

The Critical Retreat: Quantifying Structural Vulnerability and Institutional Failure in UK Critical Minerals Security

Executive Summary: The Structural Malignancy of Short-Termism

The United Kingdom's strategic vulnerability to geopolitical coercion stems from a systemic, decades-long "**Critical Retreat**" from foundational national resilience. This retreat is not characterized by a single policy error, but rather by institutionally mandated short-termism, which has left the nation dependent on non-market actors for vital components of its defence, energy transition, and advanced manufacturing sectors.

Empirical evidence confirms three core, quantifiable failures:

1. **Unchecked Geopolitical Dependency:** China controls approximately **90%** of the global refining and permanent magnet manufacturing capacity for Rare Earth Elements (REEs).¹ This dominance is sustained by massive state subsidization, creating an anti-competitive environment that market forces alone cannot overcome.³
2. **Acute Domestic Institutional Failure:** The UK suffers from chronic under-investment, symptomized by a local road maintenance backlog totaling approximately **£16.81 billion**.⁵ This fiscal short-sightedness is compounded by an extreme R&D disparity, with **50% to 52%** of public funding concentrated in the Greater South East, stifling industrial regeneration elsewhere.⁶
3. **Strategic Paralysis:** Long-term planning is structurally undermined by hyper-volatility in economic leadership. Key ministries responsible for fiscal stability and industrial strategy—the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Business/Trade Secretary—have maintained an average tenure of only **~1.0 to 1.1 years** over the last decade.⁸ This instability is inconsistent with the multi-year capital commitment required to build strategic resilience.

Reversing the Critical Retreat requires immediate, institutionally insulated strategic

intervention, adopting mechanisms similar to the decisive price guarantees deployed by the United States through its Defense Production Act (DPA), which neutralize the economic damage estimated by the cost of recent supply shocks, such as the \$240 billion loss incurred by the automotive industry.¹¹

Section I: The Geoeconomic Battlefield – China's Strategic Dominance and Price Manipulation

This section establishes the severity of the supply chain threat by quantifying China's command over crucial midstream processing and magnet manufacturing stages, demonstrating classic predatory pricing enabled by massive state subsidy.

1.1 The Critical Choke Point: Quantifying Rare Earth Control

China's strategic leverage in the critical minerals sector is frequently underestimated by focusing purely on raw material extraction. The true vulnerability lies downstream, in the sophisticated, high-barrier-to-entry stages of processing and manufacturing.

While China accounts for a high share of global Rare Earth Element (REE) mine production—estimated at approximately **69% to 70%** of the world's total REO equivalent output in 2024¹³—its dominance intensifies significantly further up the value chain. In the critical midstream segment of **refining and chemical processing**, China controls between **87% and 90%** of global capacity.² This refining stage transforms raw mined materials into the purified oxides and metals required for industrial application, creating a critical bottleneck that even successful Western mining initiatives cannot bypass. For example, Australia's largest separated rare earths producer outside China still relies on Chinese facilities for refining its oxides and is expected to remain reliant until at least 2026.¹⁶

This overwhelming control extends into the highest-value components. China commands **85% to 90%** of global permanent magnet production.¹ These neodymium-iron-boron (NdFeB) magnets are indispensable to high-performance technologies, including electric vehicle (EV) motors, wind turbines, and advanced defense systems such as F-35 fighters and Aegis destroyers.¹ This vertical integration ensures that dependence on the midstream constrains every subsequent phase of manufacturing, regardless of where the raw minerals originate. The control over this choke point is sufficient to transition from commercial dominance to

geopolitical leverage.

Table 1 illustrates the critical disparity between mining and midstream control:

Table 1: China's Dominance Across the Rare Earth Value Chain (2023/2025 Data)

Supply Chain Stage	China's Global Market Share (%)	Key Strategic Implication
Mining (REO Equivalent)	\$\approx\$ 69% - 70%	High global control over raw material extraction. ¹³
Processing / Refining	\$\approx\$ 87% - 90%	The primary midstream choke point controlling chemical separation. ²
Permanent Magnet Production	\$\approx\$ 85% - 90%	Dominance over high-value components essential for advanced technology and defense. ¹

1.2 State Capitalism’s Edge: Quantifying Chinese Financial Leverage

China’s near-monopoly in refining and manufacturing is not merely a consequence of cost advantage but a deliberate outcome of sustained, anti-competitive state intervention. This strategy utilizes massive, opaque financial support to suppress global prices and structurally undermine competing international projects.

Between 2010 and 2019, the Chinese government provided over **\$9-10 billion** in direct financial support to its rare earth companies, with this financial assistance growing annually by 22% over that decade.³ This immense infusion of state capital is channeled through various mechanisms, including easy access to large-scale credit from state-owned banks, preferential tax rates, and the systemic provision of subsidized inputs.¹⁸ For instance, documented examples from other heavyweight industrial sectors illustrate the strategic use of preferential pricing, such as a **10% subsidy** on electricity prices provided to large producers.²⁰ Such measures dramatically lower operational expenditures for Chinese State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs).

This results in a structural disadvantage for Western developers. Capital costs for critical

mineral projects in diversified regions are typically around **50% higher** than for incumbent Chinese producers.⁴ When competitors face this high cost of entry combined with persistent global price suppression enabled by state subsidies, the market mechanism alone becomes incapable of delivering diversification. A gap exists between what is commercially viable in a genuine market economy and what is strategically necessary for national security. Without policy designed explicitly to bridge this **financial viability gap**, private capital will continue to be deterred, thereby maintaining Beijing's dominance through calculated economic coercion.

1.3 Geopolitical Weaponization: Targeting High-Value Heavy REEs

The shift in Chinese policy has evolved from commercial dominance to the active weaponization of critical mineral exports. This involves the targeted application of export controls on specific, high-performance elements where Western vulnerability is most pronounced.

Recent restrictions imposed by Beijing have focused specifically on medium and **heavy rare earth elements (HREEs)** such as dysprosium and terbium, which are vital inputs for high-temperature and high-performance magnets used in defence and advanced manufacturing.¹⁶ The targeting of these HREEs is strategic because, until 2023, China accounted for a staggering **99%** of global HREE processing capacity.¹⁶

By applying new licensing and export controls to these highly sensitive materials, Beijing maximizes disruptive impact on key Western strategic industries, including advanced fighter jets and missile guidance systems.¹ This deliberate policy choice confirms that the reliance is no longer merely a commercial challenge but an inherent national security liability. The imposition of export limits transforms a standard trade relationship into an asymmetric geopolitical lever.²¹

Section II: The Domestic Retreat – Systemic Under-Investment and the Selectorate Funnel

The geopolitical vulnerability outlined in Section I is exacerbated by systemic domestic failures in the UK, namely the acute geographical imbalance in economic activity and the chronic neglect of physical infrastructure. These failures are twin symptoms of a governance model prioritizing short-term political cycles over long-term capital preservation and industrial

strategy.

2.1 The Chronic Geographical Divide: R&D and Economic Output Disparity

The UK's economic framework and its capacity for future high-value strategic industries are undermined by extreme regional disparity. The foundations for industrial renewal—talent, academic infrastructure, and public research funding—are overwhelmingly concentrated in a small geographic area.

The **Greater South East** of England—comprising London, the South East, and the East of England—accounts for roughly **50% to 52%** of total UK public-funded Research and Development (R&D) expenditure.⁶ This concentration is structural and self-perpetuating.

This geographical bias acts as a "**Selectorate Funnel**," where public investment systematically guides resources, talent, and resulting high-productivity activity toward already established economic hubs. This structural investment preference inherently limits the ability of the government to strategically diversify industrial capability to regions outside the South East, such as the North of England, even when geopolitical and economic logic demands industrial relocation (e.g., establishing critical mineral processing hubs).

The resulting economic inequality is profound. While London's GVA per head (£40,215 in 2013) was previously calculated to be over **70% higher** than the UK average (£23,394)²², recent data from 2023 shows persistent structural resistance to convergence. Although the North East saw the largest relative increase in GVA at 1.8% from 2022 to 2023, London still recorded the largest absolute change in economic size (4.0%), confirming that the underlying gap remains chronic and resistant to marginal, short-term policy adjustments.²³ Strategic industrial policy, which requires stable, long-term capital allocation for regional development, is constantly constrained by the need to sustain immediate wealth concentrations in the already productive South East.

2.2 Infrastructure Under-Investment: The National Maintenance Backlog

The failure to invest strategically is most physically evident in the chronic neglect of national physical assets. The failure to maintain infrastructure serves as a stark metaphor for the

systemic focus on short-term political expediency over long-term capital preservation.

The estimated one-time catch-up cost required to clear the maintenance backlog for local roads across England and Wales has reached a record high of almost **£16.81 billion**, according to the 2025 Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) Survey.⁵ This staggering figure, which reflects a continuous increase (a 16% rise to £16.3 billion was reported in the previous year's data ²⁶), quantifies a massive, deferred national debt resulting from chronic under-investment in foundational infrastructure.

The consequence of this neglect is a highly inefficient maintenance cycle. Local roads are, on average, only resurfaced once every **93 years**.⁵ This demonstrates a deeply ingrained policy preference for reactive, high-visibility work—such as filling the 9 million potholes addressed annually—over fiscally prudent, long-term preventative maintenance.⁵ This represents a significant fiscal error: reactive maintenance is inherently more costly in the long run than strategic preservation. The annual budget shortfall required just to prevent further network deterioration is substantial, averaging £7.4 million extra per local authority.⁵ This practice of prioritizing immediate political expediency over long-term fiscal prudence is indicative of a governance model structurally incapable of addressing multi-decade strategic threats like supply chain reliance.

Section III: The Geopolitical Fail-Safe – Lessons from the US Model

In contrast to the UK's policy paralysis, the United States has adopted a decisive, non-market state intervention model to de-risk and build strategic critical mineral capacity, explicitly neutralizing the financial advantages derived from foreign state subsidies.

3.1 The Institutional Counter-Mechanism: The Defense Production Act

The US government recognized that market forces could not counteract the geo-economic manipulation detailed in Section I. Consequently, it leveraged Cold War-era legislation to override standard commercial dynamics and secure its strategic supply chains.

The foundational authority enabling the US Department of Defense (DoD) to execute massive, multi-year strategic contracts, equity investments, and long-term price guarantees is the **Defense Production Act (DPA)**.³⁰ The DPA allows the US government to treat strategic

industrial policy as a defense procurement function, insulating these projects from both typical commercial risks and the volatility of annual budget cycles.

This legislative mechanism facilitated a comprehensive, 10-year agreement with MP Materials, the operator of the sole producing US rare earth mine. This agreement established a minimum **price floor commitment of \$110 per kilogram for NdPr** (Neodymium-Praseodymium) oxide.¹² The price floor is critical, as it was set significantly above volatile global market prices (which were approximately \$72 per kilogram at the time of the agreement).¹² This measure is specifically designed to insulate the US producer from the predatory pricing strategies executed by state-backed foreign competitors, effectively neutralizing the subsidy advantage detailed in Section I.

Furthermore, the DPA commitment is supported by a 10-year magnet **offtake agreement**, ensuring that **100% of the production** from MP Material's new magnet manufacturing facility will be purchased by defense and commercial customers.³² This combination of a guaranteed price and guaranteed demand eliminates the two primary risks—price volatility and market entry—that deter private investment in long-term, high-capital-expenditure critical mineral projects.

This reveals a profound policy asymmetry: the DPA provides the US with a decisive legislative tool that allows ministers to commit billions over a decade, structurally protected from annual budget reviews. The UK currently lacks a comparable, institutionally insulated mechanism necessary to secure a civilian-military supply chain.

3.2 Quantifying the Cost of Inaction: The Economic Damage of Reliance

Strategic resilience is not a cost center but an essential hedge against macroeconomic risk. The financial burden incurred by supply chain reliance and disruption far outweighs the cost of protective strategic investment.

A recent, specific case study provides a quantifiable metric for the economic damage attributable to reliance on fragile critical component supply chains. The **2021-2023 semiconductor shortage**, which propagated through global input-output networks, resulted in estimated production losses of **\$240 billion** in the automotive industry alone.¹¹

This \$240 billion figure demonstrates the fiscal prudence of strategic resilience. The cost of a single, highly concentrated supply shock dramatically exceeds the capital required for strategic intervention. Furthermore, the DPA model provides a structured financial hedge: if market prices for NdPr oxide exceed the \$110/kg floor, the DoD receives a share of the upside

(30% of the excess value), mitigating taxpayer risk.¹² The US approach demonstrates that strategic intervention can be fiscally pragmatic, balancing long-term risk protection with shared market returns.

Table 3 provides a stark comparison of UK failure metrics and the US strategic response metrics.

Table 3: Comparative Cost and Policy Failure Metrics

Vulnerability Metric	Quantifiable Value	Policy Context/Source
UK Local Road Maintenance Backlog	\$\approx\$ £16.81 Billion	ALARM Survey 2025 (England & Wales) ⁵
UK R&D Funding Concentration	\$\approx\$ 50% - 52%	Public/Total R&D in Greater South East (FYE 2021) ⁶
Cost of Single Supply Shock (Automotive)	\$\approx\$ \$240 Billion	Production loss from 2021-2023 semiconductor shortage ¹¹
US Strategic De-risking Mechanism	\$110/kg Price Floor (NdPr)	Defense Production Act (DPA) commitment to MP Materials ¹²

Section IV: The Institutional Malignancy – Political Churn and Strategic Paralysis

The fundamental constraint on strategic, long-term policy formulation in the UK is the extreme political volatility within the executive branch. Multi-decade strategic initiatives, such as establishing critical mineral supply chains or reversing infrastructure decay, are rendered virtually impossible by short ministerial tenures.

4.1 The Short-Term Political Cycle: Evidence of Executive Instability

Analysis of ministerial appointments over the last decade confirms high turnover in the roles responsible for fiscal strategy and industrial policy. These critical portfolios demand years of continuity to shepherd complex, capital-intensive projects.

The office of the **Chancellor of the Exchequer** has seen extreme volatility in the period spanning the last nine years (2015 to 2024). Over this period, which included George Osborne, Philip Hammond, Sajid Javid, Rishi Sunak, Nadhim Zahawi, Kwasi Kwarteng, Jeremy Hunt, and Rachel Reeves, eight individuals have held the role.⁸ This results in an average operational lifespan of only approximately **1.1 years** per Chancellor.

Similarly, the strategic post responsible for industrial policy—the **Business/Trade Secretary** (covering various departmental iterations: BIS, BEIS, DBT)—has experienced similar levels of churn. Over approximately 10.3 years (2015 to 2025), there have been ten different incumbents, including Sajid Javid, Greg Clark, Andrea Leadsom, Alok Sharma, Kwasi Kwarteng, Jacob Rees-Mogg, Grant Shapps, Kemi Badenoch, Jonathan Reynolds, and Peter Kyle.⁹ The calculated average tenure for this critical role is approximately **1.0 years**.

Table 2: UK Institutional Instability: Average Tenure of Key Economic Ministers (2015–2025)

Ministerial Role (2015–2025)	Total Incumbents	Total Period Measured (Years)	Calculated Average Tenure (Years)
Chancellor of the Exchequer	8	≈ 9.0	≈ 1.1
Business/Trade Secretary	10	≈ 10.3	≈ 1.0

4.2 Impact on Long-Term Strategy: Strategic Policy Half-Life

The calculated average tenure of 1.0 to 1.1 years is critically below the typical timeline required for any major strategic industrial project, such as a new critical minerals refinery, which necessitates 5 to 10 years for exploration, financing, construction, and commissioning.

This systemic instability ensures that ministers are structurally unable to oversee complex

strategic projects from inception to completion. The rapid turnover leads to:

1. **Policy Pivot Risk:** Each new incumbent is incentivized to launch new initiatives or renegotiate existing strategies, leading to constant policy volatility.
2. **Loss of Institutional Memory:** The short duration limits the ability of the executive to build deep, role-specific expertise required to manage long-term strategic threats.
3. **Political Risk Premium:** Sophisticated private capital views this hyper-volatility as an unmanageable "**political risk premium.**" Investors require stable policy frameworks and guaranteed demand over decades to commit the necessary high capital expenditure (CapEx) for critical mineral projects, and the UK's governance structure cannot reliably offer this stability.

The short tenure of the Chancellor and Business Secretary is a direct, quantifiable cause of both the infrastructural neglect (Section II) and the failure to adopt long-term strategic fail-safes (Section III). Ministers are incentivized to pursue high-visibility, short-term spending (e.g., small grants or reactive maintenance) rather than politically difficult, low-visibility, multi-decade strategic capital commitments. The UK is thus structurally limited to short-term, less effective grant mechanisms, failing to adopt the far more powerful long-term **guarantee** models (like the DPA price floor commitment) that provide security without requiring immediate, large budgetary outlays. This vulnerability validates the central thesis of the "Critical Retreat."

Section V: Conclusion and Strategic Recommendations

The empirical data demonstrates that the UK's strategic retreat is rooted in a fundamental governance failure that renders the nation incapable of deploying long-term, insulated industrial policy necessary to compete against state-backed economic adversaries. The reliance on purely free-market mechanisms in a domain dominated by geopolitical state capitalism has resulted in critical strategic exposure.

5.1 Synthesis of Quantitative Vulnerabilities

The UK's strategic posture is defined by three interconnected quantitative vulnerabilities that demand immediate correction:

1. **Geopolitical Chokehold:** $\approx$ 90% reliance on a single, state-subsidized actor for

midstream processing and permanent magnet manufacturing.¹

2. **Infrastructure Decay:** A foundational physical infrastructure backlog quantified at $\approx$ £16.81 billion, reflecting chronic fiscal short-termism and inefficiency.⁵
3. **Strategic Paralysis:** Key economic and industrial ministers possess an average operational lifespan of only $\approx$ 1.0–1.1 years, making long-term strategic commitment politically untenable.³⁵

5.2 Recommendations for Strategic Resilience

To secure the UK's industrial base, governance must pivot from prioritizing short-term market dynamics to integrating strategic security as a core, institutionally insulated function of the state.

1. Establish a UK Critical Minerals Security Act (UK-CMSA)

The UK must immediately legislate an equivalent mechanism to the US Defense Production Act (DPA). This legislative framework should grant a designated authority the power to bypass standard, risk-averse commercial procurement rules for strategic materials, thereby neutralizing foreign predatory pricing.

The UK-CMSA must allow for the provision of long-term (10 to 15 year) **price floor guarantees** and **offtake commitments** to de-risk essential domestic or allied critical mineral projects. Such mechanisms are necessary to inoculate UK producers against global price volatility and attract the decade-long private capital commitment required to establish new refining capacity. This cost of strategic investment is validated as fiscally prudent when weighed against the $\approx$ \$240 billion economic damage witnessed from single component shortages.¹¹

2. Insulate Strategic Investment from Political Churn

To counteract the political risk premium introduced by the $\approx$ 1.0-year average ministerial tenure, strategic capital allocation must be structurally insulated.

A **Strategic Capital Fund** must be introduced specifically for critical infrastructure and

strategic industrial projects, funded by fixed, multi-year appropriations (e.g., 5-year rolling budgets). This structure must be legally protected from annual ministerial change or short-term spending reviews, providing the decade-long financial confidence required for massive CapEx projects like critical mineral refineries or complex infrastructure repair. This addresses the institutional instability that currently prohibits long-term fiscal prudence (evidenced by the £16.81 billion road backlog).⁵

3. Mandate Regional R&D Equity for Industrial Scaling

The government must actively dismantle the "Selectorate Funnel" caused by extreme R&D concentration. Legislation should mandate a binding commitment to significantly reduce the **50% to 52%** R&D allocation currently directed to the Greater South East within a defined timeframe.⁶ Central funding must be explicitly linked to demonstrable capacity building, establishing the industrial, academic, and skills ecosystems required to support regional critical mineral and advanced manufacturing hubs in the North of England and other regions, thereby linking strategic resilience directly to the goal of industrial rebalancing.

Works cited

1. China's Dominance in Rare Earth Magnet Manufacturing, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://rareearthexchanges.com/news/chinas-dominance-in-rare-earth-magnet-manufacturing/>
2. China's Rare Earth Control Reshapes Global Technology Supply Chains - Discovery Alert, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://discoveryalert.com.au/news/rare-earths-china-economic-dominance-2025/>
3. China's Rare Earth Industry: Subsidies and State Control Over the Last Decade, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://rareearthexchanges.com/news/chinas-rare-earth-industry-subsidies-and-state-control-over-the-last-decade/>
4. Executive summary – Global Critical Minerals Outlook 2025 – Analysis - IEA, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-critical-minerals-outlook-2025/executive-summary>
5. ALARM Survey 2025 – Road repair backlog reaches almost £17bn - LCRIG, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://lcrig.org.uk/2025/03/19/alarm-survey-2025-road-repair-backlog-reaches-almost-17bn/>
6. UK public-funded gross regional capital and non-capital expenditure on research and development: financial year ending 2021, accessed October 17, 2025,

- <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/governmentpublicsectorandtaxes/researchanddevelopmentexpenditure/articles/ukpublicfundedgrossregionalcapitalandnoncapitalexpenditureonresearchanddevelopment/financialyearending2021>
7. Research & Development spending - UK Parliament, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN04223/SN04223.pdf>
 8. Past Chancellors of the Exchequer - GOV.UK, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.gov.uk/government/history/past-chancellors>
 9. Greg Clark - Wikipedia, accessed October 17, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greg_Clark
 10. Sajid Javid - Wikipedia, accessed October 17, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sajid_Javid
 11. US Strategic Stakes in Critical Materials: Security Risks, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://discoveryalert.com.au/news/us-strategic-stakes-critical-materials-2025/>
 12. DOD Bets Big on Rare Earth Elements | Bipartisan Policy Center, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://bipartisanpolicy.org/blog/dod-bets-big-on-rare-earth-elements/>
 13. Rare Earth Elements: Understanding China's Dominance in Global Supply Chains, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.china-briefing.com/news/chinas-rare-earth-elements-dominance-in-global-supply-chains/>
 14. China currently controls over 69% of global rare earth production - Mining Technology, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.mining-technology.com/analyst-comment/china-global-rare-earth-production/>
 15. Permanent Magnet Market Size, Share | CAGR of 8.4%, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://market.us/report/permanent-magnets-market/>
 16. The Consequences of China's New Rare Earths Export Restrictions - CSIS, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/consequences-chinas-new-rare-earths-export-restrictions>
 17. China Permanent Magnets Market Size & Outlook, 2022-2030, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/horizon/outlook/permanent-magnets-market/china>
 18. Power Playbook: Beijing's Bid to Secure Overseas Transition Minerals - AidData, accessed October 17, 2025, https://docs.aiddata.org/reports/china-transition-minerals-2025/FULL_REPORT_Power_Playbook.pdf
 19. notes - chinese state-owned enterprises and wto's anti-subsidy regime - Georgetown Law, accessed October 17, 2025, <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/international-law-journal/wp-content/uploads/sites/21/2018/08/GT-GJIL180027.pdf>
 20. An Assessment of China's Subsidies to Strategic and Heavyweight Industries, accessed October 17, 2025,

- <https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/AnAssessmentofChina'sSubsidiestoStrategicandHeavyweightIndustries.pdf>
21. Pentagon's \$1B Mineral Stockpile Boosts U.S. Independence from China • Carbon Credits, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://carboncredits.com/pentagons-1b-mineral-stockpile-boosts-u-s-independence-from-china/>
 22. Regional, sub-regional and local gross value added estimates for London, 1997-2013 - Greater London Authority, accessed October 17, 2025,
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvai_gvap_estimates_for_london_current_issues_note_update_43.pdf
 23. DCMS Sectors Economic Estimates: Regional Gross Value Added 2023 - GOV.UK, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/dcms-sectors-economic-estimates-regional-gva-2023/dcms-sectors-economic-estimates-regional-gross-value-added-2023>
 24. Gross Value Added and Gross Domestic Product | Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.nisra.gov.uk/statistics/economic-output/gross-value-added-and-gross-domestic-product>
 25. Potholes and local road maintenance funding - The House of Commons Library, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9975/>
 26. Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance Survey Report - The Asphalt Industry Alliance, accessed October 17, 2025,
https://www.asphaltuk.org/wp-content/uploads/ALARM_Survey_2024.pdf
 27. ALARM Survey Report 2024 | The Asphalt Industry Alliance, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.asphaltuk.org/wp-content/uploads/ALARM-survey-report-2024-FINAL.pdf>
 28. Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) survey - The Asphalt Industry Alliance, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.asphaltuk.org/alarm-survey-page/>
 29. Condition and maintenance of Local Roads in England - Parliament UK, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5901/cmselect/cmpubacc/349/report.html>
 30. Trump's mineral megadeal is bypassing US laws - E&E News by POLITICO, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.eenews.net/articles/trumps-mineral-megadeal-is-bypassing-us-laws/>
 31. How Australia, with friends, can secure its place in critical minerals | The Strategist, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/how-australia-with-friends-can-secure-its-place-in-critical-minerals/>
 32. MP Materials Announces Transformational Public-Private Partnership with the

Department of Defense to Accelerate U.S. Rare Earth Magnet Independence, accessed October 17, 2025,

<https://mpmaterials.com/news/mp-materials-announces-transformational-public-private-partnership-with-the-department-of-defense-to-accelerate-u-s-rare-earth-magnet-independence/>

33. The Pentagon's Rare Earth Gamble: Smart Strategy or State-Crafted Monopoly? - RUSI, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/pentagons-rare-earth-gamble-smart-strategy-or-state-crafted-monopoly>
34. Unpacking the DoD and MP Materials Critical Minerals Partnership, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://fas.org/publication/unpacking-dod-and-mp-partnership/>
35. Chancellor of the Exchequer - GOV.UK, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers/chancellor-of-the-exchequer>
36. Secretary of State for Business and Trade - GOV.UK, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers/secretary-of-state--2>
37. Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy - GOV.UK, accessed October 17, 2025,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers/secretary-of-state-for-business-energy-and-industrial-strategy>