

ANSWER KEY — 24 SEPTEMBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
C	C	D	A	B	B	D	A	C	B
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
C	D	C	A	B	A	D	B	D	A

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 C Main idea - RC (economics) MED

The first paragraph states the mechanism: 'Where output per worker rises, wages can rise without prices rising at all. Where output per worker cannot rise, wages must still rise... and prices must rise with them.' The third paragraph then divides the consequences into a comfortable one, affordability, and an uncomfortable one, 'who pays', ending on the claim that the phenomenon 'is not chiefly economic'. Option C carries both halves: the relative-price mechanism and the distributional difficulty. Option A inverts the argument, since the passage says service wages must rise, not that manufacturing wages lagged. Option B substitutes a lack of competition for the productivity mechanism the author builds his whole case on. Option D asserts unaffordability, which the passage expressly denies when it says such an economy 'can buy the same quantity of teaching and nursing every year at a rising price and still consume more of everything else besides'.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is the most tempting wrong answer because it sounds like the paragraph on fiscal pressure; it fails on the single word 'afford', which the passage uses only to say the cost can be borne.

Q2 C Inference - RC HARD

The second paragraph supplies the warrant: in these activities 'a measured productivity gain, where one can be had at all, tends to be a disguised reduction in the service itself', illustrated by the lecturer who teaches four hundred rather than forty and 'may have taught nothing more'. The inference the reader is entitled to draw is a rule of scrutiny, not a verdict: when such a gain is reported, ask whether the thing now being counted is still the thing that was being supplied. That is exactly option C. Option A is unsupported; training is never mentioned. Option B reverses the passage, which treats such reports as symptoms of the disease rather than as signs of recovery. Option D commits the author to a claim about national-accounting convention that he never makes; he explains the effect by the impossibility of raising real output, not by how statisticians value inputs.

Examiner's note — the trap: D attracts candidates who know the input-cost convention in national accounts; the passage never invokes it, and D would make the rising cost an illusion, which contradicts the third paragraph's fiscal pressure.

Q3 D Tone and attitude - RC HARD

The clause completes a contrast: the climb is 'greeted as a scandal of waste rather than as the arithmetic of success'. The construction concedes that the reaction is widespread and states what it ought to be instead, which is the posture of correction. The author does not condemn motives, and he does not merely record the reaction; he has just spent a paragraph supplying the mechanism that shows why the reaction misreads the evidence. That is option D. Option A is wrong because the passage argues the opposite, that the cost is affordable. Option B imputes bad faith and a privatisation agenda that appear nowhere. Option C fails on 'detached': the author is not neutral between the two readings, since he calls one of them the arithmetic of success. Distinguishing corrective from detached requires noticing that the sentence contains an evaluation, not only a description.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the standard safe-looking tone answer; it collapses once you notice that 'rather than' marks the author's preference between two readings, not an impartial record of both.

Q4 A Vocabulary in context - RC MED

'Arithmetic' here does the same work as 'an accounting identity dressed as a paradox' in the opening line of the same paragraph: the outcome is not a surprise but a necessary consequence of the premises. 'Success' points back to the manufacturing productivity growth that drives the whole mechanism. So the phrase says that rising relative service costs follow predictably from growth elsewhere and are therefore not evidence of failure, which is option A. Option B misreads 'arithmetic' as forecastability; the passage claims the direction is inevitable, never that the magnitude can be computed decades ahead. Option C shifts the ground to public willingness to pay, a matter the third paragraph treats as unsettled and political. Option D turns the phenomenon into a measurement artefact, whereas the passage insists the higher price is real and is actually paid, through taxation, insurance and endowment.

Examiner's note — the trap: B traps candidates who read 'arithmetic' literally as calculability; in context the word contrasts with 'scandal', so it is about inevitability, not precision.

Q5 B Structure and purpose - RC ELITE

The paragraph announces its own architecture: 'Two conclusions follow, and only one of them is comfortable.' The comfortable conclusion is that the rising cost is affordable. The uncomfortable one 'concerns who pays', and the remainder of the paragraph develops that second strand into rationing, dilution and cost-shifting, closing with the claim that the problem is 'not chiefly economic'. The paragraph therefore splits affordability from incidence and locates the real difficulty in incidence, which is option B. Option A is wrong because nothing earlier is described as incomplete or repaired. Option C is wrong because no second set of services is introduced; the same services recur. Option D is wrong because the diagnosis is not withdrawn: the final sentence keeps the mechanism and reclassifies the problem it generates. The distinction being tested is between adding a political dimension and replacing the economic account.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is attractive because the paragraph ends on 'not chiefly economic'; but reclassifying a consequence is not withdrawing the diagnosis that produced it.

Q6 B Main idea - RC (law and society) MED

The passage opens by separating the two outputs of adjudication, 'a private good, paid for by the litigants' and 'a public good' in the form of a reasoned judgment, and observes that 'only the first of these survives a settlement'. The second paragraph then shows that the loss is 'not evenly distributed', falling hardest where a repeat player faces one-shot claimants. Option B states both halves and is therefore the main point. Option A reduces the passage to a statistic about court workload and adds supervision of compromises, which the passage mentions only as a proposed reform. Option C promotes confidentiality clauses from a factor that 'finish[es] the work' to the principal cause, and predicts a restoration the passage never endorses. Option D recommends reversing the decline, which the final paragraph explicitly rejects as mistaking 'nostalgia for analysis'.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is the trap for readers who assume that describing a loss must imply recommending its reversal; the third paragraph disowns exactly that inference.

Q7 D Inference - RC ELITE

The second paragraph gives the selection mechanism: the repeat player 'can therefore settle generously the claims it expects to lose and fight to judgment the claims it expects to win', with the result that the corpus shifts 'without a single judge having been persuaded of anything at all'. What follows is that the published cases are an unrepresentative sample, and unrepresentative in a specific way, namely selected by the better-informed party according to its own forecast of the outcome. That is option D. Option A adds a claim about the quality of reasoning that the passage never makes. Option B is too precise: the passage gives no basis for saying the recorded damages figures are accurate. Option C is close but wrong on the criterion of selection; the repeat player selects on expected outcome, not on cost of defence, and a costly case it expected to win would still be fought.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the strongest distractor because it correctly senses a skewed sample; it substitutes cost of defence for expected outcome, which is the only selection rule the passage states.

Q8 A Tone and attitude - RC HARD

The author calls the proposal a mistake of 'nostalgia for analysis' and then gives reasons that are practical rather than moral: 'Trials are slow, ruinous and frightening, and the litigant who avoided one was usually well advised to do so.' He nevertheless accepts the loss the proposal responds to, having spent two paragraphs documenting it, and he proposes substitutes. That combination, accepting the diagnosis while rejecting the cure on grounds of cost, is option A. Option B invents an accusation of self-interest against the proposal's supporters that appears nowhere. Option C is wrong because the author is not undecided; he says plainly that the avoiding litigant was well advised. Option D reverses him entirely, since the paragraph exists to argue that the public good can indeed be produced by the alternatives listed, from preliminary rulings to anonymised publication of settlement terms.

Examiner's note — the trap: D catches candidates who skim the list of reforms and read it as a catalogue of failures; the sentence 'Each of these separates precedent from combat' shows the author thinks they can work.

Q9 C Vocabulary in context - RC HARD

'Corpus' is the body of reported decisions, and 'drifts' names a change produced by accumulation rather than by decision. The clause that follows fixes the meaning: the drift happens 'without a single judge having been persuaded of anything at all'. So the sentence describes a change in the composition of the published set, brought about by which cases were allowed to reach judgment, not by any change of judicial mind. That is option C. Option B asserts exactly the judicial persuasion the sentence rules out. Option A shifts the claim to the volume of litigation, whereas the drift concerns which cases get reported. Option D describes deliberate omission from the law reports, which would require the reports to suppress delivered judgments; the passage's mechanism operates earlier, by preventing the unfavourable case from ever being decided in public at all.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is designed for candidates who read 'drifts in its favour' as the defendant winning over the judges; the very next clause denies it.

Q10 B Structure and purpose - RC HARD

The paragraph moves in three steps. It first rejects the obvious remedy, calling restoration of the trial a case of mistaking 'nostalgia for analysis' and giving the costs of trials as the reason. It then redescribes the problem: 'whether the public good can be manufactured without the private ordeal.' Under that description the trial is only one route, so the paragraph can list four alternatives, from rulings on preliminary points to anonymised publication of settlement terms. Option B tracks all three steps. Option A is wrong because nothing is

restated in weaker terms and the remedies are named. Option C is wrong because no costs are compared and no ranking appears; the author says only that none of the measures is free. Option D is wrong because there is no historical parallel and no prediction of spontaneous reversal.

Examiner's note — the trap: A tempts candidates who notice the concession about trials being slow and ruinous and stop there, missing that the paragraph goes on to name four concrete measures.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 **C** Main conclusion - CR **MED**

The argument's recommendation is stated in the third paragraph: 'Where the conflict is material... the law should require that the conflict be got rid of rather than announced.' Everything before it is support, and the sentence after it, conceding that disclosure remains defensible for trivial cases, confirms that the recommendation is deliberately limited to material conflicts. Option C reproduces it. Option A states the first experimental finding, which is a premise offered in support. Option B states the institutional effect, again a premise. Option D is the overstatement trap: it drops the materiality limit and so contradicts the author, who expressly keeps disclosure for 'the small shareholding and the conference fee, precisely because nothing turns on it'. Identifying the conclusion here means noticing both the prescriptive verb 'should' and the qualifying clause that the author himself insists on.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is the classic scope trap: it is the author's conclusion with its qualifier removed, and the very next sentence of the passage refutes it.

Q12 **D** Necessary assumption - CR **HARD**

The argument compares two regimes and prefers elimination to disclosure on the ground that disclosure leaves the client poorer. That comparison collapses if elimination itself imposes costs on the client that are as large or larger. The argument therefore needs it to be true that eliminating a material conflict does not leave the advised person worse off than disclosure does, which is option D; negate it and the recommendation fails immediately. Option B is not required, because moral licensing works whether or not the adviser notices the slant. Option C concerns the subject pool and would strengthen the evidence, but the argument can survive with practising and recruited advisers alike. Option A is irrelevant, since the recommendation is about what the law should require, not about uniformity of enforcement across four fields.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is attractive because it sounds like a methodological requirement for any experiment; a necessary assumption must be something the conclusion cannot do without, and the conclusion survives a mixed subject pool.

Q13 **C** Weaken - CR **HARD**

The recommendation is comparative, so the strongest attack shows that the preferred regime is worse for the very person it is meant to protect. Option C does that: if prohibition in the material cases drives most advisers out of the market, clients receive no advice at all, which is plausibly worse than biased advice they have been warned about. It strikes the assumption identified in the previous question. Option A explains the political origin of disclosure rules and, if anything, supports the author's scepticism about them. Option B says second opinions do not help, which removes an alternative to prohibition and therefore assists the argument. Option D refines the licensing effect by identifying who shows it most strongly; it leaves the effect, and therefore the argument, standing. Note that the weakener must engage the remedy, not merely qualify the evidence about disclosure.

Examiner's note — the trap: D looks like a weakener because it narrows the experimental finding; narrowing a premise that survives is not attacking the conclusion, which rests on the comparison between two regimes.

Q14 **A** Strengthen - CR **MED**

The argument infers from laboratory findings and an institutional tendency that prohibition would do better than disclosure. Option A supplies the missing real-world comparison: a regulator actually made the switch for one class of product, advice on that class improved, and, importantly, advice elsewhere did not deteriorate, which also closes off the spillover worry. That is direct support for the recommendation. Option B reports client preference for being told, which speaks to autonomy and mildly cuts against prohibition. Option C identifies an administrative cost of disclosure, but the argument is not built on the adviser's time, and a cheaper wrong remedy would still be wrong. Option D compares two ways of disclosing and so debates the design of disclosure rather than the choice between disclosure and prohibition, leaving the conclusion exactly where it was.

Examiner's note — the trap: C feels supportive because it is another complaint about disclosure; a strengthener must support the specific conclusion, which is about eliminating material conflicts, not about paperwork.

Q15 **B** Parallel reasoning - CR **ELITE**

The structure to be matched is precise: a warning-based remedy shifts to a layperson the task of pricing a risk she cannot assess, the warning simultaneously licenses the party who created the risk, and the recommendation is therefore to prohibit rather than to warn. Option B reproduces every element. Diners cannot assess the hygiene risk, the displayed rating lets a poor kitchen trade on the disclosure, and the recommendation is closure by the inspectorate. Option A keeps the warning and merely improves its delivery, which is the opposite recommendation. Option D is a straightforward generalisation from laboratory conditions to a whole population and has nothing to do with disclosure at all. Option C argues from the unpopularity of a measure to its ineffectiveness, a different move altogether, and one the original argument nowhere makes.

Examiner's note — the trap: A draws candidates who match only the surface, warnings that are ignored; the original argument rejects the warning remedy, whereas A doubles down on it.

Q16 A Main conclusion - CR MED

The third paragraph tells the reader where the argument lands: 'The national budget should not be built on the trial's effect size, and the roll-out should be paced to the rate at which supervisors can be trained rather than to the rate at which tutors can be hired.' Option A states both limbs. Option B is expressly disowned, since the author says 'None of this shows that the programme is worthless', and the closing sentence treats the verdict that tutoring does not work as a mistake the ministry would be led into. Option C is a proposal about who may evaluate programmes that the passage never advances. Option D recommends abandoning the roll-out pending a third trial, whereas the author accepts the roll-out and asks only that its pace and budget be set by supervisor supply.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is the trap for candidates who treat any critical argument as a call to stop; the author writes 'nothing here argues for abandoning it' one sentence before the conclusion.

Q17 D Necessary assumption - CR HARD

The argument reads the drop from four months to one month in the larger study as evidence that supervision was the active ingredient. That reading requires that the drop was not caused chiefly by something peculiar to the larger study which the national programme would not reproduce, such as a different test, a different age band, or a disrupted school year. Option D states exactly that and is necessary: if the drop had such an alternative cause, the inference to supervision fails. Option C is far stronger than the argument needs, which is only that supervisors take time to train, not that no unconsidered method exists. Option B concerns the ministry's choice of outcome measure and is irrelevant to the causal claim. Option A is not merely unnecessary but works against the argument, whose whole point is that the tutors were not the decisive input.

Examiner's note — the trap: A attracts candidates who assume any scale-up decline must be a fall in staff quality; the argument denies precisely that, locating the active ingredient in supervision.

Q18 B Weaken - CR ELITE

The recommendation to pace the roll-out by supervisor supply rests on two steps: supervision is the active ingredient, and supervision cannot be multiplied quickly because 'a supervisor must first have been a good tutor for some years'. Option B breaks the second step at its weakest joint. If a weekly checklist and a recorded example lesson produce the same gains as twice-weekly observation by a trained supervisor, the scarce input can be substituted cheaply and the pacing constraint dissolves. Option A is consistent with the argument and arguably supports it. Option C touches the training claim by noting that the observers were postgraduates rather than veteran teachers, which is a real dent, but the argument can concede it and still say supervisors must be trained and paid. Option D concerns persistence and distribution of gains, which the argument never disputes.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the strongest distractor: it wounds the sentence about supervisors having been good tutors, but leaves intact the claim that supervision is the active ingredient and must be supplied.

Q19 D Strengthen - CR MED

The argument generalises from one programme's decline at scale to a rule about how such programmes should be budgeted. Option D supplies the missing pattern across cases and, better still, ties the size of the decline to the very factor the argument nominates: the fall was largest where trials had leaned most on supervision by the evaluating team. That converts a single observation into evidence of a mechanism. Option A concerns publication policy and bears on transparency, not on the causal claim. Option B shows that costs are underestimated generally, which is a different worry from the loss of the effect and does not implicate supervision. Option C removes pay as an explanation of the difference between the trial and the roll-out, which helps marginally by eliminating one rival account, but it identifies no positive support for the supervision claim.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is a respectable answer because it closes an alternative explanation; D beats it by supplying affirmative evidence for the specific mechanism the conclusion depends on.

Q20 A Flaw in the reasoning - CR HARD

The larger study changed several things at once. Tutors were recruited by schools rather than screened by the research team, the dedicated protected session may have gone, the scale itself changed, and supervision was thinner. From that bundle the argument extracts a single culprit, supervision, and builds a budgeting rule on it. The objection in option A names precisely that overreach: one replication with many co-varying differences cannot isolate which feature carried the effect. Option B misreports the argument, which states that nothing in it argues for abandoning the programme. Option C is false on the face of the passage, since the argument questions the inference drawn from the trial rather than relying on the team's testimony about anything contested. Option D misdescribes the evidence, which concerns measured reading effects in two studies, not delivery costs.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the trap for candidates who remember the critical tone rather than the text; the passage's explicit disclaimer about abandonment rules it out.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Baumol's cost disease? — **Services whose productivity cannot rise grow relatively dearer as productivity rises elsewhere.**

2. 'Relative price' means? — **The price of one good expressed against others, not in money alone.**

3. Labour productivity is measured as? — **Output per worker, or per hour worked.**
4. Why must wages rise even in a low-productivity service? — **Otherwise its workers leave for sectors where pay is rising.**
5. 'Real' vs 'nominal' wage? — **Real is adjusted for prices; nominal is the money amount.**
6. 'Tradable' vs 'non-tradable' sector? — **Tradables can be sold across borders; non-tradables are produced where consumed.**
7. Two features of a public good? — **Non-rival in use and non-excludable.**
8. 'Externality' means? — **A cost or benefit falling on someone outside the transaction.**
9. 'Cross-subsidy'? — **Using the surplus from one activity to fund another sold below cost.**
10. 'Rationing' a public service means? — **Limiting access by queue, eligibility or quantity rather than by price.**
11. 'Endowment' of an institution? — **A permanent fund whose income supports its running costs.**
12. 'Fiscal pressure'? — **A persistent gap between what a state must spend and what it raises.**
13. To 'dilute' a service? — **Keep its name while reducing what it actually delivers.**
14. 'Repertoire' means? — **The body of works a performer is prepared to perform.**
15. Why does the services share of national income rise as economies grow? — **Their relative price rises even when their volume does not.**
16. 'Stare decisis'? — **Courts follow the rule laid down in earlier like cases.**
17. 'Ratio decidendi'? — **The reasoning necessary to the decision; the binding part.**
18. 'Obiter dicta'? — **Remarks not necessary to the decision; persuasive only.**
19. 'Distinguishing' a precedent? — **Showing the earlier case turned on facts the present one lacks.**
20. A decision 'per incuriam'? — **One given in ignorance of a binding authority or statute.**
21. 'Res judicata'? — **A matter already decided between the parties cannot be relitigated.**
22. 'Summary judgment'? — **Judgment without trial where a claim or defence has no real prospect of success.**
23. A 'preliminary issue'? — **A point of law decided first because it may dispose of the case.**
24. 'Without prejudice' correspondence? — **Settlement communication that cannot be shown to the court.**
25. 'Quantum' in a claim? — **The amount of damages, as distinct from liability.**
26. 'Repeat player' vs 'one-shotter'? — **A party who litigates constantly versus one who litigates once.**
27. Why would a repeat player settle a case it expects to lose? — **To keep an adverse precedent out of the law reports.**
28. A confidentiality clause in a settlement hides what, and from whom? — **The terms and the defect, from later claimants and regulators.**
29. An 'anonymised' judgment? — **One published with the parties' identifying details removed.**
30. To 'compromise' a claim? — **Settle it with each side giving up part of its position.**
31. 'Conflict of interest'? — **An interest capable of improperly influencing a duty owed to another.**
32. A 'material' conflict? — **One large enough to affect the advice or decision in question.**
33. 'Moral licensing'? — **A permitted act that makes a person feel entitled to behave worse afterwards.**
34. 'Insinuation anxiety'? — **Reluctance to refuse advice because refusal would imply an accusation.**
35. 'Recusal'? — **Withdrawing from a matter because of an interest or an appearance of bias.**
36. 'Divestment' as a remedy? — **Giving up the interest instead of merely declaring it.**
37. The 'principal-agent' problem? — **The agent's incentives diverge from the principal's and cannot be fully monitored.**
38. An 'information barrier' inside a firm? — **An internal separation stopping conflicted information from crossing.**
39. To 'discharge' a duty? — **Do enough to have satisfied it in law.**
40. 'Reflexive' (of a remedy)? — **Applied automatically, without fresh thought about whether it fits.**
41. 'Efficacy' vs 'effectiveness'? — **Works under trial conditions versus works in ordinary practice.**
42. 'External validity'? — **Whether a result holds outside the setting in which it was found.**
43. 'Implementation fidelity'? — **How closely the delivered programme matches the one designed.**
44. An effect size stated in 'months of schooling'? — **The gain restated as the progress a typical pupil makes in that time.**
45. The 'active ingredient' of a programme? — **The component that actually produces the effect.**
46. 'Free rider' problem? — **Enjoying a public good without contributing to its provision.**
47. 'Absorb labour' means? — **Require a given quantity of work to produce.**
48. 'Total factor productivity'? — **Output growth not explained by more labour or more capital.**
49. 'Unit labour cost'? — **Wage cost per unit of output.**
50. An 'interlocutory' order? — **An order made during a case, not finally disposing of it.**
51. 'Costs follow the event' means? — **The losing party normally pays the winner's costs.**
52. 'Declaratory relief'? — **A ruling stating the legal position without ordering payment.**
53. 'Amicus curiae'? — **A non-party who assists the court on a point of law.**
54. 'Opportunity cost'? — **The value of the best alternative given up.**
55. 'Marginal' cost? — **The cost of producing one more unit.**
56. 'Inflation' vs a rise in one relative price? — **Inflation is a general rise in prices; a relative price rise is one good dearer than others.**
57. 'Subsidy' means? — **A payment that lowers the price a buyer faces below its cost.**
58. 'Means-tested' provision? — **A benefit given only to those below an income or asset threshold.**
59. 'Universal' provision? — **A benefit given to everyone regardless of means.**
60. 'Automation' raises productivity mainly where? — **Where output can be standardised and machine-substituted.**
61. Why is live music a classic cost-disease example? — **A quartet needs the same four players today as two centuries ago.**
62. 'Regressive' vs 'progressive' charge? — **Regressive takes a larger share from the poor; progressive from the rich.**
63. 'Precedent' in one line? — **An earlier decision that binds or guides later courts on the same point.**
64. 'Binding' vs 'persuasive' authority? — **Binding must be followed; persuasive may be followed.**
65. 'Settlement' means? — **An agreed resolution that ends the dispute without judgment.**
66. 'Vanishing trial' thesis? — **That most civil disputes now settle, so fewer reasoned judgments are produced.**
67. Why is a judgment called a public good? — **Its guidance benefits everyone and no one can be excluded from using it.**
68. 'Selection effect' in reported cases? — **The disputes that reach judgment are unrepresentative of disputes generally.**
69. 'Asymmetry of resources' between litigants? — **One side can afford to fight or appeal; the other cannot.**

70. 'Non-disclosure agreement'? — A contract barring a party from revealing specified information.

71. 'Transparency' as a regulatory tool? — Requiring disclosure so others can judge the risk for themselves.

72. 'Prohibition' as a regulatory tool? — Forbidding the conduct outright rather than requiring it be declared.

73. 'Disclosure' does what to responsibility? — It can shift the burden of judgement onto the person told.

74. 'Fiduciary' relationship, in one line? — One party must act in the other's interest, not its own.

75. 'Independence' of an adviser? — Freedom from interests that could bend the advice.

76. 'Randomised controlled trial'? — Participants are assigned by chance to treatment or control, so groups are comparable.

77. 'Effect size'? — How large the measured difference is, not merely whether it exists.

78. 'Pilot' vs 'at scale'? — A small trial under favourable conditions vs full rollout under ordinary ones.

79. 'Selection bias' in a trial? — The treated group differs systematically from the untreated one.

80. 'Attrition' in a study? — Participants dropping out, which can distort the result.

81. 'Statistically significant' means? — The result is unlikely to be chance alone - not that it is large or important.

82. 'Generalisability'? — Whether a finding holds beyond the studied setting.

83. Why can a good pilot fail at scale? — Its active ingredient - often skilled supervision - cannot be reproduced everywhere.

84. 'Budgeting an effect size'? — Assuming a trial's measured gain will repeat nationally when planning spending.

85. 'Proxy measure'? — A stand-in for something you cannot measure directly.

86. 'Cost-benefit analysis'? — Weighing a measure's total gains against its total costs.

87. 'Counterparty'? — The other party to a transaction or contract.

88. 'Threshold' in a rule? — The level at which the rule starts to apply.

89. 'Rollout' means? — Extending a programme from a trial to full operation.

90. 'Baseline' in an evaluation? — The measured starting point against which change is judged.

91. 'Scalability'? — Whether a programme keeps working as it grows.

92. 'Unit cost' of a service? — Total cost divided by the number of units delivered.

93. 'Marginal benefit'? — The added gain from one more unit of an activity.

94. 'Deadweight loss'? — Value lost when a trade that would benefit both sides does not happen.