

# UK Regional Development: A Variety Dynamics Case Study

## **Type A: Governance/Economic Systems Analysis**

**Analysis Date:** December 2025

**Framework:** Variety Dynamics (Love, 2025)

**Author:** Dr Terence Love

**Geographic Scope:** United Kingdom

**Time Frame:** 1970s-2025

**© 2025 Terence Love and Love Services Pty Ltd**

**Case Study Purpose:** This document demonstrates Variety Dynamics analytical method applied to UK regional development. It shows what Variety Dynamics reveals that conventional approaches miss - variety concentrations, transaction cost asymmetries, feedback loop dynamics, threshold risks. Analysis complements (does not replace) economic, historical, and political domain expertise. Variety Dynamics provides structural framework for understanding power locus and variety distributions in hyper-complex systems where traditional causal analysis proves insufficient.

## 1. SYSTEM CLASSIFICATION

**Type:** Hyper-complex governance and economic system exhibiting persistent regional inequality through variety concentration mechanisms

**Complexity:** 15+ interacting feedback loops creating threshold dynamics beyond predictive capacity (Love's Law: human cognition limited to approximately two-loop prediction)

**Boundaries:** Open system embedded in global economy; internal boundaries created by fiscal/regulatory centralization in Westminster controlling 95%+ taxation and policy varieties

**Time frame:** Post-industrial transition (1970s-present), acute crisis phase (2020-2025), critical threshold window (2025-2030)

## 2. ANALYTICAL CHALLENGE

**Variety Dynamics Perspective:** Regional inequality analysis conventionally focuses on economic factors - skills gaps, infrastructure deficits, agglomeration effects, market failures. These approaches assume separable problems amenable to targeted

interventions producing predictable improvements. Variety Dynamics reveals why this structurally fails: the system exhibits hyper-complexity where variety concentration creates self-reinforcing feedback loops (Axiom 20, 23) faster than policy interventions can respond, while exponentially scaling transaction costs (Axiom 36) systematically advantage already-powerful actors.

**Conventional approaches assume:** - Regional inequality results from market failures correctable through targeted policies - Infrastructure investment, skills training, enterprise zones produce measurable improvements - Problems are separable (housing crisis distinct from education issues distinct from political centralization) - Incremental reforms accumulate toward convergence.

**System violates these assumptions through:** - Variety concentrations generating self-reinforcing dynamics (London success attracts more investment, talent, institutions) - Transaction cost asymmetries favouring concentrated actors (Westminster controls 95%+ fiscal varieties, peripheral regions cannot respond to local conditions) - Interconnected crises creating coordination impossibilities (regional decline + youth debt burden + housing crisis + political fragmentation = exponentially scaling transaction costs for any unified response)

#### **Evidence from conventional interventions:**

Regional policies 1979-2025 include enterprise zones, development agencies, city deals, “levelling up” funds - representing £100+ billion expenditure across governments. Regional inequality worsened: London GDP per capita increased from 25% above UK average (1979) to 75% above (2024). Peripheral regions experienced absolute decline in some measures. Pattern across interventions: symbolic gestures, competitive bidding favouring areas with existing capacity, insufficient scale relative to variety asymmetries, policy reversal after electoral cycles.

Housing interventions (Right to Buy, Help to Buy, planning reforms) increased demand or financialized supply without addressing ownership concentration. Homeownership declined from 71% (2003) to 65% (2024), house prices increased from 3-4x average salaries (1990s) to 8-10x (2024).

Education expansion to 50% university participation with tuition fees created £206 billion student debt burden while graduate underemployment reached 33%. Credential inflation rendered degrees insufficient for middle-class employment despite rhetoric of opportunity expansion.

**Variety Dynamics insight:** These failures aren’t implementation problems but inevitable consequences of attempting causal intervention in hyper-complex systems where variety concentration creates exponentially scaling advantages (Axiom 36). Peripheral actors lack organizational varieties (Axiom 13) to exploit marginal redistributions, while elite adaptation varieties absorb incremental changes faster than transformative accumulation occurs.

### 3. VARIETY DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Variety Asymmetry (Axiom 1)

**Variety Dynamics Principle:** Power concentration follows variety distribution. Actors possessing multiple strategies, resources, and options (high variety) control system evolution. Actors with constrained choices (low variety) experience system outcomes without shaping them.

**In UK regional development system:**

**HIGH-VARIETY ACTORS** (Concentrated control):

**Westminster Political-Administrative Complex:** - Fiscal varieties: 95%+ taxation controlled centrally, regions cannot vary rates or borrow significantly - Regulatory varieties: Legislation, statutory instruments, regulatory body appointments, planning frameworks - Infrastructure investment varieties: 60% spending concentrated in London/Southeast (30% population) - Institutional location varieties: 95%+ major regulatory/policy institutions headquartered London - International varieties: Trade agreements, diplomatic relationships, EU legacy frameworks

**London/Southeast Economic Elite:** - Property ownership varieties: Estimated 10-15% of housing stock owned by top 5% wealth holders, geographically concentrated - Financial varieties: 85%+ venture capital, 70%+ corporate lending, 90%+ financial services employment London-based - Professional network varieties: Legal, accounting, advisory services enabling complex transactions - Capital mobility varieties: Offshore structures, international investment, currency hedging - Political access varieties: Proximity to Westminster, media headquarters, informal influence channels

**LOW-VARIETY ACTORS** (Dispersed constraint):

**Peripheral Regional Populations:** - Minimal fiscal varieties: Cannot vary taxation, limited borrowing capacity, dependent on Westminster allocations - Constrained employment varieties: Deindustrialization eliminated manufacturing base, service sector jobs predominantly low-wage/precarious - Limited political varieties: First-past-the-post concentrates power in safe seats, regional voice minimal in Westminster - Reduced infrastructure varieties: Transport connectivity declining relative to London, digital infrastructure gaps - Constrained mobility varieties: Housing unaffordability prevents migration to opportunity centers, debt burdens reduce geographic flexibility

**Structural consequence:** Variety asymmetry determines power locus - Westminster/London actors control system evolution (policy decisions, investment allocation, institutional development), while peripheral regions navigate outcomes without shaping them. Feedback loops reinforce this asymmetry: success varieties attract more

investment, talent, institutions; constraint varieties compound through reduced opportunities, outmigration, declining local capacity.

### 3.2 Power Law Concentrations (Axioms 39-40)

**Variety Dynamics Principle:** In complex systems, control effects and benefits follow power law distributions - small proportions of actors account for disproportionate effects. This creates surgical intervention opportunities: targeting concentration points achieves maximum power shift with minimal political transaction costs.

#### **In UK regional development:**

**Geographic concentration:** - **30% of population (London/Southeast)** receives **60% infrastructure investment** (2× concentration) - **London (13% population)** generates **23% of UK GDP** (1.8× concentration) - **Top 5% local authorities** account for **40%+ venture capital investment** (8× concentration)

**Institutional concentration:** - **95%+ major regulatory bodies** headquartered **London** (despite distributed populations) - **85%+ national media** headquartered **London** (geographic monopoly on national narrative) - **70%+ FTSE 100 headquarters** located **London/Southeast** (corporate decision-making varieties)

**Property ownership concentration:** - **10% of landlords** own **50%+ of rental properties** (5× concentration) - **5% of developers** control **60%+ of development pipeline** (12× concentration) - **Foreign ownership** concentrated in **London prime property** (15-20% of high-value residential)

**Educational concentration:** - **Russell Group universities (15% of institutions)** receive **65% of research funding** (4× concentration) - **Oxbridge + London universities** capture **40%+ of international students** (premium fee income)

**Strategic implication:** Interventions targeting these concentration points affect small proportions of actors while capturing majority of system effects - maximizing power redistribution while minimizing political resistance. For example, fiscal federalism affects Westminster elite but enables 60+ million people to benefit from regional autonomy.

### 3.3 Transaction Cost Dynamics (Axiom 36)

**Variety Dynamics Principle:** Transaction costs scale exponentially or combinatorially with variety increases, not linearly. This creates leverage: policies imposing variety obligations on large actors generate exponentially scaling costs while remaining manageable for small actors.

#### **Scaling in UK regional policy:**

**Peripheral region attempting policy innovation:** - Must negotiate with Westminster Treasury (high cost - months of lobbying, business case preparation, political capital expenditure) - Requires Parliamentary approval for fiscal variations (years of legislative

process) - Competes with other regions in competitive bidding (zero-sum varieties consuming limited capacity) - Lacks implementation capacity (no regional civil service, must build from scratch) - **Result:** Transaction costs prohibitively high, innovation varieties minimal

**Westminster implementing national policy:** - Direct control of 95%+ fiscal varieties (low cost - Treasury decisions) - Legislative authority (can implement without regional consent) - Existing implementation infrastructure (civil service, agencies) - **Result:** Transaction costs manageable, maintains policy monopoly.

**Current asymmetry:** Transaction costs currently favour centralized actors. Westminster operates policy varieties at low marginal cost (existing infrastructure), while peripheral regions face exponentially scaling costs attempting autonomous action (must build capacity, negotiate permissions, overcome institutional resistance).

**Intervention opportunity:** Fiscal federalism inverts this asymmetry. Devolving tax-varying powers to regions imposes one-time Westminster legislative cost but creates permanent regional capacity. Subsequently, Westminster faces exponentially scaling coordination costs (must manage multiple tax regimes), while regions operate autonomously at low marginal cost.

### 3.4 Feedback Loop Structure (Axiom 20)

**Variety Dynamics Principle:** Systems with feedback loops generate variety. Multiple interacting loops create self-reinforcing variety concentration - the system generates new strategic options for high-variety actors faster than control mechanisms can respond.

#### **Self-reinforcing loops in UK regional system:**

##### **Loop R1: Investment-Growth-Attraction**

London infrastructure investment  
→ Economic growth (firms locate for connectivity)  
→ Tax revenue increases  
→ Treasury prioritizes "successful" regions for further investment  
→ More infrastructure investment London  
→ [REINFORCING: Concentration accelerates]

##### **Loop R2: Talent-Opportunity-Migration**

London employment opportunities  
→ Graduate migration from peripheral regions  
→ Regional talent depletion  
→ Firms avoid peripheral regions (skills unavailable)  
→ Further opportunity concentration London  
→ [REINFORCING: Brain drain accelerates]

##### **Loop R3: Institutional-Proximity-Influence**

Regulatory institutions headquartered London

- London firms gain informal access varieties (proximity)
- Policy shaped favouring London interests
- More institutions locate London (network effects)
- [REINFORCING: Institutional monopoly deepens]

#### **Loop R4: Housing-Unaffordability-Wealth**

London house prices increase

- Existing owners gain wealth varieties (equity)
- Demand for London property increases (wealth store)
- Further price appreciation
- [REINFORCING: Wealth concentration through asset inflation]

#### **Loop R5: Media-Narrative-Legitimacy**

Media concentrated London

- London perspective dominates national narrative
- Regional issues invisible/marginalized
- Policy prioritizes London concerns
- Media success justifies London concentration
- [REINFORCING: Narrative monopoly]

**Dynamic consequence:** These loops interact to create exponentially accelerating concentration. Each loop generates varieties for London actors (investment, talent, institutions, wealth, narrative control) while attenuating varieties for peripheral regions. System generates new London advantages faster than policy interventions can redistribute - explaining why 40+ years of “regional policy” failed to reverse divergence.

## **4. KEY ANALYTICAL FINDINGS**

### **4.1 Why Conventional Regional Policy Fails**

**Conventional policy assumption:** Market failures create regional inequality; targeted interventions correct failures.

**Variety Dynamics reveals:** Variety concentration creates self-reinforcing dynamics overwhelming intervention effects. Enterprise zones, development agencies, infrastructure projects add varieties to peripheral regions, but feedback loops generate London varieties faster. Net effect: relative positions unchanged or worsened despite billions invested.

**Critical insight:** Incremental variety additions insufficient when facing exponentially reinforcing concentration loops. Transformation requires disrupting loop mechanisms or redistributing control varieties enabling autonomous regional response.

## 4.2 The Fiscal Federalism Leverage Point

**Variety Dynamics identifies:** Westminster's 95%+ fiscal monopoly is structural bottleneck. All peripheral policy innovation requires Treasury negotiation, creating exponentially scaling transaction costs (Axiom 36).

**Leverage mechanism:** Devolving tax-varying powers and borrowing capacity inverts transaction cost structure: - Regions gain autonomous fiscal response varieties (can vary rates, issue bonds, respond to local conditions) - Westminster loses policy monopoly varieties (must coordinate across multiple tax regimes) - Enables regional experimentation varieties (different approaches tested simultaneously) - Creates political accountability varieties (regional governments directly answerable for fiscal choices)

**Why high-leverage:** Single constitutional change redistributes control varieties to 60+ million people, disrupts multiple feedback loops simultaneously, creates irreversible transformation (reversing devolution politically prohibitive).

## 4.3 The Preston Model Validation

**Variety Dynamics analysis:** Preston's community wealth building demonstrates variety redistribution succeeding where national policy failed. Mechanism: anchor institutions (universities, hospitals, councils) redirected £200 million procurement spend from national corporations to local SMEs through progressive procurement criteria.

**Why it worked:** - Used existing varieties (anchor budgets already allocated) rather than requiring new resources - Targeted transaction cost asymmetries (local firms competitive on social value, multinationals competitive only on price) - Created self-reinforcing loop (local spend → local employment → local consumption → local capacity → more local spend) - Built organizational varieties first (cooperative networks, business support) before expecting delivery

**Generalizability:** Model replicable anywhere with sufficient anchor institution presence. Demonstrates Variety Dynamics principle: redistributing control varieties (procurement decisions) more effective than transferring resource varieties (grants, subsidies).

**Limitation:** Preston succeeds within existing national structure but cannot transform it. Local wealth building valuable but insufficient without national fiscal federalism, infrastructure rebalancing, institutional relocation.

## 4.4 The Threshold Convergence Risk

**Variety Dynamics reveals:** Multiple crises approaching threshold dynamics simultaneously (Axiom 48 - discontinuities in variety systems):

**Regional economic thresholds:** - Youth unemployment exceeding viable levels (15-20% in some areas) - Outmigration depleting working-age populations - Service degradation creating governance failures.

**Housing thresholds:** - Affordability reaching impossibility (deposit requirements 5-10× annual salaries) - Rough sleeping and hidden homelessness accelerating - Rental costs consuming 40-50% of incomes.

**Student debt thresholds:** - 50% of graduates never fully repaying (system financially unsustainable) - Mental health crisis among indebted youth - First generation facing downward mobility despite higher education.

**Variety Dynamics insight:** These thresholds are not independent. They interact through variety distributions (regional decline forces youth migration, housing unaffordability creates debt burden, debt prevents homeownership, homelessness triggers regional return, unemployment prevents debt repayment). Crossing one threshold increases probability of others crossing. System exhibits potential for cascading threshold crossings creating discontinuous transformation.

**Historical parallel:** 1970s-80s exhibited similar threshold convergence (deindustrialization, unemployment, housing crisis, political polarization) producing Thatcher transformation. Current convergence comparable but more complex due to identity fragmentation varieties preventing unified resistance.

## 5. IDENTIFIED LEVERAGE POINTS

**Variety Dynamics identifies intervention points where variety redistribution achieves disproportionate power shifts:**

Leverage Point 1: Fiscal Federalism

**Variety Dynamics insight:** Devolving tax-varying powers ( $\pm 5\%$  on income, corporation, VAT) and borrowing capacity to regions inverts transaction cost asymmetries.

**Implementation approaches:** - Legislative framework enabling regional tax variation - Regional bond issuance authority (50% of regional GDP ceiling) - Equalization fund (20% of additional revenues from rate increases)

**Mechanism:** Regions acquire autonomous fiscal response varieties without Westminster negotiation. Subsequent policy innovation operates at low marginal cost (regional decision) while Westminster faces high coordination costs (multiple tax regimes).

**Effect:** Disrupts Loop R1 (investment concentration) and Loop R3 (institutional monopoly) by enabling regions to fund infrastructure and attract institutions through competitive advantages.



## Leverage Point 2: Regional Development Banks

**Variety Dynamics insight:** Capital allocation varieties concentrated in London financial sector (85%+ venture capital, 70%+ corporate lending). Regional banks redistribute these varieties.

**Implementation approaches:** - Capitalize regional banks (£5-10 billion per region from government, pension funds, regional bonds) - Patient capital mandate (long-term infrastructure, SME lending, cooperative development) - Regional governance (boards not Westminster-controlled)

**Mechanism:** Breaks Loop R2 (talent migration) by financing regional employment opportunities, and Loop R4 (wealth concentration) by recirculating regional savings locally.

**Effect:** Creates financial varieties supporting regional economic diversification without dependence on London capital markets.

## Leverage Point 3: Institutional Relocation

**Variety Dynamics insight:** Physical proximity creates transaction cost asymmetries for informal influence (Axiom 5, 34). Relocating 50+ major institutions redistributes proximity varieties.

**Implementation approaches:** - Relocate regulatory bodies (Financial Conduct Authority → Edinburgh/Manchester; Competition and Markets Authority → Birmingham; Ofgem → Newcastle/Aberdeen) - Full headquarters with decision-making authority (not regional offices) - Legislation preventing relocation back to London.

**Mechanism:** London firms lose proximity access varieties (informal influence, recruitment from regulator staff), regional firms gain equivalent varieties.

**Effect:** Disrupts Loop R3 (institutional concentration) and Loop R5 (media narrative) by exposing regulators to regional economic realities.

## Leverage Point 4: Infrastructure Investment Rebalancing

**Variety Dynamics insight:** Current 60%/40% spending ratio (London-Southeast/rest) violates population distribution (30%/70%). Legislated rebalancing redistributes connectivity varieties.

**Implementation approaches:** - Statutory spending formula: 60% outside London/Southeast, 40% within - 10-year commitment preventing reversal - Independent oversight (Infrastructure Commission)

**Mechanism:** Reverses Loop R1 by forcing investment where economic activity currently weak, creating development opportunities attracting firms and talent.

**Effect:** Connectivity varieties enable peripheral regions to compete for investment without requiring London location.

## Leverage Point 5: Progressive Procurement Mandates

**Variety Dynamics insight:** Public sector procurement (£200+ billion annually) can redistribute economic varieties through criteria changes (Preston Model scaled nationally).

**Implementation approaches:** - Legislate social value weighting (30% minimum in procurement decisions) - Mandate 50% local/regional spend where competitive - Independent monitoring (Community Wealth Building Commissioner)

**Mechanism:** Changes transaction cost structure favouring local firms (compete on community benefit not just price), similar to Preston's £200 million redirection but at national scale.

**Effect:** Scales Loop disruption (local spend → employment → consumption) to entire UK public sector.

## 6. CONSTRAINTS ON POWER REDISTRIBUTION

### 6.1 Resistance Varieties (from opposition)

**Westminster political-administrative elite:** - Legislative varieties: Control Parliamentary process, can delay or block devolution - Treasury varieties: Fiscal orthodoxy embedded in institutions, "sound money" ideology resists regional autonomy - Civil service varieties: Career incentives favour centralization, resist variety redistribution threatening London positions.

**London/Southeast economic elite:** - Capital mobility varieties: Threaten relocation if policies unfavourable - Media varieties: Hostile coverage of "risky experiments," "regional protectionism" - Lobbying varieties: Industry associations, direct government access, campaign finance.

**Institutional inertia varieties:** - Path dependencies: 40+ years of centralization create structural lock-in - Coordination costs: Transforming system with 15+ interacting loops requires simultaneous changes - Knowledge varieties: Limited regional governance capacity after decades of centralization.

### 6.2 Capacity Shortfall

**Peripheral regions lack:** - Institutional varieties: No regional civil service, limited policy expertise - Financial varieties: Decades of underinvestment depleted local government capacity - Organizational varieties: Weak business networks, limited cooperative

infrastructure - Political varieties: Regional identity fragmented (England lacks devolution unlike Scotland/Wales)

**Transaction cost implications:** Even if varieties redistributed, peripheral actors require 5-10 years capacity building before effective deployment. Cannot expect immediate transformation.

### 6.3 Realistic Assessment

**Variety Dynamics analysis indicates:** Power redistribution feasible but faces substantial resistance. Required changes (fiscal federalism, regional banks, institutional relocation) technically straightforward but politically challenging.

**Conditions enabling transformation:** - Crisis creating window of opportunity (economic depression, climate disaster, political legitimacy collapse) - Sustained political leadership (10-20 years commitment transcending electoral cycles) - Popular mobilization (regional pressure overwhelming Westminster resistance) - Elite legitimacy crisis (current arrangements become politically unsustainable)

**Without these conditions:** Incremental changes likely (pilot programmes, small-scale replication of Preston Model), but structural transformation improbable. Elite resistance varieties and institutional path dependencies maintain centralization despite rhetoric of “levelling up” or “regional development.”

**Probability assessment:** Marginal improvements (20-30% likelihood next decade), transformative redistribution (10-20% likelihood, contingent on crisis), system continuation with periodic symbolic gestures (50-60% likelihood).

## 7. VARIETY DYNAMICS CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING

**What Variety Dynamics reveals that conventional analysis misses:**

### 1. Structural impossibility vs. implementation failure

Conventional analysis: Regional policies fail due to insufficient funding, wrong design, poor implementation.

Variety Dynamics reveals: Policies structurally cannot succeed when facing exponentially reinforcing feedback loops and transaction cost asymmetries. Not implementation problem but analytical framework problem - causal interventions insufficient for hyper-complex systems.

### 2. Variety concentration as root dynamic

Conventional analysis: Examines symptoms separately (housing crisis, youth unemployment, regional decline).

Variety Dynamics reveals: All symptoms emerge from underlying variety concentration mechanisms. London's fiscal/institutional/infrastructure monopoly creates self-reinforcing dynamics generating all observed outcomes. Addressing symptoms individually fails because root variety distributions unchanged.

### **3. Transaction cost leverage**

Conventional analysis: Evaluates policies on resource costs (how much money required).

Variety Dynamics reveals: Most powerful interventions manipulate transaction costs not resource transfers. Fiscal federalism, progressive procurement, institutional relocation redistribute control varieties at relatively low financial cost but high political cost (elite resistance). Explains why politically "difficult" interventions more effective than expensive but politically safe ones.

### **4. Preston Model as Variety Dynamics validation**

Conventional analysis: Treats Preston as local success story, interesting but not generalizable.

Variety Dynamics reveals: Preston validates core Variety Dynamics principles (variety redistribution more effective than resource transfer, transaction cost manipulation high-leverage, building organizational varieties before redistributing control varieties). Model generalizable to any location with sufficient anchor institutions.

### **5. Threshold convergence risks**

Conventional analysis: Examines each crisis separately, assumes gradual deterioration.

Variety Dynamics reveals: Multiple thresholds approaching simultaneously (Axiom 48), with interaction effects. System exhibits potential for discontinuous transformation when multiple varieties cross critical points. Explains why gradual decline can suddenly become systemic crisis.

---

## **8. GENERALIZABILITY TO OTHER SYSTEMS**

**Variety Dynamics principles demonstrated in UK regional development apply to:**

**Similar governance systems:** - France (Paris centralization vs. regions) - Spain (Madrid vs. autonomous communities) - Italy (North-South divide) - Australia (Sydney/Melbourne vs. periphery)

**Comparable variety concentration dynamics:** - US regional inequality (coastal vs. inland)  
- China (coastal provinces vs. interior) - Brazil (São Paulo concentration) - South Africa  
(Johannesburg/Cape Town vs. rural)

**Analogous hyper-complex systems:** - Healthcare systems (specialist vs. generalist, urban vs. rural varieties) - Educational systems (elite vs. mass, research vs. teaching varieties) - Housing markets (ownership vs. rental, development vs. affordability varieties) - Climate policy (mitigation vs. adaptation, present vs. future varieties)

**Variety Dynamics framework transfers because:** - Variety asymmetries create power concentrations universally - Transaction costs scale exponentially regardless of domain - Feedback loops generate self-reinforcing dynamics in all complex systems - Threshold phenomena occur across system types.

## 9. FURTHER RESOURCES

**Full Analysis:** Six detailed research reports available separately covering: 1. Regional Decline and London's Power Concentration 2. Warning Signs: The 1970s-80s and 1920s-30s Again 3. Regional Poverty and Fragmented Societies 4. The University Mass Education Trap 5. Preston Model and Mondragon: Proven Examples 6. Intervention Strategies

**Related Variety Dynamics Axioms:** - Axiom 1 (variety asymmetry and power) - Axiom 13 (organizational varieties as prerequisites) - Axiom 20, 23 (feedback loops and variety generation) - Axiom 36 (transaction cost exponential scaling) - Axiom 48 (discontinuities and thresholds)

**Methodology:** Human expert Variety Dynamics framework application (T. Love) with AI-assisted variety enumeration and pattern recognition, iterative refinement over multiple analytical sessions.