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Summary

The day-to-day too often crowds out preparation for the longer term and the unexpected. There are isolated instances of systematic and imaginative analysis of trends, risks and possibilities around Whitehall. There are also some policies which represent genuine efforts to confront long-term challenges on a cross-government basis, such as the Better Care Fund, which aims to improve the integration of health and social care services for older and disabled people. Whitehall is developing useful tools. The National Risk Register assesses probabilities like natural disasters and terrorist attacks. Whole of Government Accounts provide deeper understanding of matters such as the £2,893 billion long-term liabilities of Government. However, there is no comprehensive understanding across Government as a whole of the future risks and challenges facing the UK.

The most surprising and urgent gap we found was in HM Treasury. We have not seen sufficient evidence that it has absorbed a key lesson of the 2007-08 financial crash: how best to prepare for another financial crisis as a consequence of the interconnectedness of financial uncertainty with wider risks and uncertainties. The Treasury acknowledged to us that the UK remains exposed to the risk of another adverse global economic event, such as the impact of a crisis in the Eurozone, and that this could be on the same scale as the 2007-08 financial crash. London is a financial centre of the world economy, whose major institutions remain vulnerable and exposed. We welcome that the Treasury does contingency planning, and the Bank of England’s role and structures have been strengthened. Yet financial and economic risks are not included in the Government’s National Risk Register, so the Government does not consider these systemic risks alongside other, non-financial risks, such as pandemic flu and antimicrobial resistance, and different responsibilities and functions are divided between the Bank of England, Financial Conduct Authority and the Treasury. Market-wide exercises have been conducted to test resilience, but not on a comprehensive basis to address the risk of systemic financial collapse triggered by an unexpected event.

We recommend that the Treasury should undertake planning for a range of crisis scenarios, based on a broad range of forecasts, data sources and assumptions, and which may be triggered by non-financial as well as financial events. It should conduct desk-top exercises (“war games”) involving the Bank of England and the Financial Conduct Authority to test institutional responses and systemic resilience. This should inform a wider programme of cross-government exercises to test policy resilience (financial, economic, political and strategic).

We recommend the Cabinet Office include systemic financial and economic risks in its National Risk Register; and ensure that lessons learned from this are synthesised into policy making and spending decisions. This is not just to ensure financial and systemic resilience. The Treasury lays claim to responsibility for economic growth. It accepts that “slow productivity growth” raises “massive issues” for the future, but does not yet seem to appreciate the role of Government in promoting new technology and innovation across the public sector and in the private sector, such as in reducing CO₂ emissions in transport, or leading the revolution in electrical energy storage. The Government must set out how it
will exploit all the available knowledge to counter this risk of “secular stagnation” in the economy by seeking out and exploiting opportunities to promote growth through innovation.

We welcome the establishment of the Cabinet Office’s horizon scanning programme team, but this five-person team is too small to gather, let alone synthesise, all the relevant understanding generated around Government. The Canadian equivalent, Policy Horizons Canada, has some 25 staff and draws on a large number of outside experts. The Government thus cannot identify, assess and synthesise this information and so advise ministers on how to address gaps or duplication in policy and plans made by government departments, or to resolve conflicts and generate a comprehensive view of the key policy risks and challenges. The failure to act quickly on the developing Ebola epidemic in West Africa is an example, costing thousands of lives and billions in aid. This failure was by no means unique to the UK but we found that the Chief Medical Officer and the Joint Intelligence Committee combined their understanding too late for timely action.

Horizon scanning and financial planning are disjointed. There is growing awareness of the need for coordination between horizon scanning and risk assessment, but not of the need for coordination between horizon scanning and public investment decisions. The capacity is needed to generate and implement cross-government financial plans, as opposed to merely collating departmental actions and calling them a plan. The new Chief Executive of the Civil Service points out that “normally, in the headquarters of a company”, his role and the Treasury’s responsibility for setting spending limits across government would be “in one headquarters”. Some, like the new think tank GovernUp, recommend major structural reform, and the creation of a new Office of Budget and Management, to be set up in the Cabinet Office. There is a clear requirement for new capacity to inform spending reviews and decisions about financial priorities. It must be capable of formulating and overseeing the implementation of cross-government financial plans. We recommend that the Government sets out how leadership of this work will be shared by the Chief Executive of the Civil Service and the Treasury, so that their work is integrated. It should be presented in the form of advice to Cabinet, its committees, and individual Ministers to inform decisions about spending, investment and policy.

Early in the next Parliament, the Government needs to set out how it will improve the machinery of government and better educate civil servants at all levels to think about systemic risk, risk management, uncertainty and future challenges. We recommend that senior civil servants’ career development includes a period with the Cabinet Office’s horizon scanning programme team, in order to understand its role, and long-term thinking, fresh ideas and challenge. This would provide the unit with much needed extra capacity. The capacity to analyse, assess and plan for the future should be used better to underpin far-reaching decisions on systemic issues such as infrastructure, technology, financial regulation, defence and security. This is vital not just to build resilience to unforeseen adverse events but also to increase the UK’s capability to exploit opportunities and innovation, which is necessary to remain competitive and viable. Parliament should follow-up and scrutinise progress on the quality and impact of this Whitehall capacity.
Leadership for the long term: Whitehall’s capacity to address future challenges

1 Introduction

1. The problem is well-rehearsed. Most policy making is short-termist, reactive and uncoordinated. While the Government rises to the occasion when faced with a crisis, equally vital but less pressing issues which require coordination across departments are not always addressed. These range from the failure to anticipate winter pressures on NHS beds, to the failure to prevent flooding, or failure to respond to the changing intentions of adversaries, leading to military conflict. There are a range of mechanisms for encouraging longer-term thinking which the Government could adopt, as Professor Jonathan Boston of the Victoria University of Wellington has set out.1 They fall into four categories:

i) changing who makes important decisions,
ii) imposing formal constraints on decision-makers,
iii) changing incentives, and
iv) enhancing the capacity to make far-sighted decisions.

This Report focuses on the fourth category, particularly on the capacity of the Civil Service to give comprehensive and far-sighted advice to UK Government ministers, and the ability to implement policy. Future challenges confront all levels of Government from local councils to international institutions, but this Report focuses on the UK Government and Civil Service.

2. Our inquiry was prompted in part by the 2007-08 financial crisis (see Box 1). We have previously inquired into the strategic challenges facing the UK Government. In April 2012 we published Strategic thinking in Government: without National Strategy, can viable Government strategy emerge? and before that in October 2010, Who does UK National Strategy?.2 Both reports concluded that to tackle the UK’s complex, diverse and unpredictable domestic and global challenges, Government needs more capacity to support strategic leadership. There was little confidence that government policies were informed by a clear, coherent approach. Governing the future, published in 2007 by our predecessor Committee, also urged the Government to take a more coherent approach to strategic thinking.3

3. Written submissions and transcripts of our five oral evidence sessions are available on our website at www.parliament.uk/pasc. We are grateful to all those who gave evidence and to our Specialist Advisers, Dr Jamie MacIntosh of UCL and Dr Gillian Stamp, for their help with this inquiry.4

---

1 Jonathan Boston, Governing for the Future: How to bring the long-term into short-term political focus, Paper prepared for a seminar at the Centre for Environmental Policy, School of Public Affairs, American University, Washington D.C., November 2014.


4 Dr Jamie Macintosh, who is a Ministry of Defence employee on secondment as Director of the UCL Institute for Security and Resilience Studies, was appointed as a Specialist Adviser for this inquiry on 10 September 2014. He
Box 1: Financial crisis and aftermath

The financial crisis of 2007–2008 resulted in the threat of total collapse of large financial institutions, the bailout of banks by national Governments, and stock market downturns around the world. Andrew Haldane, Chief Economist at the Bank of England, said in 2012 that: “in terms of the loss of incomes and outputs, this is as bad as a world war. That is the scale we are talking about.”

Real UK GDP, 2007–2014, index 2008=100

A group of constitutional experts and economists wrote a letter to The Queen in November 2009 which contended that “the failure to foresee the timing, extent and severity of the crisis and to head it off … was principally a failure of the collective imagination of many bright people, both in this country and internationally, to understand the risks to the system as a whole.”

The Treasury published in March 2012 a review of its response to the global financial crisis. This records that as early as 2005 the principal forum for agreeing policy and coordinating action between the Treasury, the Bank of England and the Financial Services Authority, the standing committee on financial stability, identified the lack of a legislative basis to resolve failing banks. The review states that:

“Remedying this was not deemed to be a priority by the Treasury in the context of the benign financial climate. War games were played for the scenario of an individual institution failure but not for a system-wide crisis, which was judged to be highly improbable.”

---

declared the following interests: Member, Advisory Council of Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), First Division Association, and International Institute of Strategic Studies. Dr Gillian Stamp was appointed as a Specialist Adviser to the Committee on 22 December 2014. She declared no relevant interests.

5 ‘Bank crisis impact bad as world war, Andrew Haldane says’, BBC News, 3 December 2012
6 Office for National Statistics, June 2014
7 Press release, British Academy, 22 July 2009, including text of letter
8 HM Treasury, Review of HM Treasury’s management response to the financial crisis, March 2012
Limitations in government capacity

4. Our inquiry explored the problems and tensions which apply to policy making in the present and as Governments try to plan for the future (see Table 1). They all arise from the attitude, behaviour and structure of Government.

Table 1: Tensions when Governments look ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong futures analysis capability in central Government</th>
<th>Strong external analysis and challenge outside Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open publication of futures analysis</td>
<td>Quiet influencing freed from political considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If analysis looks too far ahead it may be ignored</td>
<td>If analysis does not look far enough ahead it may be treated as business-as-usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship role of the Civil Service, looking beyond the next election</td>
<td>Strong ministerial leadership today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist leadership may be able to think deeply about particular challenges and opportunities, but may lose the broader view</td>
<td>Generalist leadership may be able to see the broader view but may be uninformed on particular challenges and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The centre of Government is able to take a long-term view and challenge departmental thinking</td>
<td>Departments have practical experience and in-depth knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it</td>
<td>Those who do learn from history might learn how to refight the last war, not the next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short and inconsistent time horizons

5. There is long-term thinking in Government, but the evidence is that the short-term dominates. There is more reward for ministers and civil servants in ‘rising to the occasion’ than in preventing such occasions from arising in the first place, so that analysis and action are skewed to the short-term, argues the School of International Futures, a consultancy.

6. It is an additional challenge for Ministers and senior officials to find time to engage with issues that might not have an impact for anything up to 50 years, if at all. HM Treasury

---

9 For example, Institute of Risk Management (WFC2), Institute for Government (WFC10), School of International Futures (WFC11)

10 School of International Futures (WFC11)

11 Cabinet Office, Review of cross-government horizon scanning, January 2013
Permanent Secretary Sir Nicholas Macpherson was our only witness who argued to the contrary. He told us successive Governments had taken long-term decisions on pensions and the age of retirement with “virtually no consequences in the short run” but “very big long-term financial consequences.” It is true that Adair Turner’s Pensions Commission (2002-06) was identified by the Institute for Government as a policy making success story. However, the sustainability of pensions policy had been the subject of criticism for many years by Select Committees.

7. The time horizons adopted by different departments vary widely, as was shown by evidence to our inquiry on Strategic thinking in Government. Speaking in December 2011, former Special Adviser Matt Cavanagh cited policy on Afghanistan: the Department for International Development were working to a ten year time horizon, the Ministry of Defence were operating on a six month time scale, matching six month tours of operation, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office on what felt to him like a one week time scale. The Rt Hon Francis Maude MP, Minister for the Cabinet Office, told us that there was no particular future date the Civil Service should look to as it plans its future capacity and capability. He explained:

> It depends on what you are talking about. In terms of leadership, we should be building the leadership for 40 years hence now. It is not too early now. In terms of digital skills, that will be over the next five years. Commercial is much more—there is no one-size-fits-all answer.

**Being reactive to events and crises, not proactive**

8. The ability to pre-empt a crisis can save a Government from enormous financial and political consequences. However, many commentators see government inaction in the face of an impending problem, only to be followed by a feverish response that begins once the crisis hits. As Sir Nicholas Macpherson acknowledged in July 2014, “when projects fail or are running into difficulties, there is a huge amount of activity in the centre.” The Public Accounts Committee concluded in October 2014 that “the centre [of Government] is often reactive in its response rather than able to anticipate potentially serious problems.”

9. The Prime Minister has acknowledged that the National Security Council has tended to focus on crises rather than longer-term challenges, but appeared sanguine about this:

---

12 Q 262
17 For example, former Special Adviser Dominic Cummings, ‘My essay on an ‘Odyssean’ Education’, October 2013
18 Oral evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee on 7 July 2014, HC (2014–15) 107-i, Q 40
If the criticism is that urgent operational meetings [...] tend to crowd out more thematic discussions, I think that I would probably plead guilty. I think that it is inevitable that, when Governments have to prioritise and choose, they will talk about the most urgent things. I would say that we have spent more time on the operational emergencies than on blue-sky thinking.  

10. Francis Maude MP told us that government horizon scanning has tended to focus more on threats than opportunities. However, the Government’s Chief Scientific Adviser, Sir Mark Walport, has pressed for an emphasis on looking for opportunities: “innovation is essential if we are effectively and cost-effectively to futureproof our national infrastructure.”

‘Re-fighting the last war’

11. There is a risk that policy makers address past problems, not future challenges, as our government witnesses acknowledged. The Minister for Government Policy, the Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP, in respect of H1N1 swine flu, told us “I think you should always try to learn from what happened last time. You also have to be very careful not to learn the wrong lessons from it and not to think that the future will also look like […] the past”. Sir Nicholas Macpherson also shared this view:

Chair: What happens if the next financial crash is of a completely different type?

Sir Nicholas Macpherson: It is bound to be different. The risk at the moment is that we all spend our time re-fighting the last war.

Lack of coordination between government departments

12. We have previously identified the need for work across departments to help Government deal with current issues and react to future challenges. Author and economist Wolfgang Michalski has provided a succinct summary of the problem of cross-cutting problems addressed in isolation by separate public bodies:

Most of the key problems faced by governments are horizontal and most of government responses are vertical.

---

20 Minutes of evidence taken before the Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy, National Security Strategy, Q 1, HC 1040, January 2014
23 Q 496
24 Q 225
A number of our witnesses commented on the inter-connected nature of future challenges. For example, the British Heart Foundation argues that public health prevention should not be the sole responsibility of the Department of Health, since a person’s propensity to develop illnesses arises from interactions across Government, from habits learned at school, to the way cities are designed, to employers’ responsibilities for workforce wellbeing.

13. The Government acknowledges this problem. As Sir Jeremy Heywood, then Cabinet Secretary and now also Head of the Civil Service put it in July 2014, “many Governments over many years have struggled with the issue of how to ensure that cross-departmental issues are taken forward with the same vigour as issues that fall to one Department.” Oliver Letwin also recognised “a persistent tendency [...] for people [...] not to talk sufficiently between Departments and share enough the knowledge which they have and the understandings which they have.”

14. This problem affects longer-term thinking in Government. Sir Jeremy told us that “in many individual Departments there are pockets of people doing work on future thinking—horizon-scanning; strategic planning; whatever you want to call it—but [...] those people do not join up.” The establishment of the Cabinet Office’s horizon scanning programme team aims to address this problem. Jon Day, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, is one of the two senior civil servants to whom the unit’s staff report. He told us that: “Each Department has its own horizon scanning policy development machinery” but “this work is stovepiped and inconsistent.” This results, said Professor Michael Clarke of the Royal United Services Institute, in “too many overlapping horizon scanning documents.”

15. We prompted Jon Day and Professor Dame Sally Davies, the Government’s Chief Medical Officer, to explain why there had been such a slow response to the threat posed by the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa. Dame Sally said “there was slowness from everyone, including the WHO [World Health Organisation] and our international partners [...] what we expected to happen was the same as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where it starts in villages and they isolate it and contain it and it doesn’t spread.” Dame Sally said the lesson is that the WHO needs reform, though later accepted that “we should have discussed it [Ebola] with the Joint Intelligence Committee”. We pressed Jon Day to explain why there had been such a slow response to the threat posed by

---

27 For example, Q 63 [Professor Dame Julia Slingo]
28 British Heart Foundation (WFC13)
29 Q 76
30 Q 457
31 Q 406 and see also Academy of Social Sciences (WFC4)
32 Q 121
33 Q 133
34 Q 69
35 Q 171-172
36 Q 174 and Q 178
the outbreak. He acknowledged that intelligence processes and analysis of health developments could have been better connected, and he said:

[The Joint Intelligence Committee has] a ‘countries at risk of instability’ process, which identified the countries we are talking about as potentially vulnerable to things like disease. What we have not done—this, I think, is a lesson we do need to learn—is to link in with what is happening on the health side.\textsuperscript{37}

The result was that Ebola was not discussed in the Joint Intelligence Committee, COBR (Cabinet Office Briefing Room, which coordinates the Government’s response in an emergency), or the National Security Council until 7 August 2014.\textsuperscript{38} The outbreak was first reported in March 2014.\textsuperscript{39}

16. Numerous attempts have been made to improve cross-departmental working. Sir Jeremy rejected the criticism that cross-government working by civil servants did not equate to working for the Government as a whole: “if you pull together a group of civil servants and give them a cross-cutting task to work out, they are perfectly capable of working to that common task.”\textsuperscript{40} Sir Nicholas told us the Treasury had “a role” to play in removing the obstacles to cross-government working.\textsuperscript{41}

17. In 2007, the Scottish Government abolished the departmental structure, with head of department roles redefined around outcomes or functions rather than departments, reinforcing the idea of Government as a single organisation with a sole purpose and a single way of setting out and tracking progress towards desired outcomes, the ‘National Performance Framework’.\textsuperscript{42}

18. There are examples of good cross-government working. In evidence to the Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy in January 2014, the Prime Minister argued that the National Security Council is “a real success” in bringing together different departments’ perspectives, “making sure that the great fiefdoms of Whitehall—Defence, the Foreign Office, DfID—play together rather than separately.”\textsuperscript{43} The Ministry of Defence’s report \textit{Global Strategic Trends - Out to 2045}, was published in June 2014. Rear Admiral John Kingwell, Director of the Ministry of Defence’s Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre, told us that this publication is “the best of class, best of its type […] in the amount of cross-government work and workshops and engagement.”\textsuperscript{44} We found this

\textsuperscript{37} Q 174
\textsuperscript{38} Q 180-182 [Campbell McCafferty].
\textsuperscript{39} ‘Ebola: mapping the outbreak’, \textit{BBC News}, 25 February 2015
\textsuperscript{40} Q 415
\textsuperscript{41} Q 248
\textsuperscript{43} DfID is the Department for International Development. Minutes of evidence taken before the Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy, \textit{National Security Strategy}, Q 1, HC 1040, January 2014
\textsuperscript{44} Q 141
work is internationally respected.\textsuperscript{45} Campbell McCafferty, Director of the Cabinet Office’s Civil Contingencies Secretariat, told us the report is used “to inform the work that we are doing in the national security risk assessment, which will inform the next national security strategy”.\textsuperscript{46}

19. Major General Jonathan Shaw, former Assistant Chief of the Defence Staff 2009–2012, argued that counter-terrorism was another example of good cross-departmental working, thanks to effective leadership in the Office for Security and Counter-terrorism in the Home Office.\textsuperscript{47} A large scale “civil defence preparedness event” called Exercise Watermark took place in March 2011 to test flood readiness, involving more than ten UK government departments.\textsuperscript{48} The review team’s report found it had “clearly demonstrated that England and Wales has the capability to respond to a severe, widespread flood emergency.”\textsuperscript{49}

\textbf{Weak centre of Government}

20. Strategic capacity at the centre of Government (in the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury) provide a counterbalance to short-term thinking.\textsuperscript{50} The Cabinet Office’s headcount has increased since 2010 and it is seeking to influence a growing proportion of government spending, and we the Public Administration Select Committee, together with the Public Accounts Committee and the Institute for Government have repeatedly recommended a stronger centre of Government.\textsuperscript{51} Central units with a strategic remit have come and gone over the years. The Performance and Innovation Unit was established in 1998. This was succeeded in 2002 by the Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit, which was dismantled in 2010. This left a gap in the capacity for identifying and analysing future challenges, in the eyes of the Institute for Government.\textsuperscript{52} The Government stated that the “central strategy role” is performed by the Cabinet Office Government Innovation Group, the Horizon Scanning Programme, the Number 10 Policy Unit and the Deputy Prime Minister’s Research Unit.\textsuperscript{53} However, Major General Shaw said Whitehall lacks a central strong secretariat “that creates government plans, as opposed to merely collating

\textsuperscript{45} Committee visit to North America, November 2014
\textsuperscript{46} Q 141
\textsuperscript{47} Q 216
\textsuperscript{48} Exercise Watermark Review Team, \textit{Exercise Watermark Final Report}, September 2011
\textsuperscript{49} As above
\textsuperscript{50} Institute for Government (WFC10)
\textsuperscript{52} Institute for Government (WFC10)
\textsuperscript{53} Letter from Sir Jeremy Heywood, John Manzoni, Nicholas Macpherson and Richard Heaton to Rt Hon Margaret Hodge MP, 25 November 2014, \textit{Annex to Treasury Minute}
departmental actions, putting a ring around them and calling them a government plan, which is the sum of its individual parts.”\textsuperscript{54}

21. Voters expect governments to think longer term. Nearly three-quarters of adults polled in August 2014 for the Institute for Government said they would prefer politicians who are focused on the long term—even if that means making decisions more slowly—rather than politicians who prioritise quick action.\textsuperscript{55}

22. Change is a constant challenge. Governments cannot foresee all the changes and unexpected shocks that will come, so flexibility, resilience and imagination are essential. Plans must be adjusted in response to political and other developments, rather than fixed upon. The UK must have the capacity to take advantage of trends and shocks, so the Government must see them as opportunities, not just threats.

23. There are good examples of successful cross-government working, including the National Security Council in respect of crisis management, and counter-terrorism policy and planning. We also commend the Government for its intentions in introducing the Better Care Fund, which aims to improve integration between NHS services and social care services, addressing the pressure on the NHS caused by local government spending reductions.

24. These examples of far-sighted policy making demonstrate what is possible. The evidence, however, is that these are the exception. Officials strive to work together but tend to stay within their department boundaries. The UK Government could learn from the Scottish Government, for example, which has restructured so that policy is coordinated across the administration as a whole. We reiterate our conclusion in “Strategic thinking in Government” that the Cabinet Office must be given the means and the influence to act as an effective headquarters of Government or the failure of cross-departmental working will continue to create wasteful conflict. We commend the Cabinet Secretary and Treasury Permanent Secretary for their determination to improve this and we will keep the matter under review.

\textsuperscript{54} Q 249

\textsuperscript{55} Institute for Government, \textit{A programme for effective government}, September 2014
2 Known trends and drivers

25. A number of long-standing trends are apparent in the UK, some positive and some negative. This chapter describes these developments, which are at least partly understood, and which Government can plan for. A later chapter will consider less predictable risks and trends. But first, we will consider some of the obstacles to carrying out this planning and making use of this understanding: language, data and politics.

Definitions

26. We have explored a number of terms over the course of this inquiry. Some are well known but inconsistently used, and others can be obscure or cause confusion (see Table 2 and Table 3). Our predecessor Committee has previously concluded that distorted and confusing official language is damaging because it can prevent public understanding of policies.56

Table 2: Potentially confusing terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Stovepipes’</td>
<td>in isolation, bound by departmental jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Deliver’</td>
<td>carry out, implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Deep dive’</td>
<td>in-depth study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Data packs’</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lens’</td>
<td>perspective, point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Evolution’</td>
<td>gradual change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Transformation’</td>
<td>complete change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘To mainstream’</td>
<td>to make part of business as usual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The Science and Technology Select Committee concluded in Government horizon scanning that inconsistent use of the term horizon scanning had caused confusion.57 The Committee considered the term ‘futures analysis’ a more accurate description of the range of activities undertaken by the Government under the banner of ‘horizon scanning.’58 Sir Jeremy Heywood told us most civil servants understood the expression ‘horizon scanning.’59

57 Science and Technology Committee, Ninth Report of Session 2013-14, Government horizon scanning, HC 703, May 2014
58 As above
59 Q 405
Table 3: Definitions of terms used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Futures analysis</td>
<td>assessment and analysis of long-term issues and challenges in a policy area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon scanning</td>
<td>assessment and analysis of the future of either a policy area or a scientific topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight</td>
<td>a black swan event is a rare, surprising event with a large impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>a process of integrating ends, ways and means to meet policy objectives, or a course of action based on an assessment of the objectives, options, and available resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>a plan is a comprehensive proposal detailing who does what and when. A plan may be part of a strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>the act of generating a comprehensive proposal detailing who does what and when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine</td>
<td>guidance on how to think; a body of theory, methodology and practice (not policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>a course of action or principle of action proposed or taken by an organisation. A policy is not the same as a plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>the military assets and responses controlled by the Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>a psychological state, where there is confidence that normal life can continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic risk</td>
<td>the risk of a breakdown of an entire system rather than simply the failure of an individual part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>a prediction of the future, based on data and assumptions about influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical uncertainty</td>
<td>is fundamental uncertainty about the future where the level of risk is unpredictable and uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues

Use and access of data

28. In order to look forward and exploit opportunities, it is essential to understand the direction of historic trends. However, evidence from former Financial Times journalist Norma Cohen, a specialist in demography, stated that access and use of these data are poor. In particular, she argued that central government economists are not using population trend data. The Royal Statistical Society was also concerned that “much useful data still remains under-used in Whitehall departments, either because of a lack of awareness about its existence, or anxiety about data protection rules.” However, such data offer opportunities. For example, the use of NHS Hospital Episode Statistics could underpin large-scale clinical research, in order to make the UK an attractive destination for investment. We explored the potential of open data in our Report, Statistics and open data.

29. Sir Nicholas Macpherson, argued that some information needs to be kept secret, giving the hypothetical example of secret information on Ireland’s intentions in the event of a
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breakup of the Euro. He said the risk would be that “people could then speculate against Irish bonds and make the event self-fulfilling.” Professor Sarah Curtis of the Institute of Hazard, Risk and Resilience at Durham University confronted this dilemma:

It’s very difficult to share information about the detailed structure of power grids and their potential vulnerability in the face of climate change. That’s treated as secure information. However, on the other hand, how can you plan if you can’t share this information?

We asked Jon Day how frank officials engaged in horizon scanning can be. He said there was no distinction between horizon scanning and other policy work: “the constraints are the same”. We are not convinced by this given the unconventional, and potentially embarrassing possibilities officials engaged in horizon scanning must be free to analyse and assess.

**Politics**

30. As our predecessor Committee concluded in 2007, speculative work may carry political risks and bring few rewards. Major General Jonathan Shaw argued that horizon scanning does not get the priority it deserves because “there is no political credit for solving problems that the public do not know about”. Sir Mark Walport wrote that “there is flak from the public, media and opposition politicians when things go wrong, but little or no recognition when adversity is averted.” In oral evidence for our previous inquiry *Strategic thinking in Government*, Geoff Mulgan of Nesta (a charity which promotes innovation) said he had been frustrated in the past at Treasury unwillingness to think through negative scenarios and run scenario exercises for fear that they might leak and be interpreted as meaning the Treasury thought the scenarios were going to happen.

31. A ‘Market-wide Exercise’ programme began in 2004 to allow bodies including the Treasury and Bank of England and firms to test the resilience of their arrangements. The year before the financial crisis, one of the largest exercises dealt with pandemic flu. The

---
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2008 exercise was postponed; when the exercise resumed in 2009 it considered flooding. More recently cyber-security has become an annual theme. Reviewing the programme in 2012, the organisers recommended more frequent and diverse testing exercises.

32. There is an opportunity for Parliament to host cross-party conversations about policies with an impact beyond the short term. The Minister for Government Policy, the Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP, told us having a cross-party consensus on the need for greater integration was useful for addressing the future challenge posed by health and social care.

33. The topics covered by horizon scanning are constrained by government policy. In respect of preparation for the outcome of the Scottish independence referendum of September 2014, we had the following exchange with the Cabinet Secretary:

Cheryl Gillan MP: Would it be safe to assume that officials always look at possible future scenarios in order to protect the Government they are serving?

Sir Jeremy Heywood: No. In this case, it is very clear that we are not doing any contingency planning. I can say it as many times as you like. We are working for the Government on the Government’s policy.

Chair: You have introduced horizon scanning at the Cabinet Office, but not for this.

Sir Jeremy Heywood: Not for this, no.

Government horizon scanning is influenced by government policy and ministerial discretion: observers have noted that foresight practices are aligning with the priorities of the Government. The Science and Technology Select Committee reported in May 2014 that they were “extremely concerned” that Government horizon scanning was an echo chamber for government views, and not bringing in outside views.

What is already known

34. There are a number of acknowledged trends and drivers of change which link to major long-term challenges and opportunities for Government (Table 4). These may be primarily social, technological, economic, environmental or political in nature, but have implications across all these domains. The report of the Oxford Martin Commission for Future
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Generations remarked that they “can be extremely positive, such as poverty reduction, the emergence of the internet, longer lifespans and the decline of great wars. They can also be negative, as is evidenced by growing inequality and the rising threats of both infectious and non-communicable diseases.”

35. The underlying drivers, common to many trends, include:

- Interconnectedness and interdependency;
- Centralisation and concentration of systems, populations and assets;
- Heightened mobility;
- Longevity; and
- Faster communication.

Table 4: Example trend and driver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td>Population ageing</td>
<td>How to reform and pay for public services to deal with a larger number of older people</td>
<td>Longer life brings the opportunity of a longer productive life, and better quality old age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. In the next five years, a number of commentators believe the largest challenge facing the Government is fiscal—there is forecast to be one of the largest reductions in public spending ever envisaged in a developed country, GovernUp, a think tank, reported. This challenge is about “how to deliver services to meet the public’s rising expectations at a time when, in the absence of significant economic growth, radical consolidation is needed to restore fiscal balance.”

37. The Treasury lays claim to responsibility for “growth of the economy”. It also accepts that “slow productivity growth” raises “massive issues” for the future, but does not yet seem to appreciate the role of government in promoting new technology and innovation across the public sector and also in the private sector, such as in reducing CO2 emissions in transport, or leading the revolution in electrical energy storage. The government set out how it will exploit all the available knowledge to counter this risk of “secular stagnation” in...
the economy by seeking out and exploiting opportunities to promote growth through innovation.88

38. Education levels will almost certainly continue to rise across the globe and for both genders over the coming thirty years, but educational inequalities will probably persist.89 The globalisation of higher education will place additional demands on UK universities to ensure that Britain remains a world leader.90 Former Special Adviser Dominic Cummings has suggested that the only way to address this challenge is for the UK to improve its education and training and to create new institutions to become “the best country for education and science […] the school of the world.”91 He suggested that there is an opportunity for the UK to be “the school of the world” and adds “Who knows what would happen to a political culture if a party embraced education and science as its defining mission”.92 The Royal Statistical Society suggested the Government should commit to a 10-year strategic framework for science and innovation, raising the UK’s investment in Research and Development as a proportion of GDP from 1.7% to 2.9%.93

39. The House of Lords Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change in May 2012 concluded that the Government and society are “woefully underprepared” for the UK population’s rapid ageing.94 However “the changes do not mean a great economic or general fiscal crisis”, and “to make a success of these demographic shifts, major changes are needed in our attitudes to ageing” in terms of work, saving and use of housing capital.95 The Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy (Cipfa) note that the ‘triple lock’ commitment (that the state pension will rise by the higher of earnings, prices or 2.5%) is a significant financial burden for Government; by 2019 around 16% of all government spending will be on the state pension.96 Besides longevity, Norma Cohen identifies three other key demographic trends: falling fertility, urbanisation and immigration.97

40. In a global context, the Ministry of Defence’s Global Strategic Trends - Out to 2045 report, states that physical inactivity, unhealthy diets and increased life expectancy could lead to an obesity ‘epidemic’ as well as rises in non-communicable diseases such as dementia.98

---
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41. The Government has published a UK Five Year Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy, 2013 to 2018. It stated that infections are increasingly developing that cannot be treated. The rapid spread of multi-drug resistant bacteria, it stated, means that it could become impossible to prevent or treat everyday infections or diseases. Coupled to this, the development pipeline for new antibiotics is at an all-time low.

42. The Government has committed to reducing UK greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050, relative to 1990 levels. The Department for Energy and Climate Change stated that, if global emissions are not reduced, average summer temperatures in the south east of England are projected to rise by over 2°C by the 2040s, hotter than the 2003 heatwave which was connected to 2,000 extra deaths in the UK. Extreme weather events in the UK are likely to increase as temperatures rise, causing:

- heavier rainfall events—with increased risk of flooding;
- higher sea levels—with larger storm waves putting a strain on the UK’s coastal defences; and
- more and longer-lasting heat waves.

43. The challenges the European Union faces in coming years have the capacity, some believe, to destroy or greatly weaken it. The think tank the Centre for European Reform reported that is has become received wisdom that the chances of the UK remaining in the EU are no better than evens, and that it is not certain that the Euro will remain in its current form, with its current membership. However, in June 2014 the Ministry of Defence’s Global Strategic Trends report predicted that Europe is likely to remain a substantial part of the global economy, with the Euro and the single market still likely to exist by 2045, and European Union membership likely to expand.

44. The Public Accounts Committee recently concluded that the Department for Transport was taking a piecemeal approach to its major rail programmes, rather than taking a clear strategic approach by considering what would benefit the system as a whole and prioritising accordingly. The Transport Select Committee has highlighted that the National Policy Statement on National Networks does not consider strategic road and rail projects—such as High Speed Two—together, as part of an integrated transport strategy.
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A Cabinet subcommittee to examine infrastructure across Government was set up in
2012.109 The Minister for Government Policy acknowledged that the National
Infrastructure Plan, most recently revised in December 2014, still had “a long way yet to
go”.110

45. The use of jargon in advice to ministers can obscure meaning, hide inaction and
invite ridicule. Terms must be well understood for Government to be able to conduct
coherent analysis and for officials to act accordingly. Jargon must not be used to lend a
false legitimacy to otherwise ill-thought through ideas, concepts and policies.

46. Whitehall lacks discipline about how to think about ends, ways and means in part
because people use different terms in different contexts. For example, for the Ministry
of Defence, strategy is how you achieve policy aims. For many in the rest of
Government, the reverse is true: they understand policy to be how you achieve strategy.
In our review, strategy includes both: it is about how you choose your long-term
objectives, and how you assess the ways and means of achieving them. Both require
longer-term thinking.

47. Without a coherent understanding in the Civil Service of the trends and drivers of
change, the Government will fail to develop associated opportunities, which depend on
developing skills, educational opportunities, and investment in the UK’s science and
industrial base. This is the most effective way to improve productivity and innovation.

48. The Civil Service usually responds brilliantly to fast onset, short duration crises,
with clear responsibility taken by a lead government department. This capability is
tried and tested, both through exercises and real events. Market-wide exercises have
been conducted to test resilience, but not on a comprehensive basis to address the risk
of systemic financial collapse triggered by an unexpected event. Yet there is seldom an
emergency that one government department can handle entirely on its own.
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3 Current Government capacity

Who does what

49. A large number of high quality bodies and processes inside and outside Government influence thinking ahead and planning for known trends and unknown shocks. These include key activities such as public spending reviews which the Treasury carries out. It also publishes the Whole of Government Accounts. The Cabinet Office has oversight of some of the activities covered in this chapter, though they do not set out fully in their written evidence who does what.\(^{111}\) We discuss:

- The National Risk Register;
- The Cabinet Office horizon scanning programme team;
- The Government Office for Science;
- Strategic Defence and Security Reviews;
- The Joint Intelligence Committee;
- The Civil Contingencies Secretariat;
- The National Security Council;
- The Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre;
- Other government departments and networks;
- Public bodies and the wider public sector, including Parliament;
- Spending reviews; and
- Whole of Government Accounts.

**National Risk Register**

50. The Government’s National Risk Register for Civil Emergencies, last published in July 2013, takes likelihood and impact into account, and considers the highest priority risks to be pandemic influenza, coastal flooding, catastrophic terrorist attacks, and severe volcanic eruptions abroad.\(^ {112}\)

51. Professor Dame Sally Davies explained to us how work to coordinate and check the risk register is carried out. She said that at least once a year, the chief scientific advisers sit down to look at and cross-check the risks. She explained that some risks, such as anti-microbial

\(^{111}\) Cabinet Office (WFC12)

\(^{112}\) Cabinet Office, *National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies*, 2013
resistance, appear on more than one department’s risk register.\textsuperscript{113} Chief Scientific Advisers are working with the Civil Contingencies Secretariat to add anti-microbial resistance to the national risk register.\textsuperscript{114}

52. The Government Chief Scientific Adviser was not consulted on the first National Risk Assessment, leaving the UK unprepared for the threat that materialised in 2010 over Icelandic volcanic ash, at substantial cost to the aviation industry, travellers and the economy.\textsuperscript{115} Scientific advice was subsequently included in the development of the register.\textsuperscript{116}

\textit{Cabinet Office horizon scanning programme team}

53. Since March 2014 a small joint Cabinet Office and Government Office for Science team of about five members of staff has run the Government’s horizon scanning programme, reporting to Jon Day, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, and Sir Mark Walport, the Government’s Chief Scientific Adviser. The Cabinet Secretary acts as the ‘senior champion’ for horizon scanning.\textsuperscript{117} The programme is overseen by the Minister for Government Policy, the Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP, “who takes a close interest in the programme and actively engages with it.”\textsuperscript{118}

54. The unit acts as a centre of expertise for the rest of Government, and coordinates meetings which bring together civil servants from across Government and others to think ahead on particular themes and topics, for example, on emerging economies. The team works with the Civil Service Policy Profession to “expose and embed horizon scanning tools and techniques”, tools such as a ‘Futures Toolkit’.\textsuperscript{119} Though it aims to be as transparent as possible, not all its papers can be published, Oliver Letwin MP wrote.\textsuperscript{120}

55. Dr Claire Craig, Director of the Government Office for Science, has said that “it’s easier to do horizon scanning than it is to get the people you want to listen to it, to listen to it”.\textsuperscript{121} Professor Michael Clarke of the Royal United Services Institute expressed frustration to us that government horizon scanning does not reach as far as policy.\textsuperscript{122} As Jon Day’s review of government horizon scanning found, it is rare for horizon scanning products to include

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[113] Q 132. (The Department of Health and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs)
\item[114] As above
\item[115] Jill Rutter in Centre for Science and Policy, \textit{Future directions for scientific advice in Whitehall}, April 2013
\item[116] James Wilsdon and Robert Doubleday in Centre for Science and Policy, \textit{Future directions for scientific advice in Whitehall}, April 2013
\item[117] Cabinet Office, \textit{Horizon Scanning Programme Team}, undated
\item[118] Government Response to the Science and Technology Committee’s Ninth Report of Session 2013-14, \textit{Government horizon scanning}, HC 592
\item[120] As above
\item[121] Speaking at Westminster Higher Education Forum Keynote Seminar: \textit{Utilising academic research in policymaking - Horizon Scanning, trend analysis and engagement with academics and business}, 25 November 2014
\item[122] Q 116
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
policy implications or an analysis of how the information presented could be used to inform decision making.\textsuperscript{123} The Minister for Government Policy acknowledged the need for greater take-up of horizon scanning: “rather than putting that in some little unit somewhere, […] we need to take it much further—what I believe in the jargon is called mainstreaming; i.e. putting this in the hands of the people who are really most important around Whitehall.”\textsuperscript{124} Jon Day explained to us that horizon scanning has to “battle with the current agenda” and “there is not always a mechanism to get this information to Ministers.”\textsuperscript{125}

56. No data is held on the academic backgrounds of civil servants involved in horizon scanning.\textsuperscript{126} Jon Day told us his impression and experience was that they are no more or less short-termist than other civil servants.\textsuperscript{127} Written evidence by the Academy of Social Sciences states that there is no independent evidence about the effectiveness or value of Whitehall horizon scanning.\textsuperscript{128} The equivalent capacity in the Canadian federal Government is organised somewhat differently (see Box 2).

\textbf{Box 2: An example of central government horizon scanning capacity: Policy Horizons Canada}

\begin{quote}
Policy Horizons Canada was set up by Janice Charette, the Clerk of the Privy Council, (Canadian equivalent to Cabinet Secretary) in 2011. This addressed the need for Deputy Ministers (equivalent to Permanent Secretaries) to be exposed to long-term thinking, fresh ideas and challenge. The organisation employs around 25 staff and relies on a large number of external experts. It is funded by the Department for Employment and Social Development but is governed by a committee made up of Deputy Ministers from across the Canadian federal Government. It produces outputs, largely unpublished, intended to inform and challenge the whole of Government. Its aim as the centre of foresight is not to build foresight units within departments, but to build capacity for long-term thinking among public servants. A number of officials in senior roles across the Canadian federal government have spent a period within Policy Horizons Canada, and therefore comprise the ‘community of strategists’ we called on the UK Government to develop in our report, \textit{Who Does UK National Strategy}?\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}
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**Government Office for Science**

57. The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills houses the Government Office for Science, led by the Government’s Chief Scientific Adviser, Sir Mark Walport. Its ‘Foresight’ unit of about 15 staff, described as “long-established and much lauded” by the Science and Technology Select Committee, carries out in-depth studies “looking ahead 10-100 years on topics of national importance” and publishes reports, for example, on the future of manufacturing. Written evidence from the Cabinet Office stated that GO-Science, as it is known:

> Ensures that government policies and decisions are informed by the best scientific evidence and strategic long-term thinking. Foresight projects use the latest scientific evidence and futures analysis to address complex issues and provide strategic options to inform decisions that need to be taken now, and over the longer term.

The Science and Technology Select Committee recommended in May 2014 that GO-Science should be moved into the Cabinet Office, to increase its cross-department influence.

**Strategic Defence and Security Reviews**

58. The Government published the outcome of the Strategic Defence and Security Review, *Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty*, in October 2010. Previous reviews covered only defence, and the expansion to also cover security in 2010 was welcomed by the Defence Select Committee. However, the Committee concluded there was a risk that immediate or short-term security issues and threats might dominate to the exclusion of longer-term defence assessments. The review decided to fit two aircraft carriers to allow short take offs and vertical landing; shortly afterwards, in 2012, the decision was reversed. Sir Peter Luff MP, a former Defence Minister, has suggested that the 2010 decision was partly the result of rushed and inaccurate costing to accommodate a new Secretary of State’s preferences.

---
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59. The Defence Select Committee concluded in a 2012 Report that the review’s decision to cancel the maritime patrol aircraft (‘Nimrod’) programme, a decision that was primarily financially driven, has weakened the UK’s ability to undertake the military tasks envisaged by the review. They were unconvinced that the Armed Forces could manage this capability gap within existing resources. The Secretary of State for Defence, the Rt Hon Michael Fallon MP, has acknowledged weaknesses in the review, saying that “some things were not foreseen: the Arab spring, for example, the resurgence of Russia, the annexation of the Crimea and the interference in eastern Ukraine.” However, Oliver Letwin MP defended the 2010 review, telling us the conclusions it reached had “pretty well stood the test of time”.

60. The Institute for Government has identified rushed post-election spending reviews as a problem: “the 2010 spending review provided for aircraft carriers but not the planes to go with them, because it didn’t allow time to complete a serious defence and security review”. The majority of work on the review, it has been claimed, was conducted over a six-week period in summer 2010 with key people unavailable on holiday at times. However, Oliver Letwin said he was “pretty intimately involved in the strategic defence review, and it continued throughout [summer 2010] pretty energetically”. Sir Nicholas Macpherson told us that “There is a risk that, if you try to do something that is of a scale of a strategic defence review to meet a very early public spending timetable, something is going to give.” However, when we asked Oliver Letwin he did not have any particular view about the time it should take to conduct the next review.

**Joint Intelligence Committee**

61. The Joint Intelligence Committee’s role is to produce “objective, cross-departmental, all sources assessments, bringing together secret intelligence, diplomatic reporting and open source material.” It produces these assessments for current events but also looks ahead to identify potential risks, and to provide the Government with early warning, Cabinet Office written evidence claims. The Committee’s secretariat is the Joint Intelligence Organisation, based in the Cabinet Office (see Box 3).

---
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62. Written evidence from the Cabinet Office stated that its Civil Contingencies Secretariat is responsible for improving the UK’s ability to absorb, respond to and recover from emergencies. It is part of the wider National Security Secretariat which employs about 200 people. The team assesses disruptive civil challenges to the UK in the short, medium and long term. Its unpublished National Risk Assessment informs the publicly available National Risk Register.

63. The UK is well-placed geographically, not having major fault lines, active volcanoes or an extreme climate. Perhaps helped in part by this, the work of the Secretariat is well regarded internationally. Dame Deirdre Hines, former Chief Medical Officer for Wales, carried out a largely positive independent review of the UK response to the 2009 H1N1 swine flu pandemic. This “provided confirmation of the value of planning and preparedness” and “demonstrated that the four UK Governments can work together effectively and successfully to meet such an emergency”.

64. The National Security Council is now the Cabinet committee for collective discussion of the Government’s objectives for national security. The Cabinet Office stated that it meets weekly and is chaired by the Prime Minister. Witnesses to our previous inquiry welcomed the establishment of the Council, but witnesses to our previous inquiry, Strategic thinking in Government, pressed for greater analytical
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support for the Council. Former Special Adviser Matt Cavanagh recommended that “the Secretariat needs to be beefed up if [it] is really to play a role in terms of co-ordinating the different Departments”. The National Security Secretariat coordinates security and intelligence issues across Government and leads work on National Security Strategy and the Strategic Defence and Security Review. An update to the National Security Strategy is expected in 2015.

Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre, Ministry of Defence

65. The Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre describes itself as an internal think tank of the Ministry of Defence. The staff team of around 65 are drawn from the Army, Navy, Air Force and Civil Service. The Centre’s origins can be traced to the 1998 strategic defence review, which recognised a need for a clearer long-term, joint vision of how the Government expects the armed forces to operate, but their work necessarily embraces the whole of Government. The Cabinet Office’s written evidence to this inquiry does not mention the Centre.

66. The Centre produces a range of strategies, reviews and plans, including publishing UK Defence Doctrine. This is not a set of beliefs or policies but guidance on how to think; a body of theory, methodology and practice. The Cabinet Secretary has acknowledged that “the MoD and the security side of Whitehall do this [horizon scanning] better, in some ways, than the domestic, economic side of the Government”. Professor Michael Clarke told us that the Centre does some very distinguished work in horizon scanning.

Other Government departments and networks

67. Individual departments’ horizon scanning and foresight outputs are not always explicitly identified as such. Examples include the Department for Energy and Climate Change’s 2050 Pathways Calculator, the Government’s Industrial Strategy and the Department of Health’s UK Five Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy, 2013–2018. Cabinet
Office written evidence to this inquiry does not set out a complete list of these activities, nor detail how the centre of Government oversees them.\textsuperscript{169}

68. Twenty five professional networks exist that civil servants with a particular expertise are able to join, such as the Government Economic Service.\textsuperscript{170} These groups maintain professional standards, play a role in recruitment and develop guidance and resources for use across government departments.\textsuperscript{171}

69. The Government set up a network of ‘What Works Centres’ in 2013, intended to improve the way Government creates, shares and uses evidence for decision-making.\textsuperscript{172} The Royal Statistical Society says “there should be further investment in investigating what policy works, including through the successful ‘What Works’ network. Money invested in the short-term to support good policy will ensure unnecessary costs and mistakes are avoided at a later date.” The centres cover health and social care, educational achievement, crime reduction, early intervention, local economic growth, ageing and wellbeing.

70. The centres are:

- The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE);
- The Sutton Trust/Educational Endowment Foundation;
- The College of Policing;
- The Early Intervention Foundation;
- The LSE/Arup/Centre for Cities What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth;
- The Centre for Ageing Better; and
- The What Works Centre for Wellbeing.\textsuperscript{173}

There is a What Works National Adviser, David Halpern, who together with his team in the Cabinet Office supports the network.

**Public bodies**

71. Cabinet Office written evidence names the Office for Budget Responsibility, the Office for National Statistics and the Met Office as organisations outside central government which aim to provide expert, impartial advice and understanding of future trends.\textsuperscript{174} Other bodies in the wider public sector, including universities and the Research Councils, also carry out this work.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169} Cabinet Office (WFC12)
\item \textsuperscript{170} Civil Service, *Working for the Civil Service*, undated
\item \textsuperscript{171} Minister for the Cabinet Office, *Capabilities and Skills in the Civil Service*, October 2014
\item \textsuperscript{172} Cabinet Office, *What Works Network*, June 2013
\item \textsuperscript{173} As above
\item \textsuperscript{174} Cabinet Office (WFC12)\end{itemize}
72. The Office for Budget Responsibility examines and reports publicly on the sustainability of the public finances and publishes an annual *Fiscal Sustainability Report*, assessing the long-term economic and fiscal impact of government decisions. The Office investigates the impact of trends and policies on the public finances through forecasting, projections up to fifty years ahead and balance sheet analysis.175

73. The Met Office is a world-leading centre of expertise on weather and long-run climate modelling, the Cabinet Office’s written evidence states.176 Its Chief Scientist Professor Dame Julia Slingo told us that the Office has built a strong relationship with the Research Councils and leading universities, and so “when I am thinking about what Government need, I do not just look at what I have been contracted to do in the Met Office; I look at what I believe are the big science opportunities and where the innovation is in science that I can bring forward and operationalise into better services.”177

74. Universities can play a key role in advising the Government on potential threats, risks and other emerging issues by providing expertise and evidence for future policy decisions.178 The precursor to what is today the Economic and Social Research Council was created to provide Government with imaginative thinking about social and economic possibilities.179 Its strategic priorities to some extent reflect consensus about the problems facing state, society and economy in years to come, the Academy of Social Sciences wrote.180

**Parliament**

75. Our predecessors recommended in 2007 that Parliament strengthen its capacity to think ahead and engage with outside experts and the wider public.181 The Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology is undertaking a programme of horizon scanning work looking at major trends in society, technology, the environment, education and politics.182

76. The Finnish Parliament’s Committee for the Future, established in 1993 and made permanent in 2000, aims to conduct dialogue with the Prime Minister’s office and the government on long-term issues affecting the policies and work of the Government.183 Following a general election, the Finnish Government is required to produce a ‘Report on
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175 As above
176 As above
177 Q 80
178 Russell Group of Universities, *Government horizon scanning*, October 2013
179 Academy of Social Sciences (*WFC8*)
180 As above
182 Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, *Planned work*, undated
183 Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, *Futures and foresight*, POST Note, May 2009
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77. Scotland’s Futures Forum, a company limited by guarantee, was created by the Scottish Parliament in 2006 to help its Members think about future challenges and opportunities. It publishes reports and organises events on topics including wellbeing, business succession and social finance. It has a small staff overseen by a Board of Directors which includes MSPs.

Spending reviews

78. Spending reviews determine how funding is allocated between departments, looking forward one or more years. The Government stated in 2012 that the strategic goals and ambitions of the country should be the basis of spending review and budget processes. Cipfa argue that spending decisions and commitments should be based on “long-term affordability, rather than short term electioneering.” To overcome the problems caused by departmental boundaries, Cipfa argued that the Government should set spending plans in terms of what needs to be jointly achieved. To achieve this, they suggest that central government budget setting and financial management should be reviewed to remove constraints on local service innovation and to make services more coordinated, based on evidence of outcomes.

79. There is an appetite for a spending review covering a whole Parliament. Sir Nicholas Macpherson told us that, “ideally”, the next public spending review would set plans for the whole next Parliament. The Political and Constitutional Reform Select Committee recommended in July 2013 that spending reviews should reflect the same timetable as five-year fixed term Parliaments. The Institute for Government said that rushed reviews cause more problems later, and Cipfa call on the Government to allow departments the time to carry out reviews effectively. Polling commissioned for the Institute for Government found that 84% of adults in Great Britain agreed that it is important that politicians should take time to get the facts right when making spending decisions.
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184 Committee for the Future, Parliament of Finland, *Presentation of the Committee*, October 2014
185 As above
186 Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, *Futures and foresight*, POST Note, May 2009
188 Government Response to the Twenty Fourth Report of the Public Administration Select Committee, *Strategic thinking in Government: without National Strategy, can viable Government strategy emerge?*, Session 2010-12, HC 1625
189 Cipfa (WFC16)
190 Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy, *Cipfa Manifesto 2015*, November 2014
2010 spending review, covering financial years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15, was published on 20 October 2010, five and a half months after the general election.194

80. The School of International Futures suggests that the Treasury could have a powerful impact by using horizon scanning studies as part of the spending review process, by asking departments to demonstrate that their plans are robust in different future scenarios.195

81. The Public Accounts Committee concluded that the 2010 spending review provided no incentives for departments to collaborate on cross-government issues.196 When we asked Oliver Letwin MP who in Government is responsible for ensuring that spending plans are coherent across Government, he cited: a Department, the Treasury; a process, the spending review; and a Cabinet sub-committee, covering public expenditure.197 Our evidence shows that there remain limitations in cross-departmental financial planning, for example, in respect of health and social care (see Box 4).

**Box 4: The relationship between health care and social care**

Care services tend to be fragmented, reflecting the professional and institutional boundaries of care providers such as the between the NHS and local government, rather than co-ordinated around the needs of the individual.198 Performance is assessed against three ‘outcomes frameworks’ covering the NHS, public health, and social care separately.199

Sir Nicholas Macpherson told us the relationship between the NHS and local authorities, which are responsible for social care, is “absolutely critical” because “you can squeeze one bit of the system, but the problem just re-emerges somewhere else.”200

The Minister for Government Policy explained why progress has been very slow. He said it was “an almost unsolvable problem, because of the differences between local authorities and the centrally funded NHS. We are now breaking those barriers down […] The difficulty is one of breaking down these bureaucratic barriers and finding ways of getting people to pool budgets and work together […] It is much too late—we should have been doing it 20, 30 and 40 years ago—but at least it is now beginning.”201

The Better Care Fund, which will pool at least £3.8 billion from April 2015, aims to provide more coordinated local services to older and disabled people to care for them in the community, keep them out of hospital and avoid long hospital stays.202 The National Audit
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195 School of International Futures (WFC11)
197 Q 475
198 British Heart Foundation (WFC13)
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Office found that the quality of early preparation and planning did not match the scale of this ambition. Oliver Letwin MP described progress on the fund as “very slow” because of what he describes as “an almost unsolvable problem”, the differences between local authorities and the NHS. He said “we are now breaking those barriers down.”

Whole of Government Accounts

82. Whole of Government Accounts are a consolidated set of financial statements for the UK public sector. They are “a kind of horizon scanning”, argued the Academy of Social Sciences. Sir Nicholas Macpherson welcomed them as: “one positive development in recent years” because they “force us to make provisions for nuclear decommissioning along with medical negligence. This has provided quite an important discipline to the Treasury.”

83. The most recently published set of Whole of Government Accounts showed that the Government is liable for total future costs of £2,893 billion, including long-term liabilities of public sector pensions (£1,172 billion), nuclear de-commissioning (£69.8 billion) and the potential liabilities arising from litigation for medical negligence in the NHS (£26.1 billion). Other government liabilities are accounting provisions for the future costs that the public sector is not certain to incur but where the probability is greater than 50%. Contingent liabilities, reported separately, are costs that the public sector may incur in the future, but where the probability is less than 50%, such as clinical negligence claims that are less likely to succeed, and guarantees to underwrite debt for infrastructure projects such as Crossrail. These total £88 billion.

84. The National Audit Office has qualified the Whole of Government Accounts every year since their introduction due to “significant continuing issues with the quality and consistency of the data included”. However, it reported: “as the Treasury now has more Whole of Government Accounts trend data, it is starting to highlight some of the longer-term risks on the balance sheet. They are beginning to use this information to help inform Government’s spending plans.” Cipfa advocate greater use of the Whole of Government Accounts as the foundation for fiscal and spending decisions:

The UK boasts one of the most complete sets of Whole of Government Accounts globally, including central and local Government as well as public
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corporations. We are therefore able to quantify our long-term commitments […] and use this information to determine long-term affordability.\(^{210}\)

**Limitations in government capacity**

**Limitations in financial planning and management**

85. We previously concluded in our Report *Strategic thinking in Government* that the Budget process should improve the link between long-term objectives and specific budgetary measures.\(^{211}\)

86. Sir Nicholas Macpherson assured us the Treasury is improving financial management: “We are going to have fewer economists and a few more strategic financial managers.”\(^{212}\) The Treasury’s review of financial management in Government, published 2013, concluded that, while financial management had been on an “improving trajectory” for many years, “concerted effort” was required to improve costing, financial management information and standards of management accounting.\(^{213}\)

87. John Manzoni, Chief Executive of the Civil Service, acknowledged:

> Normally, in the headquarters of a company, it is the functionality that parts of the Treasury and Cabinet Office do. They would be in one headquarters. They are in two different places here in government.\(^{214}\)

Their separation “makes it slightly more complex” but he insisted “they can work across those boundaries.”\(^{215}\) John Manzoni praised the good cooperative working between the Treasury and Cabinet Office and said “whatever the boxes and the structure are, we have to create a mode of working that is structure-agnostic”.\(^{216}\)

88. In a report published in February 2014, GovernUp, a think tank, proposed the establishment of a single centre of Government, an ‘Office of Budget and Management’, combining functions from the Treasury and Cabinet Office.\(^{217}\) The United States federal government has an Office of Management and Budget to coordinate cross-government spending plans.\(^{218}\) In Canada, the Treasury Board Secretariat plays a central role in government financial planning.\(^{219}\) Similar arrangements are in place in other governments.

\(^{210}\) Cipfa (WFC16)
\(^{211}\) Public Administration Select Committee, Twenty-Fourth Report of Session 2010-12, *Strategic thinking in Government: without National Strategy, can viable Government strategy emerge?*, HC 1625, April 2012
\(^{212}\) Q 291
\(^{214}\) Oral evidence taken on 14 January 2015, (2014-15), HC 922, Q 14
\(^{215}\) As above
\(^{219}\) Committee visit to North America, November 2014
Civil Service skills and training

89. The lack of a central training college for Whitehall is a gaping void, argued Major General Jonathan Shaw, and one which impedes cross-government working. He argued that a training college, a “national centre of Government execution” should be set up to ensure common language across politicians, civil servants and the military. The Institute for Risk Management argued that civil servants should have greater access to training on risk management. Satisfaction among civil servants with the learning and development available to them is under 50%. In part to address these concerns, in February 2015 GovernUp called for the introduction of a “proper programme of training and development for ministers before and during their time in office”. The Institute for Government’s Julian McCrae wrote in response: “I’m more convinced than ever that it is perfectly possible to help politicians become more effective ministers, and that there is a real appetite for such support among front-benchers.” The Armed Forces Parliamentary Scheme has for over twenty years offered members of the House of Commons, House of Lords and European Parliament experience of spending a number of days with the armed forces over the course of a year. We will be reporting on these matters soon on our inquiry into Civil Service Skills.

90. There is an impressive array of high quality long-term thinking and horizon scanning across Government. The Civil Contingencies Secretariat and Met Office provide an excellent public sector capability. We welcome the Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology’s work in this area, prompted by our previous recommendation. We also welcome the establishment of the Cabinet Office’s horizon scanning programme team and its aim to coordinate work between departments. However, this central resource is much too small. It needs the capacity and the authority to address gaps and duplications and to coordinate a comprehensive and coherent analysis of the risks and challenges facing the whole of Government.

91. We commend the development of the National Risk Register. It is a vital tool to enable and encourage thinking about better management of short and long term risks. Together with Whole of Government Accounts, which provides a deeper understanding of long term actual and potential financial liabilities, they set down the context which decision makers must consider. The challenge is to ensure that this information is used in advice to ministers, and not ignored.

92. The Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre is generating world class horizon scanning which embraces the whole of Government. Though its work is used across Whitehall it is not even acknowledged by the Cabinet Office in their written evidence.
This shows that horizon scanning is still regarded as ancillary rather than central to the business of Government, and requires wider awareness of horizon scanning and changes in attitude.

93. Long-term thinking and the consideration of emerging trends need to be the driving force behind financial management and far more coordinated with public investment decisions. At present, horizon scanning has little impact on financial planning, though we commend the desire of the Cabinet Secretary, the Treasury Permanent Secretary and the Civil Service Chief Executive to address this problem.

94. Comprehensive Spending Reviews reflect the Treasury’s legitimate preoccupation with setting spending limits department by department. But there is insufficient understanding of the cross-departmental effects of investment decisions, and a lack of capacity to create genuinely cross-government financial plans. The comment made by John Manzoni, Civil Service Chief Executive, that “normally, in the headquarters of a company, […] parts of the Treasury and Cabinet Office […] would be in one headquarters […] which makes it slightly more complex”, shows that the present structure does not serve the interests of financial planning and management. Other governments including the federal governments of Canada and the United States have a single body to conduct financial planning. Some, like the think tank GovernUp, have recommended that functions from the Treasury and Cabinet Office should be combined in a new Office of Budget and Management. The present divide between the Treasury and Cabinet Office is a structural impediment to effective financial planning and management.
4   Known and unknown risks

95. Previous chapters of this Report have considered known trends and government capacity to plan ahead and deal with them. We now turn to how the Government addresses known risks, such as terrorism, and risks not yet envisaged. These are connected. Climate change is a known trend and the UK faces the known risk of associated extreme weather events, for example, but when they will occur is unknown. The unknown risks of the future could materialise to trigger events such as the collapse of a bank, or a larger, systemic collapse of the financial system.

Systemic risk

96. The advances of recent decades have attendant risks. Technological advances, for example, bring the risk of the accidental or deliberate misuse of technology. The possibility of such damaging consequences requires the machinery of Government to acquire a deep understanding of these dangers, as the Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations concluded:

While the future is full of opportunity arising from the extraordinary advances of recent decades, it is also highly uncertain and characterised by growing systemic risks.226

A systemic risk is the risk of a breakdown of an entire system rather than simply the failure of individual parts. For example, “a threat to the internet increasingly means a threat to everything.”227 In a financial context, systemic risk is the risk of a cascading failure caused by the interdependent nature of the financial system, resulting in a severe economic downturn.228 Professor Ian Goldin, Director of the Oxford Martin School, has described systemic risk as a process to be managed, not a problem to be solved.229

Forecasting capacity

97. Forecasts are a tool used to try to anticipate possible futures. They are predictions based on current data and assumptions about future influences. Forecasts can be extrapolations of trends or simulations and more complex modelling of scenarios. Forecasts that are not fulfilled are not necessarily ‘wrong’. The Government’s Chief Medical Officer, Professor Dame Sally Davies, explained that “the modellers and infectious disease experts forecast that we will experience intermittent pandemics” and so a particular outbreak is not a failure of forecasting.230

228 ‘Systemic risk’, London School of Economics Systemic Risk Centre, undated
229 Preface,  The Butterfly Defect, 2014
230 Q 152
98. High-profile errors, such as those found in the model used to evaluate the bids in the West Coast mainline franchise competition in 2012, have prompted greater focus on the quality and accuracy of government forecasting. In response, the Treasury commissioned the Macpherson review of the quality assurance of modelling in Government. There is no mention of systemic risk or horizon scanning in the review. A National Audit Office report found that it did not focus on the systemic factors preventing good forecasting. The report found that a lack of connection between forecasts by analysts and budgeting by finance teams creates a risk of failure in how uncertainty is addressed. Sir Nicholas Macpherson told us that:

They are very good at forecasting in the good times, or indeed the bad times, if there is a steady trend. [...] What forecasters are generally very bad at is forecasting inflexion points.

As Rear Admiral John Kingwell said, “identifying trends is not predicting the future”.

99. Sir Nicholas argued that the establishment of the Office for Budget Responsibility was an improvement because it made the Treasury and Number 10 think less about possible futures. The OBR’s independent forecasts allow more concrete and less hypothetical discussion, he said:

Now we have to take the forecast as read, so there is far greater debate about the contents of a Budget.

Culture of the Civil Service

100. A core role of the Civil Service is to look beyond single Parliaments so that civil servants can provide advice to the government of the day on the long-term underlying issues which affect the national interest. As Jon Day’s review of government horizon scanning put it, “it is a Civil Service responsibility to look beyond the parliamentary term.” However, the Civil Service values of impartiality, integrity, honesty and objectivity do not include any reference to the longer-term responsibilities of civil servants to ensure that advice to ministers provides appropriate challenge about the longer term. Some ministers have expressed suspicion about what might lie behind long-term thinking among civil servants. Francis Maude MP has said that: “the civil service aims not to serve the 'long-term aims of the department' but the priorities of the government of the day.”
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101. Our Report *Strategic thinking in Government* asked whether there should be a stronger, perhaps constitutional, role for the Civil Service in promoting the long-term national interest, to help counteract the negative, short-term pressures on ministers.\(^{240}\) The Government Response stated:

> [Treasury guidance] Managing Public Money was extended in April 2011 to place a specific duty on Accounting Officers to establish that new policies are sustainable. [...] It also demands that the Accounting Officer consider whether the design of the policy is likely to be resilient to foreseeable developments and shocks.\(^{241}\)

102. The confidence to challenge orthodox thinking or established policy is of particular importance for civil servants engaged in horizon scanning, foresight and contingency planning. They must be able to challenge assumptions and conventional thinking on expected futures. However, Jon Day’s review of government horizon scanning found that “there is a belief that horizon scanning is ignored when the strategic level is not open to challenge.”\(^{242}\) Trust is essential. We concluded in *Truth to power: how Civil Service reform can succeed*, that strong relationships between civil servants and ministers are based on shared understanding of purpose, mutual dependence, and openness and trust.\(^{243}\)

103. Government acknowledges that collective leadership could be improved. The Civil Service Reform Progress Report (2014) stated that it was a priority to develop and improve the collective leadership of the Civil Service so that leaders have a shared vision.\(^{244}\) This, we heard, is achieved very well in some areas, such as counter-terrorism, where planning and implementation are effective. Major General Shaw said it is clear that in relation to counter-terrorism it is the Home Office which is in charge. This, he told us, empowers the Home Office and clarifies responsibility.\(^{245}\)

### Radical uncertainty

104. Many future challenges are unknown unknowns, as Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP, Minister for Government Policy, recognised in his evidence to us: “we are frequently—and will continue to be, as human beings—taken by surprise.”\(^{246}\) We have previously expressed concern that the increase of horizon scanning can give politicians and officials a false sense of security; that they are prepared for all eventualities.\(^{247}\) We recommended that the
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Government should not be afraid to acknowledge that uncertainty exists and to promote an open discussion about risk and uncertainty in policy-making.

105. The Government is better at dealing with known risks and trends than with uncertain possible risks and challenges. For example, the Government has set up a nanotechnology strategy forum (see Box 5), but future technological change may come instead from unforeseen developments. The Cabinet Secretary acknowledged to us that there had been less co-ordination, “and therefore more risk of things falling between cracks”, in the more uncertain areas. He explained that identifying any inconsistencies or gaps was the aim of the small horizon scanning programme team in the Cabinet Office. He took responsibility for the success of this work, saying one of his jobs was to think about the contents of the in-tray in 10 years’ time, in order to “get ahead of these issues rather than just waiting for them to hit us in the face.” However, he denied responsibility when this task was put to him in a different way:

Chair: Who in the Government has overall responsibility for cross-departmental systemic risk and radical uncertainty?

Sir Jeremy Heywood: I do not think there is one person responsible for such a broad scope of things as that.

Box 5: Nanotechnology

Nanotechnology is engineering at the 1 billionth of a metre scale, to create structures and devices. Nanomaterials are used in sunscreens and computer chip transistors, for example. The most anticipated applications are in healthcare: the tiny scale allows nanomaterials to pass through biological barriers without triggering the immune system. Due to the potential for major technological breakthroughs, nanomaterials have been identified as a key enabling technology. However, risks have been identified, such as possible environmental and health impacts. A nanotechnology strategy forum chaired by ministers in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has met once a year since 2012 to promote discussion between Government and key stakeholders on the development of nanotechnology industries in the UK.

106. The evidence we heard differed on the Government’s record on horizon scanning. Rear Admiral Kingwell identified occasions when his work at the Ministry of Defence’s Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre had got it right:
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In 2001 we were stressing the future of autonomous and automatic systems on the battle space [… and] we highlighted the role of social media in undermining certain autocratic regimes.254

Dr Campbell McCafferty, Director of the Cabinet Office’s Civil Contingencies Secretariat, also identified a horizon scanning success story in the field of civil contingencies. He contrasted the costs of the foot and mouth disease outbreak in 2007 to that in 2001. The costs of the later outbreak, he said, were much more contained.255 However, Major General Shaw disagreed:

I don’t think we do have an impressive record on futurology. Black swans appear all over the place. The Arab Spring came out of a clear blue sky.256

We heard on our visit to Washington D.C. that governments should also concern themselves more with ‘grey swans’, which can be defined as future challenges you should have thought about, such as energy storage (see Box 6).257

Box 6: Energy storage

Energy storage technologies absorb energy and store it for a period of time, helping to manage variation in power generation, due to the weather (in the case of solar and wind energy) or events such as a power plant breaking down. These technologies include batteries and pumping water uphill for later release.258 The cost of storage, including large up-front costs, is the main obstacle to large-scale development of electricity storage. Uncertainty about how much storage will be needed in the future is another barrier to investment.

In the UK, only a small amount of electricity storage capacity has been built since the 1980s.259 There are a number of publicly funded electricity and heat storage development programmes, involving the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, the Energy Technologies Institute, Ofgem, the Department of Energy and Climate Change, and Innovate UK. In 2013, public sector energy storage spending on research and development was £9 million.

There is high potential for a major breakthrough in this field, for example, using ammonia for energy storage and transportation, where scientific innovation could create a whole new market for the UK.260 The Government lists energy storage as one of eight ‘great technologies’ in which it expects the UK to become a global leader.261
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HM Treasury

107. Financial risks such as a banking crisis are not included in the Government’s National Risk Register, which is produced by the Cabinet Office’s Civil Contingencies Secretariat. The Treasury’s business plan cites “reforming the regulatory framework for the financial sector to avoid future financial crises” as one of three Government priorities for the department. Sir Nicholas Macpherson disclaimed any responsibility for input into the register. When we asked why it does not contain anything about financial and economic emergencies, he replied:

You probably have to ask the people who produced the plan.

108. Sir Nicholas’s priorities and objectives for 2014/15 do not mention risk or horizon scanning or crisis planning or response. The Treasury’s 2012 review of its response to the global financial crisis review recommended further progress on a number of issues, including horizon scanning:

The Treasury should […] consider whether the UK has in place appropriate and proportionate ‘horizon scanning’ capabilities in relation to domestic and international financial stability so that the Government is best placed to spot, plan for and mitigate risks that might develop.

109. A number of commentators have highlighted the possibility of high impact financial risks manifesting, such as the size of asset management firms compared to the size of the economies in which they operate. As the BBC’s Robert Peston put it, “the decisions of just a few of them can cause boom or bust for entire economies.” The Prudential Regulation Authority lists the principal risks to the UK banking system as including “potential sharp upward movements in long-term interest rates and credit spreads, current and potential stress in the euro area and the threat of cyber attack.”

110. Andrew Haldane, the Bank of England’s Chief Economist, said in November 2014 that it was “too soon to tell whether any collective blind-spots remain. But compared with the pre-crisis period, the Bank today has two extra pairs of policy eyes”, the Prudential Regulation Authority and the Financial Policy Committee. Joint meetings between the

---

261 Policy Exchange, Tomorrow’s World: Eight great technologies with David Willetts, 24 January 2013
262 Cabinet Office, National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies, 2013
264 Q 211
265 Cabinet Office, Permanent Secretaries’ objectives 2014 to 2015, July 2014
266 HM Treasury, Review of HM Treasury’s management response to the financial crisis, March 2012
267 The next financial crisis, BBC News, 2 July 2014
268 Foreword by the Chief Executive Andrew Bailey, Prudential Regulation Authority Annual Report and Accounts 2014, June 2014
269 Bank of England, Central bank psychology - speech by Andrew Haldane, November 2014
Bank’s Monetary Policy Committee and these two, Andrew Haldane argued, “help strengthen the committees’ peripheral vision and are a safeguard against groupthink.”

111. Sir Nicholas told us that the Treasury is not complacent. He rejected “the idea that the Treasury can have all these matters under control when there are so many forces at work that are so manifestly beyond our control.” Indeed: “There are massive risks like banks collapsing, but where the Treasury tends to get surprised is with the more peripheral things that it tends to think are all under control but then is appalled to find out it does not have under control at all.” To reassure us that he was not complacent, Sir Nicholas cited a standard, well understood risk—the failure of a bank:

We did a lot of analysis and contingency planning around the impact of a banking collapse on Britain. When one of the Cypriot banks got into difficulties, we basically put into practice that contingency plan. There are a lot of Cypriots living in this country and it worked pretty well.

Sir Nicholas confirmed that the Treasury is the lead Government Department for managing financial and economic crises and said that “in the end, especially in a crisis, the really big issues come back to the Treasury.”

112. In April 2013 the Bank of England, not the Treasury, took on “enormous” new powers and responsibilities, including the responsibility for prudential regulation. The Prudential Regulation Authority, part of the Bank of England, regulates banks, building societies, credit unions, insurers and major investment firms, focusing on the harm that firms can cause to the stability of the UK financial system. It is the Bank of England, not the Treasury, which is now responsible for monetary, macro-prudential and micro-prudential policy.

**Resilience**

113. Resilience is the capacity to recover from shocks. The practice of armies maintaining reserves is a form of resilience, and London has demonstrated resilience by surviving fire, war and pestilence. Professor Ian Goldin argues that ‘just in time’ management and supply chains lead to brittle rather than resilient systems. One solution is to avoid over-reliance on single processes, and competition policy has a role to play in reducing systemic risk by ensuring that no one firm is too big to fail. Resilience can also be increased through
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diversity, on company boards and in societies enriched through immigration.\textsuperscript{280} Professor Jonathan Boston of the Victoria University of Wellington has suggested that, in organisations, some level of redundancy is needed for resilience, in the form, for example, of flexible staff.\textsuperscript{281}

114. Given incomplete knowledge, one should consider what is not known and act in ways that take this into account. The Government Office for Science gave an example of this in its report on high impact but low probability risks. In the event of an earthquake, the height and damage from a resulting tsunami wave are uncertain. In respect of the 2011 meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plant, which was triggered by a tsunami:

If the cooling systems for the fuel rods had failed to a passively safe mode of operation such as convective heat transfer to the adjacent Pacific then the system could have been much less vulnerable to what occurred.\textsuperscript{282}

This is an example of designing a system to make it more resilient.

115. There are trade-offs to resilience which mean some level of risk must be tolerated.\textsuperscript{283} Jennifer Cole of the Royal United Services Institute explained that “making the London Underground network completely resilient to terrorist attacks of the kind carried out on 7 July 2005, for example, would require the introduction of security scanners for passengers and luggage […] Measurements of resilience need to consider what is practical, as well as what is possible, to enable honesty about the points at which realistically practical measures are likely to fail.”\textsuperscript{284}

116. Mark Carney, Governor of the Bank of England, intends that firms are able to fail without threatening the stability of the system as a whole: “firms should face the discipline of the market and consequences of their actions. We do not operate a zero failure regime.”\textsuperscript{285}

117. A key conclusion of our predecessor Committee’s Report, \textit{Governing the future}, was that the Government’s assessment of likely future challenges should be as open as possible, to enable counter views to be articulated, and ensure that debate is as wide as possible.\textsuperscript{286} The Government Office for Science published a review of High Impact Low Probability Risks, such as severe space weather, in 2012. The key over-arching factor in its recommendations was the need for the inclusion of external experts and readiness to consider unlikely risks.\textsuperscript{287} Yet contacts between Whitehall and outside sources of
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knowledge and analysis are inadequate, according to written evidence from the Academy of Social Sciences:

By its very nature, foresight is ‘open book’: it demands access to the widest sources. ‘Blue skies’ are unlikely to be imagined in closed rooms.288

118. **A core role of the Civil Service is to look beyond single Parliaments to the long-term.** Its leadership must look beyond managing and controlling risks we already understand to systemic risks and uncertainty. The Civil Service value of impartiality implies a responsibility to provide advice about the longer term. Civil servants should not block or subvert ministerial decisions, but they should ensure their advice reflects a frank and honest assessment of the impact of ministers’ decisions on the long-term aims of Government.

119. The Treasury acknowledges ‘massive risks like banks collapsing’ but has not absorbed the key lesson of the 2007-08 financial crash on the interconnectedness of financial uncertainty with wider uncertainty. This leaves the UK exposed to the risk of another adverse event on the same scale as the 2007-08 financial crash. Financial and economic risks are ever present but not included in the National Risk Register. The Treasury does not therefore consider financial risks alongside other, non-financial risks, such as pandemic flu. The division of responsibilities has changed but the Treasury retains its overall accountability for financial crises.

120. **Resilience depends on informed challenge and putting in place sufficient resources to provide a buffer of redundant capacity.** This is harder to justify at times of austerity but it is all the more essential to plan carefully if cuts are being made. Independent advice is key given that group-think contributed to the financial crisis: ‘challenge’ is not about contesting the authority of ministers, it is robust information and advice to help ministers make their decisions. There is not enough challenge to Government horizon scanning, either from external views or from nurturing dissenting voices within the Civil Service.

288 Academy of Social Sciences (WFC4)
5 Conclusion

121. We have reviewed the Government’s capacity to analyse, assess and plan ahead. This is important both for known trends and risks, and for uncertain shocks and developments, sometimes termed ‘black swans’. The press of day-to-day events too often crowds out the longer term and preparation for the unexpected. But this work is essential, as however well prepared the Government is for foreseen events, fundamental uncertainties and system-wide risks remain. These are systemic risk and radical uncertainty, and they arise from interconnectedness. They therefore require interconnected preparation. Yet all the evidence is that the preparation in Whitehall is not sufficiently connected: most of the key problems faced by Governments are horizontal and most government responses are vertical.

122. Policy short-sightedness can become endemic and too often goes unchallenged by the Civil Service. Civil servants offer advice to Ministers, who have the power and responsibility to make decisions about resources for the future. They must be supported to create systematic and imaginative analysis of trends, risks and possibilities—this is already happening in some places. Obstacles like inadequate skills, inconsistent use of language, jargon, mistrust and above all, a lack of cross-government working, must be addressed. It is the responsibility of those giving advice—including those outside Government—to ensure that their advice is heard.

123. At present horizon scanning has to battle with the current agenda and its insights do not always reach policy makers. The Government’s assessment of likely future challenges should be as open as possible, to enable counter views to be articulated, and ensure that debate is as wide as possible. Otherwise, group-think will prevail and it will come as a surprise when expected futures do not materialise, leaving the UK unprepared to take advantage of future opportunities. Contacts between Whitehall and outside sources of knowledge and analysis are inadequate. By its nature, foresight demands access to the widest sources, not closed rooms.
Recommendations

124. The centre of government must strengthen its capacity for analysis and assessment of long-term issues and challenges. It should be capable of providing comprehensive advice to ministers based on this foresight and horizon scanning, as the basis for strategy and comprehensive cross-departmental financial planning. This capacity should inform spending reviews and decisions about financial priorities. It must be capable of formulating and overseeing the implementation of cross-government financial plans. The Government should set out how leadership of this work will be shared by the Chief Executive of the Civil Service and the Treasury, under the overall direction of the Cabinet Secretary and Head of the Civil Service, who should have overall responsibility for cross-departmental risk and radical uncertainty, so that this work is integrated. It should be presented in the form of advice to Cabinet, its committees and individual Ministers to inform decisions about spending and policy.

125. In order to demonstrate that the Treasury is fully prepared for another financial crisis as a consequence of the systemic risk arising from the interconnectedness of wider risks and uncertainties, the Treasury should:

- Plan for a range of different crisis scenarios, based on a broad range of forecasts, data sources and assumptions, and which may be triggered by non-financial as well as financial events;

- Conduct desk-top simulated exercises (“war games”) involving the Bank of England, and the Financial Conduct Authority, to test institutional responses and systemic resilience. This should inform a wider programme of cross-government exercises to test policy resilience (financial, economic, political and strategic); and

- Ensure that lessons learned from the above are synthesised into policy making and spending decisions, not just to ensure financial and systemic resilience, but to counter the risk of ‘secular stagnation’ in the economy, by seeking out and exploiting opportunities to promote growth through innovation.

126. The Cabinet Office, working with HM Treasury, should include systemic financial and economic risks in its National Risk Register.

127. The Cabinet Office horizon scanning programme team should be strengthened, to allow it to:

- promote a stronger appetite in the Civil Service for the understanding of risk, uncertainty and the longer term;

- continue its efforts to encourage the use of systematic and imaginative analysis of trends, risks and possibilities in the Civil Service professions. In due course it should expand this work from targeting just the policy profession to all the Civil Service professions;
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- find out what horizon scanning and foresight is going on across government and in public bodies, and report annually on the coherence and effectiveness of this work; and

- work with departments to ensure named individuals are responsible for the quality, quantity and application into policy of this work in each government department.

We recommend that civil servants’ career development should include a period with the team in order that they understand its role, and they are exposed to long-term thinking, fresh ideas and challenge, and able to think about systemic risk, risk management, uncertainty and future challenges. This would also provide the team with some much needed extra capacity.

128. All Government strategic planning documents must state how they are using the results of—not just conducting—horizon scanning.

129. The Treasury’s next spending review must not be rushed, to allow time necessary for it to be based upon cross governmental analysis and assessment and so to address the cross-governmental impact. It should then be possible for the spending review to reflect other cross-departmental strategy and plans, such as the next Strategic Defence and Security Review and for opportunities in areas such as infrastructure and technology.

130. All Select Committees should inquire at least once per Parliament into government actions to analyse trends, risks and future challenges and opportunities relevant to their remit. We also recommend that in the next Parliament, our successor Committee should lead by example in this, and offer to take a coordinating role in respect of the parallel work of other Select Committees.
Conclusions and recommendations

Introduction
1. Change is a constant challenge. Governments cannot foresee all the changes and unexpected shocks that will come, so flexibility, resilience and imagination are essential. Plans must be adjusted in response to political and other developments, rather than fixed upon. The UK must have the capacity to take advantage of trends and shocks, so the Government must see them as opportunities, not just threats. (Paragraph 22)

2. There are good examples of successful cross-government working, including the National Security Council in respect of crisis management, and counter-terrorism policy and planning. We also commend the Government for its intentions in introducing the Better Care Fund, which aims to improve integration between NHS services and social care services, addressing the pressure on the NHS caused by local government spending reductions. (Paragraph 23)

3. These examples of far-sighted policy making demonstrate what is possible. The evidence, however, is that these are the exception. Officials strive to work together but tend to stay within their department boundaries. The UK Government could learn from the Scottish Government, for example, which has restructured so that policy is coordinated across the administration as a whole. We reiterate our conclusion in “Strategic thinking in Government” that the Cabinet Office must be given the means and the influence to act as an effective headquarters of Government or the failure of cross-departmental working will continue to create wasteful conflict. We commend the Cabinet Secretary and Treasury Permanent Secretary for their determination to improve this and we will keep the matter under review. (Paragraph 24)

Known trends and drivers
4. The use of jargon in advice to ministers can obscure meaning, hide inaction and invite ridicule. Terms must be well understood for Government to be able to conduct coherent analysis and for officials to act accordingly. Jargon must not be used to lend a false legitimacy to otherwise ill-thought through ideas, concepts and policies. (Paragraph 45)

5. Whitehall lacks discipline about how to think about ends, ways and means in part because people use different terms in different contexts. For example, for the Ministry of Defence, strategy is how you achieve policy aims. For many in the rest of Government, the reverse is true: they understand policy to be how you achieve strategy. In our review, strategy includes both: it is about how you choose your long-term objectives, and how you assess the ways and means of achieving them. Both require longer-term thinking. (Paragraph 46)
6. Without a coherent understanding in the Civil Service of the trends and drivers of change, the Government will fail to develop associated opportunities, which depend on developing skills, educational opportunities, and investment in the UK’s science and industrial base. This is the most effective way to improve productivity and innovation. (Paragraph 47)

7. The Civil Service usually responds brilliantly to fast onset, short duration crises, with clear responsibility taken by a lead government department. This capability is tried and tested, both through exercises and real events. Market-wide exercises have been conducted to test resilience, but not on a comprehensive basis to address the risk of systemic financial collapse triggered by an unexpected event. Yet there is seldom an emergency that one government department can handle entirely on its own. (Paragraph 48)

Current Government capacity

8. There is an impressive array of high quality long-term thinking and horizon scanning across Government. The Civil Contingencies Secretariat and Met Office provide an excellent public sector capability. We welcome the Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology’s work in this area, prompted by our previous recommendation. We also welcome the establishment of the Cabinet Office’s horizon scanning programme team and its aim to coordinate work between departments. However, this central resource is much too small. It needs the capacity and the authority to address gaps and duplications and to coordinate a comprehensive and coherent analysis of the risks and challenges facing the whole of Government. (Paragraph 90)

9. We commend the development of the National Risk Register. It is a vital tool to enable and encourage thinking about better management of short and long term risks. Together with Whole of Government Accounts, which provides a deeper understanding of long term actual and potential financial liabilities, they set down the context which decision makers must consider. The challenge is to ensure that this information is used in advice to ministers, and not ignored. (Paragraph 91)

10. The Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre is generating world class horizon scanning which embraces the whole of Government. Though its work is used across Whitehall it is not even acknowledged by the Cabinet Office in their written evidence. This shows that horizon scanning is still regarded as ancillary rather than central to the business of Government, and requires wider awareness of horizon scanning and changes in attitude. (Paragraph 92)

11. Long-term thinking and the consideration of emerging trends need to be the driving force behind financial management and far more coordinated with public investment decisions. At present, horizon scanning has little impact on financial planning, though we commend the desire of the Cabinet Secretary, the Treasury Permanent Secretary and the Civil Service Chief Executive to address this problem. (Paragraph 93)
12. Comprehensive Spending Reviews reflect the Treasury’s legitimate preoccupation with setting spending limits department by department. But there is insufficient understanding of the cross-departmental effects of investment decisions, and a lack of capacity to create genuinely cross-government financial plans. The comment made by John Manzoni, Civil Service Chief Executive, that “normally, in the headquarters of a company, […] parts of the Treasury and Cabinet Office […] would be in one headquarters […] which] makes it slightly more complex”, shows that the present structure does not serve the interests of financial planning and management. Other governments including the federal governments of Canada and the United States have a single body to conduct financial planning. Some, like the think tank GovernUp, have recommended that functions from the Treasury and Cabinet Office should be combined in a new Office of Budget and Management. The present divide between the Treasury and Cabinet Office is a structural impediment to effective financial planning and management. (Paragraph 94)

Known and unknown risks

13. A core role of the Civil Service is to look beyond single Parliaments to the long-term. Its leadership must look beyond managing and controlling risks we already understand to systemic risks and uncertainty. The Civil Service value of impartiality implies a responsibility to provide advice about the longer term. Civil servants should not block or subvert ministerial decisions, but they should ensure their advice reflects a frank and honest assessment of the impact of ministers’ decisions on the long-term aims of Government. (Paragraph 118)

14. The Treasury acknowledges ‘massive risks like banks collapsing’ but has not absorbed the key lesson of the 2007-08 financial crash on the interconnectedness of financial uncertainty with wider uncertainty. This leaves the UK exposed to the risk of another adverse event on the same scale as the 2007-08 financial crash. Financial and economic risks are ever present but not included in the National Risk Register. The Treasury does not therefore consider financial risks alongside other, non-financial risks, such as pandemic flu. The division of responsibilities has changed but the Treasury retains its overall accountability for financial crises. (Paragraph 119)

15. Resilience depends on informed challenge and putting in place sufficient resources to provide a buffer of redundant capacity. This is harder to justify at times of austerity but it is all the more essential to plan carefully if cuts are being made. Independent advice is key given that group-think contributed to the financial crisis: ‘challenge’ is not about contesting the authority of ministers, it is robust information and advice to help ministers make their decisions. There is not enough challenge to Government horizon scanning, either from external views or from nurturing dissenting voices within the Civil Service. (Paragraph 120)
Recommendations

16. The centre of government must strengthen its capacity for analysis and assessment of long-term issues and challenges. It should be capable of providing comprehensive advice to ministers based on this foresight and horizon scanning, as the basis for strategy and comprehensive cross-departmental financial planning. This capacity should inform spending reviews and decisions about financial priorities. It must be capable of formulating and overseeing the implementation of cross-government financial plans. The Government should set out how leadership of this work will be shared by the Chief Executive of the Civil Service and the Treasury, under the overall direction of the Cabinet Secretary and Head of the Civil Service, who should have overall responsibility for cross-departmental risk and radical uncertainty, so that this work is integrated. It should be presented in the form of advice to Cabinet, its committees and individuals Ministers to inform decisions about spending and policy. (Paragraph 124)

17. In order to demonstrate that the Treasury is fully prepared for another financial crisis as a consequence of the systemic risk arising from the interconnectedness of wider risks and uncertainties, the Treasury should:

- Plan for a range of different crisis scenarios, based on a broad range of forecasts, data sources and assumptions, and which may be triggered by non-financial as well as financial events;

- Conduct desk-top simulated exercises ("war games") involving the Bank of England, and the Financial Conduct Authority, to test institutional responses and systemic resilience. This should inform a wider programme of cross-government exercises to test policy resilience (financial, economic, political and strategic); and

- Ensure that lessons learned from the above are synthesised into policy making and spending decisions, not just to ensure financial and systemic resilience, but to counter the risk of 'secular stagnation' in the economy, by seeking out and exploiting opportunities to promote growth through innovation. (Paragraph 125)

18. The Cabinet Office, working with HM Treasury, should include systemic financial and economic risks in its National Risk Register. (Paragraph 126)

19. The Cabinet Office horizon scanning programme team should be strengthened, to allow it to:

- promote a stronger appetite in the Civil Service for the understanding of risk, uncertainty and the longer term;

- continue its efforts to encourage the use of systematic and imaginative analysis of trends, risks and possibilities in the Civil Service professions. In due course it
should expand this work from targeting just the policy profession to all the Civil Service professions;

- find out what horizon scanning and foresight is going on across government and in public bodies, and report annually on the coherence and effectiveness of this work; and

- work with departments to ensure named individuals are responsible for the quality, quantity and application into policy of this work in each government department.

We recommend that civil servants’ career development should include a period with the team in order that they understand its role, and they are exposed to long-term thinking, fresh ideas and challenge, and able to think about systemic risk, risk management, uncertainty and future challenges. This would also provide the team with some much needed extra capacity. (Paragraph 127)

20. All Government strategic planning documents must state how they are using the results of—not just conducting—horizon scanning. (Paragraph 128)

21. The Treasury’s next spending review must not be rushed, to allow time necessary for it to be based upon cross governmental analysis and assessment and so to address the cross-governmental impact. It should then be possible for the spending review to reflect other cross-departmental strategy and plans, such as the next Strategic Defence and Security Review and for opportunities in areas such as infrastructure and technology. (Paragraph 129)

22. All Select Committees should inquire at least once per Parliament into government actions to analyse trends, risks and future challenges and opportunities relevant to their remit. We also recommend that in the next Parliament, our successor Committee should lead by example in this, and offer to take a coordinating role in respect of the parallel work of other Select Committees. (Paragraph 130)
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