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The UK faces major policy challenges, both in the short term, as the government charts a path towards Brexit, and in the longer term, as demographic, geopolitical, climatic and technological changes further shape the country. It would be unhelpful, even damaging, to allow either election cycles or our negotiations for leaving the EU to overshadow and distract from these challenges. They are sufficiently long-term and large-scale to require evidence and solutions to be developed now if we are to stave off potential risks and threats in the future.

That is why we asked our circle of colleagues and collaborators what they see as the most pressing policy issues for Britain – issues that run the risk of being side-lined in a time of political upheaval – and possible solutions worth exploring.

While the implications of the UK’s withdrawal from the EU were inevitably a prominent concern for our contributors, they highlighted a diverse range of challenges that they would like to see battling for government bandwidth beyond Brexit. Low productivity, regional disparities, inequality and the impact of fiscal policy across generations were some of the economic issues raised by multiple colleagues, while health and social care – and, crucially, the question of how to adequately fund them – were also recurrent policy priorities. The higher and further education sectors were singled out as needing attention, especially given possible changes in migration. Others have drawn out pressing issues as varied as mental health, housing, criminal justice reform and pensions policy.

This is clearly not a comprehensive list of the big issues facing Britain, but we will be contributing

Analysis, dialogue and an openness to innovative ideas can help address major policy problems, and the Policy Institute will be seeking to play its part in shaping and informing the agenda.

more in the coming months and years, as we pursue a broader programme of work exploring these and other vital issues in greater depth. Analysis, dialogue and an openness to innovative ideas can help address major policy problems, and the Policy Institute will be seeking to play its part in shaping and informing the agenda. Of course, sustainable solutions will require politicians and policymakers to take the long view, and to integrate wider perspectives and evidence. But these issues are consequential for all and merit the strong leadership, time and energy this will take, and we look forward to helping to do so.
The single most important issue currently facing Britain, by a long way, is getting the best possible form of Brexit. This will set the economic and social context for the UK for decades and influence every aspect of national life – for good or ill.

And while the debate around our exit from the European Union has had plenty of air time, it is so far entirely inadequate. There are many feasible forms of Brexit, and the alternatives need to be far more fully aired and discussed. In my opinion, the best form of Brexit deal would be one which leaves the UK inside the single market and the customs union, and renegotiates the operation of the free movement of labour for work and study.

But Brexit aside, there remain significant gaps in our response to growing pressures across central policy areas in the UK. That such gaps exist is hardly surprising, but there is a danger that certain issues get side-lined. For example, the outstanding, almost-existential, issue is the future of work and income, and their distribution across society as modes of production change. This issue is insufficiently considered and discussed, largely because it is so difficult. Other areas in urgent need of solutions include the funding and organisation of health, including social care, and the provision of housing, particularly for young people.

While these issues are not entirely ‘new’, they are policy challenges that have been victims of political short-termism and so remain pressing. In order to address them, we may need new approaches as well as new ways around old barriers.

A starting point would be a constructive, democratic debate on these issues. But this would require a credible opposition able to hold the government to account and offer pragmatic alternatives. It should concern us all, regardless of political persuasion, that British politics doesn’t offer that at the moment.
Demography is the key issue that is not receiving the attention it deserves. It leads directly to a debate about the future size of the state that we want, and relatedly, the kind of investment we want in our public services. Demographic change means that costs, particularly in relation to health and pensions, will rise. Do we therefore want to spend more, and thus increase taxes, or maintain the current size of the state? This is the big debate we should be having.

Another interesting question is about what sort of economy we want in the long term. Where do we see the sources of growth/prosperity coming from? Is it from a data-driven economy – and if so, what’s our attitude to the General Data Protection Regulation and maintaining data flows, for example? Is it from a knowledge-based economy – and if so, what’s our strategy around universities and migration? Or is it from a green economy? The latter is not touched on very much at all.

Finally, how far do we continue with the London-centric finance-based capitalism in a post-Brexit economy? Might we take the opportunity now that the parliamentary buildings are falling apart to do what most other countries do and separate our political and financial capitals – moving the heart of UK politics to, say, Birmingham or Liverpool?
funding of our public services, which remain under huge demographic strain. The political impact of a diminished public sector hasn’t even begun to be addressed, given our politicians are still debating the accuracy of one of the most spurious political promises in living memory – that leaving the EU would give us an extra £350 million a week for the NHS.

Then there’s another major issue facing Britain that troubles me profoundly, but isn’t to do with the EU: it is the peculiar British disease of expensive, small, hard-to-heat homes. Our housing crisis is getting some of the political attention it deserves, but the solutions proposed are still fragmentary and unfunded.
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largely in houses and flats they can’t afford (we subsidise their heating and their council tax) and which pose a huge public health risk (a single fall down the stairs of the precious ‘family home’ can ruin the end of a life, and cost the taxpayer tens of thousands in health and care costs). No one is talking about how to liberate this money to boost the incomes and lifestyles of our older generation, and encourage people to move to homes that meet their needs. And while the parties now talk about house-building, none of them do so on the scale necessary, because they are all in thrall to the idea that the economy only grows, and governments only get re-elected when house prices are rising. They all fall shy of radical reform of our planning system to make it promote – rather than constrain – new building.

Solutions to all these problems have one thing in common: they are slow and require patient, steady investment not only of money but of political capital. This is a time for a more relaxed approach to capital spending, where it is directed to the structural readjustment of our economy to survive outside the world’s largest trading bloc. And the timing of the election means that, at least, there will be five more years before the next test of public opinion, and there is time for difficult policy, slow investment and political patience.
The most pressing policy issue has to be the Brexit negotiations. Several other important questions, especially around industrial policy, will be difficult to tackle while these negotiations remain so uncertain.

A related but somewhat separate issue is the need to tackle inequalities between places. It is clear that the UK has London as a major world city – but other UK cities are relatively small. Despite this, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and some others are now doing reasonably well. But there are other cities which have not seen much recovery even when the UK economy was strengthening. These represent wasted resource, with often low levels of value-added per person.

Resolving the often-particular issues of failing cities or poor suburbs will not be easy. Government will have to be brave in exposing two truths: that the cost of boosting fortunes away from London may impede London’s growth (with a risk of lowering growth for the whole of the UK a little) and that not everywhere can be helped equally – as that means the jam will be spread too thin. Needless to say, neither of these will be universally popular.

Solutions are not easy – that’s part of the reason why more has not been done. But focusing effort and resources on a number of areas, with clear objectives and good understanding of the peculiarities of the places, would enable learning about ‘what works’ and contain criticism of the metropolitan elite.

We also need to deal with ageing and with inequality between and within generations. Older people are now often relatively well-off (as compared with previous generations). Yet many are working on past retirement age due to the fall in annuity rates, while others struggle to obtain or fund the social care needed to make their lives bearable. Meanwhile, younger people are struggling to find homes they can afford and look enviously at older generations – many of whom have accumulated considerable property wealth.

Although there is much discussion about the cost of local authority-funded social care, there is not much consideration given to entitlements. Many adults with few resources or family have social care needs which are sufficient to make their lives uncomfortable and even miserable, but not severe enough to merit local authority support. This is a national scandal – as is the uncomfortable fact that those who can pay for residential care often subsidise those who can’t.

It is encouraging that a review has started on social care. This needs to be very comprehensive and consider the right level of entitlements, the relationship with health, and the acute need for simpler pathways through distressing circumstances for individuals and their families. Above all, there needs to be acceptance that this cost needs to be shared more fairly across society, like the cost of the NHS. Today that means the better-off, but fit, pensioners assisting with the burden.
While Brexit is obviously an all-consuming issue, and it is crucial that Britain obtains a good deal, particularly relating to trade, housing must also be on policymakers’ radars. Home ownership is becoming a distant dream for younger generations, and rented accommodation is becoming increasingly unaffordable for too many. There has been a lack of focus on the housing crisis. Proposed solutions from political parties don’t appear to go far enough, and this is a problem that will only be more difficult to solve further down the line. The solutions to the housing crisis are to initiate a mass building of council houses, deregulate planning laws so that private companies can build more, and also limit migration, at least where house prices are high. The problem here is more one of politics than policy. Older people – who vote – tend to own their homes and don’t want to see their house prices fall, it is politically difficult to relax building restrictions on the green belt, and building council housing has been out of fashion for some time.

Regional inequality is another big problem. The economy is imbalanced, with too much growth being generated and stored in the South East while many regions remain without access to jobs and investment.

The Brexit vote has finally shed some light on regional inequality, and the Conservatives have shown an enthusiasm for implementing an industrial strategy, but it remains to be seen how this will play out.

The best hope to solve regional inequality is to implement a detailed industrial strategy for the regions, linking up businesses, higher education providers and government to capitalise on existing strengths and develop the industries of the future. This is, of course, easier said than done.
Yet despite this, discussion around young people rarely extends beyond education policy.

Investment in adolescent wellbeing has the potential to improve future mental health. In Iceland, research evidence has been used to target investment into the provision of sport and creative activities for adolescents. As a result, young Icelandic people have transformed from some of Europe’s heaviest drinkers, to some of Europe’s healthiest. The activities Iceland has provided have brought multiple benefits, building a sense of community, teaching skills, and giving young people alternatives to using alcohol, drugs or self-harm to deal with stress.

Austerity in the UK has hit young people hard, with huge reductions in funding for community projects, higher education and housing benefits. Instead, we should give back to our young people with targeted investment in their wellbeing. Doing so has the long-term potential to save health and social care money. More importantly, it may save lives.

Social and environmental influences are consistently shown to have a huge impact on mental health; consequently, public policy made without consideration of mental health can have dire ramifications for individuals, whereas positive policies can help create a psychologically resilient society.

Adolescence is a critical period for mental health, determining later risk of drug and alcohol addiction, depression, self-harm and psychosis. Problems and behaviours that begin at this age often have continuing health effects into later life. Mental health issues amongst UK adolescents are on the rise, and according to the World Health Organization young people in England report some of the highest levels of school pressure and some of the lowest levels of life satisfaction in Europe.
Christopher Banks  
*Politics, Philosophy and Law*  
LLB student at King’s

The specific nature of the UK’s future relationship with the European Union is very important. I think there has to be a fundamental commitment to an implementation period for any agreement. This would provide at least some assurances that simply dropping out with no deal in 2019 – with all of the legal problems that would cause – would be mitigated against at the very least. In addition, more clarity is needed about what aspects of EU funding should be ringfenced after the UK has left. These are questions that can and should be answered even before we get into the tougher questions relating to our future trading relationship, much of which is contingent on the progress of negotiations.

While the NHS receives sizeable attention in national debates, the nuance of this debate rarely goes beyond throwing more money at it. If there is to be a spending increase, there also needs to be a costed plan as to how this will be achieved.

The idea of reintroducing grammar schools is receiving nowhere near enough scrutiny and debate given the massive impact it will have on the nature of our education system. I would like to see a discussion of how streaming can be more effectively incorporated into comprehensive schools in a way that doesn’t encourage social division and inequality, but offers more of a range of learning speeds for different children within the same school.

David Willetts  
*Former Universities Minister and Executive Chair of the Resolution Foundation*

The importance of fairness between the generations when we have a triple lock to boost pensions, and when inflation is reducing real value of tax credits for working families, is a particularly pressing policy issue. So too is the stalling of productivity growth since the financial crisis. This is partly the corollary of a good thing – high employment – but it now raises deeper questions about the performance of our economic base.

Inter-generational equity gets much more media attention than it did. Often it is portrayed as a battle between the generations, when I believe there is scope for an appeal to inter-generational solidarity.

> The best single thing we could do for fairness for younger generations is build more houses in the places they want to live.
The best single thing we could do for fairness for younger generations is build more houses in the places they want to live. Governments in the 1950s and 60s created ‘New Towns’ to ease overcrowding and congestion in major cities, by buying land at agricultural values, awarding themselves planning permission, building a lot of houses at a profit and moving on to the next one. We should learn from that approach.

Productivity, too, gets some coverage, but there is little investigation into why productivity in services is performing so poorly. And we should be doing much more to invest in adult learning: there is a damaging preoccupation with early years education, when we should have a better balance across the life cycle.

Gillian Shephard
Conservative member of the House of Lords and former Cabinet Minister

While the negotiations around the terms of exit from the EU are of vital importance, particularly given their impact on every area of our lives – from the economy and trade, to defence, security and more – the underlying domestic drivers of the Brexit vote must also be dealt with. In 2016, the Social Mobility Commission identified 65 social mobility ‘cold spots’ – areas where the least advantaged in society are the least likely to get on in life. In 63 of those areas, people voted to leave the EU.

... the underlying domestic drivers of the Brexit vote must also be dealt with.

All three main political parties are signed up to tackle social mobility issues. The new government must use all the tools at its disposal – every level of the education process, local enterprise partnerships, local government, employers, business and the third sector – to heal potential alienation and division in society arising from the referendum vote, and to make real social mobility work for everyone. Real action is needed, now.

Far-reaching reform of the criminal justice system is long overdue: prisons are overcrowded and reoffending rates are extremely high. It is clear that the current approach is not reducing crime rates effectively enough. There also seems to be a lack of understanding about the mental health services needed by those who are often involved in crime and the possible impact this could have on rates of recidivism.

One possible solution is to enhance mental health screening and services for criminals, and shift to community sentences rather than imprisonment for those who commit non-violent crimes. This could be achieved by pulling together resources that already exist in this sector to enhance community centres, as well as using social impact bonds to incentivise outcomes such as reductions in re-offending.

Another pressing issue is the development of a robust recruitment, retention, education and training policy that will support a sustainable public sector workforce – specifically, those working in the health and social care sectors, who are dealing with an ageing British population and an uncertain future under Brexit.

Emma Wynne Bannister
and Sarah Williams
Global Health and Social Justice MSc students at King’s
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Productivity, too, gets some coverage, but there is little investigation into why productivity in services is performing so poorly. And we should be doing much more to invest in adult learning: there is a damaging preoccupation with early years education, when we should have a better balance across the life cycle.

... the underlying domestic drivers of the Brexit vote must also be dealt with.
Workforce gaps are particularly significant in allied health positions, and the understaffing of these roles is impacting the ability of the NHS to achieve 24/7 services. Many posts in these sectors require academic qualifications, or equivalent experience, that puts the roles beyond the reach of many – including those wishing to return to work following a career break and those seeking to change career.

A review of the qualification requirements for these roles could open up career pathways that are non-academically based, and this could be complemented by a ‘Teach First’-type programme of bursary support.

Another pressing issue is the development of a robust recruitment, retention, education and training policy that will support a sustainable public sector workforce ...

Elle Wadsworth  
Research Assistant, National Addiction Centre at King’s

Almost everyone will have a friend or have family member who requires adult social care services. More attention should be given to the current funding crisis facing this service – one that we all may require.

Completed in 2011, the Dilnot Commission was built on an extensive body of research. The proposed solutions and policy recommendations made to the government – such as a cap on individuals’ social care costs so that there are no unlimited costs and elderly people do not have to sell their homes when they go into care – should be used and not forgotten. A further suggestion would be to increase the means-tested threshold so that more people are eligible for state funding. Data shows that the population of over-65s is set to increase, resulting in more people requiring financial aid. Addressing adult social care needs to be a priority now before even more families are without help.

The decriminalisation of illicit drugs is another important policy area. The treatment of drug users should be moved from being considered a criminal issue to a health issue. This would allow users to seek help for their addiction and drug use, and allow users to gain access to medical or therapeutic help instead of incarceration. Furthermore, in time (with the help of adapted drugs education in schools) this would reshape the public’s view of drug use as a medical issue, reducing stigma and removing the glamour sometimes associated with these substances without increasing access to them. This could help in the current crises with opioids and new psychoactive substances such as Spice.
If you want a safe bet on the issues which won’t be raised in the political knockabout before the election on 8 June, here are three.

First, the financing of the health service. Everyone loves the NHS but no one wants to consider its broken financing model. Demand rises inexorably, driven by an ageing population and the success of new treatments, including some very expensive drugs. All the obvious techniques of cost control have been applied, including the rationalisation of services around fewer centres of provision and attempts at faster processing of patients. But with social care and other public services underfunded, the NHS has become the service of last resort for the elderly, the mentally ill and the Saturday night drunks. A few more billion pounds are pumped in each year but there has been no strategic review of how to match funding and demand. The answer probably lies in a mixture of user charges, insurance and general taxation, but no politician from any side has been bold enough to take on the debate.

Second is the capacity of the civil service to cope with the responsibilities it has been given by one layer of legislation after another. John Manzoni, the head of the civil service machine, has said that civil servants are trying to do 30 per cent more than they can cope with. Brexit is sucking away talent and resources from departments across Whitehall. Energy, transport, health, environment and education are all areas where the demands on civil servants are exceeding their capacity to deliver. This is not helped by a pay freeze which forces civil servants to choose between their own and their families’ interests and the concept of public service. The state has to do less, and those who manage its remaining crucial strategic role have to be paid more. But which politician will speak up for that?

The third issue is the future of the UK’s universities and the wider further education sector – by common assent a source of crucial competitive advantage in the post-Brexit world. The development of talent from all backgrounds is essential if the UK is to be both competitive and socially meritocratic. But how is the sector to be funded and managed? The future status of European and international students and staff is still unresolved in the conflict over immigration policy and numerical targets. Some universities, King’s included, are strong enough to survive almost any outcome. Others who have come to depend on international students are not. Fees cannot take the strain – student debt is already too high. The idea of scrapping fees sounds superficially attractive but doesn’t answer the question of where the money will come from.

Universities are not the only issue worthy of serious attention. The further education sector remains a Cinderella service despite its crucial importance in providing ladders of opportunity for those who don’t fit the standard academic definition of success. At the same time, the world of higher education is overwhelmed by bureaucracy, making universities in particular the last nationalised industry. It cannot be right that the bureaucrats of academia earn more than those who are engaged in primary research or in teaching. Further education has to be properly respected as a core element
of the education system, and universities have to take accountability for the way in which they use the resources they are given. But again, which politician will take on these challenges?

The pressure on politicians are immense. It is easy to see why so many avert their eyes from the underlying problems. But if the country is to thrive and people are to retain their trust in a system of layered democracy, someone must address the difficult questions and use the power of government to correct what is going wrong.

Chris Curry
Director, Pensions Policy Institute

Perhaps the most contentious issue in the policy area I work in, pensions, is around the triple lock for the state pension, which guarantees it will increase each year by the higher of price inflation, wage inflation or 2.5%. Interestingly, though, while most of the commentary seems to be suggesting that the triple lock is unnecessary and unsustainable, three of the largest political parties – Labour, the Liberal Democrats and SNP – are committed to keeping it through the next parliament.

The ‘facts’ often cited around the triple lock focus on the additional cost compared to other ways of increasing the pension, and the growth in average incomes since 2007 of pensioners as a group, compared to the working age population. However, less emphasis is placed on how individual pensioners have fared (over half of those over 60 in 2008 had seen a real fall in their income by 2014) and the level of the pension that people receive which is triple-locked (only those reaching state pension age after April 2016 are eligible for the new state pension of £155.65 per week). Other state pensions – such as the state second pension – and the level of the pension...
compared to historic and overseas state pension levels (both of which are still low) also receive little attention.

In addition, the debate is often portrayed as a generational issue, with the younger, poorer generations subsidising older, wealthier generations. However, this is an unhelpful simplification in a number of ways. There is at least as much difference in the distribution of wealth and incomes within generations as there is across generations. And younger generations also benefit from the triple lock. Without it, state pensions will be lower in future when younger generations start to receive it. To make up for the reduced state pension, they will need to have contributed considerably more (approximately four per cent of salary) in private pensions. The state pension can also redistribute within generations, while private individual saving does not.

So the real debate should not be about the triple lock, but rather the long-term future of the state pension: what purpose is it trying to serve, how much should it be, and what is the best relationship between state and private provision?

Much has been written and said about Brexit, but there are many issues that will still be with us after we leave the EU. The most pressing of these is the long-term funding of the NHS in light of demographic, technological and public health challenges. No political party is prepared to challenge the fundamental premise of ‘cradle to grave’ care, delivered universally, covering virtually all ailments. This allows the public to duck the issue of who pays, and how much, and to expect that the NHS will exponentially deliver the finest care, with the best resources and technology available at any given point in time.

NHS staffing shortages, its inability to use the best available drugs, or to deliver care in a timely manner are mainly related to funding, despite heroic efficiency gains in recent times. It still has significant waste, but that is partly due to the lack of an answer on its long-term sustainable settlement. The issue of funding is not simply one of reaching a European average or of adding a percentage point or two on its budget. It is also an issue when the good is universally available, and there is no obvious cost associated with its use, what impetus is there for broader individual responsibility on the part of the public towards their own welfare and personal health, or indeed to save for an illness-related rainy day?
of the ‘value’ of the common good on offer. When the good is universally available, and there is no obvious cost associated with its use, what impetus is there for broader individual responsibility on the part of the public towards their own welfare and personal health, or indeed to save for an illness-related rainy day?

One solution could be that of co-funding between the exchequer allocation and the individual user for certain treatments. It would have to be means-tested, as the most disadvantaged, young and very old would continue to have universal coverage, but those with the financial resources should expect to pay a small amount to use, for example, GP services. One major point of resistance against this is that there is something uniquely admirable about a system of healthcare cover for all. Another is that once charges come in, their application will grow exponentially and we will end up with a private system. This could be safeguarded against by requiring primary legislation to expand the charging system with certain boundaries. The greatest hurdle to the introduction of a co-payment system, is that no single political party can risk the backlash – so all major parties should come together under the cover of an independent commission.

Another pressing issue is that in the UK we face many challenges that relate to ‘official documentation’. The NHS does not want to check if we are entitled to free treatment, so treats everyone irrespective of whether they are eligible to use the system. Landlords don’t want to ask us for passports as they claim they are not immigration officers, but those without a passport or utility bill struggle to rent, and anyone trying to open a bank account will know of the plethora of documentation which has to be provided. The young or those with non-traditional working lives are particularly disadvantaged if they have left home but not fixed upon a long-term address. Crime, it is also argued, is harder to solve when the identity of a suspect is unknown or cannot be easily ascertained.

Most other developed countries have some form of recognised national identification. But the idea of a national ID card is anathema in the UK. The Labour government tried to introduce national ID cards in 2006, but the legislation failed in the House of Lords over civil liberty concerns. A decade later it is time to revisit the idea. Given how much private information people voluntarily hand over to social media and retailers among others, the idea of a secure national database protected with judicial oversight looks increasingly attractive. Nearly all EU countries have them and it is time we used technology to make our lives simpler.
The first area in real need of reform is prisons. Recently unveiled government plans in this area have focused on increasing prison staff, drug testing and empowering governors via an investment of £1.3 billion. However, current policy has not meaningfully addressed the high rates of recidivism, assault against prisoners and staff alike, suicide in prison (particularly among LGBTQ prisoners) and prisoners’ return to the community upon completion of their sentences. There are a variety of policy options to tackle these concerns which are worthy of further exploration. For example, improving community sentencing programmes could help incentivise magistrates to choose non-custodial punishments, where appropriate, thereby going some way towards reducing the prison population. Other community-level solutions such as victim/offender mediation could also be an option. For those who do require custodial sentences, establishing a mentorship scheme between offenders and those who have successfully reintegrated back into society could help ease the burden on prison staff. It is not enough to just increase prison staff numbers – the quality of those staff
should be improved too. That means the development of staff support services (e.g. training) should be explored, particularly in relation to mitigating suicide risk among vulnerable prison populations.

Healthcare provision is another pressing issue. Rising numbers of people over the age of 65 translate into increasing costs for health and care services and hospitalisation rates, further stretching already depleted NHS resources. While healthcare is often at the top of the political agenda, particular reform of the system to meet the needs of an ageing population is paramount. Three key reforms could start to address this deficit. Experimentation with emerging forms of technology (e.g. data collation and ethics and the use of remote medical monitoring systems), expanding the role of pharmacists in community and primary care to support the management of long-term health issues (e.g. high blood pressure and diabetes) while ensuring the system is well integrated by allowing for more seamless access to data, and empowering staff to innovate based on first-hand interactions with patients. One way to do this could be by implementing ‘hack sessions’ within traditional meetings. Team members within particular units can bring up issues they’ve noticed in their interactions with patients and brainstorm innovative solutions they can test and implement if effective. This will result in efficient and streamlined protocols developed in managing the increasing burden on healthcare practices, especially with long-term diseases afflicting the older population such as stroke and diabetes.

While Brexit is arguably the overriding issue right now, policies regarding the NHS, education and immigration have all received considerable attention recently. Although these are important short-term concerns, less attention is being paid to how to tackle the long-term challenges we face from climate change, resource depletion and overpopulation. One area of particular concern is how we can mitigate the impacts of Brexit on collaborative scientific projects.

Joint European Torus (JET) project provides a clear example of the risks facing the sector. JET has been at the forefront of research into fusion reactors for decades. Located in Oxfordshire and funded by the EU, it is a project that depends entirely on international collaboration. With Brexit and the decision to leave the European Atomic Energy Community, the future funding of JET is currently uncertain.

Given the potential of fusion to provide abundant clean energy, it is essential that this and other projects like it receive continued support. How will we fund and maintain collaborative scientific programmes and ensure our continued involvement in international projects? We must not lose sight of these broader challenges and the need to provide stability and security to the scientific community in these times of change.