx’ because the Welsh language is unimportant; plus, perhaps, from fear of generating unwelcome publicity that might have resulted in losing business; with the further worry of offending the comrades of the Public and Commercial Services Union (i.e. the Labour Party). So there is no need for you to reply to this e-mail as you have made the position of the ONS perfectly clear, and in so doing making any further correspondence pointless.

Yours

Royston Jones