PAF 2 Transcript

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
I'm at the Open University and I'm doing a Parliamentary Academic Fellowship on behalf of the Knowledge Exchange Unit.

I'm talking to former parliamentary academic fellows and hosts and asking them about their experience about the fellowship and the year means to try to think of ways that the scheme could be improved.

You can be as frank as you want. In fact, that's, you know, that's brilliant. And the transcripts will be deposited eventually at the Open University, but all identifying marks will be removed so that there's no names. There be no locations, i.e. which office you worked in because people can work out even if it's anonymized, right. Or the so and so worked in this committee. That must mean that person.

And what I'll probably try to do is send you a transcript before so you can check if there's anything you want cut out.

PAF 2  
OK, I think that's unlikely, but yeah. No, it's fine. I obviously I know I know the drill in terms of consent forms.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
And basically it's kind of split into three different sections and the pre your pre fellowship. A couple of questions about your actual fellowship experience and then you're post post phase as it were, right? You know what's happened since? And then just the last couple of questions, just asking you about if there's ways you think can things can be improved in some on, alright.

PAF 2  
Yeah, okay great.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Alright, brilliant. So just thinking back, right? When you applying for it, how did you find the process?

PAF 2  
Yeah, it's pretty straight forward. I'll have to remember how I, I mean, I was in a slightly sort of unusual position because the previous Post fellow on the Committee was a friend of mine and a former student of mine actually.

And so I'd spoken to them about it and so I had a bit of insight about it.

And yeah, I think I spoke to the Clerk a couple of times as well in the application process and she was super responsive and friendly.

The application went for the interview was fine, you know, and I heard pretty quickly, you know, I heard within a few days. So it was. Yeah. No, no, no problem, really. It was, you know, it was all very clear. They that all the forms were straight forward, you know? So it was. Yeah. I mean, it was very, very efficient. No problem at all.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Okay. That's great then. So when you actually started then?

And yeah, so I know exactly when it was because it was, it was a week of my birthday.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
What year?

PAF 2  
2020. And so yeah, so when I originally when we talked about it and you know, in the commitment I think was two days, two days a week, that's what we agreed. And the idea was that one or both of those days would be in be in London. You know when, when, when Parliament was sitting. And the idea would be I would, you know, maybe travel down on the Tuesday just be there for the committee meeting on the Wednesday because you start quite early.

I literally did one week and then we went to lockdown. So that kind of wasn't in the script. And then from there on. I can't remember the exact times, but pretty much everything was virtual for at least a year, I think, and then gradually, things started to move to hybrid and then towards the end of the fellowship I was going, I was going to London more, more on a more regular basis, but still a bit because I think they then moved to flexible working.

Yeah, the everything we'd agreed in terms of the contract would had kind of been, you know, ripped up really and eventually actually for I guess for a lot of people you change. It turned out it wasn't when I was anticipating, but in a way it made it more sustainable just in terms of like work, life balance and family and stuff, so it worked out alright.

So you obviously you miss out on the networking and things like that. But I mean it's the same for everyone. So yeah, I literally did one week and then that was it.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
But towards the end of the fellowship, you said you did get some face to face.

PAF 2  
Yeah, exactly. Yeah. So yeah, and something else I should I should tell you is so after the first year I agreed to increase my time to three days, so I went up to from 2 to 3. Ordinarily, three days a week. So we worked it. It was a bit flexible. And then I was due to finish in sort of March 22.

And so for the for the committee … the clerk asked me if I would stay on  
just to see the those reports through. So I stayed on for additional six months until September and that period I was going in for you know I was going in most weeks not every week, but most weeks I was going in.  
PAF 2

And attending committee meetings, especially towards the end, then there was a sort of spring and then there was obviously the recess. And then in the autumn I was going, I think September I was going every week until we and then yeah. So yeah. So the middle bit was completely remote. And then we was hybrid. And then towards the end there was things were turned returning not. There weren't quite normal because the office, they didn't have enough desks for everyone anyway. So it was sort of you know, so there were moving to that more flexible working, but I felt like it was good to go in and the Clerk was super supportive.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
How useful is it for you to go in?

PAF 2  
Um, very useful, I think. I mean, just for very practical things like going to Parliament, I like. I literally never been to Parliament in my life. I didn't know anything about it really. And I think that's kind of what you miss out on like, you know, just silly things like, you know using your pass and you know tell me about six months to get the pass and I couldn't use it right so. And you know, just meeting the team.

And I think actually you didn't, you didn't miss out a lot like the literally the first week I was there. The chair of the committee like took us to strangers bar for drinks afterwards and it was like it was like a different world. So it was always like this is good. But we never did that again.

Those committee systems, because they're understaffed and everything is just like you know, it's you, you're just turning the stuff around so quickly. But obviously you in an office, you can ask people questions and you can chat and get to know team like there were people basically on the team who I didn't meet physically for over a year. And there was, I think there was probably a couple people I didn't actually ever meet in, in person so that was a bit weird, but yeah, definitely been on site I think makes a difference.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
I'll come back to that in a minute and but did you have an induction plan?

PAF 2  
Did we have an induction plan. Oh yes, I think we did.

And, but I would say, I mean this is the thing and I don't know what your other respondents are telling you, but I mean I think that there was an induction, but then very quickly, you're it is, you know. And I remember quite early on that I had leave planned and I don't know if or how it was communicating, but remember Clerk was quite cross with me, you know, I mean, she was fine. It wasn't like a problem, but, but she was irritated that I had leave just after I'd started.

And I think this is this is the thing I think there are a couple of things I would say and will maybe come back to this later, but what I think what the, you know what academics get out of it and what the whole kind of rationale for the scheme.

And then I think how you're actually understood within the committee system, you know is they're not the same thing, right? And I felt the best of times, I thought like my knowledge is really important and I'm going to make a difference. And there was some really cool things I got to do you know, like briefing the committee chair when he was, you know, you know, when he was questioning like the Secretary of State was doing that in real time. And that was all, like, really exciting.

But at the time, I felt like I'm just like a vastly overpaid intern, you know, and I felt like. And that's very much a team ethic, cause you everyone chips in. It's not like, you know, you know what academia is like … But it did feel like a lot of the time that actually you're just there. You're compensating for the fact that I've got enough staff and you know, and there's a bit of a pecking order as well as quickly there.

They had quite a senior policy specialist who'd been round around the block and I kind of felt like he thought I was a threat or he felt like he had to sort of keep me in my box or whatever, but I felt like at times he wasn't. He wasn't comfortable with me being an expert and so that was a bit strange, but that was I think I was more of a kind of personality thing.

Um, but definitely the your question is about induction. I felt like, yeah, there was a bit of that. You know, he was, I mean, particularly when Parliament was sitting, cause essentially. And you'll know this is what would happen is the working week would be, you know, say you would have a committee meet on the Wednesday. So the previous week you would prepare the brief for the MPs.

You know you spend the week on that leading up. You'd send that off to the clock on the Thursday for review. That would get circulated on the Monday Committee meet on Wednesday, and then you start the whole thing over again.

So he was just literally like that. And yeah. And so I think early on, we did a covert inquiry and they basically, like, asked me to do the, you know, to lead on the kind of agrifood stuff. And that was great because it sort of I felt like that, well, this is what I do so I could do that and you know, it could pull the network in and all the rest of it.

But then other times it was, you know, the stuff I was being asked to do, I think you don't need me to do this. And then towards the end of the project, they had an undergraduate intern. Um, she was actually student funnily enough and at times, it felt like I'm not really doing anything that she isn't doing, you know.

And the fact that POST there's basically no oversight of the scheme, right? There's, you know, the occasion. Yeah, a couple of times the POST team I'd send had a couple of occasions where I didn't like the way the Clerk was talking to me.

And, you know, she pulled me up for a couple of things, like really stupid things. And I kind of said, you know, and ask POST for advice and stuff. Um and they were really good and really friendly, but in essence once you started there was nominal oversight. There was nominal supervision, there was nominal training, there was no input. Yeah.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Can I just ask? Did you have a supervisor? A designated mentor

PAF 2  
A meant a mentor. Did I have a, yeah, in this select committee?

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
When you when you started, did they say did someone identify themselves and say, did you have an immediate line manager as it were an immediate?

PAF 2  
Yeah. Yeah, I did. Yeah. So the clerk was my mentor stroke line manager. I guess I don't know how. I can't remember the exact wording that was used, but there was a change of clerk halfway through and I felt that the second, the replacement clerk, I think I had a slightly better relationship with.

And I don't know if that was a seniority thing because he was more. I mean a little bit younger than me, but it wasn't much. Whereas the first clerk was quite a bit younger than me and she's a woman. It wasn't, you know, it wasn't bad. It wasn't. You know, I'm old enough. I don't have to worry. You know, I can look after myself.

You know, it's almost like as someone with a lot of management experience, I think I wouldn't have done that that way. You know, you kind of looking at it like that.

And so yeah, so I think that it that was my feeling is that basically you know that a lot of what you're doing.

Impact is not knowledge exchange, it's essentially unpaid labour and I think that's fine cause then essentially this is the whole.  
I mean, it's the whole sort of pretence around impact, isn't it? You're playing this game where you know you, you do it, and then you were able to kind of present this in terms of the ref and say oh did all of these activities and look I've got these supporting statements but actually most of the time what you're doing is really fairly routine.

Um and so and at times I felt like they were taking the \*\*\*\* a bit. Really. In terms of some stuff for asking me to do.

My feeling is that if you know if you e-mail someone in the POST team they would get straight back to you and you know if you said can we have a chat? And I did that a couple of times but there was no it wasn't like you had a regular meeting or a check in. You know, so it was very, it's very it's very sort of decentralised, it's it seemed to me, yeah.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
OK. Just to follow up without going into detail you said you contacted post independently.

PAF 2  
Yeah.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Um, because of some issues to do with the clerk, I think.

PAF 2  
Yeah, yeah, yeah.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
They did things get resolved.

PAF 2  
Yeah, yeah, yeah. So I think I did two things I think basically.

Yeah, I think I talked to, I can't remember who in POST. But we had a chat and I just you know just said it was unhappy with the way she'd brought this up. And then and then I spoke to the second clerk and that was really helpful actually. And it was fine. I

It wasn't anything, you know, wasn't anything that upset. I think one of the things was and I guess this is one of the kind of training issues is around um, you know, around impartiality and I think she picked me up for something I'd said in a meeting with the with the chair of the committee. And it was something really like, I mean, I'm just not, frankly, I'm not really a very political person. I don't really care. It's not like, you know, it's kind of. I don't have any strong kind of political views in terms of like you know the everyday stuff. It was something really kind of that it seemed like I can't why you're picking this up.

And it seemed like but I know she was like hypersensitive around that that that issue about protocol and about impartiality.

So I just think it, I think it was just the lack of experience on her part in terms of you know, how she basically you know how she brought that up because we used to have a one to one every week and it didn't come up in that. She basically emailed me after the meeting and pulled me up on it and I think something she could have easily raised in our regular kind of one to one but it was resolved and there is no ongoing there was no there is no problem.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Just the following that could actually. This is one of the questions it kind of feeds into another one of the questions on impartiality. And did you think that impartiality was understood differently within Parliament and within you as an academic?

PAF 2  
So the guy who became clerk halfway through my time there was, I think he was more relaxed about it, than his predecessor. And I don't know which of those is more in line with the typical kind of public service and attitude, I don't know. But he didn't seem as worried about it, you know, and again, I don't know if it was just he had he had come from outside so he come he basically had been seconded from the Civil Service and was more I guess more experienced older and he just seemed to have a more relaxed attitude. So I don't know if it's just a personality thing right.

I was a bit kind of at the time I was a bit surprised cause it's sort of, you know I'm always really careful not to say anything, you know but I think one of the things I'd say as an academic and in terms of the training and induction that POST provides, I mean one of the things, the fundamental things you learn as an academic is to infer, right? That's what you do. That's your job. You look at evidence and you say, well, actually, this is what this means. And so what you learned very quickly, in particular, you're working on something as prickly as XXX you can't.  
So when you're writing a brief for the MP you everything's good. You've got to hide every statement or in every bit of information behind a third source you know. So if you're providing some background text to a question that you're asking, you want the MP to ask a minister or a witness. It's, you know, you know, you can't just provide data and say, well, this is the question you should ask …

You know, and as an academic, you just look at things and they said, well, this is really obvious. I mean it, you know you should be able to just present this as a question. It's like an obvious question.

So that that kind of took a bit of you've got to kind of wrap your head around that and the sensitivities of particular you know the politicians around that, you know?

It took a bit of adjusting to. And then the other thing of course is the pace of the work because again academic, you have the time. I mean, you do a lot of, you know, procrastinating, don't you? You ponder, where is this? It's like you've got to put a brief together and you've got a couple of hours. So you're just cutting and pasting. That's all you're doing. You're not analysing. You're not verifying you're just saying actually, right, we just need a paragraph and … you Google, you cut it, you dump it in the document.

You know you do it a quick review and then you send it on and I mean that you'd be horrified as an academic doing that cause it's just like you know, you always wat to be like triple sure of any claim you make or anything you present in the public domain. So it's a very different mindset actually and that's yeah.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Do you have you got a Twitter account?

PAF 2  
I did well. It's a good question. Yeah. So at the time, I had a Twitter account and I did use it, and I did.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Is there a personal one?

PAF 2  
It was so as a yeah and was a personal one, but I didn't use it for I didn't. I didn't tweet myself. I used it for, you know, promoting articles in, in blogs and stuff, and also promoting committee business. I think I already had a Twitter account before I joined the committee and then I did used it to forward or like stuff that come out of the committee.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Yeah.

PAF 2  
Um, I don't have a Twitter account now, and it wasn't. It wasn't anything to do with that. He was just I after the whole kind of Elon Musk thing. I just think in and all the just the crap on there, I just couldn't. I thought, well, it's just like it's just consuming me and I'm not it. There's no nothing positive on there, right? And it's just like it was kind of useful when I was on the committee, cause I need to know what was going on, you know, in terms of what the politicians were saying and the once I'd finished. And I took a breath and said, well, I don't need that anymore. But yeah, I did at the time have a Twitter account.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Just out of interest then? Did you ever hesitate in tweeting personal stuff?

PAF 2  
No, cause again I no

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
What I'm trying to get at is about impartiality.

PAF 2  
Yeah, exactly. Yeah. So, and I happened to know, you know, I mean a I'll give you an insight into, you know, how these things work is that. when we were I think putting a witness panel together for a session.

Um, that one of the MPs on the committee had gone into the Twitter account of one of the proposed witnesses worked out they were a member of the Labour Party.

I didn't. The only tweet I tended to write was saying oh he's my latest article, here’s a blog I've written.

Um, you know an occasion they'd be like, critical of government policy, but not in a very, you know … in a very sort of technocratic way, not kind of like, you know. I mean quite almost quite technical sort of analysis really.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Were you picked up on them?

PAF 2  
No, no, no, nothing. No one ever said anything on that on that.

PAF 2  
And yeah, I didn't, you know, and as I suppose if I think about it a bit more deeply I was probably mindful of the fact that I was working for Parliament, you know, so and I never really tweeting personally anyway, you know, I have never written live below the line comments. I don't even respond to you know stuff when I write something for the conversation. I just think I don't want to know what people think of it. Right so but I reckon I probably was mindful of the fact that I didn't want to say anything.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Did you get any guidance on it?

PAF 2  
No, they didn't. None of that came up.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
OK, interesting. Alright, that's really interesting. Then just spooling back, we're kind of rattling through a lot of this and because I think a lot of your answers are kind of covering …Do you have any advice for the best way to support PAFs in the future?

PAF 2  
I think what would be useful and we did set this up but it didn't really work that well. I don't know how you make it work but having a support network amongst the fellows that's independent of you know. So it's like their own sort of safe space as it were to chat about their experiences. And actually, and I know that the POST team have tried to promote that and.

So I think that's a really important right and I think also maybe the mentor system having a say, a POST fellow who's been in post, you know, who's been around a bit or he's an ex post fellow as a mentor.

I suppose being, you know, being older and being more experienced and I was able to say no to things and respond to certain things. And I think if you're and I think probably a lot of the fellows are more kind of earlier mid career it's kind of not.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Did you meet with any fellows? Have any links with any other fellows?

PAF 2  
Yeah. Well, we had this. We had this sort of WhatsApp group that we set up originally, but eventually that just didn't really just died a death. And I knew a couple like there was a fellow on the Committee who was another former student of mine. And we occasionally would chat. And I spoke to him a couple of times. He asked me, you know, I was involved with something he was doing. So he, you know, but I talked to him briefly about a few things. But that was just to kind of I already had a personal connexion to him.

But no, it wasn't like I guess if it been in London more, you know it might have been more of a thing like a you know and in a way and I don't know if this is the you know the feeling of other fellows, but my sense was POST as a thing was almost like fictitious, right? It wasn't the you didn't go to the POST office. You didn't meet them.

It was very hands off and I know there they've only got a small staff right? It's a bit like, you know, I reminded me a bit of, you know, at school when you do like work experience and then you go off to, you know, the sawmill or whatever and the school just send you there and then you end up flip sweeping the floor for a week. So it's a bit like that, right?

In that sense, but you know it and I think actually if you if you're, you know if you are just coming out of PhD or you you've only you know you've only you know you're sort of mid career then.

Yeah, I think it would be quite easy to be, no, taking advantage of is not the right word. There's just something. I think there's a bit of a misalignment because the thing about the, the Select Committee system, they're understaffed right they’re under resourced and what they're doing, they're trying. So they're getting, they're getting a POST fellow. They're getting an undergraduate intern. They're getting a postgraduate, you know, they're just trying to pull in as much resources as they can. And because they just need bodies.

And so within that system to say actually you're coming in to impart knowledge, you're coming in to exchange knowledge, you're come in to, to improve the technical capacity of the committee is very hard to hold that line. I think just and that's where I think with POST.

I would say I was struck, but by just by how little input they, you know, and obviously got a whole bunch of. I mean I don't know many of the fellows they are, but it's obviously a lot to manage. But for large amounts of time you essentially just left to get on with it. And I don't think it's ideal really.

And for earlier career Fellows is like, well, how do how do you make the most of this? How do you, you know how do you build an impact narrative, you know, what kind of things should you be doing when you're in Parliament?

You mentioned Twitter, you know, in terms of networking, you know, all of that kind of stuff. Yeah, I don't think there was enough of that really. I mean, I, for me personally, I didn't. It's not like I needed it. I don't know if my committee was unusual, but I did feel like, you know, yeah, this is.

Yeah, I mean, this is you are if you know this is you're just an unpaid intern. Basically it at times and that's no you know and I think yeah, as I say I would describe I think it's just a misalignment between you've got you've got this, there is this thing about knowledge and knowledge exchange, but they have the policy specialist for that right. And then so what? You're coming in, what's your relationship with the policy specialists? You know, are you advising them or? And I felt that actually where you might think that actually, and particularly as a as a basically like.

You teach policy specialist and then the staff will, like, shared across committees. There would be a comms team and so on. And so, yeah, so that kind of in terms of where you fit within that?

And it is not clear and that's kind of, you know, cause in a way think about if the, it's almost like you you're reporting to the clerk and the clerk's essentially the team manager. But I don't know, should you not be better reporting to the policy specialist?

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
I get the picture.

PAF 2  
I don't know. Yeah, I think that there is a bit of a misalignment between what the basically I think what the committees need is capacity right? And it's not, it's not expertise. Yeah, they can get expertise from outside. They have expertise in terms of the policy specialists and by its very nature, if you an academic, your knowledge is quite specialist is quite niche. So you might know a lot about a small area and so at times you're doing that and obviously the other times say if you're, you know if you're a lawyer or you know the contents wherever you can read. You give reporting and you can answer technical questions better than their policy specialist who's maybe been studying this for like 6 months.But a lot of the time, yeah, you are just you, you're there. It's just about capacity. It's not about expertise.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
OK. And that's really helpful. Are you aware of what sort of outputs or impacts you had?

PAF 2  
Yeah. So I've got, obviously I'm named on all the committee reports.

But also I think one of the things that you know in terms of what I would advise is one things I did when I was there. I just didn't have the time to write it up.

I tried to write policy blogs once every six weeks. And so you do have the information at your disposal to do stuff like that and you know, not something I've done historically. And so I found that really good. Yeah. And that was a way in which you could tap into the access you had.

And actually the level of detail was appropriate for that kind of thing to be able to, you know, spend a couple of hours writing, you know, 500 words. And that's probably the most appropriate thing to do when you're there. And then obviously in terms of the Committee reports. I can see bits where you kind of do make a difference.

But I mean, it's the whole thing with the committee system and I don't know, you see some committees that seem to have real impact and I don't know.

PAF 2  
But my committee was just completely ignored. It had no basically had no influence whatsoever on government where you see other communities that you know. And I think the chair makes a difference.

And not knowing that much about British politics, to be honest and. And so I learned a lot just in terms of doing that

I think a lot of learned, a lot of intangible scales, and I think that I think this is the thing I'd say, for all the kind of negative things I'm saying. I mean, it was a great experience. I would recommend it to anyone.

I think you should be paid for it, frankly.

The thing is, if you have a research grant and your buy out is 20% of Fe, you do not spend 20% of your time working on that ground. Yeah. And but on this say I had a for the first year I was 40% FD as an as a fellow you had all the travel and the days were just like you know there it was real work. It's like you're doing a full, you know, 9 to half five, it's non-stop and then that means it's really difficult to juggle other things. And so I think you should be paid for it. It's not like you should get a lot, but I think you should. There should be an allowance because it's a lot of work.   
It's just those days you cannot do anything in those days, you can't check emails, you can't deal with students. You can't get any reading done. And so then that means that you have unprotected days I'll then be really squeezed so yeah, so I you know, I think that's something and that's something the universities to think about in terms of how they cause at the minute the way it's treated with impact accelerator account is essentially it's like a grant buy out but doing a job as opposed to working on a grant I think is different.

It’s a different order in terms of its time commitment. So I do think yeah that that they should be an allowance. You know, some incentive. You know, some reward actually.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
Basically just did just picking on that, then about what you get out of it? Either your career or your own academic work in any ways.

PAF 2  
Yes, it has. And that's the thing I'd say in a way it's very indirect, but I felt that for me at that point in my career.

I was a bit sort of hacked off with internal university politics and to actually have a break from that to do something to work in a different organisational culture, you know, with a different setup, with a different managerial system. But anyway, back to question. In September, I'm about to step up to become a head of my department and. And I think I I'm not sure I would have put myself forward for that. I think I you it was almost like it gave me a bit of time to reflect, but also I think I learned a lot and had that experience.

And also I think in terms of how I was able to talk to the Vice Chancellor about that I've just having kind of outside experience and kind of impact doing impactful research. I think it has been beneficial and I don't have any regrets.

I think it was a good thing to do and all I'm saying is I think in terms of what you're doing in terms of report that there is a misalignment that seems to me between what the committees need and what POST is offering, and therefore what academics are signing up to and so the support system in terms of the peer support system, the training that's offered by POST.

You know, and I think frankly, you know, going back to the issue about payment, it's almost like I think that the government or Parliament should be paying for that. Yeah, I don't think they should be getting it for free because it's not like you're not just doing your knowledge exchange. You're essentially subsidising those committees and so I think that that's where I think the misalignment is and it might be different, it depends on the committee, depends on the nature of the work, depends how close it is to your expertise and it depends I guess on look as well.

But I think actually your what you want as an academic and will actually experience. But I wanted I want an impact case study, right? You've got POST that wants to facilitate knowledge exchange between scientists and public officials. And then you've got the committees which based, as I say, are under resourced both in terms of general capacity but also expertise. But I would say it's the general capacity that's driving it and that's where I think actually the training needs to be.

PRABHAKAR, Rajiv  
A final question then, just a couple of bullet points about ways in which it might be improved then I'm guessing payment would be one.

PAF 2  
Yeah, I think payment. I think more direct one to one support from the POST team. And supervision. And perhaps a bit stronger liaison with the clerks as well. You know? So in a sense, how often do the POST team speak? Say, your clerk is your line manager. How often are they in contact with them? But my impression was that actually, once you're in, you're in the job, you're pretty much left to get on with it unless you have a problem and you go to them.