



July 2025

Commissioned by The UK Committee on Research Integrity and the Research Integrity Concordat Signatories Group





Insights from annual statements produced within government

July 2025

Commissioned by The UK Committee on Research Integrity and the Research Integrity Concordat Signatories Group

High-level considerations

Understanding the implementation of the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity within government As highlighted in <u>guidance by the Government Office for</u> <u>Science</u>, those working in government must comply with <u>The Seven Principles of Public Life</u> (known as "the Nolan Principles"), which set out ethical and integrity standards. The UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity is seen as an interpretation of these principles within a research context.

On the recommendation of the Government Chief Scientific Adviser (GCSA), departmental Chief Scientific Advisers (CSAs) have signed up to the principles of the Concordat for the forms of scientific research undertaken within and for their departments. Similarly, on the recommendation of the National Statistician, Departmental Directors of Analysis (DDANs) and Analysis Function (AF) Heads of Profession have signed up to the principles of the Concordat for the forms of research conducted by their professions. CSAs, DDANs and AF Heads of Profession have a role in holding their department and its sponsored bodies to account for implementing the Concordat and should provide advice on it.

As part of our analysis, we searched for and identified a total of 21 annual statements <u>produced within</u> <u>government</u>. It is especially important to highlight that these statements are all available via a single webpage on the UK Government's website, managed by the Government Office for Science. This makes their identification significantly easier compared to higher education institutions and other types of research performing organisations. The range of annual statements identified does not cover all departments of the UK Government. At the same time, the abovementioned <u>webpage</u> does include contact points for a broader range of departments, including several that have not published an annual statement.

Distinguishing features of government reporting

Annual statements produced within government are more streamlined and follow a customised template Within government, a <u>reporting template</u> (not mandatory and different from the one for higher education institutions) is available and broadly used across the annual statements we examined. Annual statements making use of this template are consistently concise and outcome-focused, emphasising specific actions and results rather than providing extensive narratives.

We highlight an extent of variation in terms of framing and contents across statements produced within government. For example:

- the <u>Department for Energy Security & Net Zero</u> (<u>DESNZ</u>), as a newly formed department, discusses the establishment of their integrity framework;
- the <u>Department for Transport (DfT)</u> describes a developed approach that includes management assurance exercises to monitor compliance with standards; and
- the <u>Food Standards Agency (FSA)</u>, as an independent department, emphasises their science-driven mission through integrity processes that align with their public health mandate.

These natural differences across departments clearly show that flexibility is key when supporting research integrity, as organisational features and culture must be considered when devising strategies to support researchers within the organisation and external contractors alike. This perspective also highlights that some insights gained from the analysis of statements produced within government are likely to be applicable to any organisation navigating the balance between consistent alignment to Concordat principles and contextual implementation.

Tailoring to local context

Case studies

The <u>Cabinet Office</u> has identified the need to introduce new internal guidance and processes in relation to research transparency, ethical research and supporting quality research. For example, their annual statements includes plans for implementing processes to support regular clearance for publication of research plans before research commences and of publishing research findings promptly on completion.



The <u>Met Office</u> discusses how research integrity commitments are advanced through their corporate values, policies and procedures. For example, they highlight that their core value of being a 'Force for Good' is reflected in ethical standards and their promotion of socially and environmentally responsible activities. Like the GOS (see above), they acknowledge the importance integrity as part of the GSEP Career Framework.



The <u>National Police Chiefs' Council's (NPCC)</u> annual statement highlights their commitment to open science, supporting police forces in their efforts to make research findings and underpinning data freely available online in an accessible format. The NPCC pursues five science pillars through a formal programme of work: open access, open data, open materials, pre-registration, and citizen science.

Thank you

Report authors: Andrea Chiarelli, Frances Palmer, Jasmin Higgs, Elle Malcolmson, Ian Carter

www.research-consulting.com

This extract is part of a report commissioned by the UK Committee on Research Integrity and the Research Integrity Concordat Signatories Group.



Get in touch via<u>enquiries@research-consulting.com</u>or <u>secretariat@ukcori.org</u>

This report is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0 International). <u>doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15545127</u>





Research Consulting

莊