RHS Qualifications

Examination:	RHS Level 3
Unit:	Unit 1
Examination date:	February 2025

General Introductory Comments

Examiners' comments are produced by RHS Qualifications following each examination series.

There have now been multiple papers for the Level 3 examinations and all stakeholders are now familiar with the format, structure and demand of the papers.

The Examiners' comments included in this report are intended to help candidates and centres to develop an understanding of the requirements of the RHS Level 3 examinations. This is achieved through a review of candidate responses indicating key areas of strength, while also considering areas where candidates demonstrated a weaker understanding of Topic areas, or where there was evidence of gaps in their knowledge.

The RHS Level 3 examination papers are designed to assess the contents of the Qualification Specification according to Ofqual's level descriptors for Level 3

- demonstrate factual, procedural, and theoretical knowledge
- be able to interpret, evaluate, and apply information and ideas
- be able to discuss a range of perspectives and approaches
- demonstrate the ability to resolve complex and non-routine problems
- review how effective methods and actions have been
- demonstrate responsibility for supervising or guiding others.

These Level 3 descriptors are embedded in the Qualification Specification as shown below:

- demonstrate factual, procedural, and theoretical knowledge (AO1)
- interpret, evaluate, and apply information and ideas (AO2)
- discuss a range of perspectives and approaches (AO2)
- resolve complex and non-routine problems (AO2/AO3)
- demonstrate and apply holistic/integrated knowledge of the four Qualification-wide outcomes and the four Topic areas considered in Unit 1.

To gain higher marks candidates should be able to demonstrate mastery in the above areas.

Overview of Examination

Levels of demand

Questions were set at three levels of demand within this paper.

Questions that require a recall of basic factual, procedural and theoretical knowledge are classified as being low demand.

Questions that require the interpretation, evaluation and application of knowledge are classified as medium demand.

Questions that require integrated thinking across topics, the resolution of complex and non-routine problems, and discussions on differing perspectives or approaches are classified as high demand.

General comments

While some candidates scored higher marks, many candidates failed to get the marks that reflected their horticultural knowledge due to poor examination technique, for example through missing or ignoring key demands within questions. These responses often contained advanced horticultural knowledge and concepts, which were however, outside the scope of the question, and so marks could not be awarded.

To further support candidates this report discusses and identifies good examination technique, to help future candidates to secure marks that more accurately reflect their horticultural capabilities.

Candidates scoring high marks on this paper:	Candidates scoring lower marks on this paper:
▪ demonstrated a wide range of reading and research to equip them with the factual information required at Level 3 study ▪ provided full and accurate answers to all questions ▪ demonstrated sound knowledge of horticultural principles and practices ▪ provided responses that contained significant detail, which was relevant to the theme and demand of the question ▪ produced sustained lines of reasoning ▪ could provide holistic answers that demonstrated knowledge across topic areas including the qualification-wide outcomes.	▪ relied on their own knowledge and understanding, rather than research and reasoning when responding to questions ▪ failed to provide responses to all of the questions in the paper, in particular in Section B ▪ produced responses that were undeveloped, lacked depth, or which did not respond to the command word* within the question ▪ provided fragmented responses that failed to demonstrate holistic understanding of topic areas ▪ provided section C responses that were consistent with the Band 1 and Band 2 descriptors, in particular with regard to the breadth and depth of horticultural knowledge.

*RHS Qualifications shared the list of approved command words for Level 3 examinations in the Qualification Guidance Document. This list is shown in the table below to help candidates to prepare for future examinations.

Command word	Definition
Annotate	Learners should be able to apply labels and supporting information on diagrams
Assess	Learners are required to give a statement relating to the overall quality of the issue being considered. This could include an argument about an issue (for and against). The statement should provide evidence, with appropriate use of examples, and express an opinion about the merits of each side considered
Calculate	Learners should be able to carry out basic calculations, or estimate quantities of materials
Choose	Learners should be able to select from a range of alternatives
Compare	Provide a response that identifies similarities between things
Compare and contrast	Provide a response that both identifies similarities and identifies and evaluates differences between things
Complete	Learners should be able to provide short responses, or complete statements and tables
Critically	This word is often used before a command word, for example 'Evaluate' inviting an examination of an issue from the point of view of a critic with a particular focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the points of view being expressed
Deduce	Come to a decision based on information provided in the question
Define	Learners should be able to state formal definitions
Describe	Learners should be able to recall facts or applied processes in an accurate way
Discuss	Identify key points, explore all aspects, provide a conclusion
Evaluate	Learners should be able to use information supplied, as well as their own knowledge and understanding, to consider evidence for and against when making basic decisions
Examine	Carefully consider a topic, and provide a detailed account
Explain	Learners should be able to make clear, short, reasoned statement to explain a process or similar factor
Explain how and why	Learners should be able to make clear, short, reasoned statement to explain a process or similar factor The 'how' asks about the procedure or process The 'why' asks about the purpose of something
Give (a reason)	Learners should be able to clearly state reasons (facts) as directed
Identify	Name or characterise, for example the identification of type of plant tissue, or floral part of a plant
Interpret	Explain the meaning of information that has been provided

Command word	Definition
Justify	Learners should be able to provide evidence to support an answer
Label	Apply information to diagrams
Name	Learners should be able to provide a single word or short phrase answer
Outline	Learners should be able to provide short descriptions, for example the stages that make up a task
Predict	State what you think will happen, based on a given scenario and your own knowledge
Show that	Prove the statement in the question is correct
Suggest	Learners should be able to apply their knowledge and understanding to make recommendations for actions
Summarise	Reduce an argument to provide a brief account of the relevant information
To what extent	Examine the evidence available to include different sides of an argument, then express a view as to the merit or validity of a view or statement
Use	Learners should be able to use information provided within the question, sometimes in conjunction with their own knowledge, to carry out a task
Write	Learners should be able to provide a short answer as directed

Terminology used within questions:

Term	Explanation
Horticultural situation	Candidates may be required to state a horticultural situation. This allows the candidate to focus their response to the situation and allows the examiner to calibrate their thinking.
Horticultural setting	Candidates may be required to state a horticultural setting, this would include garden areas, for example a productive garden, or an herbaceous border. This allows the candidate to focus their response to the setting and allows the examiner to calibrate their thinking.
Growing system	Candidates may be required to state different growing systems to add context to their responses. Growing systems can be traditional, raised beds, container growing, organic, biodynamic as appropriate.

Additional guidance is provided with regard to the wider geographic location of candidates.

Candidate responses to examination questions should relate to UK horticulture.
It is appropriate for candidates to bring their own knowledge to questions; however the core knowledge being assessed in this qualification relates to the cultivation of gardens and designed landscapes within the UK.

Qualification specification and Guidance Document

The Qualification specification outlines the curriculum that candidates will be examined on. A Guidance Document is freely available from Quartz and RHS Qualifications. This document was developed to provide centres with additional guidance with regards to the interpretation of the Assessment Outcomes in terms of breadth and depth that is appropriate to a Level 3 qualification.

It should be noted that the Guidance Document is not intended to be a comprehensive guide to teaching and learning. Instead, it is designed to provide examples of some of the key areas contained within an Assessment Outcome. As an example, where an Assessment Outcome in the Qualification Specification formally lists five areas that should be included, the Guidance Document may only unpack one of these areas as an example. The centre is then expected to apply the same level of breadth and depth provided in the exemplar to the other areas defined in the Assessment Outcome.

This document is updated annually each autumn.

Section A

Questions 1 – 20

General comments on Section A

Forced answer questions are designed to test candidate's knowledge and understanding of the concepts covered in the four Topics and the four Qualification-wide outcomes that make up this unit.

At Level 3, these questions particularly relate to:

- the assessment of theoretical knowledge
- the ability to read and interpret information
- the ability to recall factual information
- the ability to apply knowledge to a range of simple scenarios
- the demonstration of procedural knowledge.

This section was well attempted by the majority of candidates, with a secure level of knowledge being displayed.

Candidates and centres are reminded of good examination technique with regards to forced answer questions:

- carefully read the question
- underline any key or important words
- score through inappropriate answers
- select the correct answer to be recorded on the response grid.

Section B

Each question is considered separately.

Question 1

The question was designed to assess candidate knowledge and understanding of interpretation in. heritage gardens.

Part a) of the question required candidates to complete a list of Tilden's six principles of heritage interpretation.

Stronger candidates were able to provide at least two of the missing principles from the list:

'Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part.'

'Interpretation for children must be designed specifically for children, and not simply a dilution of programs and information for adults.'

Some candidates were able to complete the full list by adding, 'Interpretation is an art which combines many arts regardless of subject material. Any art is to some degree teachable.'

Weaker candidate responses often included only one or two of the principles, with some candidates skipping this part of the question.

In part b) of the question candidates were required to critically evaluate the use of interpretation in heritage gardens, with reference to two of Tilden's six principles.

Candidates could select the principles provided within part a) of the paper, and so part b) of the question was not dependant on the candidate response to part a) of the question.

Examples of strong candidate responses include, when 'information does not equal interpretation, but all interpretation contains information' – this can be viewed as 'revelation based on knowledge'. The heritage garden could take its cue from this principle developing engaging information panels, audio-visual interpretation, or even sculptural commissions, which contain or point to information.

'Interpretation is not about instruction but provocation', as a principle can be used to enhance the quality of the visitor experience by providing different ways to interact with the space, for instance the use of audio tours or guided tours providing information in an interesting, enjoyable, and exciting way.

'Interpretation must relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor' as a principle can be used in the storytelling of the history of a garden in which visitors can find resonance and belonging, for example the 'between the covers' exhibition at Sissinghurst exploring Vita Sackville-West's work showcasing her trailblazing works on themes of love, identity and legacy. The interpretation behind such exhibitions can resonate with the experience of the LGBTQI+ visitors and gives them a sense of belonging when they visit the garden.

Weaker candidate responses often reworded Tilden's principles from part a) of the question.

Question 2

This question assessed candidate knowledge on the New Perennialist Movement.

Part a) of the question required candidates to name one prominent designer working in this field other than Piet Oudolf.

Stronger candidate responses correctly named prominent designers including Dan Pearson, Cassian Schmidt, Nigel Dunnett, Peter Korn, Rick Darke and Andy Sturgeon.

Weaker candidates named Gertrude Jekyll, or repeated Piet Oudolf from the stem of the question, or failed to provide a response.

Part b) of the question required candidates to name one major garden that defines the New Perennialist Movement.

Stronger candidate responses correctly named a major garden as Sussex Prairie Garden, the Walled Garden at Scamptston Hall and the Oudolf landscape at RHS Garden Wisley.

Part c) of the question required candidates to explain how the principles of the New Perennialist Movement have impacted on garden style.

Stronger candidate responses included, the development of a naturalistic style, through the technique of designing with randomness. The use of drifts of perennials that die gracefully with winter interest from their seed heads, or, the development of a naturalistic style through mixing seed sowing with the planting of young and mature plants.

Weaker candidates suggested, the beauty of seasonal shifts, (which relates to many different planting styles, and was considered too vague), other candidates suggested, a greater diversity of plants being planted in domestic gardens, citing the rise in the popularity of *Salvia nemorosa* ‘Caradonna’ as a plant (which did not relate to the requirements of the question), other candidates gave a description of the garden named in part b) rather than fulfilling the requirements of the question in part c).

Question 3

This question required candidates to apply their knowledge of reviewing horticultural trials and results through defining a number of basic terms to include:

- Standard
- Replicate
- Edge effect
- Control

Candidates who were able to give full and accurate explanations of the terms were able to gain high marks.

Some candidates failed to respond to the question, or gave vague or incorrect or confused responses. Some candidates for example explained control from a plant health perspective, stating that control is the type (biological, cultural, chemical control) being used against pests and diseases in the trial, indicating a lack of knowledge in this area. Correct responses for this part of the question correctly explained the term as a group of plants in a trial which have not received any treatment, allowing this group to be observed to serve as a comparison with those plants that had been treated.

Question 4

This question was designed to assess candidate's knowledge of plant information sources with particular reference to the terms 'nomenclature standard' and 'type specimen'.

This was a straightforward question assessing the basic recall of factual information. Candidates who were able to provide accurate explanations of the term 'nomenclature standard' and to define 'type specimen' scored high marks.

Question 5

This question was designed to assess the candidate's applied knowledge of biosecurity.

Part a) of the question required the candidate to explain the term biosecurity protocol. The question further required the candidate to use their horticultural knowledge to ensure that the term is explained within a horticultural context.

Stronger candidate responses clearly defined biosecurity protocol as a set of precautions that aim to prevent the introduction and spread of harmful organisms.

Weaker candidates discussed plant passports, the required use of PPE,

Part b) of the question required candidates to suggest six items that should be included in a personal biosecurity kit. This question required the candidate, as appropriate to study at Level 3, to apply their knowledge, and 'think on their feet' to respond to this question, which was deemed to be a higher demand question.

Many candidates were able to apply their knowledge of biosecurity and plant health to suggest:

- Latex gloves
- Propellar
- Boots or over shoes
- Alcohol hand sanitiser/wipes
- Disposable boot protectors
- Eye protection
- Stiff brush
- Clean tools
- Bottled water to clean boots and tools

Weaker candidate responses did not relate to the demands of the question, for example stating the importance of communication and keeping team members updated, or discussing that care is required not to bring soil back from the site. Candidates are advised to carefully read questions to ensure their responses align with the demands of the question.

Question 6

This question required candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of Gibberellin, and its role in plant propagation.

The question started by requiring candidates, (in part a) to explain what Gibberellin is.

Candidates who stated that Gibberellin is a plant hormone gained the full mark available.

Weaker candidate responses included stating that Gibberellin is a liquid acid, or a type of acid used in seed germination, or a liquid that can be mixed with water to form a media, seeds can be soaked in.

Part b) of the question required candidates to explain why Gibberellin is used in propagation.

Candidates who stated that Gibberellin can overcome seed dormancy or can be used to speed up the process of germination received full marks.

Weaker candidate responses were vague or incorrect, for example stating that Gibberellin increases plant growth, or that it physically weakens the seed coat.

Part c) of the question required candidates to state how Gibberellin is used in a propagation facility.

Candidates who stated that seeds are soaked in a Gibberellin solution, that seeds should be agitated or that the soak usually contains Gibberellin at 500ppm gained full marks.

Weaker candidate responses were vague or incorrect including, the seed is treated, or the seed is placed in the solution until the testa is dissolved.

Question 7

This question required candidates to explain how air pots work.

Candidates scoring high marks stated:

- air pots have ‘dimples’ with the roots being able to grow out of the horizontal side of the pot. The drier air outside of the pot, dehydrates the root, and air prunes it, stimulating root branching
- this process is repeated at all points where the roots are exposed to air a mass of fibrous root is formed
- these fibrous roots aid in plant establishment
- the holes in the air pot increase the percentage oxygen in the growing media, which increases beneficial bacterial activity, which benefits the plant through the release of nutrients and increased respiration.

Weaker candidate responses often described the appearance of an air pot, rather than consider how they work. Other weaker responses were vague or contained factual errors.

Question 8

This question required candidates to 'think on their feet' by reviewing supplied information relating to the reporting on non-fatal injuries. Candidates were then instructed to identify and discuss key factors that could have led to a reduction in the reporting of non-fatal injuries, using their own knowledge of Health and Safety.

Candidates who scored the maximum available mark were able to discuss:

- improvements in communication technology and systems over the period of time in question
- improvements in training with relation to the identification and management of risks
- the increase in courses available in basic areas such as safe lifting/manual handling
- a cultural shift leading to an increased supply of effective, kite marked PPE to staff
- the requirement to record near misses, leading to increased prevention
- the continuing advancement of both legislation and safe working practices
- the effectiveness of awareness campaigns.

Candidates who scored lower marks tended to provide responses which were vague and lacking in detail, or which only considered one or two points.

Section C

Section C candidate responses are graded against the assessment ladder, which is on the next page of this report. (This is the same ladder that is used in the Level 2 examinations.) Candidates and centres are advised to review the ladder as this indicates how the assessment decisions are made, when grading long form responses.

Candidate performance in Section C ranges from those candidates who:

- demonstrated their factual, procedural and theoretical knowledge
- were able to interpret, evaluate and apply relevant information and ideas
- were well prepared and able to produce long form responses
- could discuss relevant points from a range of perspectives
- could discuss a range of approaches
- approached the question logically
- demonstrated a full and holistic knowledge of the topic areas and Qualification-wide outcomes
- demonstrated mastery of the areas being assessed.

through to candidates who:

- produced brief responses which lacked the required level of detail
- provided responses which were unplanned and unstructured
- provided responses that gave a framework, but which did not provide the required level of detail
- picked up on certain words in the question, and wrote all they knew about these words, rather than answering the question.

In addition to the assessment ladder, candidate responses are also reviewed against the criteria set out below:

Indicative content

- Strength of response
- Integration
- Horticultural knowledge.

Strength of response

Strong candidate responses:

- developed a logical argument to answer the question
- drew on reliable information sources
- were relevant to the question
- expressed clarity of thought
- demonstrated knowledge of horticultural practices.

Integration

Candidate responses should integrate with other relevant areas of the syllabus.

Assessment ladder (for information)

Band	Mark range	Summary	Description
4	12 - 15	Fully developed (Total)	**A highly detailed, comprehensive, fully relevant response, addressing all aspects of the question** ☐ No irrelevant or incorrect material or observations at the top end of the mark range: otherwise only very minor errors/omissions (which do not detract from an otherwise strong response) ☐ Full integration/clear links demonstrated with other appropriate topics as required: a holistic approach ☐ Advanced current professional horticultural knowledge/principles demonstrated (and evidence of advanced material beyond the specification at the top end of mark range) ☐ Consistent use of correct and appropriate technical language.
3	9 -11	Mainly developed (Solid)	**A reasonably detailed and fairly comprehensive response, with mostly relevant observations, addressing most of the key elements of the question** ☐ Some minor evidence of irrelevant or incorrect material or observations (in what is otherwise a good response), with occasional lack of detail/omissions at times ☐ Secure evidence of some appropriate integration with other topics but some linked topic areas are occasionally overlooked or incorrect associations are made: a partially holistic approach ☐ Current professional horticultural knowledge/principles demonstrated most of the time, with occasional errors, but largely appropriate explanations and application ☐ Correct and appropriate technical language demonstrated most of the time, with some minor errors.
2	6 - 8	Rudimentary (Basic)	**A largely basic response with some relevant observations, addressing some key elements of the question** ☐ Some significant evidence of irrelevant or incorrect material and frequent lack of detail, with some key areas overlooked ☐ Occasional evidence of correct integration with other topics, but many areas are overlooked and incorrect associations made: little evidence of a holistic approach ☐ Current professional horticultural knowledge/principles demonstrated some of the time, but with frequent errors, and only basic explanations or application ☐ Correct and appropriate technical language only partially demonstrated but limited. Some key errors.
1	0 - 5	Undeveloped (Unsatisfactory)	**A largely poor response with few relevant observations, addressing few of the key elements of the question** ☐ Material is largely irrelevant or incorrect and lacking in any detail, with many key areas overlooked ☐ No, or very little evidence of correct integration with other topics, with many areas overlooked and incorrect associations made: no evidence of a holistic approach ☐ No or little evidence of current professional horticultural knowledge/principles demonstrated, with poor or incorrect explanations or application ☐ Little (if any) technical language demonstrated. Often incorrect. Key errors.

Question 1

This question required candidates to explain and discuss the layout of equipment and facilities required to develop a new propagation unit, with reference to Best Practice.

Stronger candidate responses fully explained and discussed key concepts to include:

- proximity to mains services
- orientation
- selection of a sheltered, rather than exposed site
- growing structures, including polythene tunnels and glasshouses
- storage of materials including growing media
- layout and flow of material through the unit
- heating systems
- mist, fog, and heated benches
- ventilation systems
- workstations with regard to location, height and ergonomics
- considerations affecting the size and scale of the unit
- published work on the layout of propagation facilities
- the provision of paths for trolleys
- waste disposal
- provision for staff welfare.

Weaker candidate responses discussed the location of the propagation facility within a garden, along with the orientation of glasshouses and other structures without moving on to respond to the key ask of the question. Best Practice, the application of trials and research findings was often covered through stating that this should be considered in the design process, rather than discussing how this should be considered, and so providing detail that meets the needs of the assessment ladder.

Question 2

In this question candidates were provided with a recent quote from an article in Horticulture Week questioning how culturally valuable historic landscapes can be maintained against the backdrop of an evolving climate. Candidates who selected this question were required to first assess the key risks facing historic parks and landscapes, before being asked to analyse the strategies that curators and garden managers are using to address these risks.

Strong candidate responses identified a wide range of key risks.
The list below reflects the mark scheme and candidate responses.
It should be noted that candidates' grades were based on the assessment ladder, where depth of knowledge relating to a small selection of these areas scored equally with breadth of knowledge relating to a wider selection of these areas:

- spring/summer/general droughts
- flooding
- stress to key features, for example trees
- risks to maintenance caused by increased costs
- contemporary stress
- damage to the built environment/garden structures
- visitor management
- heatwaves
- biosecurity.

These candidates went on to consider a wide range of strategies that curators and garden managers are using to address the risks above.

Spring/summer droughts:

- planting times have been changed to autumn planting where soil moisture is at more appropriate levels
- capacity for rainwater capture for irrigation is being expanded, but this impacts on investment elsewhere in the landscape
- increased staff costs for application of deeper mulches
- increased use of once outdated concepts such as onsite composting to build soil resilience, which increases costs and impacts elsewhere in the landscape
- the installation of targeted low water usage irrigation systems

Flooding

- lower areas of gardens, especially when there are existing water features may be at risk of flooding.
- flood frequency needs to be monitored, along with increased assessment of plant health impacts
- SUDS and landscape management systems, for example swales to capture/slow water have a cost of installation and maintenance taking resource from other areas.

Tree stress

- replacement strategies now include native, near native and climate resilient trees
- plant selection is based on predicted climate in 20 or 50 years
- increased genetic diversity in tree planting.

Increased costs

- increased costs from plant replacement, water management, increased monitoring is putting pressure on gardens, the maintenance and value of some areas need reconsidering, with the concept of 'character areas' or priority areas being identified to reflect heritage with the maintenance in other areas being relaxed
- increased planting failures caused by extreme weather, esp. flood and drought.

Contemporary stress

- the concept that gardens are increasingly being required to increase biodiversity and act as carbon sinks. The juxtaposition being that such requirements were not considered when the gardens were laid out. Stresses are created by how much they can be adapted, while still being true to heritage.
- the role of no dig in reducing input costs with regard to labour, improving soils, and increasing yield, thus releasing staff and resource for other areas.
- historical accuracy comes with an increased cost against a scenario of climate change.

Damage to the built environment/garden structures

- shrink and swell of clay-based soil types, which increases with drought and flood is causing damage to heritage features such as walls, steps and Ha Has etc.

Visitor management

- interpretation strategies need to be reviewed to explain the impacts of climate change on the heritage site.

Heatwaves

- extreme heat, often combined with drought is increasing mature tree death. This impacts on the structural integrity of parkland. Tree planting strategies need developing, accurate tree stress information is needed. Resources such as the International Dendrology Society 'Tree and Shrubs online' is becoming more important in the dissemination of information or TDAG.
- increased UV light is 'burning' tree bark, in a recent survey (Sansucci Park) 80% of mature beech, oak and lime were affected.

Biosecurity

- changing weather patterns and increases in mean temperatures are leading to new plant health threats, which are causing increased monitoring costs, and reduced labour availability for other tasks, along with the cost of tree replacement.

Weaker candidate responses lacked technical detail and breadth. Some candidates stated that some plants within these gardens and landscapes may require special care or a watering regime that is not compatible with modern sustainability practices, without providing the required level of detail, for example through naming example plants, the provision of detail relating to the special care that is required, or discussions relating to watering regimes and possible conflicts with sustainability.

Question 3

In this question candidates were required to evaluate a how a combination of plant knowledge and formal Best Practice can be combined to inform plant selection strategies.

Stronger candidates evaluated a wide range of areas relating to the question to include basic principles and concepts to include:

- Right plant
- Right place
- Right purpose.

This concept was further developed to consider fully evaluating the site, to determine the conditions plants will be grown in.

Stronger candidate responses continued with an evaluation of plant information sources, to provide reliable information about key plant requirements/characteristics that relate to plant selection strategies. Examples included evaluations relating to plant hardiness. Some candidates demonstrated greater understanding by discussing the role of R&D for example hardiness trials. The evaluation of plant trials and their findings were sometimes considered along with a range of information sources to include journals from specialist societies, professional online resources, such as TDAG, Trees and Shrubs online or the role of NCCPG National Plant Collections.

Weaker candidate responses tended to be either vague and lacking in detail, or unstructured.

Question 4

This question required candidates to identify and discuss the key drivers that have changed our thinking with regards to wild plant collecting over the past 200 years. Candidates were further required to make reference to specific initiatives, legislation, a changing world view, named plant collectors and named plants.

Stronger candidate responses included:

- a review of wild plant collecting which was driven by the appetite of the new and emerging middle class and wealthy elite for rare and unusual plants.

Key drivers are identified as

- a changing world view with regards to empire and exploitation, the rights of first peoples, the concept that plant collection was basically theft, integrating with Equality and Diversity perspective
- legislation to include key aspects, for example:
- growing knowledge with relation to biosecurity, plant importation regulations etc.
- CITES and other international conventions to protect native species.
- codes of conduct, for example Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland
- protections relating to UK collection e.g. Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981)
- examples included *Lilium regale*, collected by Chinese Wilson decimating the native populations for profit, or Robert Fortune and his role in acquiring *Camellia sinensis* against the will of the Chinese Government.

Weaker candidate responses tended to be either vague and lacking in detail, or contained considerable unrelated material.