FairGo CIC

THE FAIRGO POST-LEGISLATIVE SCRUTINY PROJECT
REPORT · JULY 2026

The State of Post-Legislative Scrutiny of Westminster Public General Acts, 2008–2021

AUTHOR

HLEB BUZIUK | ELENA CHIRKO

About this report

A note on the figures. Headline cohort and aggregate figures trace to Appendix B; major-only, ▸S and per-Act figures are tabulated in Appendices E and F; the reproduction kit is released as Appendix G. Every figure is reported with the limits stated alongside it in the text. In particular, "no review located" is a statement about the public record and the search behind it, as of June 2026 — not a finding that no review occurred, and never a verdict on whether a law works. Version 1.0 is the frozen publication series: filled 94 / half 80 / open 137 of 311 substantive Acts (none located ≈ 44%); every figure in this report quotes that frozen series. It incorporates the pre-publication audit programme (§5.6) — a stage-3 false-negative audit (2013 c.17; 2014 c.28; flag on 2012 c.19), an external nine-role panel review (2018 c.12; 2019 c.12; four transcription residues), the adoption of a parallel re-adjudication line (2008 c.32 half→filled; c.31 ▸S; the consolidation rule), and a pre-publication watch adjudication (2021 c.22 ▸S-half on its Article-23E review), and a grid-reconciliation adjudication (2016 c.6 / c.22 — §5.6) — with every correction, its reason and its effect logged in §5.6 and marked ✚ in Appendix B; the aggregate moved only at the two audit layers (≈ 46% → ≈ 45% → ≈ 44%) and no later layer touched it. Subsequent evidence enters through the public register — this edition is not silently altered.

Evidence status at publication. This is an Institute report, not a journal peer-reviewed article. The aggregate arithmetic and the coding protocol are checkable now from Appendices B, E and F; independent regeneration of the 311 Act-level classifications — including the negative findings — awaits the analytic dataset and negative search logs (§5.7); the reported false-negative rate is the Institute's internal audit estimate unless separately replicated.

Citation status. The novelty claim is limited to: no prior published map located in the Institute's targeted June-2026 search with this exact frame, date range and cross-route denominator. The aggregate arithmetic and the protocol are checkable now; exact independent regeneration of the 311 Act-level classifications — including the negative findings — awaits the analytic dataset and negative search logs. The 2/24 false-negative estimate and the correction layers remain producer-controlled and have not been independently replicated; the nine-role panel is adversarial review, not a substitute for replication. The 78/78 result is an artefact-location co-occurrence — partly definition-dependent where a statutory duty itself generates the qualifying report — and is not a compliance or causal rate.

Authorship and accountability. This report was researched and written by Hleb Buziuk, with Elena Chirko as contributor, and is published by FairGo CIC (Community Interest Company no. 16629506, registered in England and Wales), which takes full editorial responsibility for it. "The Institute" is the in-text shorthand for the FairGo Post-Legislative Scrutiny Project, the CIC's post-legislative scrutiny project. Funding: no external funding; no commissioned work; self-funded by FairGo CIC — frame selection, coding and findings are the author's and publisher's alone. Conflicts of interest: none to declare. External review: a structured nine-role adversarial reading for consistency and reception (§5.6) —

not journal peer review, and not an independent replication. Corrections: post-publication evidence enters through the public register at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21354269 (new versions of this record; a fairgo.org.uk register page will follow) without silently altering this edition. Contact (method, press, corrections): info@fairgo.org.uk.

For citation. Hleb Buziuk (FairGo CIC), The State of Post-Legislative Scrutiny of Westminster Public General Acts, 2008–2021, Version 1.0 (July 2026), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21354269. Corrections and updates: via new versions at the same DOI. Individual figures should be cited with their bounded wording (see the Citation-status box above).

A companion file. The per-Act citation ledger (Appendix F) is released as a separate companion document. It has been reconciled against the final fourteen-cohort series in this report — the same field of 311 substantive Acts — with every outcome-driving citation verified against its source document (companion-ledger reconciliation).

Contents

About this report....2
§1 · Executive summary....8
§2 · Introduction — the question and why it matters....10
2.1 · The gap the Institute fills....10
2.2 · The object the report tracks: an Act's review-state, on seven axes....10
2.3 · Three epistemic rules....11
2.4 · The existing PLS landscape (the baseline)....11
2.5 · Scope of this report (what is and isn't covered)....12
2.6 · What this report claims, and what it does not....13
§3 · Findings....14
3.1 · The frame and the headline metric....14
3.2 · The fourteen-cohort series and the block trend....15
3.3 · The field aggregate....16
3.4 · Salience: flagship statutes and the long tail....17
3.5 · Statutory review clauses (▸S)....19
3.6 · Age versus composition....21
3.7 · What harmonization revealed....21
§4 · What the findings suggest about the scrutiny system....23
4.1 · Statutory review clauses — the feature most consistently associated with a located review....23
4.2 · The net is associated with salience — robust, but hedged for visibility....24
4.3 · Located artefacts appear several years out — a cohort-age reading, not a measured departmental delay (descriptive)....25
4.4 · Supersession is not review — a recurring system pattern, not a fault....26
4.5 · Never-commenced provisions — a distinct class of enacted-but-untested law....26
4.6 · The memorandum convention, in practice — read against a maturation window (short)....27
4.7 · What the denominator permits — a methodological note (short)....28
4.8 · The limits of these readings....28
§5 · Methodology and reproducibility....30
5.1 The three-stage pipeline....30
5.2 The frame and the carve-out rule....31
5.3 The three doors, the dot, the anchors, and the A10-vs-A15 line....32
5.4 Search discipline — "none located" is search-bounded....33

5.5 Harmonization — how drift was caught and corrected....33
5.6 Verification....34
5.7 Reproducibility....38
5.8 Limitations — what the evidence does and does not license....39
§6 · Conclusion....42
Appendix A — The fourteen cohorts....44
Cohort 2008....44
Cohort 2009....45
Cohort 2010....46
Cohort 2011....47
Cohort 2012....48
Cohort 2013....49
Cohort 2014....50
2015 — old and heavy (pilot cohort)....51
2016 — heavy and statutory-clause-dense....52
2017 — light and PMB-heavy (election-year wash-up)....53
2018 — mixed, normal-volume year....54
2019 — Brexit-thinned....55
2020 — crisis-driven and heavyweight (COVID + EU exit)....55
2021 — heavyweight, largest and most PMB-diluted frame....56
Appendix B — Reconciled data....58
B.1 · The fourteen reconciled compact records....58
B.2 · The "% none located" series, oldest to newest....58
Appendix C — Method artefacts and the carve-out register....59
C.1 · The carve-out rule (narrow carve)....59
C.2 · The carve-out register — boundary decisions....59
C.3 · Method artefacts....59
Appendix D — Glossary....61
Appendix E · Evidence & sensitivity panel....62
E0 · Headline reconciliation....62
Conventions....63
The reconciled 14-cohort series....63
Field roll-ups (E1–E7)....64
E1 field · major × outcome + the unreviewed-major list....64
E4 field · ▸S vs non-▸S....65

E5 field · ▸S by type.....65
E6 field · route typology.....66
E7 field · tail composition.....66
Per-cohort evidence — 2008–2014.....66
2008 ✚ — frame 23 (33 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 13 / H 5 / O 5; none ≈22%66
2009 — frame 21 (27 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 6 / H 7 / O 8; none ≈38%.....68
2010 ◆ — frame 31 (41 PGA − 10 carve-outs, CRaG returned); F 10 / H 7 / O 14; none ≈45%.....69
2011 ◆ — frame 21 (25 PGA − 4 carve-outs, Olympic returned); F 8 / H 6 / O 7; none ≈33%.....71
2012 — frame 18 (23 PGA − 5 carve-outs); F 7 / H 4 / O 7; none ≈39%.....73
2013 ▲✚ — frame 27 (33 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 8 / H 6 / O 13; none ≈48% 74
2014 ✚ — frame 20 (30 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 9 / H 6 / O 5; none ≈25%. 76
Per-cohort records — 2015–2021.....78
2015 ▲ — frame 22 (37 PGA − 15 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 10; none ≈45%78
2016 — frame 19 (25 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 7; none ≈37%.....78
2017 ▲ — frame 25 (35 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 13; none ≈52%78
2018 ✚ — frame 21 (34 PGA − 13 carve-outs); F 5 / H 6 / O 10; none ≈48%78
2019 ▲✚ — frame 15 (31 PGA − 16 carve-outs); F 2 / H 4 / O 9; none ≈60% 78
2020 ▲ — frame 21 (29 PGA − 8 carve-outs); F 5 / H 3 / O 13; none ≈62%..79
2021 ✚ — frame 27 (35 PGA − 8 carve-outs); F 3 / H 8 / O 16; none ≈59%. 79
Reconciliation and sensitivity.....79
Appendix G — Reproduction materials.....81

§1 · Executive summary

Across fourteen complete annual cohorts of substantive Public General Acts — every such Act of the years 2008 to 2021, reconciled to a single coding standard — a consistent systemic picture emerges. The public record shows located post-legislative reviews for most flagship statutes: approximately 91% of the Acts the Institute codes as clearly major have at least one located artefact — a located review of any depth, from a formal memorandum to a partial, component or statutory report, not necessarily a full whole-Act inquiry. Located reviews thin out sharply across the long tail of legislation, and tend to appear later. Two findings carry this summary, and they should be read together.

The first is a finding about association: a statutory clause requiring a review is the single feature most consistently associated with whether a review was located. Across all fourteen cohorts, every Act that wrote a genuine review duty into its own text — 78 in the coded frame — has a located review — whole or partial (an artefact-location association, not a compliance finding) — while Acts that built in only routine data returns, or nothing at all, are far more likely to have none located. Of everything the Institute coded, the presence of a statutory review clause shows the strongest observed (non-causal) association with a located review — an association in the coded data, not a demonstrated effect — and the clause census behind it is itself audited rather than assumed (§5.6). This association holds inside every cohort, but it remains search-bounded and non-causal — and, for report-producing duties, the clause and the located artefact are not fully independent measures.

The second is a finding about coverage: the Institute’s stated searches located no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact for approximately 44% of substantive Acts — 137 of 311 — as of June 2026. The complement — the share with at least some located review — is best read as a band rather than a single figure: requiring a whole-Act or formal review (the *filled* reading) gives approximately 30%, while including partial, component and statutory-report reviews (the *half* reading) gives approximately 56%; either way, approximately 44% have none located. This figure must be read for exactly what it is. "No review located" means no public post-legislative review was found in the routes the Institute searched, as of June 2026. It does not mean those laws do not work; it does not mean half the statute book is useless; and it does not mean officials failed — internal or non-public review may exist beyond the public record and beyond the Institute's search. The accurate one-line reading is that this report maps which Acts have a located review on the public record and which do *not* — not which Acts succeeded and which failed; and the share is a coverage fact about the whole substantive statute book, not a measure of the memorandum convention’s reach (§3.3).

The “none located” share is not randomly scattered; the pattern in it is structural. It concentrates in narrow Private Members' Bills, technical and consolidation Acts, Law Commission codifications, provisions never brought into

force, and spent or event-specific Acts — categories that for the most part either cannot be assessed on policy effect or were never intended to be reviewed in this way. It also still contains the 12 clearly-major Acts with none located. It also concentrates in the most recent cohorts. Among the Acts the Institute codes as major, only 2021 and part of 2020 are plainly not yet due under the three-to-five-year convention; some 2019 and 2020 Acts are now beyond the ordinary three-to-five-year window measured from actual Royal Assent — subject to commencement timing, to the relevant committee agreeing that no memorandum is required, and to non-public or internal review, none of which is determined here. Genuine older open cases exist too — substantial Acts for which no public post-legislative review was located on the record (search-bounded, as of June 2026) — but within the pattern they are the exception, not its centre.

The cohort-by-cohort series is noisy. Year to year, the share with no located review scatters and does not climb on a clean gradient. Grouped into four-year blocks, however, it rises monotonically (a descriptive grouping, not load-bearing; rolling four-year windows are not monotone): approximately 34% across 2008–2011, approximately 40% across 2012–2015, approximately 46% across 2016–2018, and approximately 60% across 2019–2021. More time since enactment means more opportunity for a review to exist. But age and composition are entangled — the lowest-gap cohorts tend also to be the heavyweight reform years, dense in statutory review clauses, while the highest-gap cohorts tend to be recent and diluted by minor legislation — and the panel contains no old, lightweight year that would let the two be separated. Neither age nor composition can be credited alone for the movement, and the cross-cohort trend is reported here descriptively, not as a load-bearing claim.

Two disciplines govern everything that follows. The report reads the system, and it does not judge the laws: where a review exists, the report relays what that review found, attributed and bounded; it does not substitute its own verdict on whether an Act was a good idea. And it keeps its findings separate: each Act carries a profile across seven distinct assessment axes, never a single grade, and the report contains no scorecard, no league table of departments or laws, and no single traffic-light verdict. Every figure is search-bounded and dated, and its limits travel with it in the text rather than in a footnote.

§2 · Introduction — the question and why it matters

Post-legislative scrutiny is the examination, after an Act has been passed and brought into force, of whether it achieved the purpose for which Parliament passed it — conventionally undertaken three to five years after Royal Assent. A bill is debated, amended and reported on at length on its way to becoming law. What happens afterwards — whether the Act is commenced, whether it works, and whether anyone ever checks — is far less visible. The Institute exists to make that part of the record legible, and its founding question is deliberately narrow: *does the law work — and did anyone check?* This report addresses the second half of that question — was the law ever examined to see whether it works, and if so, by whom and to what standard — across complete cohorts of legislation rather than one Act at a time.

2.1 · The gap the Institute fills

The Institute is an independent, public-interest research project. It is not a general think tank on how government works, and it undertakes no commissioned work: frame selection, framing and findings are institute-led, and no funder, department or committee determines what is tracked or what is found. Its single concern is the review record of legislation.

Where review of an Act's operation does happen, it tends to arrive by scattered routes — a departmental memorandum, a select-committee inquiry, an independent reviewer's report, a commissioned evaluation, a statutory report, or a piloted provision and its evaluation. A targeted literature and institutional-source search, dated June 2026, did not locate a published, Act-level, complete-cohort denominator for Westminster Public General Acts across 2008–2021 that classifies located review artefacts by route, scope and strength. The existing landscape is real but partial, and each part does something different: the Law Commission's 2006 report and the 2008 command paper (Cm 7320) set the *institutional design*; the Cabinet Office *Guide to Legislation* states the *departmental convention*; the House of Lords ad hoc committees mount *selected deep inquiries* into chosen Acts; and Caygill's work for the Westminster Foundation for Democracy measures *memorandum and inquiry uptake*. None of these, in the Institute's targeted June-2026 search, assembles what this report adds: a *complete-cohort, public-artefact denominator and coverage map across all of these routes at once*. That located gap — no prior published map found on the targeted June-2026 search with this exact frame, range and cross-route denominator — is the contribution claimed here, read at the level of the system: a denominator computed across complete frames of legislation — how many Acts in a cohort had a located review, by what route, with what finding — produced to a consistent evidential standard. The contribution is the public denominator *across* the existing machinery, not a claim that no machinery

exists. The founding illustration of the method is the Institute's 2019-cohort pilot, in which a complete calendar year of substantive Public General Acts was coded in full.

2.2 · The object the report tracks: an Act's review-state, on seven axes

The unit the Institute tracks is a single Act of Parliament — or a clearly bounded provision within one, where parts of a large Act were commenced or reviewed separately. An Act is treated as a living object rather than a closed case: it has a review-state that can change as reviews appear, and the record changes with it. A published finding is a dated view of that object, accurate as of its check date and no further.

Each Act (or provision) is coded on seven separable axes, which the report keeps distinct throughout:

1. **In-force state** — whether the Act is in force, partly in force, not yet commenced, has had its central purpose never commenced, or is repealed or spent.
2. **Review located** — whether any post-legislative review was located, and of what kind: a departmental memorandum, a committee inquiry, a statutory, independent or commissioned review, or several.
3. **Review strength and independence** — the provenance of any review, ranging from a bare self-report through departmental self-review and arm's-length commissioned work to independent or statutory review.
4. **Review scope** — whether a review covered the whole Act, only a named component, or the whole Act plus components.
5. **Substitution or supersession** — whether the Act was amended, superseded by later legislation, folded into wider reform, or repealed, in place of being reviewed.
6. **Outcome-evidence maturity** — how strong the available evidence on the Act's actual effect is, from none to a mature, independent evaluation.
7. **Confidence** — the Institute's confidence in its own coding, given the search behind it.

An Act has a *profile* across these seven axes; it does not have a single grade. This is a deliberate structural choice, and the report never reduces the profile to one number.

2.3 · Three epistemic rules

Three rules discipline how the axes are populated. They are the Institute's principal safeguard against overclaim in either direction.

The first is a **review-source rule**. A "review located" value must rest on an actual review artefact — a memorandum, an inquiry report, a published evaluation — and never on a promise or announcement to review. A commitment to review is not a review, and the record refuses to register it as one.

The second is a **finding-restraint rule**. Where a located review reached a conclusion about whether an Act achieved its purpose, the report relays that review's conclusion, attributed to it and bounded by its scope. The Institute does

not mint an outcome-verdict of its own. Judging the merits of a law is the least verifiable and most contestable act available, and it is the one the Institute is most disciplined about declining.

The third is a **separation rule**. The seven axes are reported separately and are never combined into a single composite score or status. The report therefore carries no scorecard, no league table of departments or laws, and no single traffic-light verdict per Act. Where the discipline pulls against a tidy headline, the report states less rather than more.

2.4 · The existing PLS landscape (the baseline)

The report's "no review located" figures are not read against a blank page. An official post-legislative machinery already exists, and the report's contribution is a system-level denominator *across* that machinery, not the discovery of a void.

The central convention dates from 2008. Following the Law Commission's 2006 report on the subject (*Post-Legislative Scrutiny*, Law Com No 302), the Government set out its approach in a command paper, *Post-Legislative Scrutiny — The Government's Approach* (Cm 7320, March 2008). Under that convention the sponsoring department is expected to publish a post-legislative memorandum on an Act, generally three to five years after Royal Assent, and to submit it to the relevant departmental select committee, which then decides whether to undertake a fuller inquiry. As the authoritative account in *Erskine May* records, the memorandum is a preliminary assessment of whether the Act met its objectives, directed at the effectiveness of the legislation rather than at re-opening the policy itself; the Cabinet Office *Guide to Legislation* asks departments to plan toward the three-to-five-year point. The convention is also selective by design: a memorandum is not expected for Acts that are routine in nature, that already receive regular review, that are of only limited policy significance, or that have already been repealed.

The House of Lords adds a second route. Since 2012 the Lords Liaison Committee has undertaken to appoint at least one ad hoc post-legislative scrutiny committee each session, examining a chosen Act in depth over roughly a year; the first such committee, in 2012–13, examined adoption legislation. The Law Commission's role sits upstream of both routes: its 2006 report framed post-legislative scrutiny as a broad review of whether a statute's intended objectives were met and how effectively — the working definition the parliamentary routes still use.

In practice the machinery is thin, and this is the baseline against which the report's figures should be read. Research on the 2008–2019 period — notably Thomas Caygill's study for the Westminster Foundation for Democracy — finds the memorandum route used for only a minority of eligible Acts; in the sessions Caygill examined, roughly one in nine (about 11%) of Acts received the expected memorandum, with a decline in published memoranda since around 2015, and full parliamentary post-legislative inquiries over 2008–2019 numbering in the low tens (23, on that count). Two consequences follow for reading this report. First, the Institute's denominator counts *every* review route, not memoranda alone, so

its "any review located" share across the field is necessarily broader than the official memorandum uptake; the two numbers measure different things, and a naive comparison between them would mislead. Second, the official route's own selectivity — memoranda are not expected for routine, already-reviewed, minor or repealed Acts — is itself part of what the report observes about the system, not a defect the report has introduced. The question the report makes answerable is therefore not "does any machinery exist?" but "across complete cohorts, which Acts does that machinery — and every other route combined — actually reach?"

2.5 · Scope of this report (what is and isn't covered)

This is a picture of Westminster Public General Acts. It is not a picture of "the United Kingdom" as a single legal jurisdiction. The frame is confined to the primary legislation of the UK Parliament, and it excludes the territorial devolution and Northern Ireland-institutional settlements (the carve-out is set out at §5.2). Post-legislative scrutiny machinery, and the density and character of the statute book, differ across the devolved legislatures — the Scottish Parliament, Senedd Cymru and the Northern Ireland Assembly — where in places post-legislative scrutiny is differently organised. The series therefore speaks to UK-Parliament primary legislation, and not to Scottish, Welsh or Northern Irish law. A further territorial caveat applies within that frame: a Westminster Public General Act may extend England-only, to England and Wales, UK-wide, or asymmetrically across the four nations, so "Westminster" is not a synonym for "UK-wide". Per-Act territorial extent and application is part of the operational layer recorded below as forthcoming, and is not coded here.

This is a stated boundary of coverage, consistent with the Institute's founding terrain; it is not a judgement about devolution, nor about how well the devolved legislatures review their own statutes. Devolved primary legislation is of strong comparative interest and is a legitimate later extension of the work — it is simply outside the frame of this report.

A note on what this map is, and is not. This report is a **public-artefact coverage map** — a record, across complete cohorts, of which Acts have a located public post-legislative review artefact, and of what kind — and not an **operational compliance tracker**. The per-Act operational layer is forthcoming and is not determined here: convention-eligibility (whether the memorandum convention was expected to apply to a given Act), the due-window measured from each Act's actual Royal Assent, the current responsible department, per-Act territorial extent and application, and the initiation and follow-up flow-state of any review. "Located" is accordingly a fact about the public record and the search behind it; it is not a measure of whether a due review is overdue, whether internal or non-public review occurred, or whether any department complied.

2.6 · What this report claims, and what it does not

The report makes one kind of claim. Across fourteen complete annual cohorts of substantive Public General Acts (2008–2021), it describes the distribution of

located post-legislative review — by route, scope and strength — read at the level of the system. Its headline metric is the share of substantive Acts in each cohort for which no public review could be located, reported alongside the field aggregate across all fourteen cohorts. The detailed construction of that metric, the carve-out rule that defines the substantive frame, and the search protocol behind the word "located" are set out in the methodology (§5) and the findings (§3).

The report does not claim that any individually named Act is unreviewed: a "none located" coding is a statement about the public record and the routes searched, as of June 2026, not about the world. It does not claim that any Act works or fails — there is no merits verdict anywhere within it. It offers no ranking of departments or of laws, and no single composite verdict per Act. Where a review exists, the report relays what that review found, attributed and bounded, and it does not re-run the original policy debate.

Every empirical figure is reported exactly as it appears in the reconciled fourteen-cohort series, with approximate figures left approximate where the source carries them; nothing is recomputed, and no new rate is introduced; the sole later change-layer is the stage-3 audit of §5.6, whose two re-codes are marked ✚ and traced in full. The limits on each figure are carried in the prose beside it — because the Institute's authority rests on stating no more than the evidence, and the search, will bear.

Sources for §2.4 (existing-landscape baseline): Law Commission, Post-Legislative Scrutiny (Law Com No 302, 2006); HM Government, Post-Legislative Scrutiny — The Government's Approach (Cm 7320, March 2008); Cabinet Office, Guide to Legislation; Erskine May, "Post-legislative scrutiny of Acts"; House of Lords Liaison Committee (2012 onwards); T. Caygill, post-legislative scrutiny in the UK Parliament 2008–2019 (Westminster Foundation for Democracy, 2021). All empirical figures in §1 derive from the reconciled fourteen-cohort series.

§3 · Findings

The findings below are read from the reconciled fourteen-cohort series and its verification pass, and from those alone; every figure traces to that source. They describe the *system* of post-legislative review — which cohorts, and which kinds of Act, attract a located review — and they do not judge the merits of any law. Throughout, "no review located" means no public post-legislative review found in the routes the search checked, as of June 2026, and nothing more: it is a statement about what the search reached, not a finding that a statute fails to work, that any department neglected its duty, or that no internal or non-public evaluation exists. The empirical core of the report rests on the patterns that hold *inside* each cohort — salience (§3.4) and the statutory-review-clause association (§3.5); the cross-cohort movement over time (§3.2) is reported descriptively and is the weakest of the findings.

3.1 · The frame and the headline metric

The unit of analysis is the annual cohort — one calendar year's Public General Acts of the United Kingdom Parliament, from 2008 to 2021. The report works cohort by cohort because composition varies sharply from year to year (§3.6), and a single flat pool would hide that variation; the fourteen cohorts are a panel of small, separately-coded populations, each with its own mix of Acts.

Within each cohort the **frame** is the cohort's Public General Acts minus a defined set of carve-outs — `frame = PGA − carve-outs = substantive Acts`. The carve-outs are the three families of law that cannot be meaningfully reviewed after the fact: territorial devolution and Northern-Ireland-institutional settlements, EU-procedural and withdrawal machinery, and internal parliamentary-estate or machinery provisions. The rule and its boundary are set out in full in the methodology; for the findings the point to carry is that the carve is narrow and the frame is robust to it — at reconciliation the entire carve-boundary decision returned only two Acts to frame (the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 and the Olympic (Amendment) Act 2011, §3.7), and the field aggregate shifts only at the margin under that return. Rather than treat the headline as independent of the carve, the report bounds it across alternative principled frames (§3.3); the carve itself is a judgement about which law can be meaningfully reviewed after the fact, not a fact, and what falls inside and outside it is listed at §5.2. Two denominators are kept apart throughout, and the distinction is developed at §3.3: the substantive frame defined here is the *public-map* denominator — every substantive Act, the basis of the headline — whereas any statement about the scrutiny *system's* reach belongs against a narrower, **convention-eligible** denominator, since official post-legislative scrutiny is selective by design.

Each substantive Act's review-state is recorded across the seven assessment axes described in §2, and that record is then read down to one of three states.

Filled marks an Act for which a located post-legislative review exists. **Half** marks a partial or component review, or a self-report the Act creates about its own operation. **Open** marks an Act for which no public review has been located. For the headline denominator the report uses a **single reduced outcome** (filled / half / open); the seven axes are **preserved for interpretation and not combined into a composite score**. The three-state reading is a record of whether a review was located, not a quality score, and the report issues no scorecard, no league table and no traffic-light rating of any Act or cohort.

The **headline metric** is the share of a cohort's frame that sits in the open state — "**% none located**". For 2008, for example, the metric reads 22%; for 2019 it reads 60%. The complement — the share with at least some located review (filled or half) — is the figure the metric is sometimes more constructively read against (§3.3).

What "% none located" means must be stated precisely, because it is the report's most quotable and most misreadable number. It means: *no public post-legislative review located in the routes checked, as of June 2026.* It is search-bounded. It does **not** mean that the laws in the open share do not work, that half the statute book is useless, or that officials failed to do their job; internal or non-public review may exist beyond the routes the search reached, and the metric is silent on the substance of any Act. This caveat is not a footnote to the metric — it is part of the metric's definition, and the readings in §3.3 and §3.4 are built on it.

Finally, the cross-cohort object is a **denominator-of-denominators**. The metric is computed *within* each cohort, against that cohort's own frame; only then are the fourteen results stacked into the series and the field aggregate (§3.3). The aggregate is therefore the union of fourteen separate denominators, not a single population coded in one pass — which is the correct construction precisely because each cohort's denominator has a different composition, and the cohort, not the pooled Act, is the unit at which the metric is meaningful.

3.2 · The fourteen-cohort series and the block trend

The reconciled series, oldest to newest, is the headline metric for each cohort:

2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
22%	38%	45%	33%	39%	48%	25%	45%	37%	52%	48%	60%	62%	59%

Read year to year, the series scatters. It climbs from 2008 to 2010 (22% → 45%) and then falls sharply to 2011 (33%); it reaches 48% in 2013 and drops to 25% in 2014; it sits at 52% in 2017 and 48% in 2018 before jumping to 60% in 2019. A clean year-by-year monotone gradient — the intuition that each successive cohort should show a slightly higher "none located" share than the one before — does **not** hold. The pilot cohorts first exposed this, and it persists into the full series: the year-by-year picture is noisy.

Grouped into successive blocks, however, the movement is monotone. Across the four blocks 2008–2011, 2012–2015, 2016–2018 and 2019–2021, the none-located share rises at every step:

> 2008–2011 ≈ **34%** → 2012–2015 ≈ **40%** → 2016–2018 ≈ **46%** → 2019–2021 ≈ **60%**.

Each block's share is higher than the last. The natural reading is the one the series itself suggests: more time since enactment means more chance that a review has had the opportunity to appear, so the older blocks show a lower none-located share and the most recent block the highest. The honest characterisation is therefore a **block-level age-trend with substantial cohort scatter** — not a smooth climb, and not a finding that any single year is "more reviewed" than its neighbour. The scatter around the blocks is large enough that no individual year-to-year step can be read as a trend in its own right. The blocks themselves are **unweighted descriptive groupings**, not a fitted model, and they are **sensitive to where the block boundaries are drawn (on rolling four-year windows the rise is not monotone — the 2011–2014 window sits below its neighbours)**; they are reported as a descriptive summary and are **not load-bearing**. The weight of the findings rests on the within-cohort patterns of §3.4 and §3.5, which hold regardless of a cohort's age; an age-keyed (event-history) analysis, dated to Royal Assent and commencement, is **forthcoming** and is the proper basis for any reading of timing.

Two limits travel with this. First, the trend is the *softest* of the report's findings: it is entangled with composition (§3.6), so it cannot be attributed to age alone, and it is used descriptively only — the load-bearing claims rest on the within-cohort patterns of §3.4 and §3.5, which hold regardless of a cohort's age. Second, several of these points were revised at harmonization (§3.7), and the net direction of those revisions was upward; the block gradient is, if anything, marginally firmer after correction than the raw coding implied, rather than an artefact softened by it.

3.3 · The field aggregate

Pooling all fourteen cohorts — the union of the fourteen denominators described in §3.1 — gives the field-level figure: of **311 substantive Acts**, **137** have no located post-legislative review, **≈ 44%**.

What "located review" counts — and what it does not. A located review is not a single kind of thing. The label spans heterogeneous artefacts of very different weight: a departmental post-legislative memorandum, a select-committee inquiry, a National Audit Office or Public Accounts Committee report, an independent statutory reviewer's report, a statutory self-report the Act creates about its own operation, a regulator's report, a commissioned evaluation, or a review of a single named component. These are tabulated by route in Appendix E, where the per-route counts are set out; the headline band is the union across them. One distinction matters for reading that band: a post-legislative **memorandum is the input to committee scrutiny, not full post-legislative scrutiny itself** — a preliminary departmental assessment that a

committee may or may not take up. The safe form of the headline is therefore that **≈ 56% of substantive Acts had some public review, evaluation or reporting artefact located, while a smaller, separately counted subset — ≈ 30% — had a formal whole-Act memorandum or committee post-legislative scrutiny.** The two figures count different things and should travel together.

The complement — the share with at least some located review — is best reported as a **band**, not a single number, because what counts as a review changes the figure. Requiring a **whole-Act or formal** review (the *filled* reading) gives **94 / 311 ≈ 30%** — the formal whole-Act cut. Including **partial, component and statutory-report** reviews as well (the *half* reading) gives **174 / 311 ≈ 56%**. Either way, **≈ 44% have none located**. The reviewed share should therefore travel as a band — **≈ 30% (filled) to ≈ 56% (any located)** — not as a single 55%. One official-guidance point sharpens even the upper bound: a post-legislative **memorandum is itself a preliminary assessment, not a full review**, so the *filled* figure is already generous about depth, and much of what counts as "located review" is lighter-touch than a full evaluation.

The same meaning guard applies here as to the per-cohort metric, and matters more at the aggregate because this is the number most likely to travel on its own. "≈ 44% none located" is *no public post-legislative review located in the routes checked, as of June 2026* — not a claim that 45% of the statute book is defective, and not a charge against any department. The defensible companions to this figure, and the ones the report foregrounds beside it, are the salience finding (§3.4) and the statutory-review-clause association (§3.5), both of which are constructive and far harder to distort than the bare unreviewed share. The aggregate is best read as the starting point for the structural question — *which* Acts make up the unreviewed share — rather than as a verdict in itself.

The headline's sensitivity to the carve is reported as a bound, not asserted away. The substantive frame rests on a carve-out, and that carve is a judgement about which law can be meaningfully reviewed after the fact — not a fact about the law. Bounding the headline under alternative principled frames: on the widest frame, all Public General Acts with no carve at all (≈ 438 Acts), the none-located share would fall between **≈ 32%** — were none of the carved Acts counted as open — and **≈ 61%** — were all of them counted as open; the report's principled substantive frame sits at **≈ 44%** within that range. What the carve removes is the three families that cannot be meaningfully post-legislatively reviewed — territorial devolution and Northern-Ireland-institutional settlements, EU-procedural and withdrawal machinery, and internal parliamentary-estate or machinery provisions — while non-devolution constitutional law with a substantive, ongoing, reviewable regime stays in frame (the carve register is set out at §5.2). The headline is therefore bounded by where the carve line falls, not independent of it.

Two denominators must be kept apart, because they answer different questions. The first is **all substantive Acts** — the frame of §3.1, and the denominator behind every headline here; it is the right basis for a **public map** of which Acts

carry a located review. The second is the set of **convention-eligible Acts** — the denominator relevant to any statement about the scrutiny *system's* reach. Official post-legislative scrutiny is **selective and proportionate by design**: beyond the Finance Acts already carved from the frame, the memorandum convention does not expect a post-legislative memorandum for **Consolidation, Statute Law (Repeals), Private and Armed Forces Acts**, nor for Acts the relevant committee agrees are of very limited significance, or already repealed or reviewed. It follows that **"≈ 44% none located" is a coverage fact about the substantive Westminster PGA frame — not a measure of convention failure.** Against a convention-eligible denominator the located-review rate would be expected to be higher, and the none-share lower; the precise direction and size are not asserted until per-Act eligibility flagging is released, and this should not be read as convention failure. That **precise convention-eligible denominator is forthcoming**.

3.4 · Salience: flagship statutes and the long tail

The most stable descriptive pattern in the data is one of **salience**, not of the trend. On a standardised definition of a major Act, clearly-major statutes attract some located review far more often than the field as a whole.

The definition is applied uniformly across all fourteen cohorts: a **clearly-major Act** is a flagship substantive Government Act *or* a major constitutional Act — **not** a narrow Private Member's Bill, a consolidation, a curative or retrospective Act, a spent or event-specific Act, or a tax-administration Act. On that definition, the field-level rate is stark: of **≈ 130** clearly-major Acts across the fourteen cohorts, **12** have no located review, giving a **major-only artefact-located rate of ≈ 91%** — against **≈ 56% any located (≈ 30% on a whole-Act/formal-review basis)** for all substantive Acts (the **≈ 44%** none of §3.3). The salience gap is large.

It is also high *within* every cohort, not just in aggregate. The verification pass records the standardised major-only rate per cohort (approximate, because the "major" boundary is a judgement and per-cohort denominators wobble by one or two Acts):

```
2008 ~87-93% · 2009 ~90% · 2010 100% · 2011 100% · 2012 ~86% · 2013 ~90% ·
2014 ~100%
2015 ~83%    · 2016 ~88% · 2017 ~78% · 2018 100% · 2019 ~75% · 2020 ~71%  ·
2021 ~92%
```

No cohort's major-only rate falls below the low-sixties, and most sit in the high-eighties to a hundred per cent — a flagship statute is, in every year, much more likely to attract a located review than a typical substantive Act of the same year.

The none-located remainder — the ≈ 44% open — is correspondingly dominated by a particular kind of law. It is overwhelmingly **narrow Private Member's Bills, Law-Commission codifications, never-commenced provisions, and spent or event-specific Acts**: statutes that, by their nature, either cannot be meaningfully reviewed (spent or event-specific), have no operation to review (never commenced), or are technical or codifying measures that rarely draw a dedicated review. The unreviewed share is structurally patterned, not random.

A second pattern sits inside the major subset and points the same way as the trend of §3.2. The unreviewed clearly-major Acts are **not evenly spread across the cohorts** — they **cluster in the most recent years**. The verification pass counts one in 2020 (the Sentencing Code consolidation is excluded from the strict set under the uniform rule adopted at the parallel-line adoption, §5.6; counting it gives two) and one in 2021 (c.23; c.22 is adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check), with further cases across 2017–2019. Reading this requires the conventional timetable stated correctly: the post-legislative memorandum convention runs **three to five years from Royal Assent**. As of June 2026 that places the **2019 cohort (≈ 7 years on) and most of the 2020 cohort past that window**, with only **2021 — and part of 2020 — not yet due**. The consequence is a more careful reading than a blanket "not yet": the **newest cohort (2021, and the tail of 2020) is too recent** for a review to be expected, while **some 2019 and 2020 Acts are now beyond the ordinary three-to-five-year window measured from actual Royal Assent** — subject to commencement timing, to the relevant committee agreeing that no memorandum is required, and to non-public or internal review, none of which is determined here. The flagship Acts in the recent cluster (the Divorce, Dissolution and Separation Act 2020, the Financial Services Act 2021, the Overseas Operations Act) span both readings — the very newest are not-yet-due, while the older of them sit at or beyond the window. The age-trend is real within the major subset — the lowest major-only rates are the youngest cohorts (2020 ~71%, 2019 ~70%, 2017 ~78%) — but it should be read as the conventional window closing on successively more cohorts, not as an assurance that the recent majors with no located review will all eventually be reviewed. An Act-level clock keyed to Royal Assent and commencement is the proper basis for this judgement and is **forthcoming**.

It is not, however, pure recency. There are genuine **old major cases** in the unreviewed set: no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact has been located under the three-door rule, as of June 2026, for the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 2008, the Political Parties and Elections Act 2009, or the Civil Aviation Act 2012 — for which the stage-3 audit flags a 2023 public-bodies review of the CAA for adjudication under the three-door rule (§5.6). This does not determine whether internal, non-public, committee-agreed, or operational review occurred. These are well-aged flagship statutes for which the search reached no qualifying artefact — so the unreviewed-major share is a mix of the **not-yet cohorts (2021 and the tail of 2020)**, a band of **2019–2020 majors now beyond the ordinary window measured from Royal Assent**, and a residue of **well-aged older cases** — not a recency effect alone.

Beyond those, the older open cases are spread thinly across the mature cohorts as single cases rather than concentrated in any one year — among them the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013, the Insurance Act 2015 and the Deregulation Act 2015, and the Housing and Planning Act 2016, each a clearly-major Act for which no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact was located under the three-door rule, as of June 2026 — which does not determine whether internal, non-public, committee-agreed, or operational review occurred.

One case in the open share is of a different kind altogether and is worth separating from the rest: the Mental Capacity (Amendment) Act 2019, whose Liberty Protection Safeguards scheme was never commenced. It sits open not because a review of an operating regime is missing, but because there is no operation to review — the Act was passed and never brought into force — which marks a distinct, never-tested class within the open share, closer to the never-commenced category of the long tail than to an ordinary "not yet". The same care applies to the spent and event-specific Acts at the other structural edge of the tail: there the open state records that the Act's provisions have lapsed, not that an active regime escaped scrutiny.

The leading rival explanation must be named directly: search-visibility bias. Prominent Acts leave more locatable public traces — departmental memoranda, select-committee reports, House of Commons Library briefings, and the like — than narrow or technical Acts do. Part of the ≈ 91% major-only rate may therefore reflect the *easier discovery* of reviews of major Acts, rather than a pure difference in whether review actually happened. This is the report's main alternative reading of the salience gap, and it is carried as a live caveat rather than dismissed.

Even so, the caveat does not fully account for the pattern (though it cannot be quantified here), for a structural reason: the unreviewed *tail* is dominated by Acts that cannot or are unlikely to be reviewed at all — spent and event-specific Acts, never-commenced provisions, and codifications — so the gap is not only an artefact of how easy the reviews are to find. It is stated, accordingly, as **strong but not established**, with visibility flagged as the principal alternative explanation.

It is also robust to the obvious objection that the "major" set is itself a coding judgement. The ≈ 130-Act denominator is a boundary call, and reasonable analysts would draw it slightly differently — moving borderline cases such as the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 2008 or the Employment Act 2008 in or out. A **sensitivity check** therefore matters: as the major set is shifted by a few Acts in either direction, the major-only rate stays within the **≈ 85–90% band**. The finding does not depend on any one definition of "major"; it holds across the reasonable redefinitions of the set. That converts the definitional caveat into an argument for robustness rather than a disclaimer against it — salience is the finding that holds inside every cohort, that the visibility caveat does not qualitatively overturn, and that the definitional wobble does not quantitatively overturn.

3.5 · Statutory review clauses (▸S)

The single feature most consistently **associated** with whether a located review exists is whether the Act carries a **genuine statutory review clause** — a duty, written into the Act, to review or report on the Act's own operation (marked ▸S). Across all fourteen cohorts **all 78 ▸S Acts in the coded frame are filled or half — 78 of 78 with a located whole-or-partial artefact (a located-artefact rate on a sample-audited clause census, not a compliance or**

causal rate) — the **clearest association in the coded data**, in the sense that the presence of a genuine review clause consistently coincides with the presence of a located review. This is an association, not a demonstrated effect: where a statute carries a review duty a located review is **far more common**, but the data do not show that the clause causes the review. (This subsection reports the empirical association only; the legislative-design reading of it belongs to the implications section, not the findings.) One census caveat travels with the 100%: the ▸S flagging is a coded judgement over statute text, and the stage-3 audit (§5.6) located one duty the census had missed — the Jobseekers (Back to Work Schemes) Act 2013, s.2, whose statutory Oakley review enters the set located — so the figure is a sample-audited 100% (78 of 78), not an assumption. The clause-audit that followed (§5.6) sharpens this further, and not only in the reassuring direction: extending the clause-check to the named major-open Acts surfaced one late adjudication — the Financial Services Act 2021 (c.22), whose own Benchmarks-Regulation and Schedule 2A report duties make it ▸S rather than non-▸S: its first statutory report has issued — the FCA's Article-23E review of the exercise of the Act's benchmark powers, published 29 February 2024 with a copy to the Treasury — and c.22 is coded ▸S-half at the pre-publication check (§5.6). The defensible form of the headline is therefore that no ▸S Act is open on a sample-audited census with all flags now adjudicated, not that zero ▸S-open exist as exhaustively verified fact; and a survivorship boundary applies, since duties extinguished with a repealed Act (the Fiscal Responsibility Act 2010's reporting duty among them) never enter the denominator.

What counts as a genuine review clause is set by a line that runs between two of the seven assessment anchors — a line that the verification pass confirms is applied **identically across all fourteen cohorts**, and that must not be collapsed. A duty the Act creates to **lay a report on its own subject before Parliament**, carrying analytical content that would not be produced regardless (anchor A10), is a genuine review clause and reads as **half**: the Act generates a self-report on its own operation. A look-alike duty to make **routine operating statistics or data returns of a standing body** (anchor A15) is **not** a review clause and reads as **open**: it is data, not a review. The distinction is between a report the statute calls into being *about itself* and the ordinary statistical output of a body that would publish those numbers anyway — and it is why the A15 Acts below do not count against the ▸S finding.

The A10 → half side is well populated. The Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act 2011 (c.23) — section 20 requires an independent annual report on the operation of the Act, laid before Parliament — is the anchor case; the same call is made for the special-educational-needs reporting provision (2008 c.11), the Law Commission Act 2009 (c.14), the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (c.23), the Child Poverty Act 2010 (c.9), the Loans to Ireland Act 2010 (c.41), the Armed Forces (Covenant) reporting duty (2011 c.18), the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016 (c.1), the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 (c.7), the Istanbul-Convention reporting duty (2017 c.18), the Healthcare (European Economic Area and Switzerland Arrangements) Act 2019 (c.14), the

Fisheries Act 2020 (c.22), and the National Security and Investment Act 2021 (c.25) together with the Telecommunications (Security) Act 2021 (c.31).

The A15 → open side is the mirror image. The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding register-returns provision (2015 c.17) is the case that *set* the rule — a register return demoted to open because it is data, not review. The same line places on the open side the relevant returns under the Enterprise Act 2016 (c.12), the uptake statistics under 2018 c.10 and the routine annual reports of the National Data Guardian (2018 c.31), the Ministry of Justice family-court statistics associated with the Divorce, Dissolution and Separation Act 2020 (c.11), and the output of the Forensic Science Regulator (2021 c.14) and the Financial Services Compensation Scheme payout figures (2021 c.29).

Three calls were genuinely on the boundary, and the harmonization logs flagged them rather than resolving them silently — none changes a cohort headline, but they are carried transparently. The Telecommunications (Security) Act 2021 (c.31) was treated as borderline A10/A15 and kept as half. The Armed Forces (Covenant) reports (2011 c.18) cover *delivery* rather than the Act's own operation, which strains the half reading. The Recall of MPs Act 2015 (c.25) generates Electoral-Commission per-petition reports that were read as evaluative and kept half, though they could be read as routine. In each, the dominant reading was applied consistently, and the verification pass found no A10/A15 inconsistency that would move any cohort.

One bookkeeping note bears on this subsection's evidence. The old 2013 ▸S evidence note recorded the combined reviewed count, so the ▸S subset is not split filled-vs-half in this subsection; the cohort-level split is harmonised as filled 8 / half 5 / open 14 and revised at the stage-3 audit to filled 8 / half 6 / open 13 (Appendix B) — but they sit on the *reviewed* side of the line, consistent with the cross-cohort pattern, and nothing in 2013 contradicts the ▸S association.

3.6 · Age versus composition

The block age-trend of §3.2 and the salience pattern of §3.4 point in the same direction, but the two drivers behind them — how old a cohort is, and what it is made of — are **entangled**, and the panel cannot separate them.

The cohorts with the lowest none-located shares are also the compositionally heaviest. The four lowest — 2008 (22%), 2014 (25%), 2011 (33%) and 2016 (37%) — are heavyweight flagship-reform years, or years dense in statutory review clauses, or both. The cohorts with the highest shares are also the lightest: the three highest — 2020 (62%), 2019 (60%) and 2021 (59%) — are recent *and* diluted with Private Member's Bills and thin in flagship substance. So the years that look "most reviewed" are simultaneously older and rich in major or ▸S Acts, and the years that look "least reviewed" are simultaneously younger and light. Age and composition push the none-located share the same way and move together across the panel.

This is why the scatter of §3.2 is best read as **composition, not noise** — the high and low cohorts differ in what they contain, not merely in random variation

around a trend. And it is why neither driver can be credited on its own: the panel contains **no old-and-light year** — no well-aged cohort that is also dominated by narrow Private Member's Bills — to break the entanglement. Without such a year, the report attributes the block trend to the *pair* of age and composition, not to either alone, and treats any claim that age by itself drives the none-located share as unsupported by this data. It is the structural reason the cross-cohort trend is held to a descriptive role while the within-cohort findings (§3.4, §3.5), which hold regardless of a cohort's age or mix, carry the weight.

3.7 · What harmonization revealed

Reconciling the fourteen cohorts to a single standard did not overturn the picture, but it shifted it **uniformly upward** and located the drift on a single, well-understood boundary — which is itself informative about how much weight the comparison can bear.

The direction of the correction is the headline. **Five of the fourteen cohorts moved at harmonization** (the stage-2a step); the five are 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2020 (the 2013 demotion was subsequently reversed at the stage-3 audit, §5.6, which located the statutory Oakley review the re-search had missed), and **the net direction was upward**: every half→open demotion raised none%, the only counter-moves being a few headline-neutral filled↔half shifts and one offsetting open→half reclassification in 2016. Two further Acts were re-coded at reconciliation (the stage-2b step): the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 (c.25) returned to frame as half, and the Olympic (Amendment) Act 2011 (c.22) returned as open. These two are carve-boundary returns rather than coding-drift corrections, and their cohort effects ran in different directions — 2010 moved from 47% to 45% as a half-coded Act was added to its frame, while 2011 moved from 30% to 33%. The net across the whole pipeline is the same in either case: the field is systematically a little **less** reviewed than the raw coding implied, and the block gradient of §3.2 is firmer, not softer, after correction.

The drift has a **location**. The harmonization moves concentrate on the **half/open boundary**, and the recurring correction is half → open: a call that had credited a self-report or a partial review as half was found, on independent re-search, to be routine data or to have no located review, and dropped to open. The Self-build register-returns demotion (2015 c.17), which set the A10/A15 rule, is the clearest instance; the same shape recurs at 2017 (the Bus Services Act, c.21), 2019 (c.5) and 2020 (the Immigration provision, c.20). This is exactly the A10/A15 line of §3.5 in motion. Importantly, the boundary that moves is half ↔ open, **not** filled ↔ open — the strong-evidence end of the scale (filled Acts, ▸S Acts) is stable, and the corrections did not disturb it.

How much the cross-cohort comparison can lean on each cohort then depends on **three epistemic tiers**, which bear directly on the comparison's strength. First, one cohort is *pre-rubric and independently corrected*: 2015, coded before the rubric existed and then corrected on three counts — its moves are the **strongest** evidence that the audit catches drift, because the correction could not have been fitted to the rubric in advance (the stage-3 audit adds a matching

pilot data point: 2014’s c.28 correction, §5.6). Second, a group is *rubric-aware and lightly corrected on independent re-search*: the backfill cohorts 2008–2013 and 2020–2021, coded with the frozen standard in hand, each moving at most one Act at 2a. Third, four cohorts are *rubric-defining and so near-circular*: 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 helped define the rubric, so their "zero changes" is **weaker** evidence by construction — a clean result there can mean the rubric was fitted to the cohort rather than that the cohort was clean. The cross-cohort comparison therefore rests **mainly on the first two tiers**, and the four rubric-defining cohorts' clean results are discounted accordingly.

The overall reassurance is bounded and specific. Harmonization moved the series uniformly in one direction, confined the drift to the half/open border that the rubric most directly governs, and left the strong end untouched; the verification pass then confirmed the picture without moving any denominator — the standardised major-only recount held at ≈ 91%, the A10/A15 line was confirmed uniform across all fourteen cohorts, and the 2019 cohort was ledger-checked against the pilot record. The corrections sharpened the series rather than rewriting it.

§4 · What the findings suggest about the scrutiny system

Boundary statement. What follows are **systemic readings of the evidence — not recommendations, not verdicts on any law, and not findings about any department's good faith.** A finding of "no public review located" is, throughout, a statement about the public record and the routes searched as of 2026-06; it never implies that officials failed, because an internal or non-public evaluation may exist beyond the routes the Institute can check. Each reading below is **anchored on the findings that are stable *within* every cohort — the salience pattern and the statutory-review-clause (▸S) association** — which hold inside each year independently of the cross-cohort series. The **noisy year-to-year trend is used only descriptively**, never as the load-bearing basis for a systemic claim; where a reading leans on the trend (4.3 in particular) it is flagged as the softest. Weight in this section means **depth and hedging, not length or confidence**: the section is held to roughly the length of §3 so that it does not visually outweigh the findings it interprets, and length is treated as a signal that no quantity of caveats can overcome. The two firmest, finding-anchored readings (4.1, 4.2) are given the room; the more speculative readings (4.3, 4.6) are kept deliberately short. Finally, and in keeping with the Institute's standing separation of functions, **any recommendation about the review system is a separate, restrained act** governed by its own evidential discipline (it must name an actor, a problem, an evidential basis, a mechanism, a rationale and a trade-off); this section *reads* the system and makes none. The failure mode this section is written to avoid is collapse into advocacy.

4.1 · Statutory review clauses — the feature most consistently associated with a located review

The most stable relationship in the data is not between review and the age, subject or sponsor of an Act, but between review and a feature the statute carries on its own face. Across all fourteen cohorts, a **statutory review clause (▸S) is the single feature most consistently associated with whether a review is located: every ▸S Act (78/78) is coded *filled* or *half** *in every cohort. This holds* within* each cohort, not merely on average across them — which makes it the firmest reading here, independent of the noisy cross-cohort series and observed even in years that are otherwise unalike.

The reading this supports is about **legislative design, stated as an association rather than a demonstrated effect**: where a statute **carries** a duty to **report on that statute's own operation**, a located review is far more common (an association; causation is not tested here); where it carries no such duty, the outcome is much less certain. The reconciliation work sharpens this: *not every statutory reporting obligation behaves the same way*, and the

boundary it draws is instructive. A duty that produces a **self-report the Act creates about its own subject**, with analytical content that would not otherwise exist (the A10 line), is associated with a located review and is coded *half*; a duty that produces only **routine operating statistics or data returns of a standing body** (the A15 line) is not a review and is coded *open*. The Institute's verification pass confirmed this line is drawn identically across all fourteen cohorts. The anchor case on the A15 side is the 2015 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act, where register returns are data, not an evaluation, and the demotion of that case is what fixed the rule; the matching A10-side anchor — a statutory duty to report on an Act's own operation — is the one set out with the method.

This association is legible because it is *visible in the text of the law itself*. Unlike salience, age or political prominence — which an analyst must infer — the presence of a report-on-operation clause is a documented design choice, which is why it is the clearest association in the coded data and the one a reader can check independently.

Two hedges keep this a reading rather than a claim of cause. First, **it is an association, not a demonstrated mandate**: the data shows that a located review is found for almost all ▸S Acts, not that the clause *causes* the review or that one would not otherwise have been located. Second, **the associated feature and salience are entangled**: report-on-operation clauses appear more often in substantial Government Acts than in narrow private members' bills, so part of what the ▸S signal captures may overlap with the salience pattern in 4.2 rather than standing wholly apart from it. What the evidence licenses is the modest statement that *the route most consistently associated with a located review, across every cohort, is a statutory duty to report on the law's own operation* — what the data associates, not a rule the system is shown to obey.

4.2 · The net is associated with salience — robust, but hedged for visibility

The second firm reading is that located review is **strongly patterned by the salience of the Act**, and that the patterning is structural rather than random. On the standardised definition of a *clearly-major* Act — a flagship substantive Government Act or a major constitutional Act, and not a narrow private member's bill, a consolidation, a curative or retrospective Act, a spent or event Act, or a tax-administration Act — the **field-level major-only located-review rate is ≈ 91%** (12 unreviewed clearly-major Acts out of ≈ 130), against an all-substantive located-review share that runs as a **band from ≈ 30% (whole-Act or formal review only) to ≈ 56% (any located review)** across the 311 substantive Acts — the complement of the ≈ 44% with no located review. The gap between the ≈ 85–90% major-only band and the ≈ 30–55% all-substantive band is large under either reading, and it holds inside the cohorts as well as across the field. The remainder with no located review is correspondingly dominated not by neglected flagship statutes — though 12 clearly-major Acts do remain with none located — but by **narrow private members' bills, Law-**

Commission codifications, never-commenced provisions, and spent or event Acts — categories of law that structurally cannot, or are unlikely to, attract a post-legislative review at all.

The reading is conditional on the **denominator**. Read against **all substantive Acts** — the *public-map* denominator, the report's headline — low-salience law sits largely in the no-public-artefact-located group in a structured rather than random distribution, and the selectivity is patterned rather than even. But official post-legislative scrutiny is **selective and proportionate by design**: the memorandum convention exempts whole categories (Finance — already carved — and, by guidance, **Consolidation, Statute Law Repeal, Private and Armed Forces Acts**, plus committee-agreed exemptions for Acts of very limited significance or already repealed or reviewed). A claim about a gap in the *system's reach* therefore has to be made against the **convention-eligible** denominator, not against all substantive Acts. Stated plainly: the ≈ 44% with no located review is a **coverage fact about the 2008–2021 substantive-Act frame, not a measure of convention failure**; against a convention-eligible denominator the located-review share is higher and the none-share lower — by a margin not estimated here. The precise convention-eligible denominator requires per-Act eligibility flagging and is **forthcoming** — no number is asserted here. What the evidence shows is the shape of the selectivity, conditional on which denominator it is read against.

This is the most stable descriptive pattern in the coded data, and the one with the clearest rival explanation, carried here in full. **Prominent Acts leave more locatable public traces** — committee inquiries, command papers, press coverage, secondary literature — so part of the ≈ 91% may reflect the *easier discovery* of reviews of major Acts rather than a real difference in whether a review exists to be located. The qualitative finding holds against this challenge (the size of any visibility effect is not quantified), because the tail with no located review is dominated by Acts that are structurally improbable review subjects (spent, never-commenced, codifications) rather than by hard-to-find reviews of important laws — but it stands as **strong, not proven**, and the visibility bias is named as the principal alternative reading, not buried.

A sensitivity consideration bounds the obvious objection. The ≈ 130 "major" denominator is itself a **coding judgement**, and a reasonable analyst could move the boundary by a handful of Acts in either direction. When the major set is shifted by ±a few Acts, the major-only located-review rate moves only within an **≈ 85–90% band**, so the rate does not hang on any single borderline classification. The salience gap holds across reasonable redefinitions of "major" within that band; the ±-a-few-Acts wobble in the boundary is a limit on the precision of the rate, recorded as such. The per-cohort rates, approximate for the same boundary reason, sit consistently high — at or near 100% in 2010, 2011 and 2014, and lowest in the youngest cohorts (taken up in 4.3) — but the **field-level figure is the comparable quantity**, and the named major Acts with no located review (search-bounded) are the checkable evidence behind it.

4.3 · Located artefacts appear several years out — a cohort-age reading, not a measured departmental delay (descriptive)

This reading is the softest in the section, because it leans on the cross-cohort series, which scatters year to year. In four-year blocks the share with no located review rises — **≈ 34% (2008–2011) → ≈ 40% (2012–2015) → ≈ 46% (2016–2018) → ≈ 60% (2019–2021)** — and the same gradient reappears *inside the major subset*, where the lowest major-only rates are the youngest cohorts. The unreviewed clearly-major Acts are **not evenly spread but cluster in the recent cohorts** (one in 2020 — the Sentencing Code consolidation is excluded under the uniform rule; counting it gives two — and one in 2021 — c.23; c.22 adjudicated ▸S-half pre-publication — with further cases across 2017–2019). Some — the very newest, in 2021 and the tail of 2020 — are simply too new to have had a located review within any normal timetable; the flagship Acts behind the cluster include the recent divorce, sentencing, financial-services and overseas-operations statutes.

The reading this supports is therefore one of timing (for 2021 and part of 2020), not established neglect, but the timing has to be read against the conventional window (see 4.6). For the newest cohort — 2021, and partly 2020 — a major Act with no located review may be “not yet” rather than “never” — the coding alone cannot distinguish the two, and this report assigns neither status. For the older 2019–2020 Acts, now beyond the ordinary window measured from actual Royal Assent, the same gap is no longer simply "not yet" — though it remains subject to commencement timing, committee agreement that no memorandum is required, and non-public or internal review, none of which is determined here (see 4.6). The qualifier is that this is not pure recency — there are *old* major Acts with no located review too (the 2008 regulatory-enforcement, 2009 political-parties and 2012 civil-aviation statutes among them) — so the timing pattern is a tendency, not a rule. But a substantial part of the share with no located review, even among majors, tracks how recently the Act was passed — though age cannot be fully separated from composition on this panel. For each Act named in this reading, the coding records only that a public-review artefact was not located in the specified routes as of June 2026; this does not determine whether internal, non-public, committee-agreed, or operational review occurred.

What this raises is a question about **system cadence — whether review is scheduled or ad hoc** — not a charge that any department was slow. A scheduled rhythm is what makes “not yet” distinguishable from “none located as of June 2026”: tied to a predictable point in a law's life (a review window closing, a commencement, a superseding Act), "not yet" resolves in time; left ad hoc, the public-record gap may persist unresolved — its duration is not estimated here. The Institute reads this as a question about the *design of the system's tempo*, posed by the evidence and left open, not as an attribution of delay to any actor.

4.4 · Supersession is not review — a recurring system pattern, not a fault

A pattern visible across the corpus is that **the corpus contains recurring cases in which an Act's provisions are amended, replaced, or folded into a wider reform before any public evaluation of the original Act's operation was located (the report does not quantify the pattern). The Institute's method keeps this distinct from review: legislative change is recorded on the***substitution / supersession* axis and is **never** coded as a review of whether the original Act worked — unless the superseding process itself published a review of the original's operation, in which case that review, not the amendment, becomes the review record. The reason the architecture insists on the separation is exactly that **revisiting a subject through new legislation is a common alternative to evaluating the old law**.

The systemic reading is that "reform ahead of any located public review" recurs as a pattern in the record — the coding does not estimate its frequency — in how the statute book changes: a law is overtaken by the next legislative vehicle before any post-legislative check on its own operation is located. This is offered as a *pattern, not a fault* — superseding a law can be the right policy response, and the absence of a prior located review is a statement about the public record, not a criticism of the decision to legislate again.

Two restraints bound this reading. It is **qualitative, not quantified here**: the report's aggregates are denominators of located review, not a counted rate of supersession-without-review, so the pattern is one the method detects and keeps separate, not a measured share. And it does not license any judgement on the merits — neither that the superseded law worked, nor that it did not, nor that the replacement was wise. What the architecture's separation establishes is the narrower, more defensible point that **a later Act standing in the place of an earlier one is not evidence that the earlier one had a located review**, and the data is coded so the two are never confused.

4.5 · Never-commenced provisions — a distinct class of enacted-but-untested law

A further part of the share with no located review is of a different character again, and is worth separating from "enacted, operating, but unreviewed". Some provisions are **passed but never brought into force**: the Act, or its central provision, reaches Royal Assent and then is never commenced. The Institute's coding marks this as its own state (a provision *not commenced*, or an Act whose *central purpose is not in force*), and it carries a specific consequence — an un-commenced provision **cannot be judged on its effect**, because there is nothing operating to evaluate.

The class is not hypothetical. The Liberty Protection Safeguards in the 2019 Mental Capacity (Amendment) Act are a major reform that has not been commenced, which is why no review of its operation is located — there is, as yet, no operation to review. The same class includes other enacted-but-untested

provisions — the social-care costs cap and the Saving Gateway among them — identified in the report's design as instances of the same phenomenon.

The reading is that this is a **scrutiny gap of a different kind** from the ordinary "no located review" case. For an operating-but-unreviewed Act, the open question is whether a review has been located for a law that is doing something; for a never-commenced provision, **whether a law Parliament passed is in operation and to what effect**. Treating the two as one distorts the picture: a "none located" coding on a never-commenced provision is not a missing review of a working law but the visible trace of a law enacted and then left untested. The Institute records the commencement state as a public fact and reads it as a distinct category of gap; it makes no claim, in either direction, about whether such a provision should have been commenced.

4.6 · The memorandum convention, in practice — read against a maturation window (short)

This reading must be set against the baseline described in §2 — the Government convention that a department publishes a **post-legislative memorandum three to five years after Royal Assent**, with scrutiny by the relevant select committee — and against a *maturation window keyed to that clock*, or it misleads. Because the convention runs three-to-five years **from Royal Assent**, as of the 2026 check date only the newest cohort — **2021, and the tail of 2020** — falls, on Royal-Assent timing alone and before per-Act eligibility and commencement checks, within the ordinary memorandum window — this report classifies no Act as due or overdue; its high share of "none located" is therefore expected on the convention's own timetable and is not a finding about how far the convention is applied in practice. Measured from actual Royal Assent, **the 2019 cohort (≈ 7 years out) and most of 2020 are now beyond that ordinary window**; for those cohorts a "none located" coding is no longer simply "not yet" — though it remains subject to commencement timing, committee agreement that no memorandum is required, and non-public or internal review, none of which is determined here.

A reading about how far the convention is applied in practice is therefore available for the **mature cohorts, now including 2019–2020**, which are past the ordinary window measured from Royal Assent. There, the observed pattern is consistent with the salience reading in 4.2: located reviews concentrate on the more prominent Acts, so the convention's reach, on this evidence, appears **uneven across the long tail** rather than uniform (a located-artefact pattern; departmental compliance is not measured) — subject to the same exceptions noted above (delayed commencement, committee agreement that no memorandum is required, non-public review), none determined here. This is an observed pattern about **where located reviews are found** — with the same visibility caveat as 4.2 (part of the unevenness may be easier discovery of reviews of prominent Acts) — kept brief and non-accusatory: a statement about the public record, not about any department's diligence.

4.7 · What the denominator permits — a methodological note (short)

Stated narrowly, what this report's denominator permits is **cross-route comparison across the searched frame**: a single, checkable map of *which* cohorts and *which* Acts have a located review and which do not, computed over a complete frame rather than assembled from a curated selection. Because the same three-door rule and the same coding are applied to every Act in the frame, located reviews arriving by different routes — a departmental memorandum, a select-committee inquiry, an NAO or PAC study, an independent statutory reviewer, a statutory self-report, a regulator report, a commissioned evaluation, or a component review — are recorded on one consistent basis and can be compared within and across cohorts. That comparability is the methodological point, and the limit of the claim: it is not a statement about the adequacy of any review or the merits of any law.

The discipline that keeps this narrow is the same separation invoked in the boundary statement: the seven assessment axes are reported as a **distribution, never as a composite grade**; named laws and departments are not ranked; and any view about how the review system should change is held to a **separate, evidence-bound recommendation act**, not introduced here. The construction is **auditable in design and partially reproducible from the released companion materials**, with full per-Act reproduction — against the dataset, source URLs, and negative logs — forthcoming. The output is a coverage map and a basis for cross-route comparison, not a verdict on any review or any law.

4.8 · The limits of these readings

These readings vary in how firmly the evidence supports them, and the variation should travel with them. The **firmest** are the two anchored on within-cohort-stable findings, both held as **associations**: the **statutory-review-clause association (4.1)** and the **salience pattern (4.2)**, each of which holds inside every cohort and is not overturned by the stated challenges — the visibility bias and the ±-a-few-Acts wobble in the "major" boundary — remaining strong rather than proven. The **softest** are the **trend-based readings**, above all the **timing reading (4.3)**, which leans on the noisy cross-cohort series and on entangled age-and-composition effects that the panel cannot separate, and which is therefore offered as descriptive only. The supersession (4.4) and memorandum-convention (4.6) readings are pattern-level and qualitative, bounded by what the coded axes — not a counted rate — can support; the never-commenced reading (4.5) rests on a documented commencement state and is firm as to category, silent as to merit.

Several limits apply to all of them, on top of the boundary statement's. Every "none located" finding is **search-bounded** — no public post-legislative review was located in the routes checked as of 2026-06, never that an Act "is

unreviewed" and never that any department failed. The cross-cohort comparison rests mainly on the cohorts that are independent evidence (the pre-rubric and rubric-aware tiers); the four rubric-defining cohorts' clean results are, by construction, weaker and not leaned on. None of these readings is a **recommendation**, and none is a **merits verdict on any law**. What the evidence licenses is a set of careful readings about the *shape* of where located review falls across the system's legislation — most securely, that a located review is most consistently associated with a statutory duty to report on a law's operation, and that located reviews concentrate on salient law — and nothing stronger.

§5 · Methodology and reproducibility

This section sets out how the review-state of every substantive Act in the panel was established, made consistent across cohorts, and verified — so that the figures in §3 can be read with their construction in full view rather than taken on trust. Three commitments govern everything below: whether an Act has a review is established by a fresh search every time and never recalled from memory; the absence of located evidence is treated as search-bounded and never as proof that no review exists; and the report records what located reviews concluded, attributed to them, without minting a verdict of its own. Every empirical figure traces to the reconciled fourteen-cohort series and its verification pass; the method and its companion materials are released so that an independent party can re-run any cohort's coding to the same standard. The work is **auditable in design and partially reproducible from those released materials**; full per-Act reproduction is forthcoming.

5.1 The three-stage pipeline

The analysis runs through three stages — coding, harmonization, and reconciliation — each of which exists to protect a single invariant: the product's object is the cross-cohort comparison, and a comparison is valid only if every cohort in it was judged by the same borderline rules. The governing rule that follows from this is that no cross-cohort number is published until every compared cohort has passed the same harmonization. A single cohort's denominator is publishable on its own once it has been coded; the series, the gradient, and any age-or-composition claim are not.

Stage 1 (coding) takes one cohort-year at a time. It builds the frame from that year's Public General Acts, codes every substantive Act through one tight fresh web search, closes the denominator, and emits a compact cohort-record — a roughly one-kilobyte block that the rest of the pipeline ingests. Coding deliberately stops at that record: it does not insert the year into any series, does not recompute a series, and builds at most a single-cohort artifact.

Stage 2a (harmonization, per cohort) re-adjudicates one cohort's borderline `half/open` calls strictly against the rubric anchors, demoting anything that rests on routine data-returns, on a duty merely referenced in another body's review, on implementation, on commentary, on supersession, on pre-dating work, or on a never-commenced core provision. Every change is logged with the rule that forced it. Because parallel re-auditors can themselves drift, stage 2b (reconciliation) is run once, serially, over all the logs together: it does not re-code, but audits that the same rules were applied uniformly, resolves any residual inter-cohort inconsistency, assembles the strict-comparable series, and states honestly what the aligned series does and does not say. The reconciled series is the only object from which the synthesis is permitted to quote cross-cohort numbers.

The pilot shows why this staging is not bureaucracy. Harmonizing the 2015 cohort moved it from ~32% to ~45% "none located" and broke the apparent age-gradient that the unharmonized numbers had suggested. Drift is real, and it lives on the `half/open` border. The compact record is the narrow waist of the whole path: a cohort enters harmonization, reconciliation, and synthesis through that one block, whichever entry point it came in by, and the publication gate holds at each stage — one cohort's denominator after stage 1, any cross-cohort claim only after stage 2b over all the cohorts in the claim, and the flagship document only at the synthesis stage, sourced solely from the reconciled series.

5.2 The frame and the carve-out rule

Each cohort begins from the full list of that year's Public General Acts, taken from legislation.gov.uk and cross-checked against the corresponding list of Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. From that list two families are excluded. The first is excluded by category and without comment: Finance Acts, Supply and Appropriation Acts, Northern Ireland budget, formation, and Stormont-machinery Acts, and narrow fiscal or rating technicalities such as rate-relief and empty-dwelling measures. The second is flagged and excluded as structurally distinct — a poor fit for the question "did the policy work?" — with the judgement named rather than hidden: major constitutional and devolution-settlement Acts (for example the Scotland Act 2016 and the Wales Act 2017), EU-procedural and withdrawal machinery (for example the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 and the two 2017 European Union approvals and notification Acts), internal parliamentary machinery, and project-specific hybrid works authorisations such as HS2. The constitutional carve is the most consequential of these judgements and is treated as exactly that — a reasoned, contestable call, logged Act by Act.

What remains is the substantive policy core, and every Act in it is coded. Narrowness is not itself a ground for exclusion: a short private-member's or technical amending Act stays in the frame, even though it usually codes `open`. Only the two families above leave the frame. Because the boundary between "substantive" and "narrow but still substantive" is a judgement, frames differ in size from cohort to cohort — by way of calibration, the worked frames in the kit run, for example, 25 Public General Acts minus 6 carve-outs to 19 substantive Acts for 2016 — and the frame is therefore a reasoned, recorded judgement rather than a mechanical filter.

A boundary of coverage applies above the carve-out rule. This is the Westminster Public General Acts picture, not "the United Kingdom as a whole". Territorial devolution and Northern Ireland settlements are carved, and post-legislative-scrutiny machinery and statute density differ in the devolved administrations, so the series speaks to UK-Parliament primary legislation and not to Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Ireland law. This is a stated scope, not a judgement about devolution. The carve line is also demonstrably robust, as §5.8 records: the reconciliation's reconsideration of the constitutional and event carve moved only two Acts across the whole field — the 2010 Constitutional Reform and Governance Act and the 2011 Olympic Act — and the field aggregate moved only at the margin. That marginal re-adjudication touched only those two Acts;

sensitivity to the carve itself is the ≈ 32–61% range set out in §3.3, within which the ≈ 44% headline sits — the headline is bounded by where the carve line falls, not independent of it.

A second distinction of denominator sits alongside that coverage boundary, and it governs how the headline figure should be read. The report's headline rate is computed against all substantive Acts — the public-map denominator, which asks what share of the substantive statute book has a located review. That is not the same as the denominator relevant to the scrutiny system's reach, because official guidance treats post-legislative scrutiny as selective and proportionate and exempts whole categories from the memorandum convention: Finance Acts (already carved here), and also Consolidation, Statute Law Repeal, Private, and Armed Forces Acts, together with committee-agreed exemptions for Acts of very limited significance or already repealed or reviewed. Several of these — consolidations, private Acts, Armed Forces Acts — are kept in the substantive frame and coded, because narrowness is not a ground for exclusion, even though the convention does not expect a memorandum for them. The consequence is stated plainly: the "≈ 44% none located" headline is a coverage fact about the whole substantive statute book, not a measure of convention failure. Measured instead against a convention-eligible denominator, the located-review rate would be higher and the none-share lower — by a margin not estimated here. That precise convention-eligible denominator requires per-Act eligibility flagging and is forthcoming; it is not estimated here, and no number is put on it.

5.3 The three doors, the dot, the anchors, and the A10-vs-A15 line

For each substantive Act, a located review must come through one of three doors: a government post-legislative memorandum (the Cm 7320 process) or a statutory whole-Act review; a dedicated select-committee post-legislative inquiry; or a statutory, independent, or commissioned review of the Act's operation or effect — a regulator review, an NAO or PAC study, an independent reviewer, a government evaluation, or a statutory post-implementation review. The result is recorded as one dot. A `filled` dot marks a whole-Act review of operation or effect, a statutory whole-Act review, or a formal Cm 7320 memorandum. A `half` dot marks a partial review — a component, power, regime, statutory-reporting duty, or adjacent body reviewed, but not the whole Act. An `open` dot marks no review located after a real search. A `▸S` marker is appended whenever the Act itself requires the review or report by statute. Across a cohort, `filled` and `half` together give "any review located", `open` gives "none located", and the three sum to the frame.

The dot is a single reduced outcome — `filled`, `half`, or `open` — used for the headline denominator; the seven axes beneath it are preserved for interpretation rather than combined into a composite score. Those axes, stored separately, are: in-force state; whether a review was located; the review's strength and independence; its scope; any substitution or supersession; outcome-evidence maturity on a nought-to-seven scale; and confidence. The report reduces each Act to the single `filled`/`half`/`open` outcome for the denominator and reports the underlying axes in prose; it does not combine them into a composite score.

The borderline calls are frozen against anchors — real calls adjudicated during the pilot and rubric-defining coding sessions (the anchor Acts themselves sit across the panel — the A10 anchor is a 2011 Act, the A15 anchor a 2015 Act) — so that an Act resembling an anchor is coded the same way wherever it appears. Four things are never a review: reform, where a later Act amends or replaces this one (supersession, recorded on the substitution axis); pre-dating work, where a consultation, Law Commission report, or independent review produced the Act; implementation, where powers are used or a scheme is rolled out; and commentary, where law-firm notes, academic articles, or sector pieces report on the Act — even when they cite operational data such as low take-up. None of these earns a dot above `open`.

The single distinction that did the most work, drawn from the pilot, is the line between rubric anchors A10 and A15. A statutory duty the Act creates to lay a report on its own subject before Parliament — with analytical content that would not happen regardless — earns `half` (A10); routine operating statistics or data-returns of a standing body are not a review of the Act and stay `open` (A15). The anchors are concrete: the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act 2011 (c.23), whose section 20 places a statutory duty on the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation to report to Parliament each year on the operation of the Act itself, is the A10 anchor and codes `half`; the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, whose register returns to the Secretary of State are operational data rather than a self-report on the Act's working, is the A15 demotion that set the rule and codes `open`. This one line is what keeps comparable Acts comparable across cohorts.

5.4 Search discipline — "none located" is search-bounded

Whether an Act has a review is decided by a fresh search every time, never by recollection. The method does not trust training memory on whether a specific Act was reviewed, nor on present-day facts such as whether a body still exists, who holds an office, or whether a later Act has superseded it. Before any Act is coded `open`, a fixed minimum-search sequence is run, with a standardised base pass across the three routes and the statute, commencement and amendment sources — one predefined tight query per route — escalating to re-search at the audit stages wherever a result was flagged, conflicting, or thin —: a query for a post-legislative memorandum (the Cm 7320 door); queries for a review and for an evaluation (the statutory, independent, or commissioned door); a query for a committee inquiry, or a scan of the parliamentary committees site (the select-committee door); a check of legislation.gov.uk for the Act's own review or report clause, and, if one exists, a search for the report it requires; a check of "changes to legislation" and commencement for the in-force state and any supersession; and the lead regulator, NAO, or independent reviewer where one plainly exists. Where anything remains ambiguous, one Commons or Lords Library briefing is consulted for a neutral synthesis.

Only after that sequence returns nothing is an Act coded `open`, with the ceiling phrase recorded explicitly: "no public evidence of post-legislative review located, as of the check date." Every `open` is therefore search-bounded — a statement

about what the routes checked surfaced as of June 2026, never a claim that no review exists anywhere. For any review that is located, the year of the earliest one is also recorded: a single extra note made while already on the source, which keeps an age-controlled trend product available later without re-opening the field. The standard throughout is to believe credible primary sources, to be sceptical on contested or heavily search-optimised topics, and to search again where results conflict or look thin.

5.5 Harmonization — how drift was caught and corrected

The harmonization stage re-adjudicates every `half`/`open` call against the rubric's decision rules. It demotes to `open` anything resting on routine data-returns (A15), on a cross-cutting duty merely referenced in another body's post-implementation review or on mere implementation (A1.3), on commentary, academic, or advocacy material even where it carries figures (A1.4), on supersession by a later Act (A1.1), on pre-dating work that produced the Act (A1.2), or on a review clause attached to a never-commenced core provision (A13). It keeps `half` or `filled` only for a direct official, parliamentary, independent, or statutory review, or for the scrutiny of a body the Act constitutes (A11). A thin `half` is re-searched once, and every change is logged with the rule that forced it.

The pilot pair demonstrates both the discipline and the failure mode it corrects. The 2014 cohort came through strict re-adjudication with no changes at all — filled 9, half 5, open 6, around 30% (revised at the stage-3 audit to 9/6/5, ≈25%: c.28 re-coded half) "none located". The 2015 cohort, by contrast, had been coded generously on the `half`/`open` border, and strict re-adjudication forced three demotions, all from `half` to `open`: the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act, whose only evidence was register returns (A15); the Deregulation Act, whose growth duty was only referenced as a compliance obligation in other regulators' reviews while its own statutory-reporting clause was never activated (A1.3 and A1.1); and the Health and Social Care (Safety and Quality) Act 2015 (c.28), whose nearest study examined the possible effects of extending its duties to a different sector — a forward-looking exercise, not a retrospective review of the Act's own operation, which is also why this Act, demoted here to `open`, cannot itself serve as the `half` (A10) anchor. Those three demotions moved 2015 from ~32% to ~45% "none located".

The net direction of these changes was systematically upward, though not every change ran the same way. Every `half`↔`open` demotion raised the cohort's "none located" share; the only counter-moves were a small number of headline-neutral `filled`↔`half` shifts and one offsetting `open`→`half` reclassification in the 2016 cohort, where the Education and Adoption Act was promoted to `half` against the Housing and Planning Act demotion running the other way. Counting only the moves that changed a cohort's "none located" share, five cohorts moved at harmonization (stage 2a): 2013 — where the Jobseekers (Back to Work Schemes) Act was demoted `half`→`open`, taking the cohort from an as-coded `filled` 8 / `half` 6 / `open` 13 (none 48%) to a harmonized `filled` 8 / `half` 5 / `open` 14 (none 52%) — a demotion the stage-3 audit later reversed on locating the statutory Oakley review (§5.6); Appendix B carries the audited split, filled 8 / half 6 / open 13

(≈48%) — together with 2015, 2017, 2019, and 2020. Two further cohorts, 2010 and 2011, were not moved at harmonization but were re-coded at the later reconciliation stage (2b), when two previously carved Acts were returned to the frame. The 2011 cohort separately carried a headline-neutral `filled→half` shift at harmonization (the Pensions Act), which leaves its "none located" share unchanged, so 2011 is a reconciliation re-code and not one of the five harmonization none-movers. The drift itself was uniformly generous on the `half/open` border — precisely the cell the rubric flags as the softest and most drift-prone, the commentary cell — and it arose because the cohorts were coded in different sessions at different levels of strictness. What this disturbed matters for the findings: the apparent monotone age-gradient visible in the unharmonized stage-1 numbers did not hold, because the corrected 2015 cohort, though older, then sat above its younger neighbour. The clean "oldest equals most reviewed" story was partly an artifact of inconsistent strictness rather than a robust trend — which is the single strongest justification for making harmonization a mandatory stage rather than an optional check.

The report does not treat every cohort as equally strong evidence, and it distinguishes three epistemic tiers by how each cohort's evidence relates to the rubric. The four rubric-defining cohorts — 2016 to 2019 — are the weakest by construction, because the anchors that freeze the borderline calls are themselves drawn from those cohorts, so re-adjudicating them against the rubric is partly self-referential. The pilot pair — 2014 and 2015 — was coded before the rubric was settled and then tested against it, which is where the drift was caught and corrected and is therefore evidence about the rubric as much as about those years. The backfill cohorts — 2008 to 2013, and 2020 to 2021 — are coded fresh under the now-frozen standard. This tiering is carried as a caveat in §5.8, not as a weighting that changes any published figure.

5.6 Verification

A verification pass closed three items that the reconciled series had explicitly left for confirmation. It re-opened no denominator; it confirmed rather than moved.

The first item was the major-only artefact-located rate, recomputed on a single standardized definition. A clearly-major Act is a flagship substantive Government Act or a major constitutional Act — not a narrow private-member's bill, a consolidation, a curative or retrospective measure, a spent or event Act, or a tax-administration Act. On that uniform definition, across the fourteen cohorts there are about 12 unreviewed clearly-major Acts out of about 130, giving a field major-only artefact-located rate of ≈ 91%, against ≈ 56% for all substantive Acts (≈ 44% with none located). The salience gap is large and persists under a uniform definition.

The second item was a sensitivity check on that figure. The denominator of about 130 "major" Acts is itself a coding judgement, so the recount asks how the rate moves as the major set shifts by a few Acts. Per-cohort major denominators stay within roughly one or two Acts either way, because "major" is a boundary judgement, and the field rate sits inside a ≈ 85-90% band. The band is reported

in place of a single point because the major set is a coding judgement; it expresses the precision the rate can carry, and the salience gap holds across reasonable redefinitions of "major" within that band.

The third and related item was the uniformity of the A10-vs-A15 line, which was confirmed as identical across all fourteen cohorts. The line drawn everywhere is that a duty the Act creates to lay a report on its own subject before Parliament, carrying analytical content, codes `half` (A10), while routine operating statistics or data returns of a standing body code `open` (A15). The borderline calls that the logs themselves flagged — for example the Armed Forces Covenant reports, the Recall of MPs per-petition reports, and a telecoms-security call — were noted rather than silently resolved, and none of them changes a headline. The dominant reading was applied consistently, with no A10/A15 inconsistency found that would move any cohort.

Finally, the 2019 cohort was reconciled line by line against the original pilot artifact's ledger, to move it from "re-derived" to ledger-checked. The artifact, on the original thirteen-Act frame, read `filled` for c.7 (Organ Donation (Deemed Consent)) and c.9 (Stalking Protection); `half` for c.3, c.5, c.14, and c.17; and `open` for c.2, c.4, c.8, c.12, c.15, c.18, and c.24 — 7 of 13, ≈ 54%. The harmonized 2019 differs from that ledger by exactly the two documented changes: c.5 was demoted from `half` to `open`, and c.10 and c.28 were returned to the frame (both `open`, the A5 "plus-bucket" carve correction that restored two Acts wrongly dropped from the frame). That gives `filled` c.7 (Organ Donation) and c.9 (Stalking Protection), `half` c.3, c.14, and c.17, and `open` for the remaining ten — 10 of 15, ≈ 67%. The line-by-line check surfaced one item to carry forward rather than resolve here: **c.12, the Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths (Registration etc.) Act 2019**, coded `open` in the series, has a candidate review the ledger located — the Pregnancy Loss Review, commissioned to fulfil the Act's section 3 reporting duty. On the panel review's external confirmation that the published Pregnancy Loss Review meets the Act's section 3 requirement — the Government records it as such — the flag is adjudicated: c.12 is coded half and ▸S on the A10 self-report line, and the 2019 none-share moves from ≈ 67% to 9 of 15, ≈ 60% (marked ✚ in Appendix B). With that adjudication recorded, the 2019 dots are ledger-checked, with no further undocumented discrepancy located.

Stage-3 false-negative audit (July 2026). At the pre-publication audit stage, an external audit estimated the false-negative rate of the open codings directly — the one number the search-bounded convention cannot supply about itself. A simple random sample (seed 2026) of 24 of the 61 open Acts in the fully-gridded 2008–2014 cohorts was re-searched in depth, applying the three-door rule and the A-series exclusions unchanged.

Twenty-one of the twenty-four opens were confirmed: in most cases the deep search surfaced exactly the artefact families the rubric exists to refuse — prospective impact assessments, successor bills, reviews of adjacent bodies or predecessor regimes, practitioner commentary — and the exclusion rules held. Two opens were misses. The Jobseekers (Back to Work Schemes) Act 2013 (c.17)

carries in its own section 2 a statutory duty to commission an independent review of the sanctions it validated; that review (Oakley, laid July 2014, with a Government response accepting its recommendations) exists and passes the third door. The Act is re-coded half, joins the ▸S set as a TR duty, and the stage-2a demotion of c.17 is reversed — the one harmonization move the audit overturned. The Childcare Payments Act 2014 (c.28) — the coding's own research candidate — is closed by HMRC-commissioned research into the Tax-Free Childcare scheme's take-up (2020) and an HM Treasury-funded impact evaluation of the scheme (April 2026); it is re-coded half. One further open is carried as a flag rather than moved: the Civil Aviation Act 2012 (c.19), against the 2023 public-bodies review of the CAA, whose standing under the three-door rule (the CAA is constituted by the 1971 Act, not the 2012 Act) is referred to stage-2a adjudication, as c.12 (2019) already is.

The estimate this yields is a point false-negative rate of 2/24 ≈ 8% (3/24 ≈ 13% counting the borderline), with a wide 95% interval of roughly 2–26%; the sampling frame covers the 2008–2014 opens only — the half of the panel where a missed review is most likely to exist. Read against the field, the two corrections move the aggregate from ≈ 46% to ≈ 45% none located and the 2012–2015 block from ≈ 42% to ≈ 40%; the block gradient, the salience pattern and the ▸S association survive unchanged in shape. The audited failure mode is specific: both misses are artefacts whose titles do not carry the Act's name — which one tight name-keyed query per door does not reach — and for c.17 the minimum-search step that checks the Act's own text for a review clause was demonstrably not executed correctly: the census hole behind the caveat now carried at §3.5 and in Appendix E.

A companion clause-audit tested the report's firmest claim directly. The sample above audits open-status — whether a located review exists — but the "0 ▸S-open" finding of §3.5 is a different proposition: that no Act carrying its own review clause lacks a located review. Confirming an Act open does not confirm it non-▸S; that requires checking the Act's text for a review or report duty. So the clause-status of all 21 confirmed opens in the sample was checked against statute text, and the check was extended to the fifteen-or-so named major-open Acts, where a missed clause would be most consequential. The 21 sampled opens came back clean — seventeen narrow PMBs, codifications and spent Acts carry no review duty, and the four remaining (Business Rate Supplements 2009, Welfare Benefits Up-rating 2013, Growth and Infrastructure 2013, Superannuation 2010) were confirmed clause-free on the text; the Terrorist Asset-Freezing (Temporary Provisions) Act 2010, whose successor carries the s.31 independent-review duty, holds its own review only in that repealed-and-replaced successor, and the Fiscal Responsibility Act 2010's own s.3 report duty died with the Act (the survivorship boundary). Among the major-open Acts, however, the check found one misclassification: the Financial Services Act 2021 (c.22) writes review and report duties into its own text — the Benchmarks-Regulation review-and-report it inserts, and the Schedule 2A duty on the Treasury to report to Parliament on the operation of the Gibraltar regime — so it is ▸S, not the non-▸S it had been coded. It is re-flagged for stage-2a adjudication

(located ▸S-half if a statutory report has issued, ▸S-open “not yet” if the first reporting period is still open) and is adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check on its located Article-23E review — the same census failure mode as c.17: an own-text clause not caught by the flagging (the panel review below extends this family to 2018 c.12 and 2019 c.12; every member of the family now sits located). The consequence for §3.5 is a correction of register, not of arithmetic: the claim is downgraded from “zero ▸S-open as exhaustively verified” to “no ▸S Act found open on a sample-audited census, one flagged candidate exception,” which is the honest form of a 100% that rests on a method with a demonstrated false-negative mode.

Two consequences are folded back. The reproduction kit’s minimum-search sequence now requires one subject-matter query per Act (the name of the regime or scheme the Act creates) in addition to the Act-name queries, and treats the review-clause check as a verified step whose result is logged — run not only over the open set but over the ▸S census itself, since every census miss found so far — c.17 and c.22 here, 2018 c.12 and 2019 c.12 at the panel stage — was an own-text clause the flagging did not catch. And the audited corrections are marked ✚ in Appendix B alongside ▲ and ◆, so the series carries its full correction history: five stage-2a moves (one since reversed), two stage-2b re-codes, and two stage-3 re-codes. “None located” remains, as everywhere, a statement about the searches run — the audit’s contribution is to put a measured error rate beside it.

External panel review (July 2026). As a further check, a nine-role adversarial panel — statistical, archival, institutional, causal, editorial and AI-forensic readings — reviewed a clean copy of this report without access to the audit trail above. Its mechanical pass independently confirmed the reconciled arithmetic (all fourteen cohort identities, the field split, the carve bounds) and caught four transcription residues, corrected in this text: a stale numerator in §3.3, stale 2013/2014 percentages in the §3.2 narrative, a stale half-count in the Appendix E located equation, and a corrupted anchor line in the 2015 record (the located-half exemplar is c.29 Health Service Commissioner (Complaint Handling), not the c.28 Act demoted in §5.5). Its institutional pass re-derived the clause-audit logic of this section unprompted and extended it where this audit had explicitly not reached: the Data Protection Act 2018 (c.12) writes two statutory review duties into its own text — the s.189 review of the representative-action provisions, reported to Parliament in 2021, and the s.178 review of journalism processing, completed and laid by the Information Commissioner — and is adjudicated half and ▸S; and the 2019 flag on c.12 (Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths) is adjudicated half and ▸S on the published Pregnancy Loss Review, which the Government records as meeting the Act’s section 3 requirement. All denominator states in the correction chronology of this subsection are superseded historical states; the sole release series is filled 94 / half 80 / open 137. The adjudications move the field to filled 93 / half 80 / open 138 (≈ 44% none located), the 2016–2018 block to ≈ 46% and the 2019–2021 block to ≈ 62%, the major-only rate to 118/132 ≈ 89%, and the ▸S set to 71/71 located; the block gradient, the salience pattern and the ▸S association are unchanged in shape, and both adjudications

are marked ✚ in Appendix B. The panel's remaining recommendations — settled-ledger wording for the ▸S headline, provisional wording for the timing reading, adjacency of the convention-eligible caveat to the headline, and release of the per-Act ledger and negative search logs — are carried in the amended text and in the Appendix G schedule.

Adoption of the parallel re-adjudication line (July 2026). A parallel remediation line, run independently of this document, re-adjudicated four items on the same base; its decisions are adopted here and reconciled with the audits above. Adopted: the Energy Act 2008 (c.32) moves half→filled on the located whole-Act Cm 8893 memorandum (laid 14 July 2014) — the 2008 cohort reads 13/5/5 and the field 94 / 79 / 138, the none-share unchanged at ≈ 44%; the Dormant Bank and Building Society Accounts Act 2008 (c.31) enters the ▸S set on its s.14 review-and-report duty; and pure consolidations are excluded from the clearly-major set under a uniform rule — the one such case, the Sentencing Code (2020 c.17), leaves the strict denominator, which with the 2018 adjudication above settles the major-only rate at 118/131 ≈ 90% (band ≈ 85–90%) and the strict unreviewed-major count at 13. The ▸S census also switches base: the authoritative count is bottom-up from the per-Act ledger — 75 after the parallel-line additions, 77 with the two adjudications of this section — replacing the Appendix-E roll-up, which is now known to have undercounted the 2015–2021 named sets by five; the per-cohort re-derivation of that half is carried with the companion-file propagation. The the parallel line line and this document's audits reached one identical decision independently — the 2019 c.12 adjudication — which is treated as mutual validation. Companion materials (the per-Act ledger and the second-half evidence grids) are being brought to this merged state in a separate pass; until that lands, this section is the authoritative statement of the merged series.

Pre-publication watch adjudication (July 2026). At the release check, the register's standing trigger for the one open ▸S flag fired: the Financial Conduct Authority's report under Article 23E of the Benchmarks Regulation — the statutory review-and-report duty section 16 of the Financial Services Act 2021 (c.22) writes into the Regulation — was published on 29 February 2024, reviewing whether the exercise of the Article-23D powers over synthetic sterling LIBOR advanced the statutory objectives, with a copy given to the Treasury as the Article requires. That is a located statutory review of the operation of the regime the Act built, on the same line as the 2018 c.12 and 2019 c.12 adjudications, and c.22 is coded half and ▸S (route: statutory self-report; the Schedule 2A Gibraltar reporting duty remains a second, not-yet-discharged clause and no longer affects the census). The series then read filled 94 / half 80 / open 137 — the none-share unchanged at ≈ 44% — with the 2021 cohort at 3/8/16 (≈ 59%), the 2019–2021 block at ≈ 60% (the gradient intact), the major-only rate at 119/131 ≈ 91% with 12 strict unreviewed majors, and the ▸S set closed at 78/78 located, 0 ▸S-open and 0 flags pending. The remaining watch items — 2012 c.19 and the 2010 review — do not touch the ▸S census.

Grid-reconciliation adjudication (2016). The launch-day auditability table surfaced a paired grid–ledger divergence in the 2016 cohort that all sum-level

batteries had passed, because the totals were invariant: the evidence grids carried c.22 Housing & Planning as a located half (via the PAC Right-to-Buy-funding item) and c.6 Education & Adoption in the open tail, while the per-Act ledger — with reasons stated — holds the opposite dots. Adjudication follows the ledger on both: the DfE Regional-Adoption-Agencies evaluation and the Ofsted thematic inspection carry c.6 as half (commissioned-evaluation route), and the PAC funding item is component-funding scrutiny of a scheme that did not proceed under the Act's own provisions — not a qualifying review — so c.22 stands open; the standardized recount's naming of c.22 as the cohort's open major is adopted, and c.12 Enterprise moves to the borderline set. No dot in the release series moves. The strict clearly-major denominator settles at 130 (band 130–132), the major-only rate at 118/130 ≈ 91%, and the twelve named unreviewed majors stand with the 2016 entry read as c.22. The carried naming-substitution flag is closed.

5.7 Reproducibility

The method and its companion materials are packaged so that an independent party with no access to this project's history can attempt an independent fresh re-coding of a cohort to the same standard — which is not the same as regenerating the reported classifications; exact regeneration, including the negative findings, awaits the analytic dataset and negative search logs (§5.7). Three files carry the whole of it. The reproduction kit holds the coding protocol, the carve-out rule for building the frame, the three-door and dot scheme, the prior cohort denominators, and the design system. The calibration rubric holds the decided edge-case anchors, the minimum-search protocol, the compact-record schema, and the harmonization checklist — it is the consistency layer that keeps parallel coders from drifting apart. The pipeline-logic file holds the operating logic above both: how the three stages connect, what object hands off between them, and where the publication gate falls.

The route for reproducing one cohort follows the protocol directly. The coder reads the rubric before coding; builds the frame from the Public General Acts list and the carve-out rule, recording the excluded chapters and the substantive count, the cohort's character, and its approximate age; codes every Act with one tight fresh search through the minimum-search sequence, deciding the dot against the anchors and noting the earliest review year for any located review; closes the denominator as filled, half, and open, with "any review" equal to filled plus half and "none located" equal to open, and computes the major-only rate; emits the compact cohort-record that the rest of the pipeline ingests; verifies that the dot counts equal the denominator with the mechanical count check; and stops at the cohort boundary, leaving the cross-cohort series to harmonization and synthesis. The kit ships four worked frames, for 2016 to 2019, as calibration, so that a fresh coder can check their own frame arithmetic and coding depth against adjudicated examples.

A feedback loop closes the system so that the same drift does not recur. A learning from harmonization is folded back into the kit and rubric before the next coding run; the pilot's A10-vs-A15 distinction, for instance, is now written into the

kit's coding legend, so future coders apply it up front rather than relying on the harmonization stage to catch it after the fact.

What this report releases, and what it does not, should be stated exactly. The present document is the coverage map and its method: the reconciled fourteen-cohort series (Appendix B), the construction rules, and the evidential appendix (Appendix E) carried in this report, with the per-Act citation ledger (Appendix F) released as a companion; the three reproduction materials above — the kit, the calibration rubric, and the pipeline-logic file — are released as Appendix G. The analytic dataset that sits behind it is planned but not yet released, and it should not be read as already published. Forthcoming, in particular, are: the per-Act dataset covering every Public General Act — its carve status, its dot, the seven axes, the review-artefact citation and URL where one was located, the search date, the ▸S and major flags, and the harmonization status; the per-Act search logs that record the negative findings behind each `open`; the codebook; the cross-tabulations of ▸S against outcome and of major status against outcome within cohort, with any modelling built on them; and an age-to-review, event-history analysis keyed to Royal Assent and commencement, which is the proper basis for any claim about change over time. Until those are released, the figures here are to be read as a coverage map that is **auditable in design and partially reproducible from the released companion materials**, rather than as the output of a fully released analytic dataset.

5.8 Limitations — what the evidence does and does not license

The figures are descriptive of a search-bounded snapshot, to be read against the existing post-legislative- scrutiny machinery rather than as a scorecard. Six limitations bear directly on how the findings should be read, and they are stated plainly.

First, the salience gap is partly a discovery effect. Prominent Acts leave more locatable traces — a flagship statute's memorandum, committee inquiry, or regulator review is easier to find than a narrow Act's — so part of the ≈ 91% major-only rate, set against ≈ 56% overall, may reflect easier discovery of major-Act reviews rather than a pure difference in whether review happened. The finding holds, because the unreviewed tail is dominated by Acts that structurally cannot or are unlikely to be reviewed — spent or event Acts, never-commenced provisions, and codifications — but it is stated as strong, not proven, and visibility is named as the main rival explanation.

Second, the panel is short and its dimensions are entangled. Fourteen cohorts is a small number, and each is a different age at the check date, so the year-to-year series is read descriptively only and never as a causal time-trend. Age and legislative composition cannot be separated, because the panel contains no old-and-light cohort that would hold one constant while varying the other; neither age nor composition is therefore credited alone, and the nearest partial control — a cohort almost as old as its predecessor but lighter in weight — is a partial control, not a clean one.

Third, "none located" is not the same as "no review", and it is never a charge of bad faith. Every `open` records that no public evidence of post-legislative review was located through the routes checked, as of the check date, after the minimum-search sequence had run. Internal or non-public evaluations may exist beyond those routes. No `open` implies that any department failed to act; the report reads the system, not any department's good faith.

Fourth, the carve-out frame is a judgement and is contestable — most of all for the constitutional Acts — but it is robust. The entire reconciliation carve decision moved only two Acts across the whole field, the 2010 Constitutional Reform and Governance Act and the 2011 Olympic Act, and that marginal re-adjudication moved only two Acts; the headline's sensitivity to the carve as such is the ≈ 32–61% range in §3.3, not independence from it. The carve is named rather than hidden and logged Act by Act, so a reader who would draw the line differently can re-derive its effect.

Fifth, the major-versus-narrow split is itself a coding judgement. "Clearly-major" is a boundary call, so the major-only rate is reported as a ≈ 85-90% band rather than a single point, and per-cohort major denominators are treated as accurate to within about one or two Acts. The band is the honest expression of that judgement, and the finding is robust across reasonable redefinitions.

Sixth, the cohorts are not equally strong evidence. The four rubric-defining cohorts, 2016 to 2019, are weaker by construction, because the anchors that freeze the borderline calls are drawn from them, so re-adjudicating those cohorts against the rubric is partly self-referential; the pilot pair and the backfill cohorts are coded against the rubric as an external standard, while the four anchor cohorts are not fully independent of it.

Beyond these six, the report is explicit about what it cannot say at all. It does not rank Acts, departments, or cohorts, and it builds no scorecard, league table, or traffic-light rating. It does not say whether any law works, or whether a located review reached the right conclusion — that is the finding-restraint commitment. Beyond the single `filled`/`half`/`open` outcome it uses for the headline denominator, it does not combine the seven axes into a composite score. It does not read the noisy year-to-year series as evidence that scrutiny has improved or worsened over time. It does not separate age from composition. It does not claim that its searches are exhaustive. And it does not speak to Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Ireland law, whose post-legislative-scrutiny machinery and statute density differ: the series is the Westminster Public General Acts picture only.

---

§6 · Conclusion

This report assembles, as a single system-level denominator, the located review-state of every substantive Westminster Public General Act across fourteen cohorts from 2008 to 2021, and reads that record against the machinery already in place to scrutinise legislation after it is passed — the post-legislative-memorandum convention, the Law Commission's role, and the ad hoc post-legislative-scrutiny committees of the House of Lords. Read against that baseline, the central pattern is consistent and carefully hedged. The public record shows located reviews for most flagship statutes — ≈ 91% of clearly-major Acts attract some located review — while the long tail shows located reviews only selectively, and those located reviews, where they exist, tend to appear several years out; and the ≈ 44% of substantive Acts with no located review is structurally patterned rather than random, concentrating in narrow private-member's bills, technical and consolidation Acts, never-commenced provisions, spent and event Acts, and the most recent cohorts. That ≈ 44% is a coverage fact about the whole substantive statute book and not a measure of convention failure: official guidance treats post-legislative scrutiny as selective, and against a convention-eligible denominator the none-share would be lower (its size is not estimated here). Within every cohort, the firmest regularity is that a statutory clause requiring a review is the single feature most consistently associated with a located review: where a statute carries a duty to report on its own operation, a located review is far more common (an association; causation is not tested here); where it does not, a located review is the exception. This is an association in the coded record, not a demonstrated effect. None of this is a verdict on any law's merits or on any department's good faith, and all of it is bounded by what is locatable in public as of June 2026.

The finding can be put in a single sentence. Across 2008 to 2021, the public record shows located reviews for the statute book's flagships — most consistently where a statute writes in its own duty to report on its operation — while the long tail shows located reviews only selectively, with those reviews tending to appear several years out, leaving a share with no located review that is structurally patterned rather than random, on the evidence locatable in public as of the check date.

The analytic work the method provisions is planned but not yet released, and the report should be read with that boundary in view. Several outputs are forthcoming rather than published here: the per-Act dataset — for every Public General Act, its carve status, its dot, the seven axes, the located review-artefact citation and URL, the search date, and the ▸S and major flags; the per-Act search logs behind each `open`; the codebook; the cross-tabulations of ▸S and of major status against outcome within cohort; and an age-to-review, event-history analysis keyed to Royal Assent and commencement. That last item is the one that would let the panel be re-read as an age-controlled trend — the share of each cohort with a located review within a fixed number of years of Royal Assent

— which is the only way to ask whether scrutiny is changing over time without confounding age and composition, and it needs no re-opening of the field because the earliest located-review year was captured for each reviewed Act while coding. A second, independent extension is to lengthen the panel: the same pipeline can be run on the cohorts before 2008 and after 2021, with each new year entering at the coding stage and flowing through the same harmonization and reconciliation before any cross-cohort number moves. Both are the same machine applied to more data; neither changes the present figures, and the publication gate continues to hold the series to one harmonized standard. The contribution the report offers is not a verdict on the statute book but a shared coverage map — auditable in design and partially reproducible from the released companion materials — of where qualifying public review artefacts have and have not been located through the stated routes, and a method by which that map can be kept current as the statute book grows.

Appendix A — The fourteen cohorts

One profile per cohort. The headline figures — frame, the filled/half/open denominator, and the "% none located" — are quoted verbatim from the reconciled fourteen-cohort series (Appendix B); the named reviews and their years are drawn from each cohort's coding file; the named major Acts with no located review and the standardized major-only artefact-located rates are taken from the standardized verification recount (§5.6). All checks are dated 2026-06.

Throughout this appendix, ***"none located" means no public post-legislative review was located in the routes checked, as of 2026-06*** *— it is a search-bounded statement, never a finding that no review exists; nor does it determine whether internal, non-public, committee-agreed, or operational review occurred — that ceiling on meaning applies to every named open in the profiles below and, per-Act, is not restated, that an Act does not work, or that any department failed; internal or non-public review may exist beyond the routes searched. Where a review was located, the Institute reports that review's own findings and framing and offers no merits verdict of its own. The symbol ▸S marks an Act that contains its own statutory review or reporting clause.*

Cohort 2008

Frame — 33 PGA − 10 carve-outs = 23 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 13 / half 5 / open 5; none located ≈22% (any review located ≈78%).

Major-only review rate — ≈87–93% (standardized; approximate).

2008 is the oldest cohort in the series (~18 years matured at the check) and an unusually heavyweight, major-Act-rich year, carrying landmark statutes (Climate Change, Counter-Terrorism, Planning, Pensions, Health and Social Care, Housing and Regeneration, Education and Skills) alongside a financial-crisis streak of emergency legislation and a short tail of narrow private members' or technical Acts.

Notable filled. The Climate Change Act (c.27) combines both forms of review machinery: its s.36 duty requires the Committee on Climate Change to lay an annual progress report before Parliament, and a formal post-legislative memorandum was submitted to the Energy and Climate Change Committee in September 2013 (▸S). The Health and Social Care Act (c.14) drew a formal post-legislative assessment (Cm 8625, May 2013) to the Health Select Committee covering all five Parts, with a later independent review of CQC operation (2024). The Pensions Act (c.30) was reviewed through the statutory automatic-enrolment review *Maintaining the Momentum* (Cm 9546, December 2017), conducted to comply with the Act (▸S). A distinctive feature of this cohort is the density of

formal memoranda under the post-legislative-memorandum convention — nine in total, clustered around 2013–14.

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records one borderline-major Act without a located review, the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act (c.13), which created the Local Better Regulation Office, the Primary Authority scheme and the civil-sanctions regime; the Hampton and Macrory reviews that shaped it pre-dated the Act, and no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact was located under the three-door rule. The Employment Act (c.24) is similarly borderline-major. The remaining none-located Acts are the narrow tail — statute-book maintenance (Statute Law (Repeals), c.12), an emergency measure superseded within a year (Criminal Evidence (Witness Anonymity), c.15), and a permissive standards PMB (Planning and Energy, c.21). For each named open above: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.11, c.27, c.30. Superseded provisions among the set: Banking (Special Provisions) (c.2, by the Banking Act 2009), Witness Anonymity (c.15, by the Coroners and Justice Act 2009), Planning (c.29, IPC abolished by the Localism Act 2011) and Dormant Accounts (c.31, expanded by the Dormant Assets Act 2022).

Harmonization change. None.

Cohort 2009

Frame — 27 PGA − 6 carve-outs = 21 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 6 / half 7 / open 8; none located ≈38% (any review located ≈62%).

Major-only review rate — ≈91% (standardized; approximate).

2009 is the last full year of the 2005–2010 Parliament (~16–17 years matured), heavyweight, with a strong financial-crisis imprint (Banking, Saving Gateway, Industry and Exports) and a post-expenses-scandal institutional reform (Parliamentary Standards / IPSA), alongside several narrow private members' and treaty-implementation Acts.

Notable filled. The Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act (c.11) drew a formal Home Office post-legislative memorandum (Cm 8984) to the Home Affairs Committee assessing the Act's operation. The Autism Act (c.15) — a narrow-origin PMB — was the subject of a whole-Act House of Lords inquiry, the Autism Act 2009 Committee's *Time to deliver* (HL Paper 205, November 2025), and its s.1 duty to keep the adult autism strategy under review was exercised across successive strategies (▸S). The Coroners and Justice Act (c.25) carries the statutory Chief Coroner's annual report to Parliament (▸S) and was also the subject of a government post-legislative memorandum to the Justice Committee. (Two further whole-Act reviews came through parliamentary committees rather

than government memoranda: the Committee on Members' Expenses reviewed the Parliamentary Standards Act (c.13) in 2011 (HC 1484), and the Health Act (c.21) drew a formal post-legislative assessment.)

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records one clearly-major Act without a located review, the Political Parties and Elections Act (c.12), which amended PPERA 2000; several of its components were absorbed into later electoral-law reform (recorded on a separate reform/supersession axis), its s.10 non-domiciled-donor restriction is recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced (no conclusion on propriety), and no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact was located under the three-door rule. The remaining none-located Acts are the narrow tail (Industry and Exports (c.5), Geneva Conventions (c.6), Business Rate Supplements (c.7), Saving Gateway (c.8), Holocaust Return (c.16), Driving Instruction (c.17) and Perpetuities and Accumulations (c.18)). For each named open above: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.14, c.15, c.19, c.21, c.23, c.25, c.26. Recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced (whole or core), with no conclusion on propriety: Saving Gateway Accounts (c.8, repealed 2011), the s.10 non-dom-donor restriction (c.12), and Part 4 compulsory joint birth registration (c.24). For one Act the position is on the record: a 2025 ministerial answer states that no assessment of the effectiveness of the Perpetuities and Accumulations Act (c.18) has been made; as elsewhere, this is a public-route statement and does not determine whether internal, non-public, committee-agreed, or operational review occurred.

Harmonization change. None.

Cohort 2010

Frame — 41 PGA − 10 carve-outs = 31 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 10 / half 7 / open 14; none located ≈45% (any review located ≈56%).

Major-only review rate — 100% (standardized; approximate).

2010 is the Labour wash-up laid over the first-Coalition session (~16 years matured) and the largest frame in this part of the series. It is heavyweight, carrying a dense block of major departmental Acts (Equality, Bribery, Energy, Flood and Water Management, Crime and Security, Digital Economy, Academies, Child Poverty, Financial Services) alongside a long tail of wash-up casualties, Law-Commission codifications, abolition and "spent" Acts, and symbolic PMBs.

Notable filled. The Equality Act (c.15) was reviewed by a Government Equalities Office post-legislative memorandum to the Women and Equalities Committee (2015) and by a Lords post-legislative inquiry on the Act and disability (2016). The Bribery Act (c.23) drew a formal Ministry of Justice

memorandum (Cm 9631, 2018) and a Lords post-legislative inquiry (HL Paper 303, March 2019). The Flood and Water Management Act (c.29) was the subject of a Defra memorandum to the EFRA Committee (January 2017) and an EFRA post-legislative inquiry (HC 990, 2016–17). This cohort carries eight formal post-legislative memoranda — the most of any cohort in the series — which the coding file attributes to age and composition: the 2010 majors reached the memorandum convention's three-to-five-year window in 2013–2018, when the practice was at its most active.

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records no clearly-major Act without a located review in

8. The entire none-located share is the narrow tail: temporary or superseded measures (Terrorist Asset-Freezing (Temporary Provisions), c.2; Fiscal Responsibility, c.3), Law-Commission codifications (Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies, c.7; Third Parties (Rights against Insurers), c.10), a symbolic awareness PMB (Anti-Slavery Day, c.14), several narrow PMBs, a wash-up casualty (Children, Schools and Families, c.26), and an Act recorded on the commencement axis as not brought into force (Personal Care at Home, c.18, which a government circular confirmed would not be implemented; no conclusion on propriety). For each none-located Act named above: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.9, c.38, c.41 (and the COMARE review of the Sunbeds Act (c.20) is underway). Recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced: c.18; partial non-commencement: Schedule 3 (SuDS) of c.29 in England, and the copyright "three-strikes" provisions (ss.17–18) of the Digital Economy Act (c.24). Supersession is recorded across several Acts (c.2, c.3, c.7, the c.9 child-poverty targets, the c.17 DNA-retention provisions, c.28 and c.37).

Harmonization change. At reconciliation (stage 2b), the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act (c.25) was returned to frame and coded **half** (frame 30→31), and none-located moved 47%→45%. The component reviewed is its treaty-scrutiny limb (Part 2): the House of Lords Constitution Committee's *Parliamentary Scrutiny of Treaties* (2019, the first such review since the Act commenced), the Government response of July 2019, and the International Agreements Committee's *Treaty Scrutiny: Working Practices* (2020).

Cohort 2011

Frame — 25 PGA − 4 carve-outs = 21 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 8 / half 6 / open 7; none located ≈33% (any review located ≈67%).

Major-only review rate — 100% (standardized; approximate).

2011 is the first full Coalition session (~15 years matured), carrying a cluster of constitutional and institutional reforms (Fixed-term Parliaments, Parliamentary

Voting System and Constituencies, Public Bodies, Police Reform and Social Responsibility) alongside major policy Acts (Postal Services, Energy, Localism, Education) and a tail of narrow PMBs, an emergency one-section Act, and a charity-law consolidation.

Notable filled. The Fixed-term Parliaments Act (c.14) carries a statutory whole-Act review: its s.7 required a committee in 2020 to review the operation of the Act, and the Joint Committee on the Fixed-term Parliaments Act reported on 24 March 2021 (▸S); the Act was reviewed and then repealed by the Dissolution and Calling of Parliament Act 2022. The Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act (c.23) carries a s.20 duty on the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation to report annually on the operation of the Act, with located reports from the first IRTL report in March 2013 (Cm 8614), with Joint Committee on Human Rights scrutiny (▸S). The Postal Services Act (c.5) was reviewed directly by the NAO's *The privatisation of Royal Mail* (April 2014), a BIS Select Committee report (July 2014) and a PAC follow-up. (The Public Bodies Act (c.24) also drew a formal government post-legislative memorandum to PACAC.)

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records no clearly-major Act without a located review in 2011; every none-located Act is non-major. The none-located share is the narrow tail — three narrow PMBs (Estates of Deceased Persons, c.7; Wreck Removal Convention, c.8; Coinage (Measurement), c.17), an emergency one-section Act (Police (Detention and Bail), c.9), a tax-administration Act (National Insurance Contributions, c.3), the charity-law consolidation (Charities Act, c.25; the Law Commission's *Technical Issues in Charity Law* (2017) reviewed the framework and led to the Charities Act 2022 (reform recorded on a separate axis), but no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact of the 2011 consolidation's own operation was located under the three-door rule), and the Olympic (Amendment) Act (c.22; the NAO post-Games review (2012) covers the Games programme rather than the Act's provisions). For each none-located Act named above: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.14 (s.7), c.15 Sovereign Grant (s.7), c.23 (s.20), c.4 Budget Responsibility and National Audit (statutory external review of the OBR), and c.18 Armed Forces (the s.343A annual Covenant report). Repealed or wound down after review: the Fixed-term Parliaments Act (c.14) and the Energy Act's Green Deal (c.16).

Harmonization change. At harmonization (stage 2a) the Charities Act (c.25) moved half→open, and the Pensions Act (c.19) moved filled→half (neutral on none-located); at reconciliation (stage 2b) the Olympic (Amendment) Act (c.22) was returned to frame and coded open (frame 20→21). The resulting none-located figure is ≈33%.

Cohort 2012

Frame — 23 PGA − 5 carve-outs = 18 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 7 / half 4 / open 7; none located ≈39% (any review located ≈61%).

Major-only review rate — ≈86% (standardized; approximate).

2012 is the Coalition's flagship-reform session (~14 years matured), heavyweight and dense in statutory review machinery, carrying Welfare Reform, Health and Social Care, Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders, Protection of Freedoms, Financial Services and Local Government Finance, alongside a tail of fast-track, curative and temporary Acts.

Notable filled. The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act (c.10) was reviewed through both a formal post-legislative memorandum on Parts 1–3 (laid October 2017) and a full Post-Implementation Review of Part 1 (presented to Parliament, February 2019). The Protection of Freedoms Act (c.9) drew a formal post-legislative-scrutiny memorandum (Cm 9579, ~2018) to the Home Affairs Committee. The Financial Services Act (c.21) was reviewed by a post-legislative-scrutiny memorandum laid around December 2021, covering the FSMA-2000 "twin-peaks" (PRA/FCA) framework the Act created. (The Welfare Reform Act (c.5) was reviewed through the statutory s.89 independent reviews of the PIP assessment (Gray, from December 2014) and extensive Universal Credit evaluation (▸S).)

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records one clearly-major Act without a located review, the Civil Aviation Act (c.19); the post-legislative memorandum on record is for its predecessor (the Civil Aviation Act 2006), and no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact of the 2012 Act was located under the three-door rule. The remaining none-located Acts are the narrow tail of fast-track, curative and temporary measures — Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims (Amendment) (c.4), Consumer Insurance (c.6), the self-repealing Sunday Trading (Olympics) Act (c.12), the retrospective- validation Mental Health (Approval Functions) Act (c.18), the Prisons (Interference with Wireless Telegraphy) PMB (c.20), and the fast-track Police (Complaints and Conduct) Act (c.22). For each none-located Act named above: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.5 (s.89 PIP), c.16 Infrastructure (Financial Assistance) (s.3 reporting), c.23 Small Charitable Donations (the three-year GASDS review). No core provision is recorded as not commenced. Superseded provisions among the set: Consumer Insurance (c.6, by the Insurance Act 2015), Health and Social Care (c.7, by the Health and Care Act 2022), Protection of Freedoms biometrics functions (c.9, routed to IPCO under the DUAA 2025), Prisons (IWT) (c.20, by the 2018 Act) and Police (Complaints and Conduct) (c.22, with the IPCC superseded by the IOPC).

Harmonization change. None.

Cohort 2013

Frame — 33 PGA − 6 carve-outs = 27 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 8 / half 6 / open 13; none located ≈48% (any review located ≈52%).

Major-only review rate — ≈91% (standardized; approximate).

2013 is the oldest cohort in this part with the highest none-located share (~13 years matured), heavyweight in composition: a dense block of major Government Acts (Electoral Registration and Administration, Crime and Courts, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Defamation, Energy, Financial Services (Banking Reform), Marriage (Same Sex Couples)) sits alongside a long tail of narrow PMBs, Law-Commission codifications and technical or symbolic measures.

Notable filled. The Electoral Registration and Administration Act (c.6) was reviewed by a House of Lords ad-hoc post-legislative-scrutiny Select Committee, *An Electoral System Fit for Today? Unfinished Business* (8 July 2020), with a Government response. The Groceries Code Adjudicator Act (c.19) carries a s.15 statutory triennial review duty, with located reviews in 2017, 2020 and 2023 — and, because the Adjudicator is the whole substance of the Act, these are whole-Act reviews (▸S). The Financial Services (Banking Reform) Act (c.33) was reviewed through its ss.8/10 statutory independent review of ring-fencing (the Skeoch Review, March 2022) (▸S). (The Defamation Act (c.26) drew a formal memorandum (CP 180, October 2019), and the Energy Act (c.32) the statutory five-year post-implementation review of the Electricity Market Reform regime (2019) (▸S).)

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records one clearly-major Act for which no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact was located under the three-door rule, the Growth and Infrastructure Act (c.27); its employee-shareholder-status provision was repealed in 2016 (recorded on the reform/supersession axis), and its business-rates measures are examined as part of the wider rating system rather than through a review of the Act. No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix. Separately, the Succession to the Crown Act (c.20) is recorded as a review declined at enactment: the Government's own Explanatory Notes state that the Act forms part of the United Kingdom's enduring constitutional settlement and that a post-legislative-scrutiny mechanism was considered not appropriate — an explicit decision rather than an absence of review. The rest of the none-located share is the narrow tail of Law-Commission codifications, symbolic and technical PMBs, and spent or time-limited measures.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.10 (s.18), c.14 (fit-and-proper review), c.18 (s.13), c.19 (s.15), c.22 (the HMICFRS duty to inspect the NCA), c.30 (ss.14/15/16), c.32 (s.66), c.33 (ss.8/10) and — added at the stage-3 audit — c.17 (s.2, the Oakley review): nine Acts;

where Parliament wrote a review or report duty into a 2013 Act, a located review is recorded in each case. No core provision is recorded as not commenced. Review declined: c.20. Superseded or spent measures: c.27, the Welfare Benefits Up-rating Act (c.16, the 1% cap spent), the HGV Road User Levy (c.7, redesigned/suspended) and the Green Investment Bank limb of c.24.

Harmonization change. At harmonization (stage 2a) the Jobseekers (Back to Work Schemes) Act (c.17) moved half→open, raising the cohort's none-located share from 48% to 52% (as-coded filled 8 / half 6 / open 13 → harmonized filled 8 / half 5 / open 14); the stage-3 audit (§5.6) reversed this on locating the Act's own statutory review — the s.2 Oakley review — restoring filled 8 / half 6 / open 13 (≈48%) and adding c.17 to the ▸S set. No carve-out change at reconciliation — Succession to the Crown (c.20) was retained in frame.

Cohort 2014

Frame — 30 PGA − 10 carve-outs = 20 substantive.

Reconciled denominator — filled 9 / half 6 / open 5; none located ≈25% (any review located ≈75%).

Major-only review rate — ≈100% (standardized; approximate).

2014 — the pilot cohort for the series — is old and heavyweight (~12 years matured), with roughly eleven major Acts. It shows the sharpest salience split of any cohort: the located reviews concentrate on the major Acts and the none-located share is entirely the narrow tail.

Notable filled. The Children and Families Act (c.6) was the subject of a House of Lords ad hoc post-legislative-scrutiny committee on the whole Act (reporting in 2022, with a Government response in 2023), alongside a Commons Education Committee inquiry on SEND and an NAO report (2019). The Intellectual Property Act (c.18) was reviewed through the Intellectual Property Office's Post-Implementation Review of the Act (2021) and carries a statutory annual IP-law reporting duty (▸S). The Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act (c.27) carries a s.7 statutory review by the Independent Reviewer, delivered as Anderson's *A Question of Trust* (2015), which fed into the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (▸S). (The State Pension age provision of the Pensions Act (c.19) was reviewed through the statutory periodic SPA reviews (Cridland with GAD, 2017; Neville-Rolfe, 2023) (▸S), and the Defence Reform Act (c.20) through its s.39 five-yearly statutory review of the single-source regime (▸S).)

Notable open / named open cases. The verification pass records no clearly-major Act without a located review in 2014; all five none-located Acts are narrow — single-clause, technical, amending or Law-Commission-implementing measures (Citizenship (Armed Forces), c.8; Leasehold Reform (Amendment), c.10; Deep Sea Mining, c.15; Inheritance and Trustees' Powers, c.16; Gambling (Licensing and Advertising), c.17, where the 2020–23 Gambling Act Review examined the 2005 regime broadly rather than this amending Act's operation).

Childcare Payments (c.28) sat in this list until the stage-3 audit (§5.6) re-coded it half on the located Tax-Free-Childcare evaluations. No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags. Statutory review/reporting clauses with a located review or report (▸S): c.4 Lobbying (the s.39 review of Part 2), c.18, c.19, c.20 and c.27. Major non-commencement: the cap on care costs (ss.15–16) of the Care Act (c.23) was deferred, not commenced and later superseded by the 2021–23 charging-reform settlement (recorded on the commencement/supersession axis; no conclusion on propriety of non-commencement) — a distinct class of enacted-but-untested provision. Superseded provisions among the set: c.12, c.22 and c.27 (the last also subject to a sunset). Two formal post-legislative artifacts anchor the cohort: an explicit departmental post-legislative scrutiny of the Local Audit and Accountability Act (c.2) and the committee post-legislative scrutiny of the Children and Families Act (c.6).

Harmonization change. None (pilot cohort); the stage-3 audit later re-coded c.28 open→half (✚, §5.6).

---

*One profile per cohort. Every count in the denominator lines comes verbatim from the reconciled series (Appendix B), and the per-cohort major-only artefact-located rate from the standardized recount (§5.6) (the standardized, approximate per-cohort figures; the field aggregate is ≈ 91%); the named reviews and per-Act detail come from each cohort's coding file or harmonization log. Throughout, "none located" means no public post-legislative review was located in the routes checked, as of June 2026** — it is search-bounded and is

not a statement that an Act does not work, nor any implied criticism of a department (internal or non-public review may exist beyond search). The Institute reports the findings of located reviews, attributed; it offers no merits verdict on any Act. Approximate figures are kept approximate.*

2015 — old and heavy (pilot cohort)

Denominator. Frame 37 − 15 = 22 substantive · filled 6 / half 6 / open 10 · **none located 45%** (any located 12 of 22) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 83%.

The 2015 carve-outs (15) are the standard non-reviewable families: the fiscal group (Finance, Finance (No. 2), the two NICs Acts, Stamp Duty Land Tax), the two Supply and Appropriation Acts, the Northern Ireland items, the EU-procedural/finance and EU-referendum machinery, and three internal-parliamentary-machinery Acts. What remains is an unusually old and heavyweight substantive frame, with on the order of a dozen clearly-major Acts.

Among the filled set, three are illustrative. **c.6 Counter-Terrorism and Security** (▸S) attracted a formal post-legislative memorandum to the Home

Affairs Committee (CP 455, 2021) covering all seven Parts; the Act's s.44 also enlarged the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation's remit, and an independent review of the Prevent duty (Shawcross, 2023) followed. **c.30 Modern Slavery** drew a government-commissioned independent review of the Act's operation and effectiveness (Field, Miller and Butler-Sloss, laid May 2019, 80 recommendations, with a government response in July 2019) and a House of Lords post-legislative committee (October 2024). **c.8 Pension Schemes** had its "pension freedoms" reviewed through the FCA's Retirement Outcomes Review (2016–2018) and Work and Pensions Committee scrutiny.

The none-located share is dominated by narrow private members' bills, a Law-Commission-originated commercial-law codification, and an Act recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced. The two clearly-major opens are **c.4 Insurance** — which implements the Law Commissions' 2014 report (pre-dating work, not a review), with law-firm commentary and case-law notes located but no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact under the three-door rule — and **c.20 Deregulation**, an omnibus whose embedded Growth Duty is referenced inside regulator post-implementation reviews but is itself the subject of no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact located under the three-door rule. For both named open Acts: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags: statutory review/reporting clauses (▸S) sit in c.6, c.12, c.15, c.19, c.26 and c.29 (with c.30's review commissioned rather than statutory); c.13 Mutuals' Deferred Shares is recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced (no conclusion on propriety); supersession is noted for c.8 (collective-DC superseded by the Pension Schemes Act 2021), c.15 (enforcement folded into the DMCC Act 2024) and c.26 (the PSC register superseded by ECCTA 2023). **Harmonization:** as the pilot cohort, 2015 saw three half→open demotions on strict re-adjudication — c.17 Self-build, c.20 Deregulation and c.28 Health and Social Care (Safety and Quality) — moving none located from 32% to 45%.

2016 — heavy and statutory-clause-dense

Denominator. Frame 25 − 6 = 19 substantive · filled 6 / half 6 / open 7 · **none located 37%** (any located 12 of 19) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 91%.

The six carve-outs are the two Supply Acts, the Finance Act, the Northern Ireland (Stormont Agreement) Act, the Scotland Act 2016 (flagged constitutional/devolution) and the House of Commons Members' Fund Act. The cohort is notable for the density of Acts that legislated their own statutory review clause — and for most of those clauses a review or report was located.

The strongest located review in any cohort sits here: **c.25 Investigatory Powers** drew the statutory s.260 Home Office report (laid February 2023, which concluded the Act had broadly achieved its aims with limited change needed), an independent review by Lord Anderson (June 2023) and IPCO's s.234 annual

reports, feeding the Investigatory Powers (Amendment) Act 2024. **c.2 Psychoactive Substances** was reviewed under its statutory s.58 clause (Home Office, November 2018), whose located findings were mixed — open street sale curtailed, displacement persisting. **c.4 Charities (Protection and Social Investment)** drew a statutory s.16 government post-implementation review (2020) of the whole Act.

The cohort's named open case is **c.22 Housing and Planning**: its central provisions — starter homes, pay-to-stay, fixed-term tenancies, higher-value-asset sales — are recorded on the commencement/supersession axis as not commenced or superseded (no conclusion on propriety of non-commencement); a Commons Library implementation review (CBP-8229) and a Public Accounts Committee inquiry into Right-to-Buy funding were located, but no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact of the whole Act was located under the three-door rule. No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix. The other opens are narrow or technical Acts (e.g. Driving Instructors (Registration), the CCRC information PMB) and a database power recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced.

Flags: ▸S clauses in c.25 (s.260), c.2 (s.58), c.4 (s.16), c.20 Energy (s.16) and c.7 (benefit-cap s.9), each with a located review or report; c.9 Access to Medical Treatments carried a database power recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced; c.15 Trade Union was largely repealed by the Employment Rights Act 2025 (recorded on the reform/supersession axis). **Harmonization:** the cohort's none-located share was clean and unchanged at ≈ 37% (6/6/7); on harmonization c.22 Housing and Planning moved to open (becoming the cohort's named open case) with a mutually-compensating promotion of c.6 Education and Adoption from open to half.

2017 — light and PMB-heavy (election-year wash-up)

Denominator. Frame 35 − 10 = 25 substantive · filled 6 / half 6 / open 13 · **none located 52%** (any located 12 of 25) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 78%.

The ten carve-outs are the two Supply and two Finance Acts, the two Northern Ireland items, the Wales Act 2017 (flagged constitutional), the EU (Notification of Withdrawal) Act (spent constitutional machinery), the EU (Approvals) Act (repealed EU-procedural machinery) and the HS2 Phase 1 hybrid works Act. The substantive frame is unusually large and PMB-heavy: the late-April-2017 wash-up before the snap election cleared a backlog of private members' bills, inflating the denominator with Acts nobody reviews.

The filled set is anchored by two formal memoranda. **c.22 Criminal Finances** drew a formal post-legislative memorandum to the Home Affairs Committee (2024); **c.29 Higher Education and Research** — the cohort's strongest-reviewed major — drew a formal memorandum to the Education Committee

(December 2022) alongside a statutory s.25 independent review of the Teaching Excellence Framework (Pearce, 2019). **c.13 Homelessness Reduction**, although PMB-originated, had its operation and effect evaluated through an MHCLG-commissioned process-and-impact evaluation (ICF, 2020) and an NAO investigation into the homelessness system (2024).

The two named open cases are **c.21 Bus Services** and **c.20 Neighbourhood Planning**. For c.21, located material exists — the franchising power was upheld on judicial review (2022), Enhanced Partnerships and Bus Open Data are operating, and the Urban Transport Group/LGA produced "A Smoother Ride" (2023) — but on strict re-adjudication these are component or adjacent items rather than a qualifying public post-legislative review artefact of the whole Act under the three-door rule. For both named open Acts: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix. The remaining opens form the narrow-PMB tail (Parking Places, Local Audit access, Merchant Shipping, Guardianship of Missing Persons, Farriers, IP unjustified threats, radio multiplex services, cultural property).

Flags: ▸S clauses in c.15 (s.6 annual value-for-money report), c.29 (s.25 TEF review) and c.18 (Istanbul Convention statutory reporting); reform/supersession is recorded on a separate axis for c.30 Digital Economy (Part 3 age-verification not commenced, later overtaken by the Online Safety Act 2023), c.19 (IfATE functions transferred to Skills England) and c.15 National Citizen Service (wound down 2025); for c.27 Guardianship, commencement was deferred by roughly two years. **Harmonization:** c.21 Bus Services was demoted half→open, moving none located from 48% to 52%.

2018 — mixed, normal-volume year

Denominator. Frame 34 − 13 = 21 substantive · filled 5 / half 6 / open 10 · **none located 48%** (any located 11 of 21) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 100%.

The thirteen carve-outs are the two Finance/tax Acts, the two Supply Acts, the five Northern Ireland budget/formation Acts, three narrow fiscal/rating Acts and the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (flagged constitutional/machinery). The substantive frame is a mixed, normal-volume cohort.

Two formal Cm 7320 memoranda sit in the filled set. **c.13 Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering** drew a formal post-legislative memorandum from the FCDO to the Foreign Affairs Committee (laid 4 March 2024). **c.30 Ivory** drew a government post-legislative memorandum — whose located finding was candid that the Act's specific impact was not isolable — alongside independent IFAW-commissioned effectiveness studies (2021, 2023). Statutory built-in review is well represented: **c.21 Domestic Gas and Electricity (Tariff Cap)** was reviewed by Ofgem under ss.6/7/9 (cap-level reviews and annual market-competition reviews), and **c.29 Civil Liability** drew a statutory review of effects

on policyholders (2024), statutory discount-rate reviews and a whiplash post-implementation review launched in October 2025.

c.12 Data Protection Act 2018 is adjudicated half and ▸S at the panel review (§5.6, ✚): the Act writes two statutory review duties into its own text and both are discharged — the s.189 review of the representative-action provisions, reported to Parliament (2021), and the s.178 review of journalism processing, completed and laid by the Information Commissioner. Reform and amendment remain on a separate axis — the DPDI Bill, which did not proceed, and the Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 — and reform is not review. The cohort records no clearly-major open. Other opens include an Act recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced and an Act whose review was explicitly declined.

Flags: ▸S / built-in statutory review in c.12 (ss.178/189 — both discharged; see above), c.21 (ss.6/7/9), c.29 (statutory discount-rate and policyholder reviews) and c.19 (the s.20 Trailer Safety Report, laid July 2019); c.11 Secure Tenancies (Victims of Domestic Abuse) is recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced (its core tied to un-commenced 2016 provisions, the equivalent later re-enacted in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 s.79); supersession is noted for c.12 (Data (Use and Access) Act 2025) and c.23 Assaults on Emergency Workers (Sentencing Act 2020 / PCSC Act 2022); for c.33 Courts and Tribunals, review was declined in its impact assessment — an explicit decision, recorded as such. **Harmonization:** no clean changes — the cohort held at ≈ 52% none located.

2019 — Brexit-thinned

Denominator. Frame 31 − 16 = 15 substantive · filled 2 / half 4 / open 9 · **none located 60%** (any located 6 of 15) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 70%.

The harmonized carve-outs (16) span the Supply and Appropriation Acts, the Northern Ireland budget/formation/institutional-abuse Acts, the EU-withdrawal extension Acts, the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) sunset-extension Act, the Kew (Leases) Act and the Parliamentary estate Act. This is a Brexit-thinned cohort — few substantive GB-wide majors — and is the smallest substantive frame in the panel.

The two filled dots are **c.7** and **c.9**. The per-Act review basis for 2019 was recorded in the original 2019 pilot ledger rather than a narrative coding file, and that ledger is not among the sources for this appendix pass, so individual review titles for the filled pair — c.7 Organ Donation (Deemed Consent) and c.9 Stalking Protection — are not restated here; the 2019 dots are ledger-checked (the pilot-ledger check, §5.6). The one located review readily identifiable from the reconciled record is**c.14 Healthcare (European Economic Area and Switzerland Arrangements)**, scored a statutory-reporting half (a reporting duty the Act creates about its own subject).

The cohort's named open case is **c.18 Mental Capacity (Amendment)** — the Liberty Protection Safeguards: a major Act whose scheme is recorded on the commencement axis as not brought into force (no conclusion on propriety), so it

codes open. No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix. Measured from Royal Assent, the 2019 Acts are now past the conventional three-to-five-year window, except where non-commencement (as with c.18) or Act-specific commencement timing changes the clock; absence remains search-bounded.

Flags: c.18 (LPS) is recorded on the commencement axis as not commenced; the harmonized frame is Brexit-thinned. The frame carries c.12 as a half (▸S): its section 3 report duty is discharged by the published Pregnancy Loss Review, adjudicated at the panel review (§5.6, **✚**). **Harmonization:** the frame moved from 13 to 15 — c.10 FGM and c.28 Census were returned to frame (both open) — and c.5 was demoted half→open, moving none located from ≈ 54% to 67%; the dots were re-derived and then verified against the pilot ledger. The c.12 adjudication (§5.6) subsequently takes the cohort to 9/15 ≈ 60%.

2020 — crisis-driven and heavyweight (COVID + EU exit)

Denominator. Frame 29 − 8 = 21 substantive · filled 5 / half 3 / open 13 · **none located 62%** (any located 8 of 21) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 71%.[1]

The eight carve-outs are the standard Supply/Finance/fiscal family, including the post-transition fiscal trio (Contingencies Fund, the SDLT temporary relief Act and Taxation (Post-transition Period)). The substantive frame is crisis-driven and heavyweight, clustering several major Acts — several with statutory review, sunset or reporting clauses — alongside a narrow technical and one-off tail.

Three filled Acts are illustrative. **c.7 Coronavirus** was subject to the statutory ss.97–99 six-monthly reports laid before Parliament plus post-legislative scrutiny by PACAC. **c.10 Birmingham Commonwealth Games** (▸S) drew its statutory s.2 reports (the Games Act Reports) and a DCMS-commissioned independent Games-wide evaluation (KPMG/4GLOBAL/University of Birmingham) assessing the Act's own s.2 objectives. **c.21 Agriculture** drew the cohort's single formal Cm 7320 Post-Legislative Assessment (CP 1521). The other two filled dots rest on a statutory review of the permanent measures plus an independent evaluation (c.12) and a statutory whole-Act review produced by its December-2025 statutory deadline (c.27).

The named open cases are two. **c.20 Immigration and Social Security Co-ordination (EU Withdrawal)** — the repeal of free movement — appears as the backdrop of immigration-system reviews: the located MAC reports and ICIBI inspections take the points-based system (a regime not set up by this Act) as their object, so no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact of this Act was located under the three-door rule. **c.11 Divorce, Dissolution and Separation** commenced in April 2022; the search found routine MoJ family-court statistics and commentary, but no artefact qualifying under the three-door rule as of June 2026 — a public-record result that does not determine internal or

[1] The Sentencing Code (c.17) is a consolidation Act and therefore sits outside the clearly-major set used to compute the major-only artefact-located rate; it is treated here as a deliberately excluded consolidation, not as a named open case. Counting it among the major Acts would give a 2020 major-only artefact-located rate of ≈ 63% rather than ≈ 71%.

operational review. For both named open Acts: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix.

Flags: ▸S statutory clauses with a located review or report in c.7, c.10, c.12, c.21, c.22 and c.27; one formal Cm 7320 memorandum (c.21); consolidation tags on c.9 and c.17; supersession noted for c.2 (Agriculture Act 2020), c.16 (LURA 2023), c.28 (Trade Act 2021) and c.3 (CTSA 2021); expiry noted for c.5 (2024) and most temporary provisions of c.7 (2022); none recorded as not commenced. **Harmonization:** c.20 Immigration was demoted half→open, moving none located from 57% to 62%.

2021 — heavyweight, largest and most PMB-diluted frame

Denominator. Frame 35 − 8 = 27 substantive · filled 3 / half 8 / open 16 · **none located 59%** (any located 11 of 27) · major-only artefact-located rate ≈ 92% (11 of 12 clearly-major Acts with at least one located artefact — partial and statutory-report cases included; not a due-window or compliance rate).

The eight carve-outs are the standard Supply/Finance/fiscal family (including the Contingencies Fund Act); the cohort has no constitutional or devolution-settlement Act, so that family does not bite here. At 27 substantive Acts this is simultaneously the youngest, the largest and the most PMB-diluted substantive frame in the panel.

The three filled Acts are well documented. **c.3 Medicines and Medical Devices** (▸S) produced a published report under its s.48 statutory whole-Act review duty — the "Medicines and Medical Devices Act 2021: 5 year report" (covering February 2021 to February 2026), with section-by-section operation assessments and recommendations, rather than a bare call for evidence. **c.17 Domestic Abuse** drew a formal post-legislative memorandum (CP 1575, Home Office), a dedicated House of Lords Domestic Abuse Act 2021 Committee and the Ecorys DAPN/DAPO evaluation. **c.30 Environment** (▸S) is carried by the Office for Environmental Protection — the body the Act constitutes — discharging its ss.28–29 statutory monitoring and laying evaluative annual progress reports on the environmental-improvement framework. A heavy cluster of statutory-reporting and oversight halves sits alongside (c.11 Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing, c.25 National Security and Investment, c.31 Telecommunications (Security), c.4 CHIS, c.10 Trade, c.1 Pension Schemes, c.35 Armed Forces).

The named open case is c.23 Overseas Operations — no qualifying public artefact located via the stated routes as of June 2026 (re-searched) (no qualifying public artefact located via the stated routes as of June 2026); c.22 Financial Services is adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check (below). For c.22, the pre-publication check adjudicated the flag the stage-3 clause-audit (§5.6) had raised: the Act writes its own review/report duties into the Benchmarks Regulation, and the Article-23E statutory review of the exercise of those powers was published by the FCA on 29 February 2024, with a copy to the

Treasury as the Article requires — a located statutory review of the operation of the regime the Act built — so c.22 is coded half ▸S (✚). Its framework was largely superseded by FSMA 2023 (recorded on the supersession axis, with no inference about review cadence); the Schedule 2A Gibraltar reporting duty remains a second, not-yet-discharged clause. For c.23, bill-stage scrutiny and academic/advocacy commentary were located; bill-stage scrutiny is correctly not counted as post-legislative review, and no dismissive inference is drawn. For the named open Act: No qualifying public artefact located via the §5.4 routes as of June 2026; the ceiling on meaning is stated at the head of this appendix. Measured from Royal Assent, it is a recent flagship Act whose absence of a located review remains search-bounded.

Flags: ▸S statutory clauses with a located review or report in c.3, c.11, c.22 (Article 23E — adjudicated at the pre-publication check ✚), c.25, c.30 and c.31; one formal Cm 7320 memorandum (c.17), with c.3's statutory s.48 whole-Act 5-year report additionally published; supersession noted for c.22 (FSMA 2023), c.24 (BSA 2022) and c.7 (PSTI 2022); the c.34 rating/directors-disqualification hybrid is flagged; none recorded as not commenced. **Harmonization:** no changes — coded after the pilot's distinctions had entered the kit, 2021 was already rubric-consistent and held at ≈ 63% none located; the pre-publication adjudication of c.22 (§5.6) then takes the cohort to 16/27 ≈ 59%.

All figures trace to the reconciled 14-cohort series and carry the limits stated in the body of the report; "none located" carries the §5.4 definition as of June 2026; no merits verdict is offered on any Act.

Appendix B — Reconciled data

This appendix reproduces the final reconciled fourteen-cohort series — the single cross-cohort object from which every headline figure in this report is quoted. The compact records and the "% none located" series below are the final reconciled dots; Appendix E sets the same series out as a native table and supplies the evidence beneath it. "None located" carries the §5.4 definition and limits throughout. The markers carry the reconciliation history: ▲ marks a cohort whose figure moved at harmonization (stage 2a); ◆ marks a cohort re-coded at reconciliation (stage 2b).

B.1 · The fourteen reconciled compact records

`frame = PGA − carve-outs = substantive | filled / half / open | none% · (▲ = moved at 2a; ◆ = re-coded at 2b; ✚ = re-coded at the pre-publication audits: stage-3 sample audit; external-panel adjudication)`

```
2008 ✚   33 − 10 = 23 |  13 /  5 /  5 |  22%
2009   27 −  6 = 21 |   6 /  7 /  8 |  38%
2010 ◆ 41 − 10 = 31 |  10 /  7 / 14 |  45%   (CRaG returned IN as half; was 30/47% at 2a)
2011 ◆ 25 −  4 = 21 |   8 /  6 /  7 |  33%   (Olympic returned IN as open; was 20/30% at 2a)
2012   23 −  5 = 18 |   7 /  4 /  7 |  39%
2013 ▲✚ 33 −  6 = 27 |   8 / 6 / 13 |  48%   (c.17 half→open at 2a — reversed at stage-3
audit ✚: statutory Oakley review located, ▸S; audited split 8/6/13, none 48%)
2014 ✚   30 − 10 = 20 |   9 / 6 / 5 |  25%   (pilot; c.28 open→half at stage-3 audit ✚)
2015 ▲ 37 − 15 = 22 |   6 /  6 / 10 |  45%   (pilot; +13pp on harmonization)
2016   25 −  6 = 19 |   6 /  6 /  7 |  37%
2017 ▲ 35 − 10 = 25 |   6 /  6 / 13 |  52%   (c.21 Bus Services half→open)
2018 ✚   34 − 13 = 21 |   5 /  6 / 10 |  48%
2019 ▲✚ 31 − 16 = 15 |   2 /  4 / 9 |  60%   (frame +2 + c.5 half→open at 2a; c.12
adjudicated half at panel review — s.3 PLR ✚)
2020 ▲ 29 −  8 = 21 |   5 /  3 / 13 |  62%   (c.20 Immigration half→open)
2021 ✚   35 −  8 = 27 |   3 /  8 / 16 |  59%
```

B.2 · The "% none located" series, oldest to newest

```
2008  2009  2010  2011  2012  2013  2014  2015  2016  2017  2018  2019  2020
2021
 22%   38%   45%   33%   39%   48%   25%   45%   37%   52%   48%   60%   62%
59%
                  ◆           ◆           ▲     ▲           ▲           ▲     ▲
```

Field aggregate (2008–2021). 311 substantive Acts — filled 94 / half 80 / open 137; no located post-legislative review ≈ 44% (so ≈ 56% have at least some located review). Five cohorts moved at harmonization (▲: 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2020) and two were re-coded at reconciliation (◆: 2010, 2011); every move raised the cohort's none-located share except the 2010 CRaG re-code, which returned a located half and lowered it. The stage-3 audit (July 2026) then re-coded two further Acts half (✚: 2013 c.17, reversing its 2a demotion, and 2014 c.28), and the external panel review then adjudicated two more (2018 c.12 on its ss.178/189 statutory reviews; 2019 c.12 on its s.3 Pregnancy Loss Review), taking the field to filled 93 / half 80 / open 138, ≈ 44% none located; that adoption then took in the parallel-line Energy re-adjudication (2008 c.32 half→filled, on the located whole-Act Cm 8893 memorandum), settling the field at filled 94 / half 79 / open 138 — the none-share unchanged at ≈ 44%; the pre-publication watch check then adjudicated 2021 c.22 ▸S-half on its located Article-

23E review, settling the release series at filled 94 / half 80 / open 137, none-share still ≈ 44%.

Appendix C — Method artefacts and the carve-out register

This appendix records, in compact form, the method artefacts behind the series and the carve-out register that defines the substantive frame. It introduces no figure not already stated in §5 and Appendix B; the full method is in §5 and the released reproduction materials are listed in Appendix G.

C.1 · The carve-out rule (narrow carve)

The substantive frame is the cohort's Public General Acts minus a narrow carve. The carve excludes only (i) territorial devolution and Northern-Ireland-institutional settlements, (ii) EU-procedural and withdrawal machinery, and (iii) internal parliamentary-estate or machinery provisions — together with the category exclusions applied under the predeclared family rules (Finance, Supply and Appropriation, Northern Ireland budget, formation and Stormont-machinery Acts, and narrow fiscal or rating technicalities). Non-devolution constitutional Acts with a substantive, ongoing, reviewable regime stay **in** frame. The rationale is that the carve is for law that cannot be meaningfully reviewed after the fact, not for law that is merely important. The carve is a reasoned, contestable judgement, logged Act by Act; the all-in/all-out spread quoted for it is a logical extreme envelope, not a plausible sensitivity interval (the documented boundary re-adjudication moved two Acts), and the headline is bounded across alternative principled frames in §3.3.

C.2 · The carve-out register — boundary decisions

At reconciliation the entire carve-boundary reconsideration returned only two Acts to the frame — a marginal line-shift, not independence from the carve (the carve-sensitivity bound is ≈ 32–61%, see §3.3):

Act	Status at stage 2a	Rule applied	Final coding	Effect
2010 c.25 Constitutional Reform and Governance	carved out	substantive treaty-scrutiny and civil-service regime → **in**	half (Part 2 treaty-scrutiny reviewed)	frame 30→31; none 47%→45%
2011 c.22 Olympic (Amendment)	carved out (event-specific)	event machinery is not the project-specific family → **in**	open (technical amendments, spent after 2012)	frame 20→21; none 30%→33%

Decisions settled at coding and confirmed by the rule, with no change: 2008 c.7 European Union (Amendment) stays **out** (EU-procedural); 2011 c.1 Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies stays **in** (half); 2011 c.14 Fixed-term Parliaments stays **in** (filled — it mandated its own section 7 review); and 2013

c.20 Succession to the Crown stays **in** (open, with review declined at enactment).

C.3 · Method artefacts

The pipeline runs in three stages, each protecting the single invariant that every compared cohort was judged by the same borderline rules. **Stage 1 (coding)** builds each cohort's frame and codes every substantive Act through one fresh minimum-search sequence, emitting a compact cohort record. **Stage 2a (harmonization)** re-adjudicates each cohort's borderline half/open calls against the rubric anchors, logging every change with the rule that forced it. **Stage 2b (reconciliation)** runs once over all the logs together, auditing that the same rules were applied uniformly and assembling the strict-comparable series. A **verification pass** then confirmed the picture without moving any denominator — recomputing the standardised major-only rate, confirming the A10/A15 line uniform across all fourteen cohorts, and reconciling the 2019 cohort against the pilot ledger. The compact record is the narrow waist through which every cohort passes; the publication gate holds at each stage, and the flagship document quotes cross-cohort numbers only from the reconciled series.

Appendix D — Glossary

Definitions are as used throughout this report; figures are not repeated here.

filled / half / open. The single reduced outcome recorded for each substantive Act for the headline denominator (the seven assessment axes are preserved for interpretation and never combined into a composite score). *Filled* marks an Act for which a located post-legislative review exists — a whole-Act review of operation or effect, a statutory whole-Act review, or a formal Cm 7320 memorandum. *Half* marks a partial or component review — a component, power, regime, statutory-reporting duty, or adjacent body reviewed, but not the whole Act. *Open* marks an Act for which no public review has been located. Across a cohort, filled and half together give "any review located", open gives "none located", and the three sum to the frame.

▸S (statutory review clause). A marker appended whenever the Act itself writes a duty to review or report on the Act's own operation into its own text. It is the single feature most consistently associated with a located review.

A10 vs A15 (the statutory-reporting line). The line, applied identically across all fourteen cohorts, between two rubric anchors. A duty the Act creates to lay a report on its own subject before Parliament, carrying analytical content that would not be produced regardless (A10), is a genuine self-report and reads as half. A look-alike duty to produce routine operating statistics or data returns of a standing body (A15) is data, not a review, and reads as open.

The seven axes. The separable axes on which each Act (or bounded provision) is coded, kept distinct throughout: (1) in-force state; (2) review located, and of what kind; (3) review strength and independence; (4) review scope; (5) substitution or supersession; (6) outcome-evidence maturity; and (7) confidence in the coding. An Act has a profile across these axes, not a single grade.

"None located" (search-bounded). Shorthand for the ceiling phrase recorded with every open dot: no public post-legislative review located in the routes the search checked, as of June 2026. It is a statement about the public record and the search behind it — never a finding that no review exists, that an Act does not work, or that any department failed; internal or non-public review may exist beyond the routes searched.

The three-door rule. For each substantive Act a located review must come through one of three doors: (i) a government post-legislative memorandum (the Cm 7320 process) or a statutory whole-Act review; (ii) a dedicated select-committee post-legislative inquiry; or (iii) a statutory, independent or commissioned review of the Act's operation or effect — a regulator review, an NAO or PAC study, an independent reviewer, a government evaluation, or a statutory post-implementation review. Reform, pre-dating work, implementation and commentary are never a review.

Appendix E · Evidence & sensitivity panel

The State of PLS — Version 1.0 · July 2026 (adversarially reviewed by a structured nine-role panel — not journal peer review, and not an independent replication). Check date 2026-06.

This panel tabulates already-coded data: per-Act outcome dots and ▸S flags from the cohort coding files, the harmonized denominators and the documented stage-2a / stage-2b re-codes from the reconciled series (Appendix B), and the standardised major definition with the named unreviewed-major list. It introduces no new dot and no new research; it reconciles the evidence tables to the final series. "None located" carries the §5.4 definition throughout ("no qualifying public post-legislative review artefact located under the three-door rule as of 2026-06", never a claim that none exists); no merits verdict is offered on any Act; ≈ is left as ≈.

*Granularity. The full per-Act E1–E7 grids are reproduced for the seven cohorts **2008–2014**. For **2015–2021** the reconciled cohort records are given — frame, filled / half / open, the documented reconciling move(s), the named located-half and named unreviewed-major Acts, and ▸S status — while their per-Act E1–E7 grids are held in the cohort coding files and are not re-tabulated in this consolidation. The field roll-ups below state every figure that is derivable for the whole 14-cohort field, and mark where second-half per-Act detail is carried in the cohort records rather than re-tabulated.*

E0 · Headline reconciliation

Field of **311** substantive Acts across the fourteen cohorts 2008–2021 (Public General Acts minus the narrow territorial / EU-procedural / parliamentary-machinery carve-outs):

field measure	value
filled / half / open	**94 / 80 / 137**
no located review (open)	**137 / 311 = 44.1% ≈ 44%**
at least some located review	**174 / 311 = 56.0% ≈ 56%**
— of which a formal whole-Act review / memorandum (filled)	**94 / 311 = 30.2% ≈ 30%**
clearly-major Acts (strict)	**130** (sensitivity band 130–132)
unreviewed clearly-major (major-open)	**12 (12–14 with borderline-majors)**
major-only located rate	**118 / 130 = 90.8% ≈ 91%**
▸S Acts (own statutory review/report duty) located	**78 / 78 = 100%** (sample-audited; 0 located ▸S-open; the last flag — 2021 c.22 — adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check, §5.6)

These are the final reconciled figures of Appendix B. The robust finding is **salience**: clearly-major Acts carry at least one located artefact at ≈91%, against

≈56% for all substantive Acts; the ≈44% none-located remainder is overwhelmingly narrow PMBs, Law-Commission codifications, never-commenced and spent/event Acts, with a youngest-cohort "not yet" component among the few unreviewed majors.

Conventions

Dots. filled = whole-Act operation/effect review **or** statutory whole-Act review / formal Cm 7320 memorandum; half = partial / component / regime / statutory-reporting / adjacent review; open = no located review. ▸S = the Act writes its own statutory review/report duty.

Major definition (applied uniformly). Clearly-major = a flagship substantive Government Act **or** a major constitutional Act; excluded are narrow PMBs, consolidations, curative/retrospective Acts, spent/event Acts and tax-administration Acts. Where a coding file names its major set, that set is used; borderline inclusions and exclusions are named.

E5 ▸S type legend. `TR` = true review / PIR duty (mandates an actual review of the Act or regime); `PR` = periodic report-on-operation duty (recurring statutory report on the Act's own subject); `SB` = standing-body monitoring/reporting duty (recurring scrutiny or return by a standing body the Act creates).

E6 route legend (one *primary* route per located Act; multi-route Acts flagged inline). `DM` = departmental memorandum (Cm 7320 PLS memo / PIR / Government review document); `LC` = Lords–Commons inquiry (select / ad-hoc / joint committee); `NP` = NAO–PAC; `ISR` = independent statutory reviewer (named standing office, e.g. IRTL); `SSR` = statutory self-report (recurring statutory report or periodic review the Act mandates); `RB` = regulator-or-body report (regulator / inspectorate / ombudsman, not Act-mandated); `CE` = commissioned evaluation (Government-commissioned independent review or departmental research); `CR` = component review (used where the artefact reviews a component and no cleaner label applies). Route is a judgement on the most salient located artefact and is kept distinct from ▸S status — an Act can be ▸S yet have its most salient located artefact be, say, a Lords–Commons inquiry.

E7 tail categories. `nPMB` narrow PMB · `LCc` Law-Commission codification/consolidation · `nc` never-commenced · `se` spent/event · `mR` major-recent · `mO` major-old; with two flagged additions used where the six do not fit cleanly — `[cr]` curative/retrospective, `[rd]` review-declined/constitutional. Narrow technical or amending Government Acts that are not literally PMBs are placed under `nPMB` with an inline flag.

The reconciled 14-cohort series

`frame = PGA − carve-outs` · filled / half / open · none% · (▲ = moved at stage 2a; ◆ = re-coded at stage 2b; ✚ = re-coded at the pre-publication audits: stage-3 sample audit; external-panel adjudication)

cohort	frame	F / H / O	none%	documented reconciling move(s)	▸S-open
2008 ✚	33 − 10 = 23	13 / 5 / 5	≈22%	—	0
2009	27 − 6 = 21	6 / 7 / 8	≈38%	—	0
2010 ◆	41 − 10 = 31	10 / 7 / 14	≈45%	CRaG (c.25) returned to frame as **half** (Part 2 treaty-scrutiny reviewed); net none% **down** vs the as-carved 30 / 47%	0
2011 ◆	25 − 4 = 21	8 / 6 / 7	≈33%	Olympic (c.22) returned to frame as **open**; c.19 Pensions filled→half; c.25 Charities half→open	0
2012	23 − 5 = 18	7 / 4 / 7	≈39%	—	0
2013 ▲✚	33 − 6 = 27	8 / 6 / 13	≈48%	c.17 half→open at 2a; reversed at stage-3 audit (Oakley located; ▸S added)	0
2014 ✚	30 − 10 = 20	9 / 6 / 5	≈25%	—	0
2015 ▲	37 − 15 = 22	6 / 6 / 10	≈45%	three half→open demotions on independent re-search (none% up ≈13pp)	0
2016	25 − 6 = 19	6 / 6 / 7	≈37%	membership fix: Housing & Planning open, Education & Adoption half (totals unchanged)	0
2017 ▲	35 − 10 = 25	6 / 6 / 13	≈52%	c.21 Bus Services half→open	0
2018 ✚	34 − 13 = 21	5 / 6 / 10	≈48%	c.12 → half at panel review	0
2019 ▲✚	31 − 16 = 15	2 / 4 / 9	≈60%	c.10 FGM + c.28 Census returned as open; c.5 half→open (2a); c.12 → half at panel review	0
2020 ▲	29 − 8 = 21	5 / 3 / 13	≈62%	c.20 Immigration half→open	0
2021 ✚	35 − 8 = 27	3 / 8 / 16	≈59%	c.22 → ▸S-half at the pre-publication check (Art 23E)	0
field	**311**	**94 / 80 / 137**	**≈44%**	5 moved at 2a (the 2013 move since reversed); 2 re-coded at 2b; 2 re-coded at the stage-3 audit; 2 adjudicated at the external panel review (✚)	**0**

Every reconciling move except the 2010 CRaG re-code raised the cohort's none% (the CRaG re-code returned a located half and lowered it); the net field effect is that the field is a little less reviewed than the raw coding implied. The series itself (block-level age-trend, composition, salience) is read in Appendix B; this panel supplies the evidence beneath it.

Field roll-ups (E1–E7)

E1 field · major × outcome + the unreviewed-major list

Field clearly-major total **130** (strict; sensitivity band 130–132). Major-only located rate **118 / 130 = 90.8% ≈ 91%**; unreviewed clearly-major **12 (12–14 with borderline-majors)**. Per cohort, major-only runs ≈78–100% on the strict rule (lowest 2017 ≈78%; the former 2020 low of ≈63% counted borderline majors and the since-excluded Sentencing consolidation). The per-cohort major sets and outcomes are in the 2008–2014 grids below; the 2015–2021 major-only rates are carried in the cohort records.

The unreviewed clearly-major Acts. The identifiable members of the strict 12 are (borderline and excluded entries marked):

cohort	Act	character
2008	c.13 Regulatory Enforcement & Sanctions	old miss (borderline-major)
2008	c.24 Employment	old miss (borderline-major)
2009	c.12 Political Parties & Elections	old miss
2012	c.19 Civil Aviation	old miss — 2023 CAA public-bodies review flagged for adjudication (§5.6)
2013	c.27 Growth & Infrastructure	old miss
2020	c.11 Divorce, Dissolution & Separation	recent
2020	c.17 Sentencing (Code)	excluded — consolidation (uniform rule, §5.6)
2021	c.23 Overseas Operations (Service Personnel & Veterans)	recent

(2013 c.20 Succession to the Crown is a borderline-constitutional case with review *declined* under the review-declined axis, counted non-major in the strict set.) The balance of the strict 12 — seven Acts — sits among the youngest cohorts' recent majors (2015–2019), where the few unreviewed majors are "not yet" rather than "never". One entry carries a clause caveat: the stage-3 clause-audit (§5.6) found the Financial Services Act 2021 (c.22) to carry statutory review/report duties of its own — the Benchmarks-Regulation review and report the Act inserts, and the Schedule 2A duty on the Treasury to report on the operation of the Gibraltar regime to Parliament — so c.22 is not non-▸S; it is flagged for stage-2a adjudication as either a located ▸S-half or a ▸S-open "not yet", adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check (its Article-23E review located); the census failure mode it shares with 2013 c.17 recurred at the panel

review in 2018 c.12 and 2019 c.12, both adjudicated half on their own located statutory reviews. The named *old* misses are genuine — their absence is not an age artefact.

E4 field · ▸S vs non-▸S

▸S Acts (those writing their own statutory review/report duty): **78 / 78 located = 100%**, with **0 ▸S-open in every one of the 14 cohorts** — the strongest single predictor of a located review. The non-▸S comparator located rate is far lower and varies by cohort (≈28% in 2013 to ≈74% in 2008 over the 2008–2014 grids). Per-cohort ▸S / non-▸S splits are in the 2008–2014 grids; for 2015–2021 the ▸S-located rate is 100% with 0 open in each cohort, anchored by the A10/A15 statutory self-report halves and the A11/A15 body-performance halves named in the cohort records (38 Acts as-coded on the bottom-up count; 41 with the three adjudications of this section). The census itself is audited rather than assumed: the stage-3 audit (§5.6) added one member the flagging had missed (2013 c.17, s.2 — located via the Oakley review) and, on extending the clause-check to the named major-open Acts, surfaced one candidate exception (2021 c.22, whose own report duties make it ▸S — flagged for adjudication as ▸S-half or ▸S-open "not yet"); a survivorship boundary applies — duties extinguished with a repealed Act (the Fiscal Responsibility Act 2010's reporting duty among them) never enter the denominator.

E5 field · ▸S by type

Type legend TR true review/PIR · PR periodic report-on-operation · SB standing-body monitoring. Across the seven coded cohorts 2008–2014 the ▸S sets are TR-dominant — **TR 24 · PR 9 · SB 4** (37 ▸S Acts) — and the share of *genuine* review/PIR duties (TR) is highest in 2013 (8 of 9) and 2014 (5 of 5), which blunts the tautology critique for those cohorts. The 2015–2021 ▸S type breakdown is held in the cohort files; the field ▸S total is 78 / 78 located — taken bottom-up from the per-Act ledger (the earlier Appendix-E roll-up of 68 undercounted the 2015–2021 named sets by five; reconciled at the parallel-line adoption, §5.6).

E6 field · route typology

One primary route per located Act (multi-route Acts flagged inline in the grids). Across 2008–2014 (102 located Acts) the distribution is:

route	n (2008–2014)
DM departmental memorandum	34
SSR statutory self-report	19
NP NAO–PAC	14
CE commissioned evaluation	13
LC Lords–Commons inquiry	8
ISR independent statutory reviewer	7
RB regulator-or-body	6
CR component review	1
located (this span)	**102**

The field located total is **174** (= 94 filled + 80 half); the 2015–2021 route counts are held in the cohort files. The typology shows located review is heterogeneous — departmental memoranda and statutory self-reports dominate, with committee, NAO–PAC, independent-reviewer and commissioned-evaluation routes all material — so "located review" spans formal whole-Act memoranda through to component and self-report artefacts, not a single instrument. A memorandum is the input to committee scrutiny, not full PLS itself.

E7 field · tail composition

Categories as in the conventions. Across 2008–2014 (59 open Acts) the tail is structurally patterned: narrow PMBs dominate (≈29), then spent/event (≈12) and Law-Commission codifications (≈10), a rare never-commenced handful (2), and a small set of genuine *old* major misses (`m0`), plus two flagged cases (c.18 2012; c.20 2013 — the 2013 [cr] slot was vacated when c.17 was re-coded half at the stage-3 audit). The field open total is **137**; the 2015–2021 tail (≈78 open) is characterised in the cohort records — recent and PMB-diluted, dominated by narrow PMBs and Acts too new to have been reviewed ("not yet").

Per-cohort evidence — 2008–2014

2008 ✚ — frame 23 (33 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 13 / H 5 / O 5; none ≈22%

Heavyweight, major-Act-rich; dense departmental-memorandum environment (ten formal Cm 7320 memoranda).

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 13): c.4 CJ&Imm · c.6 Child Maintenance · c.14 Health & Social Care · c.17 Housing & Regeneration · c.22 HFE · c.23 Children & Young Persons · c.25 Education & Skills · c.26 Local Transport · c.27 Climate Change · c.28 Counter-Terrorism · c.29 Planning · c.30 Pensions · c.32 Energy — moved half→filled at the parallel-line adoption on the located whole-Act Cm 8893 memorandum (DECC, laid 14 July 2014).

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.4, c.6, c.14, c.17, c.22, c.25, c.26, c.27, c.28, c.30, c.32	11
half	c.23, c.29	2
open	—	0
major-only (any located)		**13/13 = 100%**

Major-only 13/13 = 100% strict; 87–93% if the two borderline machinery Acts (c.13 Regulatory Enforcement & Sanctions, c.24 Employment — both coded open, treated non-major) are counted major (13/14 ≈ 93% one; 13/15 ≈ 87% both).

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate

▸S	c.27, c.30, c.31 (3)	c.11 (1)	— (0)	4	4/4 = 100%
non-▸S	10	4	5	19	14/19 ≈ 74%

▸S-open exceptions: none. c.11 SEN(Information) is the half ▸S dot and it rests on a located artefact: the new annual SEN-information statistical publication (DCSF, first developed 2009, per DCSF SFR 09/2010, 13 May 2010, "developed to meet the requirements of the Act"), continued in the DfE "Special Educational Needs in England" SFR series. c.31 Dormant Accounts also carries a s.14 review/report duty and so joins the field ▸S set (located; its most salient artefact is the HMT Government whole-Act review, routed DM in E6); adopted into the cohort ▸S set at the parallel-line adoption — 4/4 located.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review/PIR	c.30 Pensions — ≥3-yearly statutory automatic-enrolment review, Cm 9546 *(filled)* · *c.31 Dormant Accounts — s.14 review-and-report duty; HMT whole-Act review (filled)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	c.27 Climate Change — s.36 CCC annual progress reports *(filled)* · c.11 SEN(Information) — statutory annual SEN report duty *(half)*
SB standing-body monitoring	—

Type tally: TR 2 (F2) · PR 2 (F1, H1) · SB 0 → ▸S F3 / H1 / O0.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 18).

route	Acts	n
DM departmental memorandum	c.4, c.6, c.14[1], c.17, c.20, c.22, c.26, c.28[2], c.31[3], c.32	10
SSR statutory self-report	c.11, c.27[4], c.30	3
CE commissioned evaluation	c.25, c.29	2
NP NAO–PAC	c.2, c.10	2
RB regulator-or-body	c.23 (Ofsted)	1
CR component review	— (c.32 re-routed DM at the parallel-line adoption on the whole-Act Cm 8893 memorandum; its FiT/RHI component reviews remain noted)	0

[1] + independent Dash CQC review. [2] + IRTL statutory remit (independent reviewer). [3] c.31 = HMT Government whole-Act review (not a Cm 7320 memo; the s.14 ▸S Act noted in E4). [4] c.27 also has a Cm 7320 memo. The coding file's formal Cm 7320 memoranda are ten {c.4, c.6, c.14, c.17, c.20, c.22, c.26, c.27, c.28, c.32 — the last located at the the parallel line pass}; the DM route here (also ten) substitutes c.31's Government whole-Act review for c.27 (routed to SSR) — same count, different membership, a dual-route bookkeeping point. Reconciliation: 10 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0 = 18 = F 13 + H 5.

E7 · tail composition (open = 5).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.21 ("Merton Rule" PMB)	1
LCc	c.12 Statute Law (Repeals)	1
se	c.15 (emergency, sunset, superseded by Coroners & Justice 2009)	1
mO	c.13 RES&S, c.24 Employment (both borderline-major — the E1 inclusions)	2

Reconciliation: 1 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 2 = 5. The two `m0` entries are the genuine *old* major misses.

2009 — frame 21 (27 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 6 / H 7 / O 8; none ≈38%

Late-Parliament heavyweight; salience pattern strong but imperfect.

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 11): c.1 Banking · c.11 Borders/Citizenship/Imm · c.12 Political Parties & Elections · c.13 Parliamentary Standards (IPSA) · c.20 LDEDC · c.21 Health · c.22 ASCL · c.23 Marine & Coastal Access · c.24 Welfare Reform · c.25 Coroners & Justice · c.26 Policing & Crime.

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.11, c.13, c.21, c.25	4
half	c.1, c.20, c.22, c.23, c.24, c.26	6
open	c.12	1
major-only (any located)		**10/11 ≈ 91%**

Sole major open: c.12 Political Parties & Elections.

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.15, c.19, c.21, c.25 (4)	c.14, c.23, c.26 (3)	— (0)	7	7/7 = 100%
non-▸S	2	4	8	14	6/14 ≈ 43%

▸S-open exceptions: none.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review/PIR	c.15 Autism — s.1 keep-strategy-under-review *(filled)* · c.21 Health — s.3 NHS-Constitution 10-yr review *(filled)* · c.26 Policing & Crime — s.50 review of Part 4 (gang injunctions) *(half)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	c.19 Green Energy — Microgeneration/GPDO report duties *(filled)* · c.14 Law Commission — s.3A annual implementation report *(half)*
SB standing-body monitoring	c.25 Coroners & Justice — s.36 Chief Coroner annual report *(filled)* · c.23 Marine — ss.52–54 statutory marine-plan review *(half, borderline TR/SB)*

Type tally: TR 3 (F2, H1) · PR 2 (F1, H1) · SB 2 (F1, H1) → ▸S F4 / H3 / O0.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 13).

route	Acts	n
DM departmental memorandum	c.11, c.19[1], c.21[1], c.25[12], c.20[3]	5
LC Lords–Commons inquiry	c.13 (Cttee on Members' Expenses), c.15[1] (HoL Autism Act Cttee), c.23[1] (EAC)	3
CE commissioned evaluation	c.22 (Richard Review), c.24 (ODI Right-to-Control eval)	2
SSR statutory self-report	c.14, c.26	2
RB regulator-or-body	c.1 (FSB/BoE resolution-framework reviews)	1

[1] also ▸S (artefact routed by most salient located form, not by ▸S status). [2] c.25 also has a statutory Chief Coroner report + Justice Cttee inquiry. [3] c.20 = non-statutory PIR of Part 8. Formal Cm 7320 memoranda = 4 (c.11, c.19, c.21, c.25); the DM route (5) adds c.20's non-statutory PIR. Reconciliation: 5 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 1 = 13 = F 6 + H 7.

E7 · tail composition (open = 8).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.6 Geneva Conventions, c.16 Holocaust Return, c.17 Driving Instruction (clear PMBs) · c.5 Industry & Exports, c.7 Business Rate Supplements (narrow technical Government Acts — flagged, not PMBs)	5
LCc	c.18 Perpetuities & Accumulations (gives effect to LC 1998 report)	1
nc	c.8 Saving Gateway Accounts (core scheme never launched; repealed 2011)	1
mO	c.12 Political Parties & Elections	1

Reconciliation: 5 + 1 + 1 + 0 + 0 + 1 = 8. c.5 / c.7 are narrow technical Government Acts folded into nPMB (read as "narrow PMB / narrow technical instrument" for these two).

2010 ◆ — frame 31 (41 PGA − 10 carve-outs, CRaG returned); F 10 / H 7 / O 14; none ≈45%

Largest frame in the series. CRaG (c.25), a major constitutional Act, is coded **half** — Part 2 treaty-scrutiny was reviewed directly (HL Constitution Committee, *Parliamentary Scrutiny of Treaties*, 2019; IAC, *Treaty Scrutiny: Working Practices*, 2020); it sits in frame as a substantive reviewable regime. The departmental-memorandum process at full stretch (eight formal memoranda, the most of any cohort).

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 10): c.9 Child Poverty · c.15 Equality · c.17 Crime & Security · c.23 Bribery · c.24 Digital Economy · c.27 Energy · c.28 Financial Services · c.29 Flood & Water · c.32 Academies · c.40 Identity Documents.

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.15, c.17, c.23, c.27, c.29, c.32, c.40	7
half	c.9, c.24, c.28	3
open	—	0

major-only (any located)		**10/10 = 100%**

Major-only 10/10 = 100% (0 major-open). CRaG (c.25), a major-constitutional Act now coded half, would leave major-only at 11/11 = 100% if added to the set.

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.38 (1)	c.9, c.22, c.41 (3)	— (0)	4	4/4 = 100%
non-▸S	9	4 (incl. c.25 CRaG)	14	27	13/27 ≈ 48%

▸S-open exceptions: none.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review/PIR	c.22 Debt Relief (Developing Countries) — statutory sunset-clause impact review *(half)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	c.38 TAFA — s.31 IRTL annual operation reports *(filled)* · c.41 Loans to Ireland — s.2 six-monthly Treasury reports *(half)*
SB standing-body monitoring	c.9 Child Poverty — SMCP Commission "State of the Nation" reports *(half)*

Type tally: TR 1 (H1) · PR 2 (F1, H1) · SB 1 (H1) → ▸S F1 / H3 / O0.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 17).

route	Acts	n
DM departmental memorandum	c.11, c.15[1], c.17, c.23[1], c.27, c.29[1], c.40	7
SSR statutory self-report	c.9, c.22, c.41	3
NP NAO–PAC	c.32, c.34	2
CE commissioned evaluation	c.20 (COMARE, underway), c.28 (Farnish review + NAO/TSC)	2
ISR independent statutory reviewer	c.38 (IRTL/Anderson)[2]	1
RB regulator-or-body	c.24 (Govt-commissioned Ofcom review of ss.17–18)	1
LC Lords–Commons inquiry	c.25 CRaG (HL Constitution Cttee + IAC)	1

[1] also Lords inquiry (c.15 Lords disability inquiry; c.23 Lords inquiry; c.29 EFRA inquiry). [2] c.38 also has a Cm 9316 / Cm 7320 memo. Formal Cm 7320 memoranda = 8 (c.11, c.15, c.17, c.23, c.27, c.29, c.38, c.40); the `DM` route (7) routes c.38 to `ISR` instead. Reconciliation: 7 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 17 = F 10 + H 7.

E7 · tail composition (open = 14).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.6 Marriage (Wales), c.14 Anti-Slavery Day (symbolic), c.19 Mortgage Repossessions, c.21 Sustainable Communities (Amdt)	4

LCc	c.7 Co-op & Community Benefit (consolidation-family; folded into 2014 consolidation), c.10 Third Parties (Rights against Insurers)	2
nc	c.18 Personal Care at Home ("will not be implemented")	1
se	c.1 Video Recordings (procedural re-enactment, spent), c.2 TAFA (Temp), c.3 Fiscal Responsibility, c.26 Children, Schools & Families[5], c.35 Local Government (spent), c.36 Savings Accounts & HiP (abolition), c.37 Superannuation	7
mO	—	0

Reconciliation: 4 + 2 + 1 + 7 + 0 + 0 = 14. Multi-labels: [5] c.26 also nc (Part 2 not commenced; superseded by CFA 2014); c.2 / c.3 / c.37 also superseded. **0 mO** is the salient feature — every 2010 open is non-major (CRaG, the only candidate, is now half).

2011 ◆ — frame 21 (25 PGA − 4 carve-outs, Olympic returned); F 8 / H 6 / O 7; none ≈33%

The reconciling moves for this cohort are documented and named. Olympic (Amendment) (c.22) is returned to frame as **open** — event machinery, spent after the 2012 Games; the NAO post-Games review covers the Games programme, not this Act's provisions. c.19 Pensions is coded **half** — its located scrutiny is the PHSO investigation and the standing State-Pension-Age review function (a component/regime result), not a whole-Act review. c.25 Charities, a consolidation-family Act, is coded **open** — its Law-Commission framework review fed the later Charities Act 2022, with no located review of the 2011 Act itself. Frame 20 → 21; F 8 / H 6 / O 7, none ≈33%, matching Appendix B. Major-only and ▸S are unaffected by these moves.

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 11): c.1 PVSC · c.4 Budget Responsibility & NAO · c.5 Postal Services · c.13 Police Reform & Social Responsibility · c.14 Fixed-term Parliaments · c.16 Energy · c.19 Pensions · c.20 Localism · c.21 Education · c.23 TPIM · c.24 Public Bodies.

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.4, c.5, c.13, c.14, c.16, c.23, c.24	7
half	c.1, c.19, c.20, c.21	4
open	—	0
major-only (any located)		**11/11 = 100%**

Major-only 11/11 = 100% (0 major-open); c.19 stays reviewed (filled or half) and the open demotion (c.25) is non-major, so the rate is robust. Adding c.15 Sovereign Grant to the major set → 12/12 = 100%.

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.4, c.14, c.15, c.23 (4)	c.18 (1)	— (0)	5	5/5 = 100%
non-▸S	4	5	7	16	9/16 ≈ 56%

▸S-open exceptions: none. c.19 Pensions is treated as non-▸S (its PHSO investigation and SPA reviews trace to a standing-body function / the Pensions Act 2014, not a review clause in the 2011 Act); c.18 Armed Forces (Covenant) is the A10/A15 borderline ▸S half (the s.343A reports cover covenant delivery).

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review/PIR	c.4 BRNA — statutory periodic external review of the OBR *(filled)* · c.14 FTPA — s.7 whole-Act review *(filled)* · c.15 Sovereign Grant — s.7 periodic Royal Trustees review *(filled)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	c.23 TPIM — s.20 IRTL annual operation reports *(filled)* · c.18 Armed Forces — s.343A annual Covenant report *(half; A10/A15 borderline)*
SB standing-body monitoring	—

Type tally: TR 3 (F3) · PR 2 (F1, H1) · SB 0 → ▸S F4 / H1 / O0.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 14).

route	Acts	n
CE commissioned evaluation	c.6 (DCMS ALB review), c.20 (neighbourhood-planning evaluations), c.21 (Timpson Review)	3
SSR statutory self-report	c.4 (OBR statutory external reviews), c.15 (Royal Trustees s.7), c.18 (s.343A Covenant report)	3
LC Lords–Commons inquiry	c.14 (Joint Cttee on the FTPA, s.7-triggered), c.1 (PCRC boundary-rules review)	2
NP NAO–PAC	c.5 (NAO Royal Mail + BIS Cttee + PAC), c.16 (NAO Green Deal/ECO[1])	2
DM departmental memorandum	c.13 (Govt two-part PCC review[2]), c.24 (Govt PLS memo to PACAC)	2
ISR independent statutory reviewer	c.23 (IRTL/Anderson, s.20)	1
RB regulator-or-body	c.19 (PHSO statutory investigation[3])	1

[1] + Bonfield "Each Home Counts". [2] + HAC 2016 inquiry. [3] + 2017 auto-enrolment review. Reconciliation: 3 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 14 = F 8 + H 6. (c.25 Charities, coded open, leaves the located set; its Law-Commission framework review is recorded in the tail as it fed the Charities Act 2022.)

E7 · tail composition (open = 7).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.7 Estates of Deceased Persons (LC-originated PMB), c.8 Wreck Removal Convention, c.9 Police (Detention & Bail) (emergency one-section), c.17 Coinage (Measurement) (trivial enabling PMB), c.3 NICs (tax-administration — flagged)	5
LCc	c.25 Charities (Law-Commission framework review → Charities Act 2022)	1
se	c.22 Olympic (Amendment) — event machinery, spent after the 2012 Games	1

Reconciliation: 5 + 1 + 1 = 7. c.3 NICs is tax-administration, normally a carve-out family but kept in-frame and open here, folded into nPMB as the narrow tail. **0 mO** — every 2011 open is non-major, consistent with the 100% major-only.

2012 — frame 18 (23 PGA − 5 carve-outs); F 7 / H 4 / O 7; none ≈39%

Coalition flagship-reform session; three formal Cm 7320 memoranda.

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 7): c.5 Welfare Reform · c.7 Health & Social Care · c.9 Protection of Freedoms · c.10 LASPO · c.17 Local Government Finance · c.19 Civil Aviation · c.21 Financial Services.

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.5, c.9, c.10, c.21	4
half	c.7, c.17	2
open	c.19	1
major-only (any located)		**6/7 ≈ 86%**

Sole major open: c.19 Civil Aviation.

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.5, c.23 (2)	c.16 (1)	— (0)	3	3/3 = 100%
non-▸S	5	3	7	15	8/15 ≈ 53%

▸S-open exceptions: none.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review/PIR	c.5 Welfare Reform — s.89 statutory independent PIP-assessment reviews (Gray) *(filled)* · c.23 Small Charitable Donations — 3-year statutory review of GASDS operation *(filled)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	c.16 Infrastructure (Financial Assistance) — s.3 annual reports to Parliament *(half)*
SB standing-body monitoring	—

Type tally: TR 2 (F2) · PR 1 (H1) · SB 0 → ▸S F2 / H1 / O0.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 11).

route	Acts	n
DM departmental memorandum	c.2[1] (DCMS PIR), c.9 (Cm 9579), c.10 (PLS memo + PIR Part 1), c.21 (PLS memo)	4
NP NAO–PAC	c.7 (NAO reorganisation), c.8 (NAO Thames Tideway), c.16[2] (NAO UK Guarantees), c.17[3] (NAO business-rates retention)	4
SSR statutory self-report	c.5 (s.89 PIP reviews), c.23 (3-year GASDS review)	2

CE commissioned evaluation	c.3 (Lord Young review)	1

[1] + HoL Licensing Cttee 2017 + DCMS Cttee 2019. [2] c.16 also ▸S (s.3 statutory reports; routed here by its most salient located artefact, the NAO VfM review). [3] + Ollerenshaw CTS review. Formal Cm 7320 memoranda = 3 (c.9, c.10, c.21); the `DM` route (4) adds c.2's PIR. Reconciliation: 4 + 4 + 2 + 1 = 11 = F 7 + H 4.

E7 · tail composition (open = 7).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.4 DV/Crime/Victims (Amdt) (PMB), c.20 Prisons (IWT) (PMB; superseded 2018), c.22 Police (Complaints & Conduct) (narrow Government fast-track amendment — flagged, not a PMB; superseded IPCC→IOPC)	3
LCc	c.6 Consumer Insurance (Disclosure) (LC-originated; superseded by Insurance Act 2015)	1
se	c.12 Sunday Trading (Olympics) (time-limited, self-repealing)	1
mO	c.19 Civil Aviation	1
`[cr]` curative/retrospective	c.18 Mental Health (Approval Functions) (retrospective-validation fast-track; spent on enactment)	1

Reconciliation: 3 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 1 = 7. `[cr]` is outside the six (the retrospective-validation case); c.22 is a narrow Government amending Act folded into `nPMB`.

2013 ▲✚ — frame 27 (33 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 8 / H 6 / O 13; none ≈48%

Heavyweight, statutory-review-clause-dense (9 ▸S, mostly genuine reviews). The stage-2a move — Jobseekers (Back to Work Schemes) (c.17) demoted half→open (none 48% → 52%) — was reversed at the stage-3 audit on the located statutory Oakley review (§5.6): the carried denominator is F 8 / H 6 / O 13, none ≈48%, and c.17 joins the ▸S set.

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 10): c.6 Electoral Registration & Admin · c.18 Justice & Security · c.22 Crime & Courts · c.24 Enterprise & Regulatory Reform · c.25 Public Service Pensions · c.26 Defamation · c.27 Growth & Infrastructure · c.30 Marriage (Same Sex Couples) · c.32 Energy · c.33 FS (Banking Reform).

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.6, c.26, c.32, c.33	4
half	c.18, c.22, c.24, c.25, c.30	5
open	c.27	1
major-only (any located)		**9/10 ≈ 91%**

Sole major open: c.27 Growth & Infrastructure. Borderline: c.20 Succession to the Crown (constitutionally weighty but a short Act; review *declined* under the

review-declined axis) is treated non-major; counting it major → 9/11 ≈ 82% (pattern intact).

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.10, c.14, c.19, c.32, c.33 (5)	c.17, c.18, c.22, c.30 (4)	— (0)	9	9/9 = 100%
non-▸S	3	2 (c.24, c.25)	13	18	5/18 ≈ 28%

▸S-open exceptions: none. c.17 was originally censused non-▸S; the stage-3 audit corrected the census — s.2 writes an independent-review duty, discharged by the Oakley review (2014) — so c.17 enters the ▸S column as a located half. The non-▸S located rate ≈28% is the lowest of the 2008–2014 cohorts — the salience / ▸S contrast is sharpest in 2013.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review w/PIR	c.10 Scrap Metal — s.18 whole-Act review *(filled)* · c.14 Mobile Homes — fit-and-proper / two-part review *(filled)* · c.19 Groceries Code Adjudicator — s.15 triennial review *(filled)* · c.32 Energy — s.66 EMR 5-yr PIR *(filled)* · c.33 FS (Banking Reform) — ss.8/10 independent ring-fencing review (Skeoch) *(filled)* · c.18 Justice & Security — s.13 independent CMP review (Ouseley) *(half)* · c.30 Marriage (SSC) — ss.14/15/16 statutory component reviews *(half)* · *c.17 Jobseekers (BTWS) — s.2 independent sanctions review (Oakley 2014) (half)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	—
SB standing-body monitoring	c.22 Crime & Courts — statutory HMICFRS duty to inspect the NCA *(half)*

Type tally: TR 8 (F5, H3) · PR 0 · SB 1 (H1) → ▸S F5 / H4 / O0. 8 of 9 ▸S are *genuine* review/PIR duties (not duty-produces-own-report), which blunts the tautology critique for this cohort.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 14).

route	Acts	n
SSR statutory self-report	c.10 (Cm 9552 s.18 review), c.19 (s.15 triennial), c.30 (ss.14/15/16), c.32 (s.66 PIR + EMR reports)	4
DM departmental memorandum	c.14 (Govt two-part review), c.23 (DfT Cm 7320 memo), c.26 (MoJ Cm 7320 memo, CP 180)	3
ISR independent statutory reviewer	c.17 (Oakley s.2), c.18 (Ouseley s.13), c.33 (Skeoch ss.8/10)	3
NP NAO–PAC	c.24 (NAO Green Investment Bank[1]), c.25 (NAO + PAC + GAD[2])	2

LC Lords–Commons inquiry	c.6 (HoL ad-hoc PLS, HC)	1
RB regulator-or-body	c.22 (HMICFRS NCA inspections)	1

[1] + ACAS early-conciliation eval. [2] GAD cost-control review + NAO Mar 2021 + PAC Jun 2021. c.17 re-enters the located set at the stage-3 audit via the statutory Oakley review (routed ISR); its as-coded half had wrongly rested on JCHR Remedial-Order scrutiny. Formal Cm 7320 memoranda = 2 (c.23, c.26); the `DM` route (3) adds c.14's Government two-part review. Reconciliation: 4 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 14 = F 8 + H 6.

E7 · tail composition (open = 13).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.3 Prevention of Social Housing Fraud, c.4 Disabled Persons' Parking Badges, c.8 Mental Health (Discrimination) (symbolic), c.11 Prisons (Property), c.13 Presumption of Death, c.15 Antarctic	6
LCc	c.1 Trusts (Capital & Income), c.2 Statute Law (Repeals), c.21 Partnerships (Prosecution) (Scotland)	3
se	c.7 HGV Road User Levy (redesigned/suspended), c.16 Welfare Benefits Up-rating (1% cap, spent)	2
mO	c.27 Growth & Infrastructure (sole strict-major open) · c.20 Succession to the Crown (borderline-constitutional, **review declined** — `[rd]`; not in the E1 strict-major denominator)	2
`[cr]` curative/retrospective	— (c.17 formerly sat here; re-coded half at the stage-3 audit on the located statutory Oakley review)	0

Reconciliation: 6 + 3 + 0 + 2 + 0 + 2 + 0 = 13. The `mO` line splits into the strict major open (c.27) and the review-declined constitutional case (c.20, `[rd]`); the slot formerly held by c.17 — re-coded half at the stage-3 audit — is the vacated curative/retrospective category (`[cr]`). The remaining flagged cases do not seat in the six — flagged, not forced.

2014 ✚ — frame 20 (30 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 9 / H 6 / O 5; none ≈25%

Old and heavy; the sharpest salience split of any cohort (all five opens narrow; c.28 re-coded half at the stage-3 audit). ▸S entirely genuine review/PIR duties.

E1 · major × outcome. Major set (n = 11): c.2 Local Audit & Accountability · c.4 Lobbying · c.6 Children & Families · c.11 Offender Rehabilitation · c.12 ASB, Crime & Policing · c.19 Pensions · c.20 Defence Reform · c.21 Water · c.22 Immigration · c.23 Care · c.27 DRIPA.

major outcome	Acts	n
filled	c.2, c.6, c.11, c.19, c.20, c.22, c.27	7
half	c.4, c.12, c.21, c.23	4
open	—	0
major-only (any located)		**11/11 = 100%**

Major-only 11/11 = 100% (0 major-open). c.23 Care carries the major non-commencement of the care-costs cap (ss.15–16) but is coded **half** (the care-and-support side reviewed in parts) — a located-half major, not an open.

E4 · ▸S × outcome (+ non-▸S comparator).

set	filled	half	open	total	located rate
▸S	c.18, c.19, c.20, c.27 (4)	c.4 (1)	— (0)	5	5/5 = 100%
non-▸S	5	5	5	15	10/15 ≈ 67%

▸S-open exceptions: none.

E5 · ▸S by type.

type	Acts (outcome)
TR true review /PIR	c.18 Intellectual Property — IPO PIR of the IP Act 2014 *(filled)* · c.19 Pensions — periodic statutory SPA review *(filled)* · c.20 Defence Reform — s.39 5-yearly review of the single-source regime *(filled)* · c.27 DRIPA — s.7 statutory review (Independent Reviewer, Anderson) *(filled)* · c.4 Lobbying — s.39 independent review of Part 2 (Hodgson) *(half)*
PR periodic report-on-operation	— *(c.18 also carries a statutory annual IP-law report — secondary)*
SB standing-body monitoring	—

Type tally: TR 5 (F4, H1) · PR 0 · SB 0 → ▸S F4 / H1 / O0. 5/5 ▸S are genuine review/PIR duties — like 2013, the strongest cohorts on the tautology test.

E6 · route × scope × independence (located = 15).

route	Acts	n
DM departmental memorandum	c.1 (DWP annual DMPS review[1]), c.2 (PLS assessment / Redmond response[2]), c.18 (IPO PIR)	3
ISR independent statutory reviewer	c.27 (Anderson, s.7), c.4 (Hodgson, s.39)	2
NP NAO–PAC	c.11 (NAO HC 951[3]), c.9 (NAO 2020 gender-duty compliance)	2
SSR statutory self-report	c.19 (periodic SPA review), c.20 (s.39 5-yearly review)	2
CE commissioned evaluation	c.22 (Home Office right-to-rent evaluation[4]), c.12 (Home Office ASB-powers research), c.28 (HMRC TFC take-up research 2020; HMT-funded TFC impact evaluation 2026 — stage-3 audit ✚)	3
LC Lords–Commons inquiry	c.6 (HoL ad-hoc PLS, "A failure of implementation")	1
RB regulator-or-body	c.21 (Ofwat non-household retail-market reviews)	1

CR component review	c.23 (OBR / consultation analysis of components; cap non-commenced)	1

[1] + independent Oversight Cttee (Donaghy). [2] + Kingman 2018 + NAO/PAC 2019. [3] + HMIP early-implementation + Justice Cttee 2018. [4] + ICIBI + NAO Windrush + independent Windrush Lessons Learned. Explicit departmental PLS memoranda ≈ 1 (c.2) + committee PLS (c.6); the `DM` route (3) adds c.1's annual review and c.18's PIR. Reconciliation: 3 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 15 = F 9 + H 6.

E7 · tail composition (open = 5).

category	Acts	n
nPMB	c.8 Citizenship (Armed Forces) (1-clause PMB), c.10 Leasehold Reform (Amdt) (tiny PMB; repealed), c.15 Deep Sea Mining (PMB, UNCLOS), c.17 Gambling (Licensing & Advertising) (narrow Government amending Act; parent 2005 regime reviewed, not this — flagged)	4
LCc	c.16 Inheritance & Trustees' Powers (implements LC 2011 report)	1

Reconciliation: 4 + 1 = 5. c.10 also spent/repealed; c.17 is a non-PMB narrow Government Act folded into `nPMB`. c.28 — the flagged re-search candidate — was re-coded half at the stage-3 audit (§5.6) on located Tax-Free-Childcare evaluations. **0 mO** — all five opens narrow.

Per-cohort records — 2015–2021

Reconciled to Appendix B at cohort granularity. The per-Act E1–E7 grids for these cohorts are held in the cohort coding files; the records below give the frame, the filled / half / open split, the documented reconciling move(s), the named located-half and named unreviewed-major Acts, and ▸S status.

2015 ▲ — frame 22 (37 PGA − 15 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 10; none ≈45%

Three half→open demotions applied on independent re-search (none% up ≈13pp) — the strongest evidence the audit catches drift (a pre-rubric, independently-corrected cohort). Located-half exemplar on the A10 line: c.29 Health Service Commissioner (Complaint Handling) — statutory annual-report duty; the A15 side of the line is anchored by c.17 Self-build (register returns — demoted open). ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2016 — frame 19 (25 PGA − 6 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 7; none ≈37%

Totals match the series; the membership fix records Housing & Planning as **open** and Education & Adoption as **half**. A10/A15 statutory self-report halves: c.1 and c.7. A rubric-defining cohort (its clean result is weaker evidence by construction). ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2017 ▲ — frame 25 (35 PGA − 10 carve-outs); F 6 / H 6 / O 13; none ≈52%

c.21 Bus Services half→open. Located halves: c.18 (Istanbul Convention) — A10/A15 self-report; c.5 Children & Social Work (Child Death reviews) and c.16

(Social Work England) — A11/A15 body-performance reviews kept distinct from routine accounts. Major-only ≈78% — the lowest in the series. A rubric-aware cohort. ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2018 ✚ — frame 21 (34 PGA − 13 carve-outs); F 5 / H 6 / O 10; none ≈48%

No unreviewed clearly-major: c.12 Data Protection Act 2018 is adjudicated half and ▸S at the panel review (✚, §5.6) on its ss.178/189 statutory reviews, both discharged. A rubric-defining cohort. ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2019 ▲✚ — frame 15 (31 PGA − 16 carve-outs); F 2 / H 4 / O 9; none ≈60%

Frame 13 → 15: c.10 FGM and c.28 Census returned to frame as **open**; c.5 half→open. The 2019 ledger was unavailable at stage 2a, so these dots are re-derived and now ledger-checked (consistent with the pilot ledger). Located halves: c.12 Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths — s.3 Pregnancy Loss Review (panel adjudication ✚) — and c.14 Healthcare (European Economic Area) — A10/A15 self-report. Among the most-unreviewed cohorts; rubric-defining. ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2020 ▲ — frame 21 (29 PGA − 8 carve-outs); F 5 / H 3 / O 13; none ≈62%

c.20 Immigration & Social Security Co-ordination half→open. Located half: c.22 Fisheries — A10/A15 self-report. Named clearly-major with no located artefact (as of June 2026): c.11 Divorce, Dissolution & Separation — recent. c.17 Sentencing (Code) is excluded from the strict set as a consolidation (uniform rule, §5.6). Major-only ≈63% only if borderline majors and the excluded consolidation are counted. A rubric-aware cohort. ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

2021 ✚ — frame 27 (35 PGA − 8 carve-outs); F 3 / H 8 / O 16; none ≈59%

Recent and PMB-diluted. Located halves: c.25 National Security & Investment and c.31 Telecommunications (Security) — A10/A15 self-reports; the Office for Environmental Protection (Environment Act) — A11/A15 body review. Named clearly-major with no located artefact (as of June 2026): c.23 Overseas Operations (Service Personnel & Veterans) — recent; c.22 Financial Services is adjudicated ▸S-half at the pre-publication check (Art 23E, ✚). ▸S-located 100%; 0 ▸S-open.

Reconciliation and sensitivity

2011 resolved. The earlier panel left a 2011 reconciliation item open; it is closed here. The cohort's reconciling moves are named — Olympic (c.22) returned to frame as open, c.19 Pensions filled→half, c.25 Charities half→open — giving frame 20 → 21 and F 8 / H 6 / O 7, none ≈33%, matching Appendix B. Major-only (11/11 = 100%) and ▸S (5/5 located) are unaffected.

▸S note. "Every ▸S Act in the coded frame has a located review" holds: **78 / 78 located, 0 ▸S-open in any cohort — the stage-3 audit (§5.6) added 2013 c.17 (s.2; the Oakley review) to a census that had missed it; the panel review added 2018 c.12, and the parallel-line adoption (§5.6) adopted**

the ledger’s bottom-up base — 75 after the parallel-line additions (2008 c.31; 2019 c.12) — for 77; a pre-publication watch check (§5.6) then adjudicated 2021 c.22 ▸S-half on its located Article-23E review — 78 in all. c.11 SEN(Information) (2008) is verified on the located DCSF SEN-information statistical publication (SFR 09/2010); c.31 Dormant Accounts (2008) is added to the ▸S set on its s.14 review/report duty and is itself located (HMT whole-Act review). The set's located rate is 100% with c.31 a full member of the set (s.14 review-and-report duty, adopted from the parallel line) — zero ▸S Acts are open either way.

Major-boundary sensitivity. The clearly-major denominator is 130 strict; the band 130–132 reflects the handful of borderline inclusions (e.g. 2008 c.13 RES&S and c.24 Employment; 2013 c.20 Succession; 2016 c.12 Enterprise — demoted from the strict set at the grid-reconciliation adjudication, §5.6). Major-only is 118 / 130 = 90.8% ≈ 91% strict; counting all borderlines as major lowers it modestly (toward ≈91% across the field, and to the per-cohort floors above — 2017 ≈78%; the 2020 floor rises under the consolidation exclusion). The salience contrast (≈91% major vs ≈56% all substantive) survives the boundary either way.

Filled-only-for-major. On the stricter bar — a formal whole-Act memorandum or completed review (filled only) — the major rate is lower than the any-located 91% but remains well above the field filled share of 94 / 311 ≈ 30%: clearly-major Acts carry the large majority of the formal whole-Act artefacts, while the field's filled share is held down by the narrow tail. The two readings bound the salience finding — major Acts are reviewed at ≈91% on any-located and at a high-but-lower rate on formal-memorandum-only, against ≈56% / ≈30% for all substantive Acts.

Appendix G — Reproduction materials

Released with this report so that an independent party with no access to the project's history can re-run a cohort's coding to the same standard. The construction is auditable in design and partially reproducible from these materials; full per-Act reproduction is forthcoming.

Three files carry the method.

The reproduction kit — the coding protocol, the carve-out rule for building the frame, the three-door and dot scheme, the prior cohort denominators, and the design system, with four worked frames (2016–2019) shipped as calibration.

The calibration rubric — the decided edge-case anchors, the minimum-search protocol, the compact-record schema, and the harmonization checklist: the consistency layer that keeps parallel coders from drifting apart.

The pipeline-logic file — the operating logic above both: how the three stages connect, what object hands off between them, and where the publication gate falls.

From these three an independent coder can apply the protocol anew to any cohort; re-deriving the Appendix B series decision by decision additionally requires the per-Act ledger and the negative search logs listed above — the design is auditable now, the results reproducible on their release.

Companion file. The per-Act citation ledger (Appendix F) is released as a separate companion document. It has been reconciled against the final fourteen-cohort series in this report — the same field of 311 substantive Acts — with every outcome-driving citation verified against its source document (companion-ledger reconciliation).