1. **How will you and your party act decisively to tackle the crises in the natural environment?**

The environment is not mentioned in the Treaty of Rome. Instead, the EU has sought to impose a suite of policies in its members with the aim of bureaucratic uniformity, resulting in environmental measures which have often been, at best, unsuitable and, at worst, disastrous for the environments which they ought to serve.

Democracies have a far better historical record for preserving the natural environment than do unelected governments of whatever shape. Examples abound of the failures of tyrannies and bureaucracies, from the drying up of the Aral Sea in central Asia as a result of a Soviet irrigation policy — described by former UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon as “one of the planet’s worst environmental disasters”.

In contrast, the United Kingdom has long been a global leader in environmental protection, passing green laws since before two thirds of the EU member states existed as countries. Our earliest legislation – the first Public Health Act – introduced statutory controls on pollution and brought oversight of the water supply, sewerage, drainage and environmental health regulation under a single body. Dating from 1848, it even predates the formation of Germany and Italy as nation states, and further Public Health Acts followed in 1866, 1875, 1904, and 1961.

The National Trust was first incorporated in 1894, and 1907 saw the first National Trust Act passed by Parliament. In 1949 – the year before the Schuman Declaration on the European Coal and Steel Community – Westminster passed the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. This created a National Parks Commission to oversee the creation of 10 national parks and made provision for nature reserves.

The UK thus has a long history of Parliament and civil society co-operating to protect the environment. To complement this, we have for decades provided a strong lead in negotiating international agreements and conventions.

In 1979, for instance, the UK became a founding signatory to the Berne Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, hosted by the Council of Europe. We were equally proactive in our response to the Ramsar Convention on protecting wetlands, signing before any other EEC country, and the UK today administers over 1 million hectares of designated Ramsar sites.

Likewise, we were an early signatory to the 1973 Washington Treaty, establishing the Convention on International Trades in Endangered Species (CITES). Switzerland, Sweden, and Cyprus were the first European states to sign, and the UK was the second EEC nation to join, after only Germany.

The 1960s saw the development of the pan-European Project MAR, established because of concerns for declining water bird populations brought about by the rapid destruction of European marshes and wetlands. The MAR conference has been called a turning point in the development of strategies for conserving these birds, and provides a fine example of co- operation outside the EU: it was the product of collaboration between British, Dutch, and French organisations, and not of the Common Market.

The UK’s proactive attitude continues to this day and we remain an ambitious, optimistic leader on environmental matters. In 2015, for instance, we created the largest contiguous ocean reserve in the world in 834,000 km2 around the Pitcairn Islands. Jo Royle of the Pew Charitable Trusts’ Global Ocean Legacy project said of the scheme: “With this designation, the United Kingdom raises the bar for protection of our ocean and sets a new standard for others to follow.”

It is foolish to suggest that a country with such an outlook and a centuries-long pioneering record will now neglect our commitments and duties to the environment, regardless of the terms on which we leave the European Union. The European Union (Withdrawal) Act undertakes to nationalise the entire acquis communautaire to ensure that there is complete continuity in the way we meet our environmental commitments. Thereafter, our democratically accountable Parliament regains its full control to repeal or amend the existing body of law in the best interests of the United Kingdom and our environment.

Indeed, leaving the EU means that the UK can strengthen our environmental role by retaking a full seat on the world bodies that determine global regulation, at which we are currently represented by the EU collectively. These include the WTO, the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which regulates guidelines on food and food safety. In so doing, we will regain our right to vote in such bodies, as well as our right to initiate new standards and propose amendments to existing ones.

Taking our own place on the International Plant Protection Convention, for example, would give us a far stronger voice in addressing the diseases which are becoming more and more prevalent as globalisation encourages the international trade in plant products. The British Isles being islands ought to convey a natural advantage; by taking back control of our own borders and continuing to collaborate with the Republic of Ireland, we can learn robust lessons from Australia and New Zealand, establishing these islands as a haven for healthy plants, which can then be safely and profitably re-exported.

Energy policy must, naturally, be a key pillar of our environmental efforts. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas and its concentration in the atmosphere is increasing. The main cause of that increase is the burning of fossil fuels.  The atmosphere today is warmer than it was 50 or 100 years ago and carbon dioxide emissions are likely to have caused some (probably most) of the warming since 1950.  I agree with the consensus on all these points.

For as long as I can remember, alarming predictions for the future have been made but none have come close to the apocalyptic scale predicted. The same is true of climate reports. In 1990, the IPCC estimated a global mean temperature increase of 0.3°C per decade. But since 1990 the warming rate has been from 0.12 to 0.19°C per decade, depending on the database used, which falls outside the uncertainty range of the IPCC’s predictions.

Similarly, the IPCC predicted that if CO2 emissions tracked the “Business as Usual” scenario, we would see a rise in global mean temperatures of about 1°C by 2025. CO2 emissions have indeed tracked the “Business as Usual” scenario, but from 1990 to 2017 the increase in temperatures has been 0.31 to 0.49°C depending on the database used.

We must also remember the fact that CO2 emissions have increased green vegetation on the planet by 14%, in a phenomenon dubbed “global greening”. CO2 fertilisation is likely to increase crop water productivity throughout the world, and by up to 48% for rain-fed wheat in arid areas. If realised in the fields, the effects of elevated CO2 could considerably mitigate global yield losses whilst reducing agricultural consumptive water use by between 4 and 17%.

Such findings offer perspective, but nonetheless point to the need for reform of our energy provision. The UK has reduced greenhouse gases by 25% since 2010, whilst decarbonising faster than any other G20 nation since 2000, largely through replacing coal with natural gas. In 2018, renewables generated 33% of the UK’s electricity. This was up from 6.9% in 2010, but we must bear in mind that this is still relatively modest, especially considering that electricity accounts for only around 15% of energy production.

This is welcome news, but we must be careful not to fall into the trap of enacting policies simply to make ourselves feel virtuous, whilst damaging domestic industry and, in reality, simply moving the problem elsewhere. In 2011, for instance, Rio Tinto closed its aluminium smelting operation near Newcastle in response to UK carbon taxes to move its operations elsewhere, costing some 515 jobs.

Similarly, China and India are by far the biggest producers of CO2. While other countries reduced their coal capacity in the 18 months to June this year, for instance, China’s increased its capacity by 42.9GW. 148GW of Chinese coal-fired plants are being built or planned, which matches the current capacity for coal across the entire EU.

UK policymakers must, therefore, be very careful not to damage UK jobs and industries for the sake of gestures which are, ultimately, not saving the planet. The UK produces only about 1% of global emissions, so we cannot solve this problem alone. We must be proactive in working with other countries, which is why we are hosting the global climate change summit in Glasgow in December 2020.

We must innovate our way out of the problem. The UK will need around 40GW of new, low-carbon baseload generation by 2050 to meet the Conservatives’ net-zero emissions target. Technology undoubtedly holds the answer to achieving that, but it is no use setting our hopes on fashionable technologies simply for their superficial or intuitive appeal. Wind turbines, for instance, are already close to their maximum theoretical efficiency – the Betz limit – and their effectiveness will always be determined by the wind available.

Given that, for wind turbines to supply only the annual global growth in demand (and no more), nearly 350,000 would need to be built each year. This is 1.5 times as many as have been built since the early 2000s, and would require more land than the area of the British Isles every year, or an area the size of Russia over 50 years.

Allied to this, the mining of rare-earth metals in Mongolia for the magnets generates toxic and radioactive waste on a massive scale. It takes about 150 tonnes of coal to make a turbine. Were we to build the 350,000 to meet growth, it would need 50 million tonnes per year – about half the EU’s coal-mining output. The arithmetic is, therefore, against wind energy ever making a significant contribution to world energy supply.

Nuclear power is an obvious candidate, but there is a simple, obvious problem in achieving that capacity from large fission plants: there are neither enough suitable sites nor enough time to build them. Reaching the net-zero target would require opening one new Hinkley Point-sized power station every four months between now and 2050. That could cost anything from £6 trillion if we could find enough civil engineers, not to mention the spiralling costs which similar reactor designs have faced at the Olkiluoto nuclear project in Finland and at Flamanville in France, where problems have arisen even to make the technology work.

With small, modular nuclear reactors (SMRs), however, we see a proven technology which can provide power much more flexibly than intermittent renewable sources. Couple that with lower construction costs and the potential to use small reactors in Combined Heat and Power systems, and SMRs become a technology with enormous potential to provide clean, sustainable and reliable energy.

Combined heat and power (CHP) cuts emissions, cuts costs and creates jobs. While the best estimates of efficiency in conventional power stations is around 50% CHP plants can deliver over 90% efficiencies and, despite high capital costs, presents exciting opportunities.

One example is to promote energy efficiency in the NHS. Its buildings consume over £410 million worth of energy and produce 3.7 million tonnes of CO2 every year. Energy use contributes 22% of the total carbon footprint and, in its own terms, the NHS says that this offers many opportunities for saving and efficiency, allowing these savings to be directly reinvested into further reductions in carbon emissions and improved patient care. In 2013, it launched a £50 million fund, aiming to deliver energy savings of £13.7 million a year. CHP comprised a substantial part of this spending.

In the United States, the value of CHP is beginning to be recognised. One state – Massachusetts – has delivered large electricity savings in recent years through CHP. CHP capacity in the United States is currently 83.3GW compared with about 9GW here. Freiburg in Germany now produces over half of its energy from CHP, up from 3% in 1993.

Implemented nationally, this revolutionary programme of localised electricity production would massively increase the resilience of the system, considerably improve energy efficiency overall, and ease pressure on the distribution system.

In December 2017, the Government provided funding of up to £56 million over three years to support SMR research, which could facilitate an expansion in CHP. Outside the EU and its state aid rules, the Government must continue to make this a priority alongside plans for the first conceptual hydrogen fusion power plant by 2024. The Government announced a £200 million investment into the project in October, designed to demonstrate commercial energy production by 2040. In a similar vein, the Advanced Propulsion Centre, based at the University of Warwick, administers a £1bn Government investment fund for promising, low-emission powertrain technologies, including hydrogen fuel cells. In tandem, we can review our regulatory framework to ensure that the burdens and costs of regulation do not unduly hold back full commercial exploitation.

The human race has come through adversity before, by harnessing the full potential of our creative, innovative power and fully exploiting the very latest technologies. Similarly, I am clear that the way ahead on the impact of greenhouse gas emissions is to innovate out of the problem with the very latest, cutting edge techniques.

1. **What will you do to ensure we have farming policies that support land managers in contributing to nature’s recovery?**

Agriculture and management of the countryside ought to be at the forefront of our environmental efforts. I want to see us use cultivated land more efficiently, giving us exciting opportunities to free up more space for biodiversity and wildlife; the adoption of innovative technology is key to meeting the challenge. Outside the EU, the UK will be free to set its own agricultural policy, tailored to our own environment and designed to reward farmers for the environmental good that they do, from preserving habitats to supplying clean water and flood defences.

It is well known that the UK pays far more into the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy than the roughly €4 billion which UK farmers receive from it each year. On top of this cost, the Government has to pay very significant “disallowance” fines for any deviations from the CAP. According to the Comptroller and Auditor General, Sir Amyas Morse, “the total value of cumulative disallowance penalties incurred under CAP 2007-13 is £661 million”, which amounts to over £90 million each year.

Given that we are net contributors to the CAP, and that disallowance payments will naturally end, there is no reason whatever that agricultural support cannot be maintained at (or even exceed) its current levels. Indeed, the Environment Secretary Theresa Villiers has pledged that farming support will be maintained for the life the next Parliament under the Conservatives.

Nonetheless, Brexit does provide an opportunity for significant subsidy reform, offering more tailored support to the needs of UK farmers and the environment. In this regard, we can learn the lessons from the trailblazing path taken by New Zealand and Australia, which have seen spectacular improvements both in the environment and in agricultural profitability following the decision to abandon production subsidies and pro-actively seek relationships with new markets around the world.

In New Zealand, for instance, production subsidies and the need to satisfy Government policy had driven farmers to produce 70 million sheep and another 50 million lambs. With no market for them and no room for storage, some 6 million lambs in a single year were turned into fertiliser. New Zealand farmers were receiving only $6 per lamb. Without production subsidies – and with farmers focused on the consumer rather than the Government – New Zealand farmers receive more than ten times that sum, exporting roughly the same quantity of meat while almost halving the number of sheep. Such growth has been mirrored in New Zealand’s dairy, wine, fruit and horticultural industries, and the liberalisation has even stimulated new industries such as venison.

Embracing genetic technology has been a key factor in improving efficiency. There has, for example, been a focus on producing easy care breeding ewes which are able to lamb outside unaided and produce two lambs. New Zealand Suffolk and Texel now have smaller shoulders to enable easier lambing. A 2017 study comparing Irish and New Zealand sheep found that New Zealand sheep have a lambing difficulty of 2.2% compared to 3.6% for the 5-star replacement Irish sheep and 9.7% for the 1-star replacement Irish sheep.

Meat yield has become more prominent in recent years due to the introduction of payment on meat yield by abattoir Alliance Group. Many stud breeders in New Zealand have been able to assess rams for meat yield by using a CT scanner. According to a study by Meat Promotion Wales, many farmers, since using this technology, have seen meat yield increase from 45% to over 50% and this has enabled an extra $5.00 premium per lamb to be created.

These key issues linked together with other breeding tools such as gene markers for foot rot have enabled the New Zealand farmer to reduce their workload and inevitably increase their sheep numbers and production levels. A single shepherd in New Zealand is able to look after 2,000 ewes comfortably and family farms with one or two workers can keep up to 10,000 breeding sheep.

EasyRams, based in North Shropshire, aims to bring New Zealand techniques and bloodlines to the UK. According to them, the average number of sheep managed by 1 person has risen steadily from 850 to over 4000 since subsidies were abandoned in New Zealand 30 years ago.

New Zealand is not alone in having benefitted from this kind of approach. Australia has signed 9 free trade agreements in the last 12 years, with trade liberalisation reducing the cost of everyday items for consumers and allowing them to spend more money in the rest of the economy. Family-run farms (which make up 99% of the sector) have seen reduced input prices allow them to compete globally, as one of the most successful agricultural sectors in the world, without the need for subsidies. The former Australian High Commissioner to the UK, Alexander Downer, summarises the Australian outlook well, when he says: “I am not aware of any country that has become rich by being protectionist, or by following an economic model based on import substitution. Hermit kingdoms are not happy, wealthy or successful. Protectionism hinders, rather than helps, an economy.”

We can have confidence that the food-producing areas of the UK could be similarly successful in competing with the world outside the constraints of the CAP. The food chain contributes £85 billion per year to the UK economy, supports 3.5 million jobs, and provides 62 per cent of the food we eat. The food and drink sector is the UK’s largest manufacturing industry – bigger than cars and aerospace combined; it employs one in eight people. Many of these jobs are located in rural areas, and a UK policy must encourage import substitution and the export of quality products.

The benign British climate, the length of our days and our soil quality provide some of the most productive land in the world, as illustrated by Northumbrian farmer Rodney Smith, who broke the world record for the highest wheat yield in 2015 with 16.5 tonnes/hectare. There is also evidence that consumers prefer to buy local, regardless of cost, with a recent study suggesting that 51% of consumers would by the same amount of British produce (and 27% would buy more) when given the choice against a cheaper imported alternative.

Public procurement by hospitals, schools, defence and prisons is worth £2.4 billion per annum and represents around 5.5 per cent of food service sector sales. We must direct this procurement towards UK producers to provide a baseload demand, and create an expectation for authorities to source nutritious foods of the highest standards, and farmers empowered to supply those products.

In accordance with the 2014 Bonfield Plan and fully compliant with WTO rules, it must be made easier for procurers to deliver an efficient service via a straightforward consistent process, which in turn provides a clear message to suppliers as to what is required. We can thus encourage more SMEs and local suppliers to the market, with systems of assurance in place to maintain a close alignment between procurers and suppliers.

This approach will not, however, be suitable in all regions. In mountainous areas and National Parks, for instance, food production alone is not an adequate means of generating income, yet the environmental work which farmers do underpins the rural tourism industry worth tens of billions of pounds to the economy. A move away from production subsidies emphatically does not mean an end to agricultural support; it is vital that farmers continue to be rewarded for the environmental and public good which they do.

Under the CAP, there has been no mechanism for the market to reward farmers and landowners for the work they do in maintaining and improving these most precious environments, but an independent UK will be able to make such payments. The additional roles of providing national food security, maintaining the cultural landscape, conserving and ameliorating biodiversity, producing saleable water and managing flood control can all be fully rewarded as part of an integrated rural policy. Given the high profile of floods in recent years, there would be clear public support in particular for rewarding farmers for water management and the delivery of clean water. Measures such as these were, in broad terms, set out in the DEFRA consultation document in 2018 and are reflected in current Conservative policy.

Switzerland provides a pertinent example of such policies in action. Particular services are remunerated through direct ecological payments with the aim of creating valuable plant and animal habitats. Farmers are rewarded for extensive meadow land, permanent flowery meadows, preserving natural field margins, reed beds, hedges, copses and wooded river banks amongst others.

Alpine farmers are particular beneficiaries. Many would struggle to compete on the basis of food production alone, but are crucial to the environmental maintenance of the Alps. Every summer, some 220,000 sheep, 20,000 goats, 120,000 cows and 350,000 calves spend three months on upland pastures, and farmers receive payments for this transhumance on the condition that they farm in an environmentally-friendly manner.

Such schemes are in tune with the UK’s long commitment to conservation and are consistent with WTO rules. The WTO identifies agricultural subsidies as being in blue, amber, or green “boxes” according to their distorting effects on production and trade. Those considered to be significantly distorting, including price support and subsidies directly related to production quantities, are placed in the “amber box”. Limits are imposed upon these measures, with only *de minimis* support (5% of agricultural production in developed countries) allowed. However, environmental and conservation schemes, research funding, training programmes and disease control measures – all of the type considered here – are placed in the green box. Since these measures are Government funded and do not distort prices for consumers, no limits are placed upon them.

As well as rewarding farmers for the environmental good that they do, we must be alive to the benefits that embracing technology can bring to the natural environment. Sadly, the EU has been consumed by an overarching desire for bureaucratic uniformity, consigning it to become the Museum of World Farming. Its hostility to new technology, driven by powerful but misguided campaign groups, is causing European research to stagnate, to the detriment of both agricultural yields and the environment.

France, for example, is missing out on over 4.5 tonnes per hectare in its maize yield compared to the US, amounting to a total loss of over 6 million tonnes. That crop could be worth an extra £600 million, or France could free up half a million hectares for wildlife, recreation, or forestry.

Brexit should, therefore, represent a wonderful opportunity to boost productivity outside this failing model. We should embrace the opportunities of innovation, offering farmers the greatest freedom to grow their businesses and consumers the greatest choice of products, while improving the natural environment. We should balance the [precautionary principle](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/05/17/eu-court-hands-bees-boost-backing-insecticide-ban/) – currently interpreted in the most severely prescriptive manner by the EU – with a requirement to uphold the innovation principle.

For decades, the EU has stood squarely against this view. In July last year, the European Court of Justice rejected the advice of its advocate general and ruled that organisms created using the precise gene-editing technique CRISPR-Cas9 should be subject to the same almost prohibitive regulatory hurdles as those created by genetic modification. Scientists from over 70 European research institutes objected to the ban, but the ruling was all too predictable given the EU’s stifling approach to innovation. It will have, as Professor Stefan Jansson from Umeå University puts it, “a chilling effect on research”.

In 2017, for instance, scientists at the Roslin Institute near Edinburgh announced that they had used CRISPR to make pigs immune from Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome virus. This will now be impossible to commercialise under the enormous regulatory burden; no company will risk trying.

Likewise, scientists from the University of Minnesota and Calyxt have used another gene-editing method, TALEN, to produce a wheat resistant to powdery mildew and therefore in need of less fungicide spray. This will make the US more competitive against British wheat growers unable to follow suit.

Progress in genetic technology is merely the natural development of the husbandry which mankind has practised for millennia. We have bred and crossbred plants since the Stone Age to modify their genetic makeup, produce higher yields and promote resistance to pests and disease. Genetic technologies simply eliminate the guesswork but, as Dutch plant scientist René Smulders said, the EU’s approach is “like using a typewriter while the computer has already been invented.”

The potential for these technologies to alleviate food scarcity is vast, in the tradition of Norman Borlaug’s Green Revolution which saw genetic modification of wheat relieve appalling food shortages on the Indian subcontinent to turn it into a net exporter.

Malnutrition more widely still affects almost 2 billion people around the world, accounting for the loss of 3 million young lives each year and stunting the growth of one in four children. Manifestly, new approaches are needed and embracing biotechnology holds the key to that progress.

In tandem with this, genetic technologies can do environmental good. A 2014 survey found that genetic technologies had reduced pesticide use by 36.9% on average around the world, while increasing yields by 21.6%. Its authors found “robust evidence” for the benefits of GM crops for farmers in both developing and developed countries and hoped that it would help to “increase public trust in this technology.”

Overall, therefore, boosting productivity and improving the environment are both, simultaneously possible with an independent, technologically-aware agricultural policy. We must reward farmers for the environmental good which they do, while allowing them to embrace the innovations which will allow them to use cultivated land more efficiently, opening up opportunities to free up more space for biodiversity and wildlife.

1. **What will you do to ensure that proposed development supports high quality, publicly accessible greenspace?**

Increasing biodiversity and habitats should be a priority. The Chancellor confirmed in the Spring Statement that the Government will mandate biodiversity net gain, meaning the delivery of much-needed infrastructure and housing will not come at the expense of vital biodiversity.

Biodiversity net gain will require developers to ensure habitats for wildlife are enhanced, with a 10 per cent increase in habitat compared with the pre-development baseline. Developers will have to assess the type of habitat and its condition before submitting plans, and then demonstrate how they are improving biodiversity, for example by creating green corridors, planting more trees, or forming local nature spaces.

It is also vital that existing local wildlife sites are protected for future generations and recognised as an essential part of our country's natural heritage. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that protection for local wildlife sites will continue. The NPPF lists local wildlife sites as "international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity". Local authorities must "identify, map and safeguard" wildlife sites as part of their local plans.

As I mentioned in my previous answer, embracing agricultural technology can allow cultivated land to be used more efficiently, allowing us to grow more food on less land and, in so doing, freeing up land for forestry, wildlife and recreation.

Technological advances over the course of the 20th century, for instance, mean that the UK now has almost three times as much woodland as it did a century ago. Woodland cover in England was at 5% at the end of the First World War. Today, it stands at over 10%, around the same level as when Chaucer wrote the *Canterbury Tales*, and continues to increase. When I was Environment Secretary, I set a target to reach 15%, the levels of the Domesday Book**,** by 2060 and very much hope that will be met.

I also created the office of Chief Plant Health Officer after the appalling arrival of ash dieback in 2012, and was pleased to see a study published this month identifying the genes that give trees resistance to ash dieback, opening the way to breeding resistant trees and safeguarding ash populations for future generations.

No less important is safeguarding the marine environment. As I mentioned, the UK created the largest contiguous ocean reserve in the world in 834,000 km2 of water around the Pitcairn Islands, which set “a new standard for others to follow.” I introduced the charge on plastic bags as a “blunt instrument” to reduce their use, but in the longer term, we need to set a real price incentive to spur technological advances to develop genuinely biodegradable plastics.

We must also do more to protect our native fauna and flora. Damage from invasive species costs almost £2 billion each year. The red squirrel and the white-clawed crayfish face local and perhaps national extinction as a result of diseases spread by alien grey squirrel and signal crayfish.

The intransigence of the EU has meant that, while studies have been completed, effective action has been woefully slow, and the threat to these native species continues to grow. An invasive flatworm from Brazil – the Obama Flatworm, *Obama nungara* – is a predator of land snails and earthworms, and thus endangers both soil fertility and wildlife. It is already a threat to agriculture in France and is spreading rapidly across Europe. There are 18 further invasive flatworm species already in Europe, and the uncontrolled trade in pot plants is rapidly expanding their reach.

All too often, conservation groups are now reporting the arrival of exotic grasshoppers, wasps, beetles, moths and spiders at garden centres and nurseries, many with the potential to cause dramatic damage to native wildlife and agriculture, only to be met with inaction. It is thus small wonder that the CEO of Buglife, Matt Shardlow, describes our current biosecurity as “feeble”.

The British Isles being islands, however, gives the UK in co-operation with the Republic of Ireland an enormous natural advantage in protecting our landscape from invasive species. With the latest developments in technology and technique, we can capitalise on that advantage to develop a modern, responsive system to predict, monitor, and control the spread of pests and disease. By retaking control of our borders, we can implement a system with the kind of rigour found in Australia and New Zealand, to the benefit of our animal and plant health. This will ensure the safety of British trees, plants, animals and green spaces for generations to come.