

Speech: A Moment of Opportunity for Afghanistan

Thank you Mr President, and thank you to our briefers, particularly may I pass on my thanks to Special Representative Yamamoto for updating the Council on the latest report and for all of the work that you and your team are doing in challenging circumstances. Thank you.

Mr President, this feels like a moment of opportunity for Afghanistan.

Recent events including the unprecedented ceasefires and the preparations for upcoming elections give us all reasons to be cautiously optimistic. We must do everything we can to make the most of this opportunity to end the violence.

President Ghani's offer to the Taliban of talks without preconditions and the ceasefires over Eid al-Fitr are most welcome. The extraordinary images of soldiers and Taliban fighters embracing in the streets of cities across Afghanistan gave hope to millions of Afghans that an end to the conflict was achievable.

The Afghan Government has shown an impressive commitment to peace. Now we need a similar commitment from the Taliban. The Taliban need to decide whether they want to be a part of the future of Afghanistan. It seems to be what many of their fighters want. It is what the Afghan people want. It is time for the Taliban's leaders to show true courage and true leadership and work for peace.

Of course, the only solution to the conflict is an Afghan-led and owned political process.

Mr President, there are now four months to go until parliamentary elections in October. We welcome the progress to date on key electoral reforms and thank UNAMA for supporting the Afghan government in their preparations.

Boris Johnson, the British Foreign Secretary, was in Kabul only yesterday. And he said there that "we encourage UNAMA to keep up the pressure on the Afghan Government and its electoral management bodies to ensure credible, inclusive and timely elections."

The UK and the wider donor community are also playing our parts, and we are encouraging the Independent Election Commission (IEC) and Electoral Complaints Commission (ECC) to deliver elections on time with a focus on reducing opportunities for fraud. We are particularly concerned that key positions remain unfilled at the IEC and we call on the Afghan Government to appoint a new CEO and the provincial ECC Commissioners without delay.

Following the elections, the Geneva Conference on Afghanistan in November will be an opportunity for donor countries and the Government of Afghanistan to take stock of progress since 2016 and to ensure the government is on track

to deliver its reform commitments. This is also an opportunity for the donor community and the government to consider the future of international support beyond 2020.

Mr President, at this moment of potential change, we should reflect on progress to date, particularly on the rights of women and girls. This is a personal priority of the British Foreign Secretary, who met Afghan girls participating in a UK-funded sports education programme during his recent trip. Over the last six years, UK aid has helped 300,000 marginalised Afghan girls into education and trained over 10,000 teachers.

But there is some way to go to reach our goal of 12 years of quality education for all girls. The UK is contributing almost \$1 billion in development funding in Afghanistan between 2016 and 2020. We will continue to work closely with our Afghan partners to promote opportunities for all Afghans.

Mr President, I began by saying that this felt like a moment of opportunity for Afghanistan. There is a prospect of peace. Elections are coming, which can help support peace and social stability. Let us stand beside our Afghan partners at this moment. Let us stand beside the Afghan people as they determine their own future.

Thank you Mr President.

[News story: Food chain resilience in a changing world: conference report](#)

The 2018 Government Chemist Conference was a success, with over 100 delegates attending the event at BMA House on 13 and 14 June to hear experts discuss the challenges of providing food and drink for the public that is authentic, safe and sustainable. Approximately 50 different organisations were represented, including public analyst laboratories and contract testing laboratories, research associations, government, universities, instrument suppliers and food manufacturers.

[Julian Braybrook](#), the Government Chemist, opened the conference followed by a keynote lecture from BEIS Chief Scientific Adviser, [Professor John Loughhead](#). Professor Loughhead focused his talk on the current challenges in the provision of food that meets the needs of customers in terms of affordability, safety and authenticity at a time of global change. As well as geopolitical change, scientific advances and shifting attitudes are contributing to create a complex scenario for all stakeholders in the food and drink space. He explained how different departments within BEIS are working together and with the newly created Food and Drink Sector Council to develop and support a regulatory landscape that ensures the delivery of those

customer requirements.

Other presentations across the two days included a talk by Franz Ulberth from the European Commission Joint Research Centre on the work they are doing to combat the global issue of food fraud, a theme that was expanded by Chi Singh Ng from the Government Laboratory in Hong Kong on his talk titled "Food Safety Challenge – Hong Kong perspective".

The recent Government Chemist referee work was presented by [Michael Walker](#), LGC, who highlighted some of the most unusual cases received during the year, including the classification of kratom, and definition of jelly cups. Delegates also heard presentations on the roles of some of the bodies responsible for ensuring food safety and authenticity, including the Public Analyst Service, the Food Authenticity Network, Food Standards Scotland, Public Health England and the challenges they face.

Dr Giles Yeo from Cambridge University offered an interesting introduction to the role genes play in obesity, although remarking that there are environmental factors which have a major effect, and Kate Cooper from Birmingham Food Council highlighted the need to communicate with the public in ways that are accessible and novel.

[The presentations from the conference are now available.](#)

Julian Braybrook, Government Chemist said:

The GC conference aims to bring together all stakeholders working on issues affecting the resilience of the food chain supply, and once again it has delivered on that aim. I am particularly grateful to the excellent set of speakers who provided insightful information about food safety, authenticity and security. We look forward to continuing the conversation until we meet again in 2020.

Jon Griffin, President of the Association of Public Analysts and member of the GC Programme Expert Group:

The biennial Government Chemist Conference provides representatives from official laboratories the opportunity to gain an insight into current analytical method development and potential food and feed issues. This, together with the ability to interact with other professionals from the food and feed sector and relevant government departments, means attending this event is essential to maintain our knowledge base and professional competence.

In addition to support from the Government Chemist programme, sponsorship was received from DEFRA, FSA, Food Standards Scotland and the Association of Public Analysts Educational Trust.

Speech: Chief Secretary to the Treasury Liz Truss speech to the London School of Economics

Introduction

As an economics geek, and a committed free marketer, I've always admired the London School of Economics.

Despite its left-wing reputation, it was the academic home of Hayek.

But even more than that, it produced my husband, Hugh O'Leary.

It means that whenever I want a late night discussion about supply side reform or econometrics, there's always someone on hand.

The permissive society

And why do I love this stuff?

Because I care about freedom.

I've never liked being told what to do. And I don't like to see other people being told what to do.

Britain is a country that is raucous and rowdy.

We have a younger generation of self-starters growing up, who are desperate shape their own futures. Who reject hierarchy and understand the networked world and who want to take on the establishment – and win.

That's not just a healthy attitude to have in life. I believe it's key to our economic future.

I believe that our future lies in cultivating their maverick spirit.

I want our economic model to be one where it's not about the state deciding what you do, it's about you deciding what you do.

And from the grainbelt of our agricultural heartlands, to the brainbelt bursting out around our great universities...

From the port cities to the inland empires.

With greater freedom, all of these places have the capacity to do and be more.

Truly free enterprise has huge economic benefits, driving down prices and creating growth and jobs.

It breaks down monopolies, hierarchies and outdated practices.

It destroys barriers, and erodes inequality.

It's good for business, and it's good for our nation of Airbnb-ing, Deliveroo-eating, Uber-riding freedom fighters. As the LSE's own Lionel Robbins said: "every day, thousands of people cast their votes for the hundreds of products and services on offer, and from the competition to win votes, better and better products and services arise."

We all benefit from the creativity and innovation of a free market.

New gadgets may begin in the hands of the wealthy few.

But they most often end up improving all our lives.

From the bricklayer to the banker, we all use the same smartphones.

There's no more important time to be thinking about this.

Britain has a unique opportunity to re-establish itself as the land of the free.

After surviving the financial crisis and launching the Brexit process. We can put public finances on an even keel, and drive progress through economic liberalisation.

Our Industrial Strategy will guide us towards achieving that. It sets out how we are building a Britain fit for the future – how we will strengthen our skills, bolster our industries, and build the infrastructure we need to boost productivity and the earning power of everyone throughout the UK.

We already have a strong base, with a record number of start-ups, and record levels of employment.

But if we get the next phase of our development right, if we liberate every part of our economy, we can truly turbocharge growth.

Freedom to work

I believe that liberating the economy has to start with the individual, and helping more people get into jobs.

Work isn't just about feeding your family.

It's about your sense of self and independence.

What we've done as a government, is help more people gain that independence.

Since we came to power, we have reformed employment law, making it easier for companies to take on staff.

We've widened access to professions, making it easier to train as a teacher or lawyer.

We've taken huge strides to even the playing field for women in top professions.

We've also built on a history of supply side reform in the labour market.

In the 1980s, Mrs Thatcher curbed excessive union power which created barriers to entry and meant cronyism was the key to climbing the ladder. More recently, it was the welfare state that was holding people back, and our changes released millions who were trapped in poverty into well-paid work.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

But the results prove them wrong – we now have record employment and the lowest unemployment rate since 1975 which has reduced inequality.

Meanwhile, our European neighbours with labour markets much more restrictive than ours are struggling.

France's unemployment rate is double ours, while in Spain and Italy it's even worse.

But there are still barriers stopping people getting into work in this country. Often these are barriers as thin as a sheet of paper.

Because Britain has a higher proportion of licensed workers than France, Italy or Belgium.

When well-designed, professional qualifications can ensure the public are protected from harm.

But for those without the funds or family connections to break in from outside, finding work can be frustrating.

In the 1980s, it was unions that were holding people back from getting jobs – now it's over-regulated occupations.

And for consumers, it can mean less choice, and higher prices.

So if we can reduce these barriers, everyone will benefit.

I want to liberalise unfair regulation to make it easier for people to follow their dreams and start new careers.

I want to challenge unfair rules and fees, and make sure that barriers are not being put up to important industries in the UK economy, I will explore taking forward a cross-government review of occupational licensing.

Freedom to live

For that individual following their dreams, there needs to be affordable housing wherever they want to live. If I see an opportunity I want to get a

piece of the action.

I want to surf the zeitgeist to where it's all happening.

When I moved to London from Leeds as a graduate in the 1990s, I came because of the opportunities on offer here.

Back then, I could afford to find somewhere to live.

And now, having benefited from that opportunity, it would be wrong of me to deny it to others.

This government has delivered more affordable homes.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

But too many people that have got themselves on the ladder have been allowed to pull it up behind them.

Which means that young people these days can struggle to get flats near their jobs.

According to the Resolution Foundation, the share of working age people moving for jobs has gone down by 25 per cent since 2001.

And this is hitting people in the pocket – they estimate the average earner would have been £2,000 better off if they were able to get on their bikes.

If we sorted this out, it could give a boost to individual workers, and to the economy.

Evidence from America would suggest so.

A recent study in America by Hsieh and Moretti showed that freeing up housing regulations in New York, San Jose and San Francisco to median levels could increase the US's GDP by 3.7 per cent.

But the most productive cities are being held back by restrictive regulations.

It's much the same story in the UK – restrictions on building are holding cities up.

Our housebuilding rate peaked in the 1830s – long before we had cranes and diggers – simply because there were fewer planning restrictions.

That's why I'm heartened by groups like London Yimby, who want to open up planning.

It's the right and fair thing to do for people.

And it would be one of the fastest ways of boosting our country's productivity.

In Japan, things are different.

In the early 2000s, they relaxed their urban development rules, giving people the freedom to change their property as they see fit.

And commercial developers are free to do as they please in designated zones.

It all means that whereas house prices doubled and quadrupled in London and San Francisco – they were much flatter in Tokyo.

It's restrictions that are causing problems, so we need to liberate.

We should densify our built environment, and look at making it easier for local neighbourhoods to raise the height of their houses.

All this affects businesses too.

They need access to the best talent, and the benefits that come with economies of scale.

So I want to see us remove the barriers to prosperity in high growth areas.

That's why we're piloting a manufacturing zone in the East Midlands, where some aspects of planning are pre-agreed – with a nod to the Japanese system – helping manufacturers get straight to work on building their factories.

And I want to work with industry to see if more Development Corporations, like the one we used to build Canary Wharf, could be a success.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

Freedom to do business

For many people, following their dreams doesn't just mean getting the job that they want...

It means starting a business of their own.

And those people should have the freedom to fight for their place in the market.

I see it as my role as Chief Secretary to the Treasury to be on the side of the insurgents – I see myself as the disruptor in chief!

Because British people love change.

From the adoption of the latest gadgets – the microwave meal, to the smartphone to being one of the most socially advanced, modern countries in the world...

This ancient rock of Northern Europe has always been at the forefront of progress.

I saw a recent IPSOS Mori poll which showed that, of 23 of the world's most

advanced economies, British people were the least likely to say that the world is changing too fast.

We have some of the highest start-up rates, and fastest-adopting consumers in the world.

We've embraced new apps like Citymapper and JustEat because they have given us extra freedom, and because they have given extra work and income to people often on the fringes of society.

Most of us welcome all this change, but some have a stake in the status quo.

The blob of vested interests campaign for a thicket of regulation to surround incumbents and protect them from competition.

The government should take these vested interests on, and free the disruptors to bring life to the market and empower those on the margins.

Sometimes, traditional businesses face regulatory barriers that disruptors don't.

For example, I've heard from a guesthouse in my constituency that had to gain two licenses to let his guests listen to the radio. Airbnbers don't have to worry about the same restrictions.

And commercial TV is price capped on advertising, while their competitors on the internet – including Google – are not.

But the answer isn't to increase regulation, and keep everyone back.

I believe that the answer is to look at whether the regulations that we have are fit for purpose, to reduce barriers for everyone, so that competition is a fair fight.

Because we should reward those with the brightest ideas, rather than those with the biggest legal departments.

I've already mentioned what we could do with housing and planning in this country.

But could we reduce energy bills by simplifying regulation and enhancing competition?

Or encourage growth by cutting fees and regulations for businesses, rather than offering further subsidies that benefit incumbent firms?

I want us to do everything we can to make things fairer, simpler, and easier for businesses to compete.

Many of the rules that we have in place are important in guaranteeing public safety.

But it's hard to shake the feeling that sometimes they just get in the way of consumer's choices and lifestyles.

And government's role should not be to tell us what our tastes should be.

Too often we're hearing about not drinking too much...

...eating too many doughnuts...

...drinking from disposable cups through plastic straws...

...or enjoying the warm glow of our wood-burning Goves...I mean stoves.

I can see their point: there's enough hot air and smoke at the Environment Department already.

A guy in my constituency, who brought in £10,000 a year to Mundford Football Club by setting up advertising hoardings around the ground, had to take them down, after one person complained to the council.

If Frances McDormand can put up three billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri, why can't we do the same in King's Lynn, Norfolk?

I've heard that the EU are debating a copyright law that could ban memes from the internet...

In my own words. That. Is. A. Disgrace.

Or take burgers. I keep being told by excellent burger producers, whether it's the Burger Shop in Hay-On-Wye or Bleecker Street in London, that there are strict restrictions against selling medium rare.

Why can't I as a consumer decide, as I would be in most parts of the USA, or France?

Regulations against my tastes in burgers may see a little trivial, but they are symptomatic of a broader malaise.

Unnecessary red tape restricts business and consumer freedom, so I believe we should cut it wherever we can.

Freedom to trade

Finally, we should extend our liberal economic outlook to the world.

Because if your business grows so big you want to expand overseas, you should have the freedom to do that.

Brexit comes with a host of opportunities, and surely one is that Britain is well placed to make the case for open and liberal trade.

Doing so will bring the same benefits as for economic liberalisation at home: broadening choice for consumers, and increasing competitive pressures on businesses.

Trade as a proportion of GDP – a traditional measure of openness – is 78 per cent of GDP in South Korea, compared to 58 per cent of GDP in the UK.

And every extra percentage point of openness increases productivity by 1.23 per cent, so if we matched South Korea in the long run, this would give a massive boost to our GDP.

The sleek state

For people and businesses to have the best opportunities, government has an invaluable role in educating our children, keeping us healthy, investing in world-class infrastructure and keeping markets fair and open.

But we should also be constantly vigilant that the state does not balloon out of control.

Because the more government spends, the higher taxes have to be.

And that means less money for businesses to spend on their own priorities, like the farm in Lincolnshire that needs a new machine to automate potato picking.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

And higher tax means less money for me to decide when to go on holiday or buy a new car.

The Spending Review taking place next year gives us an opportunity to address this.

It gives us a chance to get debt down, modernise Government and keep control of the size of the state.

Responsibility for the public finances

I have to confess it can be lonely at the Treasury.

Poring over the spreadsheets, freezing with the heating off in winter or sweltering with zero aircon in the summer.

The only excitement is helping yourself to the Chancellor's secret KitKat stash.

It can sometimes feel like there's always a party going on that you're not invited to – particularly when the Foreign Office is next door.

While everyone around is spending money or at the very least talking about it, we are the preachers of prudence.

Over the past 8 years, we have cut government waste whilst focussing on quality and value for money in our public services. Overall we've reduced government spending from a whopping 45 per cent of GDP to 39 per cent, meaning we could cut tax on the lowest paid whilst maintaining world class public services.

We have cut the deficit by three-quarters, to just over 1.9 per cent now.

We are now on course for debt to be falling as a share of the economy by this year.

It's precisely because of this prudence, that we've been able to boost funding for the NHS.

The settlement, which was done on an extraordinary basis, outside the Spending Review, because we recognised the real pressures in this service, is only possible due to the government's economic credibility.

It's only because we've kept purse strings that we have been able to do this.

And that's why we need to continue on our path.

Despite everything we've done, we've still got the highest debt for fifty years at 85 per cent of GDP.

And we need to turn this around.

Because high debt can dissuade investors. And the OBR have warned that if the UK is hit by a shock this could send debt over 110 per cent of GDP.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

Setting up the OBR and developing our fiscal rules have helped us counter this tendency, and put Britain on a path to lower debt.

Other countries have followed a similar path.

Switzerland and Chile have shown that flexible yet robust fiscal rules can be designed which balance budgets over the business cycle.

These rules are self-discipline mechanisms, which help ensure that governments do not get carried away.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

The big state is not inevitable

Some people argue that, as a country's population becomes older, the state must take an increasing share of the economy.

But there are many aging countries with advanced economies that do not have high tax and spend.

Instead, they deliver really high quality services, with less waste and at better value for money.

Japan has an old population with a median age of 47, compared to Britain's 40.

But their spending as a share of GDP is slightly lower than the UK's.

Japanese colleagues told me that they recently raised VAT to 8 per cent – and

that was causing consternation!

South Korea, meanwhile, has a comparable median age to Britain, but a very small state.

Their government expenditure is only 32 per cent of GDP.

All these countries are facing similar problems, but are finding solutions.

We shouldn't necessarily seek to emulate everything these countries do: Japan has debt levels of 200 per cent GDP, while South Korea's economy is driven by a small number of conglomerates.

But the point remains: an aging country does not ipso facto mean a country with high tax and spend.

Even countries that we sometimes think of as having big states are realising that governments should seek to do less, better.

Canada, after the misconceived expansionist years in the 1960s, when they raised taxes and nationalised businesses...rescued their economy in the 90s by cutting spending and balancing the budget.

Sweden had a similar story. In the two decades since their banking crisis in the early 90s, they kept a tight hand on their budget and overhauled their sprawling welfare state.

As a result, their economy has been transformed in the two decades since their banking crisis.

All across the world, countries are addressing their problems not simply by raising tax and spend, but by reshaping and reinventing themselves.

It's not macho to demand more money

That means creating a sleek, effective, sharp and focused public sector.

Yes, we all want well-funded, high-quality public services.

But government has a responsibility to live within means, ruthlessly pursue efficiencies, eliminate waste, and constantly re-examine the scope of government in a world of constant technological change.

As a Government we are spending £800bn, the equivalent of £29,000 per household.

We spend more than Germany or Japan on schools per student and our spending on health, currently at the Western European average, will match France's by 2024.

We spend a higher proportion on welfare and pensions than most of our European neighbours, too.

But often government budgets are simply rolled over from the year before,

rather than being rigorously reappraised based on their merits.

We need to look at budgets with fresh eyes, and think more as a start-up would.

Those familiar with the 1984 film Gremlins – will recall how the cute Gizmo, when fed after midnight, turned into a slime-soaked baddie Stripe.

In much the same way, there's a tendency for governments and bureaucracy to multiply and exert further control. And before you know it gremlins are everywhere.

There is a temptation to feed these creatures after midnight.

But more widely we have to recognise that it's not macho just to demand more money. It's much tougher to demand better value and challenge the blob of vested interests within your department.

Some of my colleagues are not being clear about the tax implications of their proposed higher spending.

That's why, in next year's Spending Review, I want to take a zero-based, zero-tolerance approach to wasteful spend.

We need to take a look at ourselves and think "what is the best way to use the money entrusted to us?"

We have to make every pound pull its weight. We have to make every pound pull its weight.

The digital state

As well as re-examining what the state does, we should also look at how it does what it does.

David Cameron spoke about the post-bureaucratic age and an information revolution but we're still wading through paper.

The box that I take home every night groans and creaks with documents.

It feels less like the post-bureaucratic age and more like the most-bureaucratic.

So it's my ambition that we transition to a digital, no-paper state within a generation.

And according to a report from Reform and Deloitte, if we fully rolled out artificial intelligence in Government – we could save £17bn.

Fiscal discipline and economic liberalisation are two parts of the same story: the desire to give people power over their own money and their own lives.

Many people voted for Brexit because they wanted to take control of their own

lives. And the public will find it unforgivable and a betrayal of Brexit if just as we embark on a bright future outside the EU – we impose higher and higher taxes on them taking away the control they have over their own money.

This is a complete contradiction of the Brexit vote.

If that's not enough to convince anyone, then a look at the alternatives should.

[POLITICAL CONTENT REMOVED]

Living in a stagnating country that was utterly boring, with the government controlling more of our lives.

Or there's the option pursued by some other Western nations – carry out some regulatory and tax reforms – and see an economic boost.

But also let fiscal responsibility slide and allow the deficit to balloon.

We've been there before. It leads to boom and bust.

Or there's the worst of both worlds advocated by Jeremy Corbyn – a combination of policies he has admitted will lead to a run on the banks.

More spending, more state control, and runaway debt. This would lead straight to penury.

As Paul Ryan said, it would lead to a world where everything is free – except us.

Economies and societies are stronger when individuals, families and businesses have the freedom to decide for themselves

By giving them all more power – we have the ability give our country the huge economic boost it needs.

[News story: Food chain resilience in a changing world: conference presentations](#)

[Conference programme, abstracts and biographies](#) (PDF, 8.31MB, 39 pages)

Presentations from the 2018 Government Chemist Conference can be found below:

[Welcome and introduction, Julian Braybrook, Government Chemist](#) (PDF, 1.52MB, 16 pages)

[Referee casework outcomes, Michael Walker, Consultant Referee Analyst, LGC](#) (PDF, 2.55MB, 65 pages)

[Application of whole genome sequencing for public health interventions around foodborne pathogens, Kathie Grant, Public Health England](#) (PDF, 2.75MB, 31 pages)

[Resilience through food forensics – essential post EU exit, Jon Griffin, President of the Association of Public Analysts](#) (PDF, 1.44MB, 21 pages)

[Regulating Our Future – modernising food regulation in the UK, Catriona Stewart, Food Standards Agency](#) (PDF, 1.28MB, 22 pages)

[The European Commission Knowledge Centre for food fraud and quality, Franz Ulberth, European Commission Joint Research Centre](#) (PDF, 2.37MB, 30 pages)

[Road map for the harmonisation of DNA testing for meat speciation, Timothy Wilkes, LGC](#) (PDF, 1000KB, 30 pages)

[Are your genes to blame when your jeans don't fit?, Giles Yeo, MRC Metabolic Diseases Unit, University of Cambridge](#) (PDF, 1.99MB, 17 pages)

[How the food industry is preparing for EU exit, Helen Munday, Food and Drink Federation](#) (PDF, 1.46MB, 20 pages)

[How can measurement science assist in improving the molecular detection and management of antimicrobial resistance?, Jim Huggett, LGC / University of Surrey](#) (PDF, 2.57MB, 28 pages)

[Early warning systems to detect, predict and assess food fraud, Yamine Bouzembrak, RIKILT](#) (PDF, 5.7MB, 31 pages)

[How far have we come since horse-gate; global tools available to fight food fraud, Selvarani Elahi, LGC](#) (PDF, 1.71MB, 36 pages)

[Accelerating rice improvement in South Asia, Katherine Steele, Bangor University](#) (PDF, 3.1MB, 30 pages)

[The Hand That Feeds: A musical about food crime, Kate Cooper](#)

[**News story: Knife Crime Market Exploration**](#)

To aid in the design of the challenge we are engaging the market in order to provide the H0 with an understanding of what capabilities currently exist or are in development that could provide solutions.

Background

The HO is concerned about recent increases in homicides, gun crime and knife crime. Although crime has fallen rapidly over the last 20 years, some types of violent crime recorded by the police have shown increases since late 2014. In 2017, knife crime rose by 22% across England and Wales which has resulted in a significant increase in fatal stabbings and incidents where serious injury has been caused. The use of knives to enable acquisitive crime has also seen a marked increase. Whilst the increase in knife crime is a complex problem with many influencing factors, the ability for police to detect knives being carried by people is fundamental to reducing the harm caused. This is particularly challenging when knives are concealed and carried in crowded spaces. Consequently, the use of current detection systems is limited. The UK Police have implemented strategies to tackle the issue and the application of science and technology must play an important role in tackling this threat and in April 2018, the Government launched the Serious Violence Strategy, which aims to tackle knife crime and other forms of serious violence.

What we want

The HO is interested in solutions that can identify or detect people carrying, overtly or covertly, a wide variety of steel-bladed knives in open spaces, crowds and uncontrolled areas (i.e. where there is no presence of security). There is a requirement to detect steel-bladed knives in the presence of other commonly carried benign metal items (e.g. keys, phones, coins etc.). As well as being concealed on the person, this also includes knives carried in bags (e.g. handbags, backpacks etc.).

We are interested in all forms of potential solutions from specific technologies, through to advances in behavioural sciences. Potential solutions could be at any level of maturity, but we are particularly interested in those at the higher end of the scale.

Solutions that can contribute to the detection of steel-bladed weapons being carried by individuals or groups will support the UK Police in their decision making process regarding an appropriate operational response and ultimately reduce the number of casualties across the UK.

By completing the Capability Submission Form neither the Government nor yourselves are committing to anything, but your submissions will be used to help focus the direction of the work.

What we don't want

We are not interested in literature reviews, paper-based studies and marginal improvements to existing capabilities (i.e. those used in controlled areas such as metal detectors in arches and hand-held devices). For this challenge we are only interested in steel-bladed weapons, not other forms of blade such as polymeric or ceramic.

How to submit a Capability Submission Form

Complete the attached one page form [Knife Crime Capability Submission Form](#) (ODT, 868KB) (noting the word limits) and then email it to accelerator@dstl.gov.uk by 5pm on 20 July 2018. Please only provide details of one product/capability per form. If you have a number of potential solutions then please submit multiple forms.

If you have any questions then please email accelerator@dstl.gov.uk with Knife Crime in the subject line.

How we use your Information

Information you provide to us in a Capability Submission Form [Knife Crime Capability Submission Form](#) (ODT, 868KB) that is not already available to us from other sources, will be handled in-confidence. By submitting a Capability Submission Form [Knife Crime Capability Submission Form](#) (ODT, 868KB) you are giving us permission to keep and use the information for our internal purposes, and to provide the information onwards, in-confidence, within UK Government. The Defence and Security Accelerator will not use or disclose the information for any other purpose, without first requesting permission to do so.