



Science and Technology Committee

Oral evidence: [Work of the Chief Scientific Adviser, Foreign and Commonwealth Office](#), HC 988

Wednesday 22 January 2014

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 22 January 2014.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Andrew Miller (Chair); Mr David Heath; David Morris; Stephen Mosley; Pamela Nash; Sarah Newton; Graham Stringer; David Tredinnick

Questions 1-43

Witness: **Professor Robin Grimes**, Chief Scientific Adviser, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, gave evidence.

Q1 Chair: Professor Grimes, welcome to this session. We periodically meet chief scientists with the various Departments on a getting-to-know-you basis. In fact, I was meeting last night with two of your colleagues—one from the Home Office and one from DEFRA—so there is quite a free-flowing dialogue between Parliament and the chief scientists, which we welcome.

Before we get to the meat of the discussion, I want to ask you a question stemming from the exchange that I had with the Foreign Secretary on the Floor of the House yesterday. It is somewhat of a parochial matter, in that it affects my constituency and Stephen Mosley's. I refer to the proposal that Veolia Environmental Services Ltd undertake the destruction of some chemical weapons stocks from Syria. It is a very simple question: are you satisfied that the procedures that are in place are sufficiently robust for us to be able to say to our constituents that there is no additional risk to them, other than those presented by living around a chemical complex?

Professor Grimes: The short answer to that is that I am entirely satisfied that the processes, protocols and safety issues are in place. The materials that we are going to be receiving in the UK are the so-called B chemicals. In order to make an agent that is used in warfare, A chemicals are added to B chemicals, which actually make the agent. The first thing is that they have separated out those two components, and the B chemicals are the ones that we are taking. On their own, they are not in the range of chemical weapons materials.

The second thing is that those B chemicals are ones with which the UK is used to dealing. We use them in a range of different chemical processes, including pharmaceuticals. We are also used to taking them, dealing with the left-over products and incinerating them, indeed at Ellesmere Port, so the health and safety issues and everything are in place.

Actually, can I say that I think it sends a very positive message that the UK is in a position that we can routinely and easily deal with these sorts of materials? I think it is right and proper that we are accepting them and stepping up to the plate.

Q2 Stephen Mosley: The site is in Andrew's constituency, but it is within half a mile of my own constituency as well. If people who are concerned about the situation write to us asking for information that we do not know, are we able to forward them on to you and ask for a response from the Foreign Office?

Professor Grimes: I think that would be right, yes; I don't see why not. I am only 10 months into the job. I have not had that one before, but yes, I think that would be perfectly okay.

Q3 Chair: Thanks very much. Moving on to more general issues, in your short time what do you see as the most pressing scientific issue facing the FCO?

Professor Grimes: Gosh! There are lots of different issues, certainly around climate change, in trying to get our agenda forward internationally, which I think is important. In generic terms, having science increasing up the agenda, and the Foreign Office pushing that agenda, is very important. I am passionately keen that we are able to really use our strengths academically, industrially and in terms of our national labs, to further our national position. It is a rather broad thing, I'm afraid.

Q4 Chair: I understand that the Department has found some money to expand your office. Are all the positions now filled?

Professor Grimes: They will be filled by the middle of February. We have Andrew sitting here, who is my deputy, so today you are seeing some of those new positions filled. Of course, they are reassignments of existing positions within the FCO.

Q5 Chair: But does this mean you will be able to take on more work in the Department than was traditionally the case?

Professor Grimes: Yes. We have already been doing that. The Foreign Office is very open and welcoming to more work in science, technology, engineering and medical-related matters as well. We have to prioritise obviously, but it is looking great.

Q6 David Tredinnick: Following on from that, the Foreign Office departmental improvement plan of June last year indicated that you were preparing an action plan to make "scientific evidence and advice more visible at senior levels." Can you tell us how that is going? Have you made any progress yet on that?

Professor Grimes: That was the Government Office for Science report in 2012; is that right?

Q7 David Tredinnick: This is a departmental improvement plan that came out in June last year. The gist of it was that you were preparing an action plan, whatever the source, to make “scientific evidence and advice more visible at senior levels.” Do you feel that you are making any progress on that?

Professor Grimes: Yes, I do.

David Tredinnick: Going off your last answer, I think you probably are—if that helps you a bit, although I’m not sure it’s my job to help you.

Professor Grimes: There are two things; that is right. There is the departmental plan, which is part of an overall FCO plan, and we have contributed to that. We are in the process, as you heard, of filling those positions and so forth, so yes, I feel very confidently able to say we are doing that.

There is also the Government Office for Science plan, which also made suggestions about expanding what we were doing—people and so forth—and making people more aware within the FCO, and all of that is wound into that as well.

Q8 David Tredinnick: Notwithstanding what you are saying, which is very positive, the Foreign Office departmental improvement plan makes no mention of a science and innovation strategy for the Department. Is that something you would want to formalise, to try to help you again?

Professor Grimes: Yes, absolutely. It has to be up front and central in that planning, but this is a process that we are in at the moment. We are making progress. We have come a long way already, but I must say I am taking very much the long-term view of trying to infiltrate science into the FCO.

Q9 David Tredinnick: I certainly get the feeling intuitively, listening to you, that science has been like Mars to the Earth as far as the Foreign Office is concerned; it is something it has never really looked at. Is that right?

Professor Grimes: That is perhaps a little unfair. I would point to the science and innovation network, which I think is an outstanding organisation and one with which I dealt before I came to the FCO. Indeed, it was one of the reasons why I was keen to apply for the job in the first place. That is telling you that scientists generally out there are proud to be called to go and do work with the FCO. There is a push from the science end to the FCO, and we have the science and innovation network, which is supported very robustly by the FCO, particularly at post.

Q10 David Tredinnick: Finally, diplomacy is really a lot about feel, is it not? Do you think that under these new arrangements the FCO is moving towards being a more evidence-based organisation, or is it still about looking people in the eye across the table and making decisions as the main way of doing it?

Professor Grimes: In the end, you are right. You have to have people who have the experience and have come through the diplomatic system so that they can look you in the

eye and make those sorts of decisions, often when dealing with quite difficult issues. I think science plays a part in that, and there is a greater realisation that science plays a part in that, by being something that is sometimes easier to discuss. In post, people are understanding better how to use science, and that means that they are looking at the evidence and they are understanding how to look at scientific evidence more.

The Foreign Office has always been interested in evidence, in so far as I can tell you that in my 10 months there. It may not be scientific evidence in the way that I am used to persuading my PhD students to use evidence, but it is evidence none the less.

Q11 Graham Stringer: What do you mean by “science diplomacy”?

Professor Grimes: It is one of those terms, indeed, that means different things to different people. From my point of view, science diplomacy is two things. It is the use of science to further our national aims, but it is also the use of diplomacy to promote our science, so it goes both ways. One of the nice things about science diplomacy is that it does benefit both sides and it is clear how it benefits both sides.

Q12 Graham Stringer: I will come back to that in a second. Would you say that the primary purpose of the £375 million announced in the autumn statement to improve research and innovation capacity in emerging powers was for science diplomacy?

Professor Grimes: You are talking about the emerging powers fund.

Graham Stringer: Yes.

Professor Grimes: The emerging powers fund is a BIS fund; it is not an FCO fund. I would not say that its primary purpose was science diplomacy, but there is no doubt that by engaging with these important countries we gain science momentum. It may not have been the primary reason we did it, but certainly it will have a very positive effect.

Q13 Graham Stringer: We have gone a long way here looking for definitions. I am not sure what “science momentum” means.

Professor Grimes: I am really mixing my scientific metaphors here, aren’t I? If I was thinking about engaging with one of the emerging powers through this fund, I would be interested to think about what a particular country’s interests scientifically were, whether or not it had the infrastructure to do that science, and what difference the science that we would be doing with it would make. I am interested in increasing the UK scientists working with the scientists in that country, developing those ties and, for example, increasing the number of research projects leading to research publications, which lead in to new discoveries jointly with those countries for the benefit of both countries; but remember that this is an ODA fund, not primarily for the advantage of the UK.

Q14 Graham Stringer: You are a scientist. Are these benefits measurable, and are they measured?

Professor Grimes: There are simple metrics that you can use to determine how your scientific collaboration with a country is going. One of those obviously is the number of peer-reviewed publications, but of course that in itself is difficult because there are journals and journals, and you want to aim for the ones that will have the biggest impact internationally. You are looking at the number of PhD students, for example—I am talking very broadly here—that you are able to train. Again, you want to be supporting and building the country you are developing with, as well as supporting and developing your own country in that regard. There are different metrics, and you have to look at them quite carefully.

Q15 Graham Stringer: Is there a metric of benefit to this country? I can see the general benefits of having better science in other countries and more qualified scientists, but is there a measured benefit for this country?

Professor Grimes: There are numbers of different ways that you can do that, and again, we need to think about that quite carefully. I would point to the fact that there was a great Royal Society report in 2012, which was able to demonstrate clearly that the impact that publications emanating from international collaboration have, in terms of their citations, was much better. If you are collaborating internationally, your science has more impact; it is better received by the international community; and it leads to more things, so you can measure that.

Q16 Pamela Nash: Professor Grimes, I wanted to know a bit about how you find suddenly being in the realms of Whitehall, coming from an academic background. I understand that you were part of the SAGE for Fukushima and had done a little bit of advisory work here, but how did you find that transition?

Professor Grimes: I am with the Foreign Office three days a week, so theoretically I still have two days a week at Imperial College running my research group, although admittedly one of those tends to be Sunday. I think that that, by the way, is a very important part of my position. It maintains my international credibility, which is an advantage—it is almost a “science diplomacy” point, is it not?

I have been very welcomed by the FCO, and I am just concentrating on the FCO for a moment. I am part of the senior leadership group, which I was very welcome to join and encouraged to make comments on. That gives me insight as well as influence. In terms of across Whitehall, I would point to the chief scientific advisers’ group, which meets for breakfast every Wednesday morning. That is a wonderful institution. I really can’t say enough how positive it is. I feel really privileged to be part of that group.

Going back to the chemical weapons question right at the beginning, Vernon Gibson, who is the MOD’s CSA, I worked together on an hour-by-hour basis to try to understand those issues, which was why I was able to answer the question of course. He is a chemist as well. That was an example; I work closely with Chris Whitty, for example, so I am learning an awful lot from the old hands, as it were. Therefore, in that regard I found it to be very welcome, with lots of ways of getting into different Departments. I don’t think I know well enough to be definitive, but I wonder whether or not this is an example of excellence in cross-Whitehall working.

Q17 Pamela Nash: That is good to hear—good news for a change. Just concentrating on the FCO, what training was there or was there an induction process when you started to teach you about how the Foreign Office works and foreign policy, and how to apply your skills to that?

Professor Grimes: Yes; there were a number of different courses. Obviously, some of them were about practical things like security issues and so on and so forth, and some were about trying to understand the structure of the FCO. I think the FCO have very good training courses. A lot of the things are available to a lot of people. They are quite nice, because you also meet a whole range of people from the FCO. Those courses are not just for director generals; when you go to them you see everybody. That is great, because you talk to them and understand it from the bottom up, sideways in and so forth.

The academy is also going to be developed within the FCO. I am hoping to get involved in that and so give back some training to that. There are also language skills courses, if I was ever to have the time. Everybody is welcome to do those, so it is great; it's really good. In fact, I have taken some ideas from that back to Imperial College.

Q18 Pamela Nash: Fantastic. Is there anything that you think should be changed, whenever there is a successor to yourself?

Professor Grimes: I am hoping that we will be able to have a discussion with the diplomatic academy about the sorts of things that a science and innovation department might be able to offer. I am very much an evolutionist; I am not much of a revolutionist, so I like to work my way into these sorts of things.

Q19 Pamela Nash: It sounds as if you are very suited to the FCO if that is the case. Can I just ask about your working relationship with the Foreign Secretary and the Ministers? How does that work? How are you able to advise them, and how often do they call upon your advice?

Professor Grimes: I suppose the main person I have been interacting with is Hugo Swire. Perhaps one of my successes since I have arrived is in very easily persuading Hugo Swire, who also has prosperity work, so this fits in very nicely with his existing role. He is now the champion of science within the FCO. I think that was a recommendation of the GO-Science proposals for the FCO, so we have done that. Hugo and I have met a number of times. I did a joint thing with him in India on one of the trips that he and I were both on, and I see that increasing with time, as I am understanding what it is that a scientist does to help a Minister and what a Minister does to help. Where is the synergy? I am trying to understand that. I have seen Mr Simmonds as well, and we are in the process of increasing engagement with the Foreign Secretary at the moment in a number of different ways.

Q20 Pamela Nash: To take Hugo Swire first, do you have a set time to meet him regularly, or is that quite an informal working relationship?

Professor Grimes: Do you know, I have thought about that? I am sure he would be open to that, but there need to be issues that you want to talk to him about because he is so busy, so I tend to wait until there are issues we need to talk about together. I have never had any problem in being able to go and see him in his wonderful office, which is the old India office, which is a joy to go to anyway, and of course the history of that is fascinating as well. That is one of the aspects of being in the FCO that is great. I did not feel that I needed to do that, to be honest.

Q21 Pamela Nash: How often have you met Hague?

Professor Grimes: I have communicated with the Foreign Secretary a number of times. In fact I am doing so at the moment quite a lot, but we have not managed to meet up yet. Although I have been there for 10 months, for the first three months I was there for only a day a week. I was offered the job and started a week later, as it were. Imperial College was good enough to let me go for a day a week immediately, so it is early days and we are moving up to a greater engagement. I felt that getting the champion in place and working with him was the great momentum, as it has also been going to post. I have been to 12 posts and thus worked with 12 high commissioners and ambassadors, and got to know them. I felt that that was an extremely important thing on which to concentrate early on.

Q22 Pamela Nash: The information you gave us about your work with Hugo Swire is really good news, but I am surprised, I have to say, that the Foreign Secretary has not called you into his office after 10 months.

Professor Grimes: One of the other ways you communicate with the Foreign Secretary is through diplomatic telegrams—the diptels. He reads all of those. One of my aims has been to work with posts in such a way that there is a positive outcome for science roughly every month. Again, you do not want to do one every single month on a Tuesday or something, but you really want to get that momentum up so that people in posts understand what science can do for them. They communicate that to the Foreign Secretary through the diptels, all of which he reads, so he understands what is going on and what is happening. But again, he is very busy, and there has to be a real reason that needs a specific face-to-face chat, and I have no doubt that that will be happening relatively soon.

Pamela Nash: I understand. We just think that your role is very important and you should meet him.

Professor Grimes: Thank you very much.

Q23 Sarah Newton: You have spoken very positively about the FCO's science and innovation network; in fact it was one of the things that tempted you to apply.

Professor Grimes: Indeed.

Q24 Sarah Newton: This Committee undertook a report and recommended that that particular network work more closely with DFID overseas officers. What progress has been made on this?

Professor Grimes: I see Chris Whitty, the chief scientific adviser at DFID, very regularly. There is an example: we do have lunch every month to go through various issues, as well as seeing each other at the Government chief scientific advisers' breakfasts. He and I are always discussing the issues, and we work together on the emerging powers prosperity fund as well. Therefore, the links with DFID are very, very good indeed, and the work they do is not only very important but also very interesting scientifically. I feel that the relationship is there.

Q25 Sarah Newton: It is wonderful that you meet regularly and have established this good relationship. Can you give us some examples of the fruits that have been borne of that relationship? That is probably totally the wrong analogy, but you know what I mean. A lot has happened as a result of such great collaborative working.

Professor Grimes: I am sure there are agricultural examples. Along with Sally Davies, we have been interested to promote the concerns with health issues. He and I worked together very much on the L'Aquila issues. This is the way scientific advice is given to Governments and the associated issues in Italy, which you know about.

Sarah Newton: Yes.

Professor Grimes: We have been concerned to try to get to the bottom of that together, working specifically, but there are lots of DFID science and innovation office projects—I do not have a list of them in front of me—going on all the time at post.

Q26 Sarah Newton: A colleague wants to ask you questions specifically on that, so I will leave that for now and come to another thing you said. You thought there was real potential to expand the FCO science and innovation capability. Over time, what do you feel could eventually be achieved there?

Professor Grimes: Are you talking about expanding the science and innovation network?

Sarah Newton: Yes, absolutely, and its capabilities.

Professor Grimes: At the moment, we have all the positions filled that the science and innovation network has at its disposal, so I think it is really about trying to understand how to use the science and innovation network to greater effect. They work very hard. Every two years they meet in London. We have a small report, for example, for this year, and I am holding that up at the moment. The annual meeting or the biennial meeting is absolutely excellent and very exciting. I am interested in understanding how to get the information that is developed during the particular visits out to a wider audience. This goes back to the issue that scientists who come on these events are extremely proud to be called upon by the FCO. I want to see the science and innovation network make more use of their enthusiasm. We sometimes do not appreciate the extent to which they would like to do more and develop reports, which can then go into wider circulation. We had a great example recently from Malaysia where the science and innovation officer there helped scientists in an event to do with fisheries and agriculture. I forget the term exactly for that, but I am sure you know. That report then went through their network, but also through the NERC newsletters, to a wider audience. That means there will be more scientists aware

not only of that piece of work, but of the science and innovation network generally. They will be more keen to come on those events and to make the connections that have been made in Malaysia, and also New Zealand in that case. We can make more use of what we do and of the scientists who go on those visits.

Q27 Sarah Newton: Going back to the question about science diplomacy, what would you see as the benefit to the UK through expanding the network in the way you have just described? How would you see the benefits of that?

Professor Grimes: It is the science synergy. We understand the ideas that are being developed in those other countries much better than we would otherwise. Reading the literature is, of course, the traditional way that scientists have gained an understanding, but reading the literature is at least 18 months behind the thinking of those people. Therefore, you go and you have those very focused meetings. Remember that science and innovation officers are very experienced in understanding how to get the most out of two or three days, and getting people round efficiently to more than one place. They bring back that knowledge to the UK, and that informs our thinking and research grant applications; and it also means that scientists from those countries are attracted to come and spend time in the UK, so it is a real win-win-win.

Sarah Newton: That sounds terrific.

Q28 Mr Heath: Round about 15 months ago you could not open a newspaper without it going on and on about Chalara fraxinea—ash dieback disease. I was a newly-appointed Forestry Minister and found it quite difficult to find any information coming in from our FCO network or other sources. Nobody from missions in Warsaw, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, Paris, Brussels or Amsterdam seemed to have picked up the fact that this was an epidemic inevitably reaching us across the English channel. I just wondered to what extent the posts are attuned to that sort of scientific intelligence—if I call it that; it sounds rather grander than what I am talking about—or simply providing an analysis of what is happening, particularly when we are talking about a potential epidemic in plant, animal or human health terms. To what extent are they picking up those signs and feeding them back to London?

Professor Grimes: Of course, a science and innovation officer in a given country has an extraordinarily large, broad remit to look for. If I or Andrew as head of the science and innovation network were to ask a specific question, there is no doubt that they would have the networks and capabilities to find out about that for us. In a situation like that, that would probably occur through a science advisory group for emergencies—a SAGE request. I sit on SAGE. If there was a specific emergency, then I would be able to go. For example, I experienced that in Fukushima. I was on SAGE during Fukushima—not in my capacity with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, but as a sort of jobbing academic. I saw first hand how the different chief scientists were able to go back and ask those sorts of questions. I have no doubt that I would be able to go to post. I would ask those questions, I would get those answers, and it would be a matter of hours.

Q29 Mr Heath: But that is reactive. I am talking about looking forward—or horizon scanning. To what extent are we capable of feeding back potential threats to our UK national

interest and do people feel that is part of their job? They read all the national press within their area; are they picking up things like that? Do they have the expertise to take an informed view of what is important and what is not, and is it something you can instil in our missions?

Professor Grimes: I have no doubt that they would let me know about those things if they saw them and felt they were important. Putting my hand on my heart, I cannot say that we have specifically tasked them to do that formally yet. I take that back with me; it is a very good point. Horizon scanning is something as a scientist in my research area that I do all the time and I encourage my research group to do all the time, so I should be encouraging the science and innovation officers to do that all the time. Of course, there are an awful lot of those things out there, so we would also have to make sure that they did not just completely inundate us with extremely interesting but lots of different things.

Mr Heath: I fully understand that.

Professor Grimes: But that is a really good point, and I will take that back.

Q30 Mr Heath: They would have the vocabulary to deal with it effectively.

Professor Grimes: Yes.

Q31 Mr Heath: Is that in all missions? Where do you have science officers?

Professor Grimes: If my memory serves me correctly, it is 28 different countries.

Q32 Mr Heath: The rest are all classicists and linguists.

Professor Grimes: No, no, no.

Q33 Mr Heath: You can't get rid of our stereotypes of the FCO.

Professor Grimes: Again, as just a thought, when we have our next SIN meeting, I believe that people from this Committee would be invited to come along to the various receptions, training sessions and informative sessions to hear about the actual things going on, and maybe it would be interesting for them to understand about this Committee and how Committees work generally. That would be quite edifying.

Q34 Chair: Many of them have their posts as a result of work done through Parliament, led by members of the Parliamentary and Scientific Committee. For example, Peter Jost campaigned for years and years to expand the network of science counsellors. Maybe the science counsellors ought to engage more effectively with Parliament.

Professor Grimes: By the way, I should point out that, in addition to the science and innovation officers, there are the prosperity officers, and they work together very clearly as well. There are regional hubs which look at other countries surrounding them as well, so it is not quite fair to say it is just 28 countries.

Q35 Chair: David Heath has a strong point here. The knowledge around mainland Europe about what was happening with ash dieback was quite significant, when we look back at it with hindsight, but it did not trickle over here until it trickled over here as a disease. That is a bit unfortunate, is it not?

Professor Grimes: Okay, so we have some work to do there.

Q36 Stephen Mosley: The Cabinet Office is running its formal horizon scanning programme. In fact we have an evidence session on it with the Minister immediately after this meeting. The Foreign Office is involved with four of the five work streams in that programme. What has been your engagement with the horizon scanning programme?

Professor Grimes: I am a member of the risk and horizon scanning expert group. That is a cross-government and cross-disciplinary horizon scanning group. That is chaired by Sir Mark Walport. I provided science and innovation advice across the three FCO priorities. Horizon scanning is really part of the DNA of the FCO from a political and diplomatic point of view, and it needs to become so from a science point of view as well. If I am requested to look at particular things—again, through the chief scientific advisers’ group—I am able to call upon my colleagues and use their networks to make those sorts of processes and programmes available. I feel quite positive about that.

Q37 Stephen Mosley: In terms of embedding the programme in real policy and real work on the ground, it seems to be a fantastic exercise in the office. However, from what we have just heard about what happened with ash dieback, it does not seem to be influencing policy on the ground there. How well embedded do you think horizon scanning is in policy development and real action on the ground?

Professor Grimes: From a diplomatic point of view, it is their bread and butter, but from a science point of view we have established that there is more we can do to enable that.

Q38 Stephen Mosley: On a different topic, can I bring in the British Antarctic Survey? You will probably be aware that about 18 months ago the Committee did a quick report on the proposed merger between BAS and the National Oceanography Centre. Have you been involved in any of the discussions about the future of British Antarctic Survey funding, and whether or not that comes directly from the Foreign Office or not?

Professor Grimes: BAS is funded by NERC, so it is up to NERC to make the decisions associated with that funding; it is not for the Foreign Office to dictate that. However, having said that, we have a very long-standing expert group in the polar regions department. I have to say I am personally interested in it. I have been to the Arctic twice doing glaciological work, so it is something in which I am interested and keep an eye on. I talk to the chief executive of NERC about this, but it is their funding and so is really a BIS issue.

Q39 Chair: Did you have any input into the Government's response to the British Antarctic Survey report that we wrote?

Professor Grimes: Can you remind me of the date of that report?

Q40 Chair: It was before your post. It was in October 2012, so it was before your time, I guess.

Professor Grimes: Unfortunately not. As I have just said, I do have particular research interests in this area, so I certainly would have. There are meetings that we have, and I attend regularly.

Q41 Graham Stringer: Europe and this country are losing research capacity because of the European Union's antagonism to GM foods. It is very difficult to get any authority, even where research has been done on GM goods. What role do you have in turning round that situation? This country is definitely losing both in terms of scientific research and the benefit of GM products.

Professor Grimes: I have to say you have caught me out here. I do not know the answer to that question specifically, but I can find that out for you, if you would like me to.

Q42 Graham Stringer: It is clearly an important part of the work of the Foreign Office to try to change that position. I accept that you do not have the information, but it would be useful if we could have a written response to that.

Professor Grimes: Okay; I will get a response to you on that.

Q43 Chair: Going back to the horizon scanning expert group, can you tell us a little more about that body structurally? Who is on it, and to whom does it report?

Professor Grimes: It is chaired by the Government chief scientific adviser. I went to one meeting early on in my time here. Again, I hope you will forgive me, but I do not have the information in front of me to give you that definitive answer.

Chair: Perhaps you would be kind enough to follow that up as well. Professor Grimes, thank you very much for your attendance this morning. It is interesting to hear about the different parts of the world in which you have responsibility. I am sure the Committee would like to join you on some of your visits, but I do not think the House would pay for them. Thank you for your attendance this morning.