Review of FSA Social Science: Annex 3A GSR Code self assessment

Department: Food Standards Agency (Social Science Team)

Name of Head of Profession: Joanna Disson

Date completed: April 2023

How to complete the template

Red, Serious concerns

- you have very limited/no control over application of this indicator and/or
- systems not in place or in development and/or
- you know or suspect that practice is highly variable

Amber, Development area

- you have some control over application of this indicator and/or
- procedures may be in development and/or
- practice is reasonably consistent, but you may have some concerns

Green, Strong

- you have sufficient control over the application of this indicator and/or
- you have clear procedures/guidance in place (if appropriate) and/or
- you are confident that these are known and applied most of the time
-

GSR Products

Rigorous and Impartial

- based on sound methodology and established scientific principles

- quality assured
- based on best design, given constraints
- conclusions are clearly and adequately supported by data

Indicators	Self-assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Good practice

Project design RED: Projects not formally reviewed (either internal or external review) at the design stage of a research project. AMBER: Some projects are reviewed at design stage, but practice is inconsistent or processes in development. GREEN: Processes in place for appropriate formal review – internal or external to organisation - at design stage of all projects to ensure that decisions on methods and methodology represent the best options, given available budgets and time constraints.	Amber to Green	Project specs are always reviewed internally – at least by G7, often G6. External peer reviewers may be appointed at the beginning of many projects, and review the project specs. This isn't currently applied across every single project: a decision is made on a case-by-case basis subject to the pace, complexity and purpose of the work.	Risk that the quicker turnaround project designs aren't reviewed to the same extent as other projects. This may be appropriate as there is a need for proportionality, but there could be a more consistent, formal process to decide which projects need external peer review, and for which internal review is sufficient. Processes are in place for example,: ACSS QA Gateway for (almost) all new projects (there are some exceptions to this (for example, very low value and/or quick turnaround survey work)	The new ACSS QA gateway process may bring this up to a "green", by ensuring that new projects are externally reviewed at design stage. Recently have begun uploading project plans to the Open Science Framework: https://osf.io/

Quality assurance of outputs RED: No formal procedures in place to quality assure outputs. AMBER: Processes in place for internal quality assurance but no formal mechanisms in place to ensure that outputs are appropriately independently reviewed. GREEN: Processes and guidance in place to advise on appropriate quality assessment at completion, including external and internal peer review as and when necessary, to ensure that methods and analysis have been rigorously executed, and conclusions are clearly and adequately supported by data.	Amber to Green	Most project outputs are externally peer-reviewed by the ACSS or the FSA's Register of Experts. This isn't currently applied across every single project: a decision is made on a case-by-case basis subject to the pace, complexity and purpose of the work. When there is sufficient capability in-house, outputs are quality assured internally. Some work has its own Steering / Advisory Group. Quality assurance also sought from cross-governmental colleagues working on similar issues (for example, behavioural Handwashing project review by cross-government handwashing group)	-	Register of Specialists and ACSS demonstrate well established mechanisms for seeking peer- review. The new UCL Quality Assurance Toolkit is a further opportunity to embed good practice

Overall rating (1 to 10): 8

Relevant

- anticipates future policy issues as well as addressing current ones
- answers clear and researchable questions
- contributes to all stages of the policy and delivery process
- delivers solutions that are viable, actionable and represent value for money.

Indicators	Self-assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Good practice

Short/long term balance RED: The balance of short and long term social science work is not appropriate for the requirements of the evidence base. Little or no contribution to departmental horizon scanning work or attempt to anticipate future research needs. AMBER: There is a reasonable balance of long and short-term social science research but improvements necessary. Some attempt to anticipate future issues, possibly through GSR contribution to departmental horizon scanning work. GREEN: There is a good balance of long and short-term social science research. Future policy needs are anticipated, and GSR contributes to departmental horizon scanning work.	**Amber to Green**	We regularly monitor wider food trends and compile any stories that are of interest in a document on our shared drive. Every few weeks, we circulate the most interesting / relevant news stories across AU and also do an internal Yammer post. We conduct timely research on our rapid testing platform via the call off contract with Ipsos, for example, Alt Proteins report, Healthy sustainable diets report. We have started doing a monthly publication for the consumer insights tracker, increasing frequency so that customers can always quote the latest figures. We also have a suite of long-term tracking surveys, for example, Food and You 2, Consumer Insights Tracker, FBO Tracker.	More work is done for the short term than the long term.	We led and contributed to various pieces of FSA horizon scanning work in 2020 and 2021 for not only the short term but the medium to long term for example, FSA Covid-19 Horizon Scanning, social media listening We delivered a whole programme of work at pace to meet evidence needs during Covid, for example, the Covid tracker and the handwashing tracker. To inform the development of the new 3rd pillar of FSA's strategy, we have published evidence reviews and research on healthy sustainable diets and developed new questions added to F&Y2.

Departmental business planning RED: Little or no involvement in the development of departmental business plan, including input and impact indicators, or input to how performance against priorities will be managed. AMBER: GSR provides ad hoc analysis to inform development of departmental business plan, including input and impact indicators, and measuring of performance against priorities. GREEN: GSR is proactive and successful in providing analysis and advice for departmental business plan, including input and impact indicators, and development, monitoring and delivery.	Amber to Green	Performance resources report which utilises Food and You 2 and Consumer Insights Tracker data Our data contributes to the published Annual Report and Accounts We conducted an internal piece of research to improve FSA Diversity and Inclusion Evaluation Action Plan published. We produced a whole tranche of work in good time to inform the new third pillar of new FSA Strategy (for example, Public interests needs and concerns around food)	-	Liaising with policy stakeholders on F&Y2 questionnaire to cover emerging areas of interest, for example, GE, GM foods SS team member on each of the cross-FSA Area of Research Interest (ARI) Steering Groups. Regular catch ups and key OGDs/research funders for example, Defra.

Strategic level sign-off RED: There are no mechanisms in place for research programmes and projects to be signed off at policy and/or Ministerial/equivalent senior post for example, CEO level. AMBER: Some individual projects receive policy and/or Ministerial/equivalent senior post for example, CEO sign off, but there is scope for more engagement at this level and plans are in place to address this. GREEN: There is policy and/or Ministerial/equivalent senior post for example, CEO sign off for all research programmes and projects.	Amber to Green	Portfolio/ARI Steering Groups comprised of the policy stakeholders sign- off the bid for funding for the project. Investment Board (IB) process – all projects have to be signed off at Director level for funding approval. Our commissioning process – policy teams approach us to conduct work ACSS QA Gateway signs off new work design	-	We get sign off from policy area leads for final outputs, for example, fieldwork materials, reports Future Publication Panel (FPP) process requires project reports to be signed off by a DD panel for all publications not considered low risk by head of SERD. We brief the top of the office on new publications, including the research methodology and its limitations, so CEO/CSA Chair have sight prior to publication.

Impact is assessed RED: No post-hoc assessment of the impact of research. Difficult for HoPs to provide evidence of the impact of social research on policy and delivery. AMBER: Some ad-hoc assessment of research but not consistently applied, or processes may be in development. Some evidence of the impact of social research. GREEN: Appropriate processes are in place to assess the usefulness/impact of the research and the extent to which it has answered policy questions, including feedback from policy/delivery colleagues on project completion. HoPs are able to produce examples of policy relevant research for both current and future policy issues.	Amber to Green	EPI forms help us establish impact throughout the lifecycle of a project. Social Science Impact Log, which tracks our dissemination activities and how our data has been used. Food and You 2 feedback survey sent to policy and other stakeholders (not yet sent – draft survey uploaded as evidence). Tracking DOIs	-	Engaging with external research users. Post project review of impact – following up with policy to understand which impacts we anticipated have been realised / which recommendations implemented.

Overall rating (1 to 10): 8

Accessible

- published
- data made available where possible
- clear and concise
- related to existing work in field

Indicators	Self-assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Good practice

		Social research reports published on the FSA website under 'Research reports' in line with accessibility guidance (now in HTML format).		
		Social research reports and data tables are published in line with accessibility guidelines. The FSA Intranet has a whole area and pages dedicated to accessibility, with guidance and templates (to use internally and share with contractors) and training videos. We also have a folder in the Social Science Teams channel with accessibility guidance, resources and templates. All members of the social science team have attended accessibility training (provided by the FSA comms team), and refresher sessions and		Example comms plans from recently published research projects: The UK Public's interests, needs and concerns around food A rapid evidence review on sustainability
Published RED: Outputs are not routinely published according to GSR Publication Guidance.			FSA research is published as standard in line with our open and transparent principles, not always but usually within 12 weeks of receiving final output as per GSR publication guidance. The majority of our research	Working groups / workshops with FSA colleagues across different teams, with reports shared and published. For example the Climate Change and Consumer Behaviours workshop with

Format RED: Outputs are not sufficiently accessible for all stakeholder groups. Local guidance for authors is not available. AMBER: There is a move towards clear, concise and more accessible outputs but practice is inconsistent or in development. GREEN: All outputs are written in clear, concise and jargon free language with short summaries routinely produced. Key messages are easily identifiable and understood. Guidance is available for	Green	Transparency policy (published on the Intranet here) shows that openness is one of the core values of the FSA. All research reports are published as HTML now and checked by Samantha Merrett (our accessibility lead in Comms) prior to publication and data tables are shared with John Clowes (data team) for publishing on the FSA data catalogue. Our KIMS team also assess each new dataset for suitability of publication using an online form (process outlined here). The Welsh language policy published on our Intranet details how we are legally obliged to provide all services in Welsh. We liaise with the Welsh Translation Unit to check requirements when	We do usually ask for 1-3-25 reports in our research specifications but could embed this further.	Example reports with executive and/or short summaries included: The UK Public's interests, needs and concerns around food (Executive summary included at start of report) Food and You 2 (main findings summary included on webpage in addition to full final report and technical report. Executive summary also included at start of report). Consumer Insights Tracker. Rapid evidence review on sustainability is an example report with

Overall rating (1 to 10): 9

Legal and ethical

- complies with relevant legislation
- complies with GSR ethical guidelines

Suggested indicators	Self-assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Good practice

Ensuring good practice in the commissioning, management and conduct of government social research RED: GSR research does not uphold the principles outlined in the GSR Ethics guidance. There is no clear process for identifying and assessing risks which may compromise these principles, or for obtaining further relevant advice and clearance for projects where necessary. AMBER: The GSR Ethics principles are upheld as far as the head of profession is aware, but the process for identifying and assessing risks which may compromise these principles, and for obtaining further relevant advice and clearance for projects could be better embedded.	Amber to Green	For all externally commissioned work, ethics are required in the research specification to be considered by tenderers using the GSR ethical guidelines. We highlight particular areas and additional sensitivities for consideration. We have, on occasion, sought external advice from an ethical advisory. In addition, our recent behavioural trials have used Kantar's ethical panel. And had extensive ethical procedures for for example, Kitchen Life 2 Ethical issues are included in our discussions regarding new work at the ACSS QA Gateway. **Principle 1: Research should have a clear user need and public benefit** • Investment Board Process for approval of research projects to ensure they are it offers value for money and aligns with the needs of the organisation • Policy of transparency - all research is published and presented to internal FSA stakeholders. Research methods used are outlined in all publications along with findings. **Principle 2: Research should be based on sound research methods and protect against bias in the interpretation of findings** • ACSS Steering Group - all new research projects are reviewed by the ACSS to ensure that the research questions and methods used are sound. • QAT asks some high level questions about methods and justification **Principle 3: Research should adhere to data**	For GSR ethics principles: 1. None 2. None 3. New team members may not be aware of PIA guidance. Team training session to be arranged 4. None 5. Considerations for enabling participation for those who are harder to reach (for example, those who don't have internet access those with English as a Second	1. Rese is prioritis through A steering groups to ensure projects w clear polic and busin need are prioritised 2. Meth reviewed through ACSS. Research work packages protocols signed off prior to wo commenc 3. Data protection of tenderi process. process in place, wit guidance when this should tak place.

Procurement RED: Social research is not consistently procured in line with GSR Guidance on the Procurement of Government Social Research. Good practice is not followed to reduce burdens to suppliers or maximise value for money and use to the customer. AMBER: Inconsistent application, or knowledge of, GSR Guidance on the Procurement of Government Social Research and application of good practice. GREEN: GSR research is conducted in line with GSR guidance on the Procurement of Government Social Research, backed by departmental procedures and the advice of procurement experts. Unless there is a strong, justifiable reason, all contracts are awarded as the result of competition. Good practice in procurement is followed to ensure that processes are proportionate, burden on suppliers and commissioners is reduced as far as possible, the supplier market is developed, and processes are	Amber to Green	Unless it is not possible due to time constraints, all tenders go through the full competitive tendering process. Procurement team are involved in all tendering processes and moderate the panels. Individual scores are then agreed by consensus. High value tenders have an external impartial expert on the panel to help ensure quality and value for money.	Some contracts go straight to the call off contractor due to time constraints.	-

Data security RED: No systems or guidance in place for handling, storing and sharing data. There is concern that GSR members are not fully aware of their responsibilities. AMBER: Systems and guidance in development, GSR members' awareness of data security being addressed as a priority. GREEN: Systems and guidance in place for handling, storing and sharing data in line with CO core minimum standards and relevant legislation. GSR members are fully aware of their responsibilities and actively manage contractors' data security and handling processes.	Amber to Green	Systems and guidance in place for handling, storing and sharing data All contractors must provide details of how they will securely store, process and share personal data in their tender application form/ work package response.	Training on data protection/security is not provided to GSR members beyond the generic information management course.	Mandator Civil Serv data secu e-course every yea

Data sharing RED: Little or no thought to how data can be used or shared beyond the original purpose of its collection. Inhibits use of data by others and does not use existing data appropriately/where possible. AMBER: Some sharing of data takes place but on an ad hoc basis. Secondary analysis is carried out, but more use could be made of existing sources. GREEN: Ensure data resources are made best use of by us and others, by making them openly available as far as possible. Data management and sharing considered as part of planning process for new data collection projects, recognising different levels of data sensitivity. GSR members proactively support the re-use of data and make systematic use of data archives where appropriate (for quant and qual data).	Amber to Green	Data tables are routinely published on the FSA website as part of FSA core principles of being an open and transparent science led organisation. We systematically use data from archives other sources where appropriate, for example, for scoping evidence reviews, for our horizon scanning work.	-	Data shar is planned and compleme by our pr comms pl agreed wi Comms.

Overall rating (1 to 10): 8

Performing role with integrity

- make best use of available resources
- give appropriate methodological and impartial evidence-based advice, challenging where appropriate

Suggested indicators	Self assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks
Make best use of available resources/achieve value for money RED: There are no formal processes in place to consider the added value of a project, taking into account the evidence base. Value for money is not monitored throughout the life of projects. AMBER: Inconsistent practice in reviewing the added value of new projects prior to undertaking new research. Value for money is not regularly monitored throughout the life of projects. Processes are in development to address these issues. GREEN: GSR members routinely consider the added value of a project before undertaking new research. Value for money is routinely monitored throughout the life of a project.	Amber to Green	Business case processes for example, VFM ACSS QA gateway process for example, VFM Procurement processes for example, VFM Work with policy stakeholders to understand existing evidence base. Conduct REAs/literature reviews to understand evidence base and evidence gaps and use this to inform commissioning.	Ensuring documents are up to date

Suggested indicators	Self assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks
Knowledge management RED: Knowledge management is patchy with no mechanisms in place to encourage GSR members to keep up with, share and retain knowledge (including research/methodological/policy developments) at individual or organisational levels. AMBER: Most GSR members undertake knowledge management activities, including keeping up with research/methodological/policy developments relevant to work area. No mechanisms yet in place to help promote the sharing and retention of knowledge at the individual or organisational levels. GREEN: GSR members routinely keep up with emerging research/methodological/policy developments relevant to work area. This activity may be written into their objectives. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that organisational knowledge is shared and retained as appropriate.	Amber to Green	Social Science Library to capture existing research L and D channel library of resources See section on "Appropriately skilled and continuously developed"	Ongoing maintenance of resources Degree to which GSR members are embedded into policy areas (for example, invited to relevant meetings which don't have explicit research needs, have documents shared etc.)

Suggested indicators	Self assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks
Open, fair and honest RED: GSR staff are not given appropriate support and guidance to enable them to earn trust and respect of users of government social science research, research participants and the wider public. Appropriate mechanisms do not exist to ensure learning received from stakeholders is acted upon. AMBER: GSR staff are given some support and guidance in this area, and learning is acted upon in most cases, however, more could be done to support staff and to develop skills. There is some concern that GSR staff are not always making the right judgements in how they deal with stakeholders. GREEN: GSR members work to gain the trust and respect of users of government social science research, research participants and the wider public, and are given appropriate support and guidance to do this. As a profession, GSR deals openly and fairly with research customers and other stakeholders, acting upon feedback and information received. GSR members use good judgement to balance rigour and relevance, build constructive relationships within and outside their profession, and perform their challenge role appropriately.	Green	Insights are published. We measure trust in the FSA and track the reputation of the FSA (FSA Reputation tracker, Food and You 2) Membership of cross-government groups (for example, on behaviour research and evaluation) Disclosure of data and reports for transparency.	-

Overall rating (1 to 10): 8

Appropriately skilled and continuously developed

- recruited and promoted in line with GSR recruitment protocol

- committed to continuous professional development in line with the CPD handbook

Suggested indicators	Self assessment rating	Evidence to support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Good practice

Recruitment and induction RED: GSR members not recruited in line with GSR Recruitment Guidance. No formal arrangements for local induction. New recruits not encouraged to attend central GSR induction. AMBER: Some GSR members are recruited in line with GSR protocols. Local induction processes are in place, but these are not applied consistently for all new recruits. New recruits are encouraged to attend central GSR induction. GREEN: All members are recruited and promoted in line with the GSR Recruitment Guidance using either locally managed procedures or by drawing on a centrally managed process. [For corporate members this should apply to all members recruited from point organisation joined GSR]. Formal procedures are in place for inducting new recruits to organisation, and to GSR if recruited externally. External recruits encouraged to attend central GSR induction, and this is routinely taken up when available.	Green	Excel document of team qualifications, years of experience etc.	-	All our members are recruited in line with the GSR recruitment protocol.

Continuing Professional Development RED: Development plans not routinely produced and members not routinely achieving and/or recording 100 hours of CPD. No discussion of current/ future skills needs at unit and/or organisational level. Perceived or actual lack of development opportunities locally. Few CPD opportunities identified or promoted at unit/organisational level. AMBER: Development plans are generally produced. Evidence that some GSR members are achieving and/or logging 100 hours of CPD. Skills needs at unit and/or organisational level may have been discussed but no formal plans are in place. Some development opportunities are identified and promoted at unit/organisational level. GREEN: Development plans are routinely produced. Evidence that most GSR members are achieving and/or logging 100 hours of CPD. Opportunities exist for members to discuss their professional CPD on an annual basis. Recognition at unit and/or organisational level of current and future skills needs	Green	Individual CPD logs Team CPD log SERD capability plan - including for social science.	The individual, with the support of their line manager, are expected to produce their own development plan We have made an active choice not to conduct a skills audit.	Individual CPD logs On a team level and individual level we have a lot of CPD and have now created a team evidence log for this L&D Teams chat channel to share events. Feedback given to the rest of the team from individuals regarding L&D.

Career and talent management RED: HoP has little or no control over facilitating/supporting career moves of GSR members. Little guidance offered to members about career management and how to gain broader/deeper experience within/external to the organisation. Little/no promotion of leadership development amongst GSR members at any level. Access to talent management opportunities is limited. AMBER: HoP has some influence in facilitating/supporting career moves of GSR members but in organisational context more could be done. Opportunities such as leadership development, talent management, broader experience and take-up of generic analyst roles are available but these could be better promoted. Promotion of leadership skills development focuses only on senior members. GREEN: HoP plays active role (as appropriate) in managing the career development of GSR members and promotes opportunities to develop and demonstrate leadership skills at all levels within the	Amber to Green	HoP, with team, enables all individuals to gain experience of different work areas (as best as possible subject to business needs) as well as line management opportunities Fast Streamers have successfully rotated within the team to date 2 members of staff have recently been seconded and loaned to other departments.	Managed moves are not really feasible due to workload / resourcing pressures The small and centralised nature of the team means there are limitations on internal career moves (for example, we have no GSR SCS)	Regular career conversations with team members as part of line management responsibilities, for example, Talent and career conversations, for example, Mentoring All GSR members are encouraged to play an active role in X-govt groups & GSR working groups. Several are currently active. Access to talent management opportunities, for example, Civil Service talent and accelerated development schemes. Badging exercise will be held in 2023 for non GSR members.

Balance and use of skills RED: Not all GSR members have roles where they are able to routinely use and apply research skills and knowledge. AMBER: GSR members use a wide range of research skills and knowledge when commissioning and managing research but there is limited opportunity to undertake primary data collection and/or secondary analysis and/or research synthesis. GREEN: Most GSR members are given the opportunity to undertake primary data collection and/or secondary analysis and/or research synthesis, in addition to applying research skills throughout the commissioning and managing process.	Amber to Green	All team members (including non-GSR) are constantly using research skills and knowledge whether via project delivery or providing advice to policy. Where possible (subject to making the best use of limited resources) staff conduct research and analysis.	Resource limitations / workload pressure restricts opportunity to undertake work in-house. However, budget restrictions in the next FY may necessitate that we do more in-house.	Examples of primary data collection / secondary analysis / research syntheses are for example, 'Consumer Insights Tracker, published Handwashing research, in house REAs.

Overall rating (1 to 10): 8

Outward facing

- establish effective links with the external research community

- actively collaborate with policy/delivery colleagues
- actively collaborate with other analytical professions within and across departments

Suggested indicators	Self-assessment rating	Evidence for support assessment rating	Issues or risks	Go

External research community: RED: Some links with the external research community pursued but not very well developed. No plans in place to identify more. Potential for external engagement not realised. AMBER: Some well-established links with external research community. Further links identified and plans may be in place to follow up, but not systematic. More emphasis needs to placed on this kind of activity for example, engaging with both individual external experts and external research bodies. GREEN: GSR members engage actively in developing links with the external research community in their work/policy area. Strategic plans in place to support this activity, for example, external social research advisory committee in place, joint funding of research programmes or centres with external research bodies, consulting externally on research programme.	Green	Advisory Committee for Social Science (ACSS) and working groups in place to advise on research programme / projects and provide links with academics working in food research Regular presentation of our research to ACSS and other FSA committees (ACMSF, WFAC, NIFAC) Research fellowships and PhD studentships in place. Research fellow embedded in the social science team, providing links with academia Register of Specialists in place and used to identify and commission peer reviewers Joint funded projects with UKRI Active engagement and dissemination of research to external research community including academics, research agencies and third sector organisations doing their own research for example, WRAP, Food Foundation, Trussell Trust. The Consumer Insights Tracker excels at this.	-	Dis us list blo an ext co Be co po co fes Int Fo An Bri Fe Gr Co Ge ISS Inr Ex (IIE (se

Other government analysts RED: Few opportunities for GSR members to work with, or gain knowledge of, the other analytical professions. Limited engagement with other analytical HoPs. AMBER: Some notable interaction and working by GSR members with the other analytical professions. Mechanisms for planning or facilitating joint working are in their infancy. Established contact/engagement with other analytical HoPs. GREEN: GSR members are aware of the contribution of the other analytical professions, know when and how to engage them and there are good examples of working together where appropriate. Mechanisms for the joint planning of analysis are well in development or have been implemented. Routine and constructive contact with other analytical HoPs.	Green	Regular engagement with wider Analytics Unit (AU) through regular unit level meetings with other analytical professions (and their HoPs) including statistics, operational research, economics and strategic insights (intelligence) Collaboration with other analytical professions within the FSA on joint projects with other professions for example, consumer insights tracker, F&Y2, Kitchen Life 2, evaluation work	-	Re pro su for ec Co an go ex De res cro rep int the

Policy/delivery community RED: Little interaction with policy/delivery community and structural arrangements do not promote close working relationships. AMBER: GSR members do have links with the policy/delivery community but more could be done to increase the visibility and input of GSR into the policy cycle. GREEN: GSR members act as educators, internally and externally, promoting the profession of GSR to key stakeholders and working collaboratively with these stakeholders to ensure the relevance, comprehensiveness and applicability of social research output. Appropriate structural arrangements are in place for the allocation and location of social researchers, which allow close working relationships with key stakeholders.	Green	Team members have good links with FSA policy community and are regularly approached by Policy for analytical input.	Subject to resources, we could play a more active educative role with policy teams (for example, running introductory/training sessions for policy)	Re Pr Gr clo rel Po gr co on sta

Overall rating (1 to 10): 9