



## Liaison Committee

### Corrected oral evidence: Special inquiry committee proposals 2020-21

Monday 13 July 2020

10.45 am

Members present: Lord McFall of Alcluith (The Chair); Lord Bradley; Lord Davies of Oldham; Baroness Hayter of Kentish Town; Earl Howe; Lord Judge; Lord Lang of Monkton; Lord Smith of Hindhead; Lord Tyler; Baroness Walmsley.

Evidence Session No. 1

Virtual Proceeding

Questions 1 - 17

#### Witnesses

I: Lord Moynihan.

II: Lord Ravensdale; Lord Browne of Ladyton.

III: Lord Rees of Ludlow.

#### USE OF THE TRANSCRIPT

This is a corrected transcript of evidence taken in public and webcast on [www.parliamentlive.tv](http://www.parliamentlive.tv).

## Examination of witness

Lord Moynihan.

Q1 **The Chair:** The public part of our meeting is now beginning. I draw Members' attention to the declarations of interest that have been circulated. Lord Moynihan will speak on his proposal for a national plan for a sport and recreation special inquiry committee.

Lord Moynihan, welcome to the Liaison Committee hearing. We are grateful to you for attending and speaking to your proposal. The Members are particularly interested in what the proposals will achieve and what difference they will make. Will they fill gaps in our knowledge? Will they be inquiries that do not overlap with the work that any other committees are doing? That is background that we have kept in mind as we have chosen these particular inquiries for shortlist.

**Lord Moynihan:** I would like to thank the Committee for considering this proposal. Since my submission, I have narrowed the focus of the proposed inquiry to the central question of whether the delivery mechanisms are in place for an effective sport, recreation and fitness policy for the 2020s, and, if not, why not, and what recommendations the inquiry would make to assist policymakers in achieving their objectives.

The delivery mechanisms that we are talking about involve interdepartmental co-operation, international federations, UK Sport, Sport England, local government, co-ordination between the devolved nations, clubs, schools, the governing bodies of sport, the private sector, sponsors and the voluntary sector. They all have their part to play.

The question is whether we have a structure that captures the strength of all these bodies to deliver the best outcomes for all members of society, able bodied, disabled, young and old. As to the specific questions you have just asked, would such an inquiry complement the work of departmental Select Committees? Yes. In particular, it would complement the work of the DCMS Select Committee, which is looking at the specific policies and the impact Covid-19 has had on its sectoral responsibilities.

A question in writing was whether the activity proposed can be confined to one session. Yes, I believe the inquiry will command widespread interest outside the House and address the role of enablers in sport and recreation policy, taking into account the growing voices of our sportsmen and women, who can impact public policy, as well as best practice internationally, courtesy of Zoom and Microsoft Teams.

Does the proposed inquiry address areas of policy that cross departmental boundaries? Very definitely, yes. DCMS leads in this sector, but the Department for Education and the Department of Health and Social Care are central to achieving government objectives. The PM's office, Defra, DfID, the FCO, the Home Office, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the MoD all have distinct yet important roles to play. Critically, the question the inquiry would address

is whether the best mechanisms are in place to co-ordinate their contributions.

Finally, the question whether the inquiry will make best use of the knowledge and expertise of Members of the House of Lords was posed to me. Across the House of Lords, we have leading sports administrators, top sports lawyers, leading medics, who have taken a great interest in this, including a former president of the Royal College of Surgeons, many woman Peers with exceptional knowledge of education and children's issues, dance and the challenges of girls participating in sport and recreation, and Members who have excelled at national and international levels in able-bodied and disabled sport. I have spoken to them all and they have a great deal of support for this initiative.

In closing, I think 2021 is a good time, because it will be one of the greatest years of sport in history. This is therefore, I respectfully propose, an excellent time for such an inquiry, which can help to set the framework for effective national plans for sport, recreation and fitness in the 2020s.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for your very coherent presentation and keeping in time. Do Members have any questions to put?

Q2 **Lord Bradley:** Thank you for that presentation. You have listed a huge number of stakeholders. Are you confident that they will all engage and participate, and particularly that the national and international independent governing bodies of sports will participate within a timeframe of 12 months?

**Lord Moynihan:** Yes, I am. I have spoken to some national governing bodies of sport. They are as concerned as I think the inquiry would be about the effectiveness of how the money is disbursed through the governing bodies of sport and particularly through UK Sport and Sport England. I would expect them to warmly welcome this initiative. It would ensure not only that they get the money they need—I hope—to execute and deliver their services to the sportsmen and women, but that they have a better voice, and on top of all that can make sure that their objectives are taken into account. The inquiry will look at whether they are satisfactorily taken into account now. My own experience in sport is that they will have many good recommendations in that context.

Q3 **Earl Howe:** I have two points to put to you. First, the paper clearly shows that the DCMS Committee has been, and indeed is, engaged in a whole range of work that appears to cut across quite a lot of the work that you are proposing. We obviously do not want a whole lot of duplication. A lot of work is also being developed on Sport England's future strategy. Were this to go forward, do you feel there is a danger of that eliminating a significant line of your inquiry? Those were the two points I felt should be covered.

**Lord Moynihan:** Since my original written proposal, I had the benefit of discussing this with the clerks. In those discussions, the inquiry moved to being focused far more on the delivery mechanisms, because a full

assessment of the delivery mechanisms and how effective or ineffective they are is not covered by the current proposed work of the DCMS Select Committee, nor indeed any other committee.

In many respects, a lot of very excellent initiatives have been put forward by the Government. In recent days, we have heard one about obesity among young people that looks not at the policies put in place to tackle obesity but at whether the mechanisms are effective in channelling the Government's objectives to the end results. That is not covered by any of the other Select Committees. For that and for their guidance, I am very grateful to the clerks.

**Q4 Lord Judge:** Is the focus on the national heroes and heroines who will win us gold medals, or on the people who are just struggling along at one mile an hour to cover 10 miles to keep fit? I ask because, whether it is test matches or village and school cricket, if it is both, how are you going to fit them into the 12 months?

**Lord Moynihan:** The former should not take too long. I expect that the committee would look very clearly at the one body that is focused on Olympic and Paralympic success, for example, which is UK Sport. I expect there would be a short and important focus on the delivery mechanism via UK Sport to the governing bodies to deliver elite performance. That would be nothing like as central to the inquiry as the grass-roots delivery of government objectives in education and in health and, indeed, through the DCMS.

That is where most of the challenges exist at the present time, and the inquiry would look carefully at the success or otherwise of the mechanisms that deliver those objectives. The answer to your question is that the focus is far more on grass-roots participation than on elite performance.

**Q5 Lord Lang of Monkton:** Your paper reveals an extraordinary range and diversity of sports bodies. I wonder whether this is what has triggered your inquiry, because on the face of it it could look totally shambolic. I do not know. To me, it seems that one wants the sport organisational side to be as close as possible to the sports involved, and indeed to the different geographies involved, but your paper has a rather praesidial headline referring to a national plan. Could you enlarge on that a little and perhaps reassure those of us who think that it should not be too dominant?

**Lord Moynihan:** An issue that the committee could look at is that, comparing participation in sport and recreation as a percentage of the population in 2005 and now, we are actually worse than we were. We had a remarkable Olympic Games in 2012 and an outstanding urban regeneration legacy. The challenge has been having a sport and recreation legacy across the length and breadth of the United Kingdom.

Looking at the obesity figures announced last week, there are obviously very real concerns. Emerging from Covid, UK fitness published figures last week showing that we have never had such an unfit generation of young people. They are 60% less fit than they would normally be going

into a summer holiday, and regrettably during a summer holiday they become even more unfit.

Against that background, the question is not the issue of government objectives, which from both parties are correct, in my view; it is whether we have the mechanisms that can deliver results from those objectives. There are many departments and they need to work closely together. Is the mechanism for that close co-operation in place? If not, that is the sort of issue that I hope an inquiry would look to address.

It is the same with governing bodies. I found that this theme has not been looked at within Parliament. It would be ideal for the House of Lords because of the expertise that lies within the House. Getting into the detail and the analysis of this could well bring up some very helpful recommendations, which would be warmly accepted by both sport and government.

**The Chair:** Lord Moynihan, could you give us shorter answers please, given the time?

Q6 **Baroness Walmsley:** I have two quick questions. In your original proposal, you talked about accountability of the sports governing bodies. Would you include accountability for the safeguarding and well-being of participants in that? Secondly, there has long been concern about the survivability of minority sports. Would your committee contribute to their survivability in any way?

**Lord Moynihan:** Yes, on both counts. It would also, I hope, decide not only to look at the representation, which is one of the key issues, but to make sure that sport governing bodies were effectively hearing the voices of the athletes in addressing the concerns raised by both your questions. This is becoming more and more commonplace in wider areas of social policy but should be taken into account in sport. Finding the best mechanisms for those voices to be effective needs to be a priority.

**Lord Davies of Oldham:** Chair, you castigated Lord Moynihan for giving an answer that was a bit too long, but it cut my question down to a very great degree. He emphasised what I think we should all realise: the developing crisis in sport and our failure to sustain participation among young people. One reason why I backed this proposal is because I thought it was important for the Committee to direct its focus on those who will suffer most after the pandemic: namely, young people, who have had neither the opportunity to work nor the opportunity to participate in certain areas of sport for a considerable time. We have been letting them down. That is why it is important that we concentrate on this area, and I very much welcome Lord Moynihan's presentation today.

**Lord Moynihan:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Lord Moynihan, that is all the questions. Not for one minute did I castigate you. It was a gentle encouragement to maximise the impact you can make to the Committee. It was in that vein. I agree with

Lord Davies about your presentation. It was very concise, so thank you very much for that.

## Examination of witnesses

Lord Ravensdale and Lord Browne of Ladyton.

**Q7 The Chair:** Good morning, Lord Ravensdale and Lord Browne. The floor is yours for your combined proposal regarding net zero carbon emissions by 2050.

**Lord Browne of Ladyton:** My noble friend Lord Ravensdale and I shall share the opening remarks. There is a need for a process of accountability to robustly test the adequacy and resilience of the Government's plan for net zero by 2050, to examine the evidence base, and to test whether it has effective and robust governance mechanisms and effective methods of co-ordination and ways to harness the contribution and energy of business, academia, sector experts, civic society and the general public. The Committee on Climate Change is an advisory body with no power to carry out this task. Accountability of this nature is the responsibility of Parliament.

The scope and implications of net zero are so significant that a specific committee to consider such horizontal strategic issues is considered the most appropriate way forward. The only current Lords committee considering these issues is limited to an EU context. Related committees in the Commons reflect departmental responsibilities and cannot address cross-cutting issues.

The House of Lords, with its diversity of membership and unique mix of scientific, technical, business, public policy and parliamentary experience, is best placed to discharge that responsibility. From recent debates in your Lordships' House, it is apparent that, while there are competing views about the specific steps required to achieve the target, the knowledge base exists, as does the energy to engage.

**Lord Ravensdale:** Achieving net zero will be one of the most complex political, scientific and engineering challenges of our time. Due to its wide scope and effect, it is fundamentally cross-cutting. It has implications for nearly all government departments. Crucially, it needs to be considered as a system. Despite our clear and simple net zero targets, we do not yet have a road map to underpin that target and detail how we will get there. An overarching framework for how we will govern our net zero target and address the adequacy and resilience of the Government's plans is therefore vital.

One year presents a realistic timetable to produce recommendations that will be foundational in two respects. First, the overwhelming advice from experts is that the next year will be pivotal in ensuring that the right

plans and building blocks are in place for the short, medium and long term to deliver net zero. Secondly, in the lead-up to COP 26 over the next year, the necessity for the UK to demonstrate international leadership only adds to the urgency for adequate scrutiny and a set of foundational recommendations to be in place.

To sum up, this is an unmissable opportunity for the House to pull its considerable expertise together and lead from the front in setting the foundations to ensure that the nation meets this vital goal.

**The Chair:** At the outset, I meant to say that we are interested in what the committee can achieve, what difference it can make, whether it is filling a present gap and whether it overlaps with any other committees that are looking at issues. I think you have addressed that in your pithy presentation. Does anyone wish to ask any either Lord Browne or Lord Ravensdale questions?

Q8 **Baroness Walmsley:** My only hesitation about this very important topic is that it is a big task for a year. However, I firmly think that it needs to be done. I wonder, Lord Browne and Lord Ravensdale, how you would tackle the difficulty of putting together recommendations about a road map in the short time that you have. It seems amazing to me that there is none, but it would not be the only area of policy where there is an objective and a target but no road map. My other committee, the Science and Technology Committee, came across another one only recently. I wonder how you would try to achieve that objective in such a short time.

**Lord Ravensdale:** The implications of net zero are so significant that we almost cannot afford not to be actively scrutinising these issues now, as you alluded to. A carefully structured foundational inquiry that delivers valuable recommendations is capable of being performed in a year.

To go into a bit more detail on the outcomes, the first is the road map. What is required to deliver a clear, measurable road map to net zero, including adaptation to ongoing climate impacts? That would identify where mechanisms to support a road map are already in place, are deficient or need to be created, with a concise set of recommendations. That is a concise scope that can be delivered.

The second is scrutiny and investigation into the adequacy and resilience of the Government's plans. What is in place, what are the gaps, what is being funded and what is not? It is eminently possible to place in scope the foundations of what we need to deliver net zero within one year. Finally, there is also a strong case in the longer term to create a permanent sessional committee to look at climate. This one-year committee could deliver that and then pass the baton to that permanent inquiry afterwards.

**Lord Browne of Ladyton:** This parliamentary responsibility for scrutiny and accountability will be ongoing. It will not stop within a year. Parliament will have to adjust. Almost certainly, the Government's plans, as they are implemented, will change the environment and what needs to

be dealt with as we go along. This will have to be looked at in a modular way. As it turns out, we have COP 26 planned for some months after the committee would report. Looking at it in that context would be a good starting point for such long-term scrutiny.

**Q9 Lord Lang of Monkton:** This is a very important subject. I congratulate you on seeking to organise a Select Committee over it. However, there is an enormous amount of traffic on this particular subject, both in Parliament and outside it. Perhaps you could enlarge a little on this. Do you really feel that you can produce a report that is over and above, outwith, and more embracing and revelatory than all the other work that is going on?

**Lord Browne of Ladyton:** Inevitably, the committee would have to take evidence from people who are otherwise expressing their views about these very challenging issues and producing reports in many cases. The vast majority of the work out there is being done by people who have specific interests and in many cases are promoting individual solutions or packages of solutions.

The fact is that this is an extraordinarily difficult challenge, but it can be broken down into modular stages. As it happens, we have an opening stage that coincides with COP 26, which will give us a framework for this to be done in the next year. This is the beginning of a process that will last a long time for Parliament and the House of Lords. It will be an opportunity for the House of Lords to show relevance to a major issue in the public discourse. It will be an opportunity for us to engage people from a wide, diverse perspective of society, including younger people, and begin to lay the plans for long-term scrutiny and accountability for this process as it proceeds over decades.

**Lord Ravensdale:** That is right. There are a huge number of organisations looking into this, but that should not detract from the really important scrutiny role of Parliament. Democratic scrutiny is vital for something of this magnitude.

It is worth talking about the Committee on Climate Change briefly, because it is the statutory adviser to the Government and Parliament. One of the signatories to our proposal is the deputy chair of the Committee on Climate Change. She clearly recognises the importance of parliamentary scrutiny on this and of a committee to do that.

**Q10 Lord Tyler:** I wanted to follow up precisely the point that Lord Ravensdale made just now about the Committee on Climate Change, which is a statutory committee. Despite what Lord Browne said at the beginning about the interface, perhaps between the two I am not really clear how the expertise of that committee, which is a permanent committee, will feed into this temporary committee. I wanted to make sure that there is no degree of overlap there, which may cause more confusion than clarity.

Lord Ravensdale also said just now that he saw this as leading perhaps to a longer-term committee. I am all for accountability to Parliament and so

on, and maybe there is a problem with the Committee on Climate Change in that it is not accountable to Parliament in the same way perhaps as other institutions. Could either or both of you explain how you would see these two very important exercises co-existing?

**Lord Ravensdale:** To expand on what I said just now about the overlap, it is recognised that the Committee on Climate Change is an advisory body. Only Parliament can carry out that democratic scrutiny role of the Government's plans.

There is a clear difference in what the Committee on Climate Change is looking at. It is looking more at the policy side of it. It is looking at policy and technology and how we will do this. This committee is all about defining that road map—how we organise the governance, the timetable, the milestones and the reporting. There is a clear difference there with what the Committee on Climate Change is trying to achieve. It is that democratic scrutiny of the policy being undertaken that Parliament has to do.

On the permanent committee side, this committee needs to deliver in the next year to feed into the COP and set the foundations for delivering net zero, but net zero needs to be scrutinised all the way through. That is why we see this being part of a staged approach whereby this committee, once it has reported and set the foundations, could pass over to a longer-term committee to provide regular scrutiny of how we are meeting our net zero target.

**Q11 The Chair:** Thank you very much for your presentation. I take it that you consider this a discrete piece of work and you will be able to report within a calendar year. Is that correct?

**Lord Browne of Ladyton:** Yes. I am certain that the committee, when it sets about the task of determining the scope of its work, will be able to report meaningfully within a year. I apologise to Lord Tyler, because I think I may have misled him. My reference to the Committee on Climate Change was to distinguish it from the task that this committee would carry out, not to show an interface between the two of them. I see them as being complementary and not competing, actually. They advise. The accountability element of this can only be done by Parliament and it is a responsibility of Parliament. How to do it is an enormous challenge, but it is the duty of Parliament.

**The Chair:** Thanks for your presentation this morning, the time you have given us and the weight of that presentation.

## Examination of witness

Lord Rees of Ludlow.

**Q12 The Chair:** Lord Rees, good morning and a very hearty welcome. Your proposal is on risk assessment and risk planning. Could you present it now?

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** Covid-19 is a wake-up call. The national risk register mentioned pandemics of influenza type as a serious threat, but said that a new virus could cause up to 100 fatalities. How wrong we were. It reminds us that our interconnected world is vulnerable to new classes of risks, which could cascade nationwide and even globally: widespread breakdowns in the electric grid, cyberattacks on the internet, bio-error, bioterror or massive radiation releases. Compared to familiar threats, carcinogens in food, road accidents and the like, these long-tail or black swan risks are neglected. None as yet has happened on the mega scale of Covid-19, so we are complacent about them, but such events could happen with minimal warning. They are not slowly emergent like climate change.

Any such catastrophe could disrupt social order by overwhelming hospitals, choking basic supplies, et cetera. It is a wise maxim that the unfamiliar is not the same as the improbable. If you multiply the likelihood of such events by the consequences, as in calculating an insurance premium, you would infer that it is prudent to invest far more resources in preventing these threats and enhancing our resilience if the worst happens. We should not just, as it were, prepare for the last war.

A year-long inquiry would focus on generic issues pertaining to all high-impact catastrophes. These span the remit of several departments. They have security aspects and, plainly, a global dimension, too. We want to ask whether our risk register is adequate, whether enough resources and expertise are being deployed on preparation for the risks, whether the Treasury's Green Book discount rate criteria are appropriate for assessing the appropriate scale of investment, and whether international co-operation is being adequately planned. An inquiry can draw on the broad technical, political and security expertise within the House, and 21 Peers have already expressed interest in this proposal, including Lords Crisp, Mair and Willetts and Lady Neville-Jones. It surely could not be timelier than it is today. Thank you very much.

**Q13 Earl Howe:** Thank you very much for that presentation. I am sure we all agree that this is a tremendously important subject. Well, we do agree; otherwise we would not have shortlisted it. Quite rightly, just now you emphasised the need for an adequate process across government for assessing risk. It is the process.

At the same time, I think it is quite clear that the Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy, which, as your paper mentions, is conducting an inquiry into biosecurity, will continue to cover elements of that risk assessment process. For example, the Cabinet Secretary and director of the Civil Contingencies Secretariat recently gave evidence to the JCNSS

on the latest risk assessment. The recent integrated review will look at the risk assessment process and will come under the focus of the JCNSS. Given the JCNSS inquiry, it would be tremendously important for the inquiry that you are proposing to carefully consider its scope and make sure that it really will complement the work going on elsewhere.

If I could put in a personal comment here, I believe it would be best if the inquiry, should it go ahead, avoid Covid-19 altogether and what went wrong. I think we have lost count of the number of committee inquiries into Covid-19. There is likely to be a public inquiry. Whether the committee would be able to assess the whole thing in the round is questionable anyway. While that provides the context for what you are proposing, it should not provide the substance, if I may suggest.

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** I completely agree. We know there is a special inquiry, and there will surely be other 'post mortems' on the aftermath of Covid-19. I mentioned that simply to show that we were underprepared and to indicate that we should consider a whole range of catastrophic threats. In a one-year inquiry, we should focus on generic issues such as the Treasury Green Book, how much we should invest in these long-term uncertain scenarios, and in ensuring that international collaboration is maximum. We need to take advice in drawing up the agenda, avoid overlap and maximise synergies.

- Q14 **Lord Judge:** Earl Howe's question has rather covered the point I wished to make. I want to make sure that this committee will not be interfering with, obstructing or making any difficulties for the Covid-19 Committee that has just been set up and that is looking into the lessons to be learned from the way we have handled the problem.

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** No, absolutely not. The only lesson that is relevant to us is that we were underprepared. I quoted from the 2017 national risk register, which did not have coronaviruses high on the radar at all. We would not address Covid-19.

- Q15 **Baroness Hayter of Kentish Town:** These really are questions to which I know not the answer. Does this approach cover non-physical things, such as an undermining of democracy or a free press? What if our way of doing democracy and decision-making was undermined? Does that appear on a risk register? Would that be covered by this sort of area?

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** I cannot speak for those who compile the national risk register. What I would say, which is relevant, is that if we consider the list of disasters that I gave, such as a massive breakdown in the electricity grid or the internet, or anything like that, the main threat would be to social order and, indeed, a risk of anarchy if hospitals were overwhelmed, communications were zero, food supplies disappeared, et cetera. One has to be prepared, and local governments have to be prepared.

I would make one point. There is one risk that we may over-react to: radiation doses. there would be immediate lockdowns and evacuations. As we learned from Fukushima, the evacuations can do more damage

than the event. The appropriate response needs to be discussed very broadly to see what risks people are prepared to accept.

**Baroness Hayter of Kentish Town:** I actually meant the other way round, not how a disaster would affect government. I realise that we are being broadcast, so I want to be slightly careful. Say an American President did something that undermined people's faith in government. Is that ever seen as a risk—that the problem is something that a Government or the press cause? Does that count as a risk in these risk registers?

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** It should count as a major issue for us as the upper House, surely. I think it would be beyond the remit of this particular one-year inquiry. I am sure you are right. Those are things that worry us very much at the moment.

Q16 **Baroness Walmsley:** Would your committee look at the mechanisms and effectiveness of horizon scanning? The worst risks are those that come from left field, so horizon scanning is a very important part of effective preparedness for risk.

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** I certainly think that we ought to look into the risk register and how risk assessment is carried out. The Covid-19 example that I quoted shows that it was manifestly inadequate. Greater resources need to be applied to it. How much we could achieve in this particular inquiry would be limited insofar as some assessments – threats from terrorism for instance – require access to classified information. It is clear that the horizon scanning is an important first step in this.

**The Chair:** Earl Howe, you asked the first question. Do you wish to come back on that?

**Earl Howe:** No, except to thank Lord Rees and emphasise something that I think he was telling us. This is not just about how the government risk register is compiled; it is about what we do about the risks once they have been identified and how we respond across government to the priorities that the risk register sets. Have I understood you correctly?

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** Yes, indeed. As I mentioned in my presentation, we are clearly underresponding. If you multiply the probability of these events, which no one could say is terribly low, by the immense consequence and work out an insurance premium, you get a sum in the billions or tens of billions. That is what should be spent in minimising the likelihood of these things happening or coping better with them. What is currently being spent is peanuts in comparison.

Q17 **The Chair:** Before we sum up, I asked other parties what their proposal achieves. What difference would it make? Would it fill a gap? Would there be overlap with other departments? Is this a novel element that you are suggesting that no other committee is looking at? I think you have addressed those points, but if you want to add to anything as your final remarks, I would be happy.

**Lord Rees of Ludlow:** I would like to re-emphasise that clearly the issue spans many departments. It also has an international dimension with international organisations—the International Atomic Energy Agency, WHO and all the rest. I think we want to make sure that those in government who have special responsibility for all those domains are activated and take this seriously. Since it is so broad, we will have to take a great deal of advice from departments, avoid overlap with other inquiries, as was said, and of course not be too ambitious about what can be done in a one-year inquiry. Given the range of issues, which I think everyone would agree are under-discussed, we are preparing for the last war. We are not preparing adequately for other catastrophes. I feel that this inquiry could make a big impetus in one year.

**The Chair:** That was an admirable presentation. You had a wide canvas and illustrated to us the issues of low probability but high impact, and the world of radical uncertainty that we exist in. Lord Rees, thank you very much for that. We are indebted.