

# Innovations in subnational climate mini publics in the UK



With:  
*The Democratic Society*  
*Electoral Reform Society Cymru*  
*Datblygiadau Egni Gwledig (DEG)*  
*Ipsos UK*  
*Mutual Gain*  
*NatCen*  
*Shared Future*  
*TPXimpact*

March 2023

# Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 What's in this report.....	1
1.3 Project Partners and funders.....	1
1.4 Acknowledgements .....	2
2. Methodology: process and reflections .....	3
2.1 Agreeing definitions.....	3
2.2 Choosing interviewees .....	4
2.3 Interview script and process.....	5
2.4 Case studies .....	7
2.5 Budget .....	7
3. Innovations in subnational climate mini publics in the UK.....	8
3.1 Participant recruitment, onboarding, remuneration.....	8
3.2 Deciding the focus of the mini public .....	11
3.3 Evidence selection.....	12
3.4 Evidence presentation .....	15
3.5 Facilitation techniques .....	18
3.6 Developing and agreeing recommendations.....	23
3.7 Presenting recommendations back to commissioners.....	26
3.8 Achieving impact: commissioner action on mini public recommendations .....	29
3.9 Achieving impact: wider action on mini public recommendations .....	31
3.10 Achieving impact: supporting ongoing participation by, and the empowerment of, mini public members.....	33
3.11 Achieving impact: embedding participation and deliberation.....	36
3.12 Achieving impact: supporting local organisations and the local economy.....	37
3.13 Engaging members of the public beyond mini public participants.....	37
3.14 Evaluation .....	41
3.15 Commissioning and commissioners.....	42
3.16 Participant wellbeing .....	44
3.17 Technology platforms .....	46
3.18 Working to a budget .....	48
4. Outline case studies.....	50
4.1 Adur and Worthing Climate Assembly (2020) .....	51
4.2 Newham Permanent Citizens' Assembly (2021-22) .....	52
4.3 Blaenau Gwent Climate Assembly (2021) .....	54

4.4	GwyrddNi (2018 – present) .....	56
4.5	Bristol Citizens' Assembly .....	57
4.6	The Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly .....	58
4.7	Camden Climate Assembly (2019).....	59
4.8	Car Dependency Citizens' Jury (2021).....	60
4.9	Devon Climate Assembly (2021) .....	61
4.10	Kingston Citizens' Assembly on Air Quality .....	62
4.11	Rethinking Water Citizen Juries.....	63
4.12	Our Zero Selby (2021-22).....	64
4.13	Brighton and Hove Climate Assembly .....	65
4.14	Glasgow Citizens' Assembly on the Climate Emergency .....	66
4.15	Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change .....	67
4.16	Newham Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change (2020) .....	68
4.17	Blackburn with Darwen People's Jury (2023) .....	69
4.10	Citizens' Panel on Home Energy Decarbonisation (2022) .....	70
4.11	The Copeland People's Panel on Climate Change & Climate Change and Young People in Copeland (2021).....	71
4.12	The Furness Citizens' Jury on Climate Change (2021-22) .....	72
4.13	The Kendal Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2020) .....	73
4.14	The Lancaster District Climate Change People's Jury (2020) .....	74
4.15	The Leeds Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2019).....	75
4.16	The North of Tyne Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change (2021).....	76
4.17	Shipley Citizens' Jury.....	77
4.18	The Social Housing Tenants' Climate Jury (2021) .....	78
4.19	The Southwark Citizens' Jury on Climate Change (2022) .....	79
4.20	The District of Warwick People's Inquiry on Climate Change (2020-21) .....	80
4.21	Barnet Climate Assembly .....	81
4.22	Blackpool Climate Assembly .....	82
	<i>Appendix One: Interview script.....</i>	<b>83</b>
	<i>Appendix Two: Case study template.....</i>	<b>88</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Climate assemblies and juries look set to remain a growing trend in European countries, at least for now. Despite this fact, there is still relatively little research available about how these mini publics are run and the impact they have.

The Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA) has established itself as the go-to place for those interested in improving the practice and impact of climate assemblies. Most of its focus in its first 18 months has been on national level initiatives. This means it has not looked in any detail at the wealth of climate assemblies and juries happening at subnational levels.

The number and diversity of these subnational mini publics means that the potential for innovation in practice is high. For example, the Devon Climate Assembly was preceded and proceeded by broad public and stakeholder engagement; the Grenoble Convention has experimented with the use of scenarios; Polish municipal assemblies have secured the agreement of mayors to implement any recommendations with near consensus support; and the Brussels City Region has recently announced the world's first permanent climate assembly. KNOCA has a role to play in helping to collect, collate, analyse and disseminate knowledge of these subnational innovations, to support the development of practice across the continent and beyond.

This report is a first-step in this process. It is the product of a commission from KNOCA to The Involve Foundation ('Involve') to collect and collate knowledge about innovations in subnational climate mini publics in the UK and Ireland, with a particular focus on if and how they differ from national climate assemblies. More climate assemblies and juries have taken place in the UK than in any other country. The aim of the commission is two-fold: to enable the collection and collation of relevant data, and to test and refine the mode of data collection. KNOCA will disseminate the findings on innovations from the project through its networks. It will also use the lessons learnt on data collection to roll out the collection and collation of data on sub-national climate mini publics across Europe.

## 1.2 What's in this report

This report contains four main sections:

- This introduction;
- A brief description of the data collection methodology and initial reflections on its strengths and pitfalls;
- A library of 'innovations' in subnational climate mini public practice in the UK and Ireland;
- Brief case studies of each of the mini publics referred to in the report.

## 1.3 Project Partners and funders

**The Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA)** is an active community of policy makers, practitioners, activists, researchers and other actors with experience and interest in climate assemblies who co-create activities and knowledge. It aims to improve the commissioning, design,

implementation and impact of climate assemblies, using evidence, knowledge exchange and dialogue.

**The Involve Foundation ('Involve')** is a UK's leading public participation charity, with a vision of a vibrant democracy where everyone can shape a society that works for us all. It aims to make participation and deliberation central to our democracy, to help meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

This project is kindly supported by the **European Climate Foundation**.

## 1.4 Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the willingness of representatives from the following organisations to be interviewed and to support the creation of the mini public case studies.

In alphabetical order, these organisations are:

- The Democratic Society (Demsoc)
- Electoral Reform Society (ERS) Cymru
- Datblygiadau Egni Gwledig (DEG)
- Involve (colleagues beyond those involved in writing this report)
- Ipsos UK
- Mutual Gain
- NatCen
- Shared Future
- TPXimpact

We would like to thank them for their generosity in giving up their time and, most importantly, in sharing their knowledge and practice with us.

We would also like to thank Sortition Foundation who contributed additional information to this report.

## 2. Methodology: process and reflections

This section covers descriptions of, and reflections on, five key areas of the methodology:

- Agreeing definitions
- Choosing interviewees
- The interview script and process
- The case studies
- The budget

### 2.1 Agreeing definitions

For the purposes of this work, the project partners agreed to define a **subnational climate mini public** as any project that has the following characteristics:

- **The process took place at a sub national level.** In the UK context, UK-wide or devolved-nation-wide processes were excluded; everything else was included;
- **Climate change was a key part of the rationale for the engagement and how it was framed.** However the process did not have to have been all about climate change. Nor did it have to have covered every aspect of climate change. Mini publics about issues like transport, retrofit or energy might well meet this criterion, for example;
- **Participants were recruited to reflect the make-up of the local population.** This includes processes which intentionally over-sampled certain demographics;
- **Participants were asked to take on board new information about the topic,** beyond discussing the issues with each other;
- **Effort was put into ensuring the evidence given to participants was balanced;**
- **Participants deliberated together and then reached one or more recommendations or conclusions;**
- **The process lasted at least 2 days (or equivalent).** For example, it may have taken place over several evening sessions.

#### Reflection

This definition is, arguably, too broad. For example, a participatory budgeting process (or at least parts of it) could meet this definition, depending on how it is run. For this report, Involve and KNOCA agreed to exclude some processes on a case by case basis. However for future work, KNOCA may want to tighten the definition so that it is clearer from the outset. This will be most important in countries like the UK where the organisations running mini publics also run a wide variety of other types of public engagement. The complicating factor here is perhaps some remaining questions about exactly where the “edges” lie, as one interviewee put it, on what is and isn’t a mini public.



The other area of confusion around the definition was about whether engagement that was run locally but whose sole aim was to feed into national decision-making processes was in scope. Involve determined that it wasn't. We recommend that KNOCA add a point to the definition that says the main purpose of the process has to be about informing subnational decision-making.

Beyond 'subnational mini public', the other term that required a definition was '**innovation**'. Many practitioners believe that the word 'innovation' is over-used, in that very few developments are genuinely new; most have been tried by other people in other contexts. Rather than agreeing a definition of the word 'innovation' per se, the project partners therefore agreed what 'standard practice' for national climate assemblies was for the areas covered in the interview script. We asked interviews to read these definitions before answering each question.

### Reflection

Broadly speaking, this process seemed to work well in directing interviewees to the areas of their practice that would be most interesting to KNOCA and each other.

The definitions were necessarily crude to keep them short, and there are therefore areas of practice from national climate assemblies (both older and more recent) that have come up in the interviews and are included in this report. We recommend that KNOCA reads through the innovations that have come up through this report and tightens the descriptions of 'standard practice' as relevant.

Finally, there are still undoubtedly instances where some interviewees described practices that others didn't mention because of differences in whether or not interviewees saw them as interesting or innovative. It is therefore important to exercise caution when reading the innovation library: for smaller innovations, it is possible that a lot of interviewees have tried them, even if that is not explicitly mentioned in this report. Again, KNOCA may wish to tighten some of the definitions of 'standard practice'.

## 2.2 Choosing interviewees

The steer from KNOCA was to interview practitioners, rather than commissioning organisations. Within that parameter, the project partners agreed a list of organisations to approach. To the best of Involve's and KNOCA's knowledge, there have not been any subnational climate mini publics in the Republic of Ireland, so the interviewees all came from the UK.

For the most part the interviewees came from the organisations best known for running mini publics in the UK. The exceptions are as follows:

- **Traverse** ceased trading just before the interview invites were sent out. Members of its team were not invited for interview given the interviews proximity to Traverse closing;
- Involve had previously delivered a short training session on citizens' assemblies for National Lottery Climate Acton Fund grantees. Involve approached the fund to ask about potential interviewees. They introduced us to **Datblygiadau Egni Gwledig (DEG)**.

## Reflection

Broadly this seems like a reasonable way to choose interviewees, given there was only funding for ten interviews. The key question is who is missing. There are at least three key answers to that:

- **Former employees:** Not all the subnational climate mini publics run or supported by organisations like Involve are included in this report in the same depth, or indeed at all. To do that would have required additional interviews with former staff and associates, which the budget did not stretch to.
- **Small, local organisations (both community groups and consultancies) and groups of self-organising individuals who are running climate mini publics:** We are not certain how many of these organisations and self-organised groups exist. Involve knows of some because they are either part of our wider networks or have approached us for advice. Other interviewees probably know of others.
- **Commissioners:** Taking a step back from the parameters of the project, the decision not to include commissioners is also worth discussing. Interviewees were often not well-sighted on what commissioners had gone on to do with mini public recommendations and how that had (or hadn't) worked internally. Commissioners may also have had a different and interesting perspective on the commissioning and delivery of the mini publics.

KNOCA may want to consider extending the number of interviews it can fund to allow for the inclusion of one or all of the above groups.

## 2.3 Interview script and process

The project partners agreed the interview script together and Involve shared the interview script with interviewees in advance. The interviews themselves lasted an hour each, with some overrunning slightly. Some interviews were with just one person and some were with two colleagues from the same organisation. The interviewer let interviewees read the interview questions themselves rather than reading them out, making it easier for interviewees to digest the descriptions of standard practice that each question included.

The structure of the interview took interviewees through different stages of the mini public processes - recruitment, evidence selection, evidence presentation, and so on. It then asked them some cross-cutting questions around, for example, how they sought to achieve different types of impact and how much influence participants had over different parts of the process.

The script originally had some optional questions at the end around issues that were of interest to Involve, but were of less interest to KNOCA on this occasion. These covered, among other areas, barriers and enablers to innovation. There was not time in the interviews to get to these questions. The interview script can be found in Appendix One of this report.



## Reflection

In some ways it is a little early to judge whether this approach worked, as it depends on whether - and to what extent - the content of this report is useful to KNOCA and the interviewees. However to offer some initial reflections:

**Interviews vs a workshop:** The alternative to interviews would have been a workshop, conducted online as interviewees live in very different parts of the UK. The interview format had two main advantages over the workshop. It allowed the interviewer to explore each organisation's innovations in some depth, and it took up a minimum amount of interviewees' time. On balance, we think interviews were probably the right option.

**Changes to questions:** It would be worth making some changes to the interview script before using it again. We would recommend that KNOCA considers:

- Taking out Q8 and Q9, and replacing them with questions about how mini publics sought to create different types of impact;
- Taking out Q12 and instead adding: (a) a question in-between the current Q1 and Q2 about whether there was anything interesting about how the mini public was commissioned or the outputs it was seeking and (b) a question near the end about how the commissioner took forward the recommendations of the mini public.
- Refocusing Q14, possibly solely to cover the current part 'a' of the question, which led to some interesting responses and discussion. Parts 'b' and 'c' can definitely be taken out, as this content gets covered in response to other questions. There is a question about whether part 'e' is useful, given guides on technology platforms that exist elsewhere. Part 'd' produced some interesting responses, and it is up to KNOCA whether it is or is not interested in exploring this area of mini public practice.

**Process vs impact orientated questions:** A more fundamental change to the interview script that KNOCA may want to consider is focusing the questions around different kinds of impact organisations want mini publics to achieve, rather than around practice at different stages of the mini public process. Questions would ask interviewees what they had done to try and increase each type of impact and if it had worked. Taking this approach would require some certainty around the types of impact organisations are seeking to achieve. It, arguably, also assumes that all organisations have the same aims. In the interviews for this report it felt like there were some differences between organisations in whether they saw their work as around engagement and empowerment, or as research; and on whether they had a mission that allowed them to go the extra mile to create certain impacts, or whether they were more limited to delivering a specified service to a client. Whether an impact focussed approach would be more useful to KNOCA and interviewees is hard to judge. We are inclined to think it would be. It is something for KNOCA to consider.

**Learning from processes other than climate mini publics:** An hour-long interview was just about enough time to cover organisations' practice on subnational climate mini publics. It wasn't enough time, in most cases, to explore what learnings could be drawn from other types of

processes they run (locally or nationally). Options for KNOCA to consider include: accepting that this is a necessary limitation of this work and not changing anything; restructuring the interview around types of impact to reduce the number of questions and making sure there was a part 'a' and 'b' to each question (one about subnational climate mini publics and one about relevant lessons from other practice).

**Document review:** Most interviewees struggled to remember all the details of mini publics that happened several years ago, despite preparing for the interviews in advance. The project budget didn't allow us to check through project reports for any interesting missing information. It is a question for KNOCA whether it wants to budget to allow for document review in other parts of Europe.

## 2.4 Case studies

The project partners asked interviewees to fill out a short case study table for each subnational climate mini public they had run. They could do this themselves or send information about the mini public to Involve to fill out the table for them. Some interviewees took Involve up on this offer, others did the table themselves. The aim of these tables was to clarify basic details about each mini public without having to spend time collecting this information in the interviews. The case study template can be found in Appendix Two of this report. The case studies themselves are in Section 4.

### Reflection

It is too early to know whether or not KNOCA and the interviewees feel these case studies are covering the right information to be most useful – and indeed whether having the case studies adds any value at all:

- **Is the content right:** We tried to keep the case study template minimal so that it did not take organisations long to fill them out. However as a result they potentially miss important context, for example about the level of honoraria paid.
- **Are case studies useful at all:** There are other lists, like [this one](#), of subnational climate mini publics that link to further information about each process.

The case studies do, obviously, take some time to complete so unless they add significant value to KNOCA or interviewees, KNOCA may not want to repeat them.

## 2.5 Budget

The budget available for this work was not sufficient to cover Involve's costs in delivering it. It also did not include funding to recompense participating organisations for their time to take part in the interviews or compile their own case studies. This wouldn't take a huge amount of extra budget to address; KNOCA may want to consider slightly increasing the budget for this work in other areas of Europe.

## 3. Innovations in subnational climate mini publics in the UK

This section outlines the main ways in which interviewees reported conducting mini publics differently from the 'standard practice' descriptions. The list of 'innovations' we have included is not exhaustive; we aimed to include those that we felt would be of most interest to KNOCA and the interviewees themselves. We have included some brief reflections on these 'innovations' at the start of each section.

We are also aware that interviews were not comprehensive. Some interviewees will have mentioned practices that others left out thinking they were not sufficiently interesting or innovative. Some interviewees mentioned practices tried in local engagement other than climate mini publics, while others did not. It is important to bear in mind that what is presented below is therefore not a definitive list of who has tried what. Where we know for sure that additional organisations have tried an innovation on a local project that was not a climate mini public, we have added an 'also tried by' label.

### 3.1 Participant recruitment, onboarding, remuneration

Standard practice: A sortition process delivered by a professional organisation (e.g. Sortition Foundation) that recruits a broadly representative sample of the local population, possibly purposely oversampling certain demographic groups. This is followed by an onboarding process to prepare participants to take part. Participants receive some sort of honoraria for taking part and have their expenses covered. Other than being reserves for if a participant drops out, there is no further communication with people who said they would like to take part but were not selected as participants.

Interviewees described some innovations aimed at **increasing uptake of sortition invitations**, including amongst sections of communities who are less likely to reply. Most of the other innovations involved **variations in the sortition process** for a range of purposes. Some interviewees reported occasionally **not using sortition** at all.

The different potential reach of sortition at a local scale, whilst not an innovation in itself, is also worth noting. In Shipley, the council delivered invitations to every household in the area. In Blaenau Gwent, their 10,000 sortition letters meant that one in three households received an invitation.

Another key difference between interviewees is how much they give participants in honoraria. Not all interviewees commented on this aspect of their work, but from those who did, honoraria for a whole day session range from around £25 to £75 per person. At the lower end of this scale, one organisation offered participants a £75 bonus for coming to all four assembly sessions.

#### 3.1.1 Communications to let people know sortition invites are coming: various

Several organisations reported that commissioners and partners on their projects had used communications channels to let people know that sortition invites would be arriving. For example, in Blaenau Gwent the local authority tweeted about the invitations and the housing associations put

out notices for their tenants. Communications in Barnet included the leader of the council talking about the assembly in his New Year letter and some social media activity.

Some organisations also reported working with local organisations to let people know about the invites. For example, in Barnet this was done as part of wider pre-engagement work with the very active local climate network. In Cambridge, it included asking the colleges to forward on invite letters to students, as the letters were due to arrive after term broke-up.

### 3.1.2 Knocking on doors to complement sortition: Shared Future in Blackburn with Darwen

In Blackburn with Darwen, two members of staff from the Sortition Foundation spent a day knocking on doors of addresses that had received the letter. The aim was to increase uptake from areas with higher levels of deprivation. Sortition Foundation report that this resulted in:

*"a significantly increased response rate from households contacted a second time via a doorstep chat (i.e. if the person was home) or a hand delivered follow-up letter. The final group of participants included two people from these households visited in person, and our evaluation is that it is very likely that the in-person visits made the difference in them deciding to take part. The evaluation of the facilitators was that these participants made a noticeable contribution to discussions, and that their participation increased the diversity of participants in the room. We assume that this approach generally increases the diversity of participants in the room in a novel way, because "people who would not normally respond to a postal invitation" are the otherwise-silent majority in a postal invitation process. We identified further possible improvements to this approach that we would make in future, and we intend to run another trial this year."*

Sortition Foundation noted that they developed this approach in conversation with [Linus Strothmann](#).

Shared Future also reported that, for a much earlier citizens' jury on fracking, they had trained students to knock on every fifth or so door, as a way of increasing uptake from people who might not always put themselves forward.

### 3.1.3 Asset-based community development: DEG for GwyrddNi

For the GwyrddNi project, DEG and its partners started with an Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) approach. They mapped what was already happening in the relevant local communities to try and identify the super-connectors of people. This included an active effort to reach out to people who might normally be missing from mini public processes:

*"As part of our mapping process, we would have had all sorts of groups, and then we, internally thought about who might we be missing here? What are the kinds of people who might miss out? Maybe homeless people or refugees or those with disabilities or those from minorities in our communities. Then we asked a question about how do we find those people? How might we get in touch with them? Then we got in touch if there were intermediaries, for example, a homeless charity or something like that, we would get in touch with them and ask them if we could either come and speak to people or if they could pass on our details."*

DEG then used these networks, significant social media activity, and their own extensive local contacts to ask people to sign up to the sortition process, as well as sending out 22,000 invitation letters. They also had a short film that they used to introduce GwyrddNi. Despite these efforts, they didn't achieve the numbers, or make-up, of participants that they had hoped for.

### **3.1.4 Collecting consent to contact people: TPXimpact in Blackpool and Barnet**

In Blackpool and Barnet, TPXimpact included a box for consent on the sortition form that asked people to consent separately to (a) updates about the process and (b) other opportunities to get involved in climate issues and/or more broadly. The consent was for ongoing contact from the commissioning organisation. There was good take-up of this offer.

### **3.1.5 Recruitment for mini public subgroups: Involve, Bristol**

In Bristol, Involve knew the assembly would be splitting into three subgroups to look at different topics. They followed a standard sortition process to send out recruitment letters and ask people to sign up, but when the Sortition Foundation processed that data they created three balanced subgroups (i.e. treating it like three small assemblies), rather than looking at the representativeness of the assembly cohort as a whole.

### **3.1.6 Recruitment for a standing citizens' assembly: Demsoc in Newham**

Demsoc asked participants in the first Newham assembly how they should recruit for the second one. The participants recommended keeping half of them (to retain their skills and knowledge) and recruiting the other half (to give new people the opportunity to take part). Demsoc followed this recommendation.

Recruitment for the second assembly therefore worked as follows:

1. Demsoc asked participants from the first assembly who would like to take part in the second assembly.
2. From those were interested, Demsoc then used the data collected during the original sortition process to select as representative group as possible to continue their participation.
3. With support from the Sortition Foundation, Demsoc then went back the original pool of people who had put themselves forward for the first assembly. From these, they selected the rest of the second assembly's participants so that the membership of the second assembly again closely reflected the local population.

Demsoc thought carefully about how to facilitate the second assembly to manage the dynamics between the participants who had and hadn't taken part in first assembly. For example:

*"Where it was appropriate, we called on the previous people to share their experience in a sensitive way without overshadowing fresh eyes. [...] We didn't want for the assembly weekends for all the louder people, the people who knew what the score was, to have a louder voice. We didn't want to intimidate the new people."*

This approach was also followed in the micro group sessions that took place between the assembly weekends. Facilitators of these sessions were trained to make sure participants from the first

assembly “were empowering [new participants] with skills rather than trampling or intimidating people with their skills and knowledge.”

### 3.1.7 DIY sortition: various

Please see Section 3.18.2.

DEG did the sortition process itself for GwyrddNi. This included using an app to select eventual participants from the initial pool of respondents, matching participant data to census statistics.

### 3.1.8 Using door-to-door and on-street recruitment: Involve, multiple locations

*Also tried by: Shared Future, Mutual Gain*

In Camden, the council and project partners used door-to-door and on-street recruitment methods led by Camden community researchers. Random stratified sampling was used to select the final participant list to ensure it was representative of Camden’s demographic make up.

In Selby, Involve and its partners used a mixed recruitment approach. They asked people who had signed up to stay in touch after the wider engagement activities before the mini public if they wanted to take part in the mini public itself. They accepted as many of those people as possible into the mini public without making it demographically unrepresentative, and then did the rest of the recruitment using on-street recruiters. Involve decided to try this method given the range of people reached during the wider engagement phase and project aims around building a group of people locally who could help to take forward the mini public recommendations.

## 3.2 Deciding the focus of the mini public

Standard practice: No description given
---

Interviewees described a number of ways in which participants and other actors helped to inform the question put to the mini public and where it focussed – rather than the commissioner fully determining these issues on its own.

Other relevant innovations are described in Section 3.13 on wider public input.

### 3.2.1 Wider input into the question being asked at the mini public: various

*Also tried by: Involve, Demsoc*

In Barnet, TPXimpact talked to local climate groups, head teacher groups and other local organisations about what the question for the assembly should be. *[Note: See also Section 3.13.3 for examples of where councils used pre-engagement work or prior public consultations to inform the questions put to mini publics].*

### 3.2.2 Participant involvement in choosing where to focus: Shared Future, multiple locations

Shared Future have asked participants to help determine the focus of the mini public in all the climate juries they have run:



*"For Blackburn, they hear from commentators about what is climate change, they hear where the emissions are locally, and they do an activity to explore how change happens. Then we said to them, 'Okay, you understand now how incredibly complex climate change is, we're going to need to prioritise what we're going to talk about. So let's have a conversation now about which three, it doesn't have to be three, up to three topics that you'd like to talk about in more depth.' Then we try and do some consensus building around that and eventually reach a decision. Then those become the topics that we recruit commentators for for the next three sessions, if it's evenings. We've also done it whereby we've said, 'You can have three topics, but you decide two, and then we're going to ask the oversight panel if they want to between them choose one of the three topics.' Or we've sometimes said, 'We want you to come up with some topics that you think are really important and need to be talked about some more; but we're going to ask the oversight panel because they might have a feeling about which of those are most able to be influenced locally in terms of where policies are at or how realistic it is or whatever.'"*

### **3.2.3 Taking an Asset Based Community Development approach: DEG for GwyrddNi**

For GwyrddNi, DEG took a bottom-up, emergent approach to the entirety of their project, and the mini publics within it. For example, they spent the first six months of the project talking to people about what was important to them in their areas. This informed the focus of each of the assemblies. Similarly to the pre-engagement for Our Zero Selby (see Section 3.13.3), DEG didn't start these conversations by talking about climate but instead turned the conversation to talk about climate part way through. DEG's approach throughout GwyrddNi reflects the community development ethos and aims of its work.

### **3.2.4 Participant involvement in standing assembly design: Demsoc in Newham**

Demsoc reported encouraging assembly members from the first Newham standing assembly to "drive improvements to develop and co-design the next assembly."

## **3.3 Evidence selection**

Standard practice: Attempt to provide evidence that is balanced and covers the broad range of views and perspectives that exist. The evidence presented and who presents it is agreed by the commissioning body and/or some sort of advisory group. Consideration is given to the demographic diversity of those presenting. Evidence is generally from the commissioning body, academics, businesses and civil society groups, rather than being about lived experience.

At its most basic, the evidence participants hear at a mini public reflects the question put to it. Interviewees noted variations in practice around giving local communities input into both what question the mini public is asked and what evidence is presented to it. Some interviews also put out open calls for speakers.

In terms of what evidence mini publics heard, interviewees talked about using local speakers. And including evidence based on people's lived experience and evidence gathered from the wider community. Not all of these innovations are unique to local mini publics; some have been tried at national climate assemblies too.

### 3.3.1 Wider input into evidence selection: various

Several organisations reported combining advisory boards with wider input into evidence selection. For example, in Newham, Demsoc ran three workshops with service leads at the local authority, Councillors, and voluntary and community sector organisations, respectively. These workshops served multiple purposes, including informing what evidence was presented to the assembly:

*“So we did three rounds of workshops to really plug them into this opportunity and get their ideas for what insight they wanted and also some ideas of who should be involved as experts. That felt like a really positive thing to do because that connected the wider system into what the outputs were going to be.”*

In Cambridge, Involve ran a stakeholder session for a wide variety of stakeholders. There was also an open call for anybody to submit ideas via a website about information they thought it was important for the assembly to hear about; *“That was used as a reference point for the advisory group and for me to go, ‘Oh, hang on a minute, somebody has suggested that we have an example from Holland on whatever. Can we bring that in? How might we cover that?’”*

### 3.3.2 Call out for speakers: Mutual Gain in Newham

In Newham, Mutual Gain put out an open call for speakers. Individuals were eligible to reply, as well as representatives from civil society organisations:

*“...we had a couple of local people come along on the Saturday - we dedicated a Saturday morning, where they could just speak to local people who were passionate about this, but not necessarily aligned to any of the people that were presenting. We had a local monk ..., I think, come along, just talked about what it meant for him from a faith-based perspective. [...] That went down really well. Then we had a local sustainability activist...”*

### 3.3.3 Participant input to who speakers are: various

Shared Future asks participants if there is anyone in particular they'd like to hear from, once they have prioritised the topics they will take forward (see Section 3.2.2). They then give these suggestions to the advisory group:

*“They'll [the advisory panel] not say ‘no you can't have them’; but they might say, ‘Oh, we need some more balance here, we need these extra people [too].’”*

In Blaenau Gwent, ERS Cymru asked participants to decide which speakers got invited back:

*“After all of the speakers had spoken over the first weekend [including taking part in a Q&A], we got members of the assembly to vote on who they wanted back. Then we put them in specific groups, and did a kind of carouselling, so that every member of the assembly got an in-depth chat with the person they wanted to actually speak to, throughout the second weekend.”*

DEG's assembly process is much more emergent and community-led altogether and they are very responsive to requests for speakers:

*"If they said, 'Oh, we really want to hear from somebody about greener tourism,' then we'd see what we could find and bring somebody in about greener tourism or electric vehicles or whatever."*

### **3.2.5 Local speakers: DEG for GwyrddNi**

For GwyrddNi, DEG found through their community outreach that people didn't want to hear from national experts; instead they wanted to hear from local people. DEG did try to get a balance of perspectives on approaches to action on climate change, but with the local focus as, if not more important:

*"So people who could talk about the local area, was one of the most important things for us. So keeping it as local as possible, and yet still being able to, enlist that respect from the audience, from the assembly members, about the information that they were sharing. That's all - that was the most important."*

*"So when I was setting it up, I thought, oh, we might have someone from one of the academic partners come and talk, or we might use some of the videos from the UK climate assembly as a means of sharing evidence. In the end, at one of the assemblies, for example, we had a professor from the university come and talk very much about carbon and carbon counting. Then in other areas, we had a woman who has made a TV programme about the Antarctic, and she's now a warden of a small island off the coast here, and talking about the types of changes she's seen in her work and that sort of thing. So we had other environmentalists come and talk, for example. Predominantly, all Welsh speakers as well, so that was also very important for our message."*

### **3.2.6 Presenters who talk about their lived experience: various**

Several organisations reported including presenters who talked about their lived experience, rather than for example their professional academic or policy specialism. At the Newham standing assembly, this included hearing from local citizen scientists. In Bristol, this included hearing perspectives from the disabled community, young people, and other under-represented voices, via local community groups and the people they worked with.

### **3.2.7 Decision makers sharing their own personal experiences: Involve, Rethinking Water juries**

Involve reported that they started each of the Rethinking Water juries with a short talk from a key decision maker who would be looking at the recommendations from the Jury. However:

*"Instead of their information input being about their role as a decision maker, it was very much about their lived experience, and their connection to whatever the river or water body was that we were talking about. It was basically showing that in that local area, even those top decision makers are directly connected as humans, in the way that you as a participant are also connected to that as humans. It was trying to almost rebalance power a little bit, and create a connection between decision makers and participants, and also show that the water environment is something that is shared between us. It was always being place based, like that person living in that area, and having a direct connection to that space, as well."*

### 3.2.8 Evidence from the community: various

Several organisations reported that their mini publics happened after wider engagement with local communities (see Section 3.12.3). In these processes, input from this wider engagement often formed part of the evidence base for the mini public. For example, in Camden and Selby, the wider engagement was about collecting ideas for climate action that the mini public then considered. In Cambridge, the pre-engagement included asking people to submit their experiences of travel in Cambridge. Involve displayed these responses on the wall at the assembly for assembly members to look at during breaks, to supplement their own lived experience.

## 3.4 Evidence presentation

Standard practice: Evidence presented by speakers, usually talking to PowerPoint presentations. This is done online, in-person or pre-recorded. There are Q&As with the speakers after they present. Some written information may also be given to participants prior to engagement sessions.

Interviewees mentioned a range of different ways of presenting evidence not covered by the description of standard practice. They also talked about some of their practice around dealing with PowerPoint presentations including:

- Providing guidance to speakers and working with them in advance to make their presentations more accessible;
- Giving participants red and yellow cards so that they can ask presenters to slow down or stop, as needed;
- Identifying assembly members who may be struggling and giving them additional support.

These have all been tried at national climate assemblies.

Other more minor variations in practice included:

- Going straight into carousel sessions (presenters answering questions at tables), with speakers just introducing themselves from the front first rather than giving a full presentation;
- Showing films and short videos.

### 3.4.1 Asking speakers to fill out forms summarising their key points: various

In Blaenau Gwent, Mutual Gain (who worked with ERS Cymru on the assembly) asked speakers to fill out a form in advance that asked questions like: “What is the main message? What are the points that you want assembly members to take away from this, and what are your recommendations to improve things?” They gave assembly members the completed forms in advance so that they had the option to prepare themselves ahead of assembly sessions if they wanted to.

In Newham, Mutual Gain asked speakers to fill out a similar written template (which could include links to further information), as well as pre-recording their presentations. They then gave participants the choice of watching the video or reading the template.

### 3.4.2 Banning PowerPoint presentations: Shared Future, multiple locations

Shared Future banned PowerPoint presentations for a few juries, because of a concern about an overreliance on preprepared complex presentations. Instead they told presenters that they could pass around images if they wanted to:

*"... it was really interesting because it forced commentators to use more creative ways of sharing their information. So in Leeds, they got round it by having one of the presenters use Lego blocks to represent the columns on a graph, which was really good actually because lots of people then referred back to that and said, 'You remember, ... how high that red column was, do you remember that?'"*

Other organisations also reported that presenters who did not use PowerPoint presenters went down well. ERS Cymru reported that in Blaenau Gwent:

*"The best example of people who gave evidence were the ones who were like, there was one guy who was sat in a hut with a wood burner being like, 'This is my office, this is where I work. I work on trees and wood life.' Then there was another guy that had his ... three-year-old daughter, holding up some coffee beans, holding up a banana and being like, 'What's the link between all of these things? They're all imported, and that affects climate change.'"*

For GwyrddNi, DEG noted:

*"Yes, so yes, we did people with PowerPoints. We also had a local commercial fisherman join us via Zoom from his boat. He was out fishing, and we were very lucky, it was a very fine day. That was cracking, actually. Really good, and he just spoke through the differences he's seen made and the work they've done with universities to understand these things, that was really cool."*

### 3.4.3 Use of narratives, storytelling and case studies: various

Several organisations are exploring different ways of presenting evidence, based around narratives and storytelling.

For example, in Barnet TPXimpact is partnering with University College London to run an activity they developed with Nesta called the Strategy Room. The activity is done in groups of ten on iPads, and starts with participants hearing someone talking about climate change and how it's affecting their life (a story). It then moves through a process of looking at ideas that have been tried elsewhere to address the challenges raised in the story, with participants eventually arriving at preferences for policy solutions. A challenge here has been how to present ideas without suggesting they are the solution and shutting down creativity and discussion.

### 3.4.4 Ideas sheets and cards: various

In Camden, Involve and Demsoc turned ideas for climate actions collected from the local community into A4 cards (one card per idea), which were colour-coordinated according to who the action was for (local council, neighbourhoods, individuals etc). Instead of speakers presenting the ideas from the front, tables worked through the cards together. The aim was to make the ideas easier to grasp

and reflect on, as well as making activities more interactive (e.g. moving ideas cards around the table).

In Selby, involve themed ideas for climate actions collected from the local community and turned them into big A3 coloured sheets, one colour per theme. Each idea was represented by a box on the sheet that briefly described what it was, alongside notes on its co-benefits, relative feasibility and relative impact on emissions reduction. Participants all had their own copy of the sheets that they could annotate and write on. Again, the aim was to make the ideas easier to grasp and reflect on, than if they had been presented from the front of the room.

### **3.4.5 Gallery interaction: TPXimpact in Barnet**

In Barnet, TPXimpact are going to trial having stations or zones around the room as a way of exploring the council's sustainability strategy and linking it to the bigger picture. For example, one station or zone might be about transport, another about waste and so on. They want to use different ways of presenting the information in those areas, for example bringing in tactile objects. There will either be speakers or facilitators at each stand to help participants engage with the content. The aim is to have "that slightly more informal vibe where people can do stuff at a slightly slower pace if helpful."

### **3.4.6 Stalls: TPXimpact in Barnet**

In Barnet, TPXimpact are planning to invite various community groups to set up stalls as part of the process. Participants will then be able to circulate round the stalls as part of a formal assembly session and interact with the groups, hearing different perspectives. Again, the idea is to provide a slightly more informal way of interacting with information than having speakers present from the front of the room, and for that information to be more visual and engaging.

### **3.4.7 Self-guided walking tours: Demsoc in Newham (15 minute neighbourhoods)**

*Note: other organisations said they had planned to use self-guided walking tours but Covid-19 meant those plans then changed.*

In Newham, Demsoc worked with the local authority to organise self-guided walking tours:

*"What we were keen to do was to take assembly members out of their local bubble, out of their own particular neighbourhoods, and offer them the opportunity to do a local tour as a resident. So the council supported - I think there was about five different tours into different neighbourhoods - and using the microsite, we put maps, things to look out for, instructions, things that were going on that the council were already developing in that area. We encouraged people ... to go and to step outside of their boxes, go visit a different neighbourhood and be a researcher and bring back their insight. [...], so that's a different way of getting assembly members to gather in their own lived experience."*

The original intention had been for someone at the council or from the project team to do the tours with assembly members, as guided tours at a fixed time and date. When capacity didn't allow for that, Demsoc instead flagged the self-guided tours to assembly members on the second day of the first assembly weekend. Demsoc then also slightly extended the timeframe in which assembly members could do the tours - from one weekend, to a period covering two to three weekends.



Around 80% of the assembly members did the tours during this time, far exceeding Demsoc's expectations. Assembly members brought back their insights to a micro group session (see Section 3.15.2), where they discussed them. Some assembly members also shared their photos and thoughts on the microsite gallery (see directly below).

### 3.4.8 Visits: DEG for GwyrddNi

For GwyrddNi, DEG noted that each assembly had its own facilitator, who led the ABCD work in the area. The facilitators used different facilitation techniques depending on their personalities and who was in their groups. This led to a wide range of activities including mini public members going on visits between sessions:

*"Then yes, between assemblies, there have been meetings as well, where people have decided they wanted to get together, and then there's been walks and things arranged for attendees. One of our assemblies, they took an hour to go and have a look around the local permaculture farm that was right next door, walk around that. We've packed people out in their wet weather gear to go for a walk around the lake and come back with their thoughts on what they've done there."*

### 3.4.9 Microsite photo galleries: Demsoc, multiple locations

Demsoc's use of microsites is detailed in Section 3.15.2. Some of this practice involves participants taking photos that are relevant to the assembly topic and sharing them with other participants via a microsite gallery. For example, for the Newham assembly on 15 minute neighbourhoods:

*"...we asked people to take pictures of their neighbourhoods, and then later on, we asked them to take pictures from the tours."*

### 3.4.10 Modelling climate friendly actions: DEG for GwyrddNi

DEG used electric vehicles to pick mini public members up when they needed a lift:

*"I think that also helps people to see electric vehicles and test them out ..."*

## 3.5 Facilitation techniques

Standard practice: Facilitation techniques are discussion and word-based. They ask participants to, for example, think about pros and cons, what's most important etc. This is either recorded by participants themselves on post-its or worksheets, or written up by a facilitator (e.g. on flipcharts).

Interviewees reported using a range of different facilitation techniques. The rationale for using these techniques varied, and covered (the following are not mutually exclusive):

- Helping participants to warm-up, re-energise or reflect;
- Enabling participants to have less structured discussions;
- Accommodating a range of learning styles;
- Validating participant's own knowledge and experience as important;
- Creating fun and enjoyable ways to think about priorities;
- Supporting participants to think about more abstract ideas, like power, time and change.

Some of the techniques would be possible in both a jury or an assembly. Others are, arguably, better suited to the smaller jury format. Some of these techniques are also suitable for national assemblies, and indeed have already been used at national assemblies. Some, like geographical mapping, more suited to a local scale.

Some of the techniques are common in community development work, but less often used as part of mini publics.

### 3.5.1 Warm-ups, breaks, and reflections on how participants are feeling: various

Many organisations use creative approaches for warm-up exercises, breaks, or reflections on how participants are feeling at the start or end of the day. This is not different to national assemblies, but we are including some of the techniques mentioned here as it is useful to share practice:

- **Drawing on post-its** – asking participants to draw a picture on post-its about how they are feeling and hold them up to the screen.
- **Weather charts** – handouts that have about fifteen weather symbols on (e.g. a cloud, sun, rain or thunder, sun behind a cloud). Participants choose one and explain why they've chosen that symbol and how they feel, or how they're feeling about the process.
- **Blob trees** – using a picture of a tree with different figures on it doing various activities ([like this](#)) and asking participants which of the figures they relate to and why.
- **Online picture groups** – asking participants to look at a group of photos (like [this one](#) of different sheep), and choose the picture that best explains how they are feeling or feel about something. They then explain their choice to their group.
- **Picture postcards** – asking participants to choose a picture postcard on their way into the room that reflects how they are feeling about something. They then present the postcard and why they chose it to their group. You can buy packs of picture postcards online, or pick up freebies to build a collection.
- **Treasure hunts** – asking participants to go and find an object (of a particular colour, use or type) when energy is flagging in an online session.
- **Stretch bingo** – a roulette wheel that you display on your screen. You asked an assembly member to say 'stop' and wherever it stops, that's the stretching exercise everyone does.
- **Temperature checks** – asking everyone to look at their phones and see who's in the place where it's hottest and coldest, as an icebreaker at the start of the day.

One organisation reported starting online sessions with upbeat music:

*"I normally take DJ requests. I open with music all the time. Upbeat music. If they've got any local favourites that they want to play in relation to either the topic or the place where we are, I take a DJ request. I tease them a bit about I'll be your local DJ."*

### 3.5.2 Dynamic facilitation: Involve in Bristol

Involve has explored using dynamic facilitation techniques, where the facilitator's role is to allocate notes to different headings whilst allowing participants to have a free-flowing discussion. This is instead of asking participants to have a more structured conversation. For Bristol, Involve created templates for facilitators that allowed them to capture notes under the headings such as opportunities, barriers, solutions, and questions.

### 3.5.3 Giving participants a choice of how they do activities: various

Several organisations give participants a choice about how they do activities in order to accommodate different learning styles. For example, in Blaenau Gwent participants were asked to bring something to the next session that represented what they wanted to get out of the recommendations. Participants could draw a picture, take a photograph on their phone, bring an object with them, write down words, and so on. Similarly, TPXimpact likes to use 'think, build, draw' approaches during mini public sessions, where participants have a choice about whether to write something down, draw a picture, build something out of lego or other materials, and so on. DEG reported using lots of different techniques to accommodate different learning styles, for example:

*"So at different times, we've given people a sheet of paper and said, 'Can you draw for us the future that you'd like to see for your community?' Or deliver it as a poem or in whatever way you want to do it."*

### 3.5.4 Building your future: Mutual Gain in Newham

Mutual Gain brought an Appreciative Inquiry technique into the Newham climate assembly. It involved participants building something on their table about what they wanted their future to look like, using glue, glitter and so on. The facilitators captured the dialogue that was happening while participants decided what to build and built it, rather than asking respondents a question that they explicitly had to respond to:

*"It was amazing. The two people that hadn't spoken in the previous session were right in there and it really got them involved, and helped them carry on staying involved throughout that process."*

### 3.5.5 Case studies, stories and role-play: various

Ipsos UK talked about how they use case studies (written or short animations) to help people consider what they think. They have also split groups into pairs to ask people to consider issues from different perspectives, using case studies and role descriptions. The aim is to provide a different way in to considering an issue and its possible pros and cons.

In Newham, Mutual Gain also used scenarios and role-play:

*"We created scenarios, or little summaries of people, like stereotyping people really. You're a taxi driver in Newham, you've been working here for a long time, what do you think about this? You're a childminder, here, what do you think about it? ... the purpose of that was to try and think beyond the people in the room, and to start thinking about the common good and*

*how other people might respond to it. ... they'd have time to think about how that person might feel. Then they would have to contribute to a conversation using that character”.*

### **3.5.6 Storyboarding: TPXimpact In Barnet**

In Barnet, TPXimpact are exploring using storyboarding early on in climate mini publics to enable participants to talk about their feelings in different ways. The idea would then be to refer back to the story boards as participants head towards drafting recommendations.

### **3.5.7 Geographical mapping: various**

Several organisations have used mapping activities, both offline and online. In the Newham assembly on 15-minute neighbourhoods, Demsoc used an online mapping activity to help people grasp what a 15-minute neighbourhood could mean for them:

*“They had Jamboards of their neighbourhood, and they were able to build important factors for them. [...] So geographically, on a map, plotting things that they wanted to see in their neighbourhoods. So GP surgery, schools, park, whatever. They really enjoyed that because they'd been listening to people all morning, and then finally, they got into a space where they could just go, 'For me, my family, it means this.' .... [It was] [!]literally, a map on the Jamboard of their neighbourhood, and then they could just slot... I think we had icons and sticky notes that they could just drag and drop, and that was really good. They enjoyed the fun of that”.*

In Cambridge, Involve asked assembly members to plot where they lived on a map of the area. This had the dual purpose of allowing assembly members to visualise where they all came from, whilst also addressing potential concerns that all assembly members would come from the city centre.

See also 3.5.9 below.

### **3.5.8 Validating participants' own knowledge and experience: various**

Shared Future has used geographic mapping activities early in processes, as a way of validating people's own lived experience and knowledge, and showing that it is important:

*“We do that sometimes through mapping, so having maps of neighbourhoods and putting them in neighbourhood groups, and then having a conversation through the map, which is far less threatening. So asking them, 'Do you want to share, first of all, where you live? Try and find where you live on the map.' So automatically we're valuing the knowledge they have. Then we've said in the past, 'Mark on red post-its things that you think locally are not helping to address climate change and mark on green post-it notes things that locally you think are helping to address climate change.' So I think that's a really nice, easy entry into a process. We've also done that with photos, ... large photos of the area, and then having that same conversation, in case people don't feel comfortable with maps. [...] ... like this is the high street, this is an aerial photo with the green areas surrounding it, here's a picture of the town hall, here's some housing, here's an estate....”*

DEG have used a similar technique:

*"We have had people outside. This is one that I got to run, and we created a map on the floor outside. So we'd say, again, 'This is the ...valley and that's Snowdon down there, and here's the lake and here's Penygroes and here's this place and here's this place. I want you to go and stand in the area where you come from.' So everybody got a picture of where they all came from in the valley themselves. 'Then have a chat with the person next to you about the cool things that are in that area,' or stuff about climate and all that. Then in another area, in the Llŷn Peninsula, they then formed groups to have conversations about that area. Those groups have turned into groups who are developing ideas outside of the assembly as well. Micro-community groups, we've called those."*

Another technique that DEG used, as part of the above mapping or separately, involved asking participants "What have you seen in your local area that is evidence of a changing climate?"

*"So we heard lots of stories about snow cover and insects on windscreens and flooding."*

This latter approach may not always work. In Blaenau Gwent ERS Cymru reported that participants found it hard to make the connection between local flooding and climate change.

### **3.5.9 Pinpoint: Mutual Gain in Newham**

In Newham, Mutual Gain took all the potential recommendations that had come out of the assembly so far and the preceding wider community engagement work, and turned them into a massive table that looked like lots of big colourful sticky notes on a huge sheet of paper. They then gave groups a set number of different stickers (lightning strikes, love hearts, question marks). Groups used the stickers to express their opinions of the ideas:

*"If you really love it - you've got to use these hearts wisely... If this is really like, woah, we shouldn't be doing this, I don't really like this, then you use your lightning strike. Then don't use your question marks for everything because everyone can ask questions about everything, but if there's one which you think I'm torn between loving this or putting a lightning strike on it because I don't fully understand what it means, then it needs a question mark. They did that, and they would deliberate about where they were going to put their question marks. They'd be discussing where the question marks go, where the lightning strikes, they would do that in groups."*

### **3.5.10 Rooms and bricks: DEG for GwyrddNi**

For GwyrddNi, DEG sometimes used a drawing or floor plan of a house to help participants prioritise ideas. Participants had to decide what idea to put in each room to create the area they wanted to see. They sometimes used 'bricks' (A4 pieces of paper stuck to the wall) to get participants to build visions.

### 3.5.11 Power mapping: Shared Future in Leeds

In Leeds, Shared Future asked participants to create a power map:

*“So we got everybody to list all those people, organisations, institutions who have the power to be able to influence what our response to climate change is locally, then we had a pot in the middle of the space we were working in which we described as the ‘power pot’. We transferred the individuals, organisations and institutions to separate pieces of card, like ‘MP’, and then people would volunteer to pick it up, the MP card, and then you would have to arrange yourselves in the room according to how much power you felt they had. So the closer to the pot, the more power you had. Then we reproduced that on a bit of paper for them, and we kept on returning to it throughout the process. Also during some of the commentator sessions, during the break we would give the commentators the power map and say, ‘Have a conversation amongst yourselves, commentators, about this power map and what would you agree with and what would you disagree with?’ Then they presented that back to the jury members as an extra piece of information.”*

### 3.5.12 Activities for thinking about time and change: various

Several organisations are thinking about different ways to help participants think about time and change.

- **Why change happens:** In Blackburn with Darwen, Shared Future asked participants to think about examples of change that they had experienced personally, seen locally or had seen nationally or globally. Then they asked participants to think about what it was that allowed that change to happen, before getting participants to share their thoughts back with the wider group. This led to a conversation about areas including legislation, regulation, bringing people together, incentives, and so on, which the group then reflected back on when they started to write their recommendations.
- **What change looks like:** Shared Future have used visioning exercises where they asked participants to shut their eyes and think about what their community would look and feel like in 30 years’ time. They have done similar exercises using drawing, as have other organisations. TPXimpact have asked participants to think about change by looking backwards, for example at all the things that have changed in the last twenty years and/or an item that was used twenty years ago that wouldn’t be used now.

## 3.6 Developing and agreeing recommendations

Standard practice: Participants draft recommendations themselves in plenary or in small groups, sometimes with facilitator support. Where this is done in small groups, there is a process of refining the recommendations involving the other participants. Once the wording of the recommendations has been agreed, they are voted upon by all participants in a secret ballot. All recommendations receiving more than a certain % of votes are recorded as passed.

Interviewees tended to report developing recommendations in the way described as ‘standard practice’. There were however some variations: interviewees **used voting in slightly different ways** and for different purposes; some **limit the number of recommendations** produced, others leave that



choice up to participants; some start with individuals' ideas rather than group work; some use **creative facilitation techniques** at the start of recommendation development; some add **an additional stage to sense-check recommendations** after they are agreed. Of all the interviewees, DEG had the most different approaches to developing recommendations, involving work outside of assembly settings.

### 3.6.1 The role of voting: various

Interviewees reported arriving at recommendations in a range of different ways:

- Some organisations use an 80% voting threshold as an indication to commissioners of which recommendations “feel quite easy to sell if you like with the [wider] community.” These organisations still include recommendations receiving less than 80% support in the project report.
- Some organisations report on all the recommendations, but use the results of votes to say for example that the top ten recommendations were x,y and z.
- Involve once (Rethinking Water juries) used the voting to narrow down the number of areas on which recommendations would be written (from twenty to six), instead of having a vote at the end of the process.
- Ipsos UK has sometimes used weighted voting - i.e. giving participants five votes and saying they can spread them as they want to, so that they could give all five votes to the same recommendation if they so chose.
- DEG doesn't use voting. Instead it uses conversation to agree priority ideas.

### 3.6.2 Limiting the number of recommendations: various

Some organisations, including Involve and TPXimpact, tend to limit the number of recommendations coming out of mini publics, where commissioners allow them to.

Other organisations have implicitly hinted at a limit. For example, putting '1,2,3' down the side of the jamboard in which participants are drafting the recommendations.

Shared Future tends to leave this choice to participants:

*“Our phrase is usually you might want to think about how many recommendations we put together...some people would argue that fewer recommendations means that you stand a better chance of things being read and being implemented; but you might feel that you don't want to be limited by that because you need to get your points across. Someone might say, 'Well, what's the usual number?' We'd say, 'Anything between 15 and 35 probably.’”*

For those organisations who do put limits on the number of recommendations this is just about the amount of time available in the mini public. For others there are several reasons for this practice, although they also recognise that counterarguments exist:

*"... we felt that a small number of really well drafted, well defined recommendations are more impactful than a large number of higher-level, less detailed recommendations. [...] We [also] wanted not just a high-level recommendation, but also actions that were related to them, and rationale. We wanted all of that to be written in the participants' own words, and we needed time for that. [...] also limiting down so that they [the recommendations worked up] are the focused...the prioritised and the most strongly agreed across people."*  
*"Yes, because, simply, councils can't deliver on a set of, like, 60 recommendations. They find it impossible to monitor them. They find it very difficult to... not cherry-pick, and I think we see that across a lot of assemblies, whereas I think, if you have a smaller set of recommendations, say ten key things that need to happen in X place to do a thing, it also really helps in the delivery and the commitment that has been made to the process to try and work on those things. You can bring it into decision-making spaces in really clear and tangible ways, whereas if you have a massive list of stuff, you just can't discuss those in decision-making settings, and it becomes a very superficial conversation, rather than a specific conversation. I think there's a really helpful comms point, to be honest, to having a smaller set of recommendations and being able to bring in a wider group of stakeholders to maybe deliver action with you as a council. It's just more practical, and I think the sense of satisfaction that folks might get out of a process because they can see the tangible action and all that good stuff is preferable to just having long lists of stuff that is cherry-picked."*

It is important to note that some mini publics that have not limited recommendation numbers have been very impactful.

### **3.6.3 Starting with individuals' ideas for recommendations**

Both DEG and Shared Future reported sometimes starting with individuals' ideas for recommendations, rather than then work in small groups. Other interviewees may well have tried this too.

### **3.6.4 Sculptures and human sculptures: Shared Future, Blackburn with Darwen and Suffolk**

Shared Future's processes often involve participants creating a statement that sits alongside their recommendations. They sometimes use creative facilitation techniques to start the process of developing the statement:

*"...in Blackburn, we experimented with something a bit more creative to help them do some thinking before writing the statement. So we got them all to go into small groups and to think about what they would like to show in the statement and then to express that through a human sculpture or tableau. That worked really well and I think we made that decision because we felt they were a group that would be up for it, so they did it, and that worked well, everybody joined in. At Southwark, we asked them to make sculptures with junk materials to show - so we provided a whole load of junk materials and art materials, we got them to make sculptures about what they see as the problems that need to be addressed. Then we got them to rejig those sculptures to try to show what solutions might look like. That worked well."*

### 3.6.5 If you could do anything.....: Ipsos UK, multiple locations

Ipsos UK tends to ask assembly members to take a step back at the end of the recommendation drafting process. They say, as paraphrased by them:

*"Right, we've been through this process. Here are your recommendations but just think now about if this was science fiction, if you could do absolutely anything, does this still fit? Are these still the recommendations? Which of these do you think works/do you want or what would you add in that scenario?"*

One of the aims of this activity is ensure participants have a chance to put forward views that they feel are less realistic or against the evidence they have heard, but that they still want:

*"The Brighton example's a good one where everyone wants trams back in Brighton but the council are [saying], 'It's pointless. There's no point getting trams. It doesn't make any sense,' but people want trams back. So we kept coming back to this thing of going, 'If you could have trams would you want them?' Everyone keeps saying, 'Yes,' so you have to reflect that somewhere. It's not quite the same thing but it's letting people out of the cage that we've built for them almost, a little bit."*

### 3.6.6 Working on recommendations between sessions: DEG for GwyrddNi

DEG reported starting the recommendation process by asking individual participants for their ideas. However this isn't the only way they approached the process:

*"There were also themed groups, where people said, 'No, I'm really interested in energy,' or, 'I'm really interested in growing,' or, 'I'm really interested in travel,' or all this sort of stuff. Then we said, 'Well, go on then. Go out and have those conversations.' So I'm part of a WhatsApp group for the energy group, and it's amazing. Every day, there's five or six messages on this group of ten people.... They've met, they've developed ideas, they've put them into pro formas, they've prioritised their ideas, they've presented them to each other. Now, in a couple of Saturdays' time, they're all going to come together, and each group is going to present to the whole, and then we're going to have a kind of fair, where people are going to mill about and have conversations and sense check ideas, and all that."*

### 3.6.7 Deciding how the recommendation process works: various

Some interviewees reported asking participants to agree the process for agreeing recommendations.

## 3.7 Presenting recommendations back to commissioners

Standard practice: The recommendations are written up and included in a project report, which is given to the commissioner and possibly also circulated to other stakeholders involved.

Most, if not all, interviewees had tried variations on the standard practice. These centred on supporting participants to present back their own recommendations, holding launch events, and using film and videos in different ways to share processes' recommendations and key messages.

Some of these innovations have also been tried at national climate assemblies; others haven't or at least not in the same way.

### 3.7.1 Involving participants in presenting back recommendations: various

Most interviewees reported involving participants in presenting back recommendations to commissioners and/or other partner organisations. There were some differences in what this involved, centring around:

- **Assembly members' role:** Whether assembly members presented the recommendations themselves, spoke about the experiences of being part of the process, and/or took questions;
- **Preparatory work:** Generally where participants were presenting, organisations did some preparatory work with them in advance. For example, one organisation described how they *"would meet with the people and go through what the process is because they're going into a formal space online. So just prepping them for that, making sure they're confident, making sure they're able to articulate their recommendations and use their own experience next to it as well."*
- **Expenses and accessibility:** There were also some variances in whether organisations covered participants' expenses to take part in these events, provided childcare and so on;
- **Who presents and how that is chosen:** In some cases, all or almost all mini public members helped to present the recommendations. In others, members volunteered themselves, with organisations also then approaching people to encourage them to take part where the volunteers were not reflective of the wider make-up of the mini public.

Several interviews said that participants presenting recommendations themselves, and in their own words, gave recommendations more credibility and impact.. As importantly for at least some interviewees, it is also part of what mini publics are aiming to do around supporting and empowering participants to be part of the democratic process. In their view, supporting participants to present their own recommendations rightly centres participants in the process and the space.

For most mini publics, the process of involving participants in presenting recommendations has gone smoothly. However there is at least one exception where it went less well:

*"[The politicians]... basically dismissed most of what they [the participants] said, and said, 'Yes, we're already doing that anyway.' It caused quite a bit of upset amongst the group. [...] We had to do a lot of damage limitation after that with the people that had participated."*

### 3.7.2 Launch events: Shared Future, multiple locations

Also tried by: *Involve*

Shared Future run recommendations launch events for their climate mini public recommendations:

*"Yes, we really push quite hard with commissioners that they should have a recommendations launch event. [...] For example, on Monday, the Blackburn with Darwen*

*recommendations launch event will happen. So we've met with them [the participants] for two evenings to prepare them so that they actually lead it... [...] The MCs are two young women [who must both be under 23 I think, one of Asian heritage, the other one white and heavily pregnant and with proper Blackburn accents]. There's 22 of them [the participants] who are coming along, and I think 19 of them are presenting something or saying something out of the 22, out of the 27 that took part in the process. So it's presentations about the process they've followed, some personal stories, and then small, facilitated discussion groups with stakeholders to try and get people to pledge to take action. So in one of the online ones, I can't remember which, we had 140 people; and for Blackburn face-to-face we've got 100 people registered, so that's very exciting."*

Pledges are usually from individual attendees, for example about how they will take the recommendations back into their work. The Council takes those pledges and has sometimes used them to follow-up. The launches are powerful, because attendees get to hear from people that they don't normally hear talking about climate:

*"Sometimes they will usually say in their personal stories, 'I wasn't that fussed about climate change, but I thought this was interesting,' or 'I actually came for the vouchers, but once I got stuck in, it was great,' which gives it quite a lot of legitimacy in the eyes of policy makers I think.*

### **3.7.3 Film tours and videos: various**

In Kendal, Shared Future couldn't do a recommendations launch event because of Covid-19 restrictions. Instead, the council crowdfunded a short film about the jury, and then the film toured some online community meetings with two of the jury members presenting the film and then taking questions. The film went to, amongst other meetings, the local Labour and Liberal Democrat party meetings. The Labour Party locally, as a result, convened a subcommittee to respond to the recommendations.

The Rethinking Water Juries also happened during Covid. Involve recorded assembly members presenting their recommendations to camera on Zoom, and then turned that into a film that they presented to various key actors in the commissioning body. Involve also shared the film with all the speakers and the advisory group members, and used it in wider communications work. The Rethinking Water juries were local processes, that ran in multiple locations at once. Participants from all the juries used the same microsite, so Involve also posted the films from each jury so that participants could see what other juries were recommending.

In Cambridge, Involve livestreamed and also recorded the final reflections session with participants.

*"... so they'd done their vote, and they had thought about what the priorities were in terms of those big decisions, and then we'd asked them to come up with their final message to the Greater Cambridge Partnership [that we live streamed and recorded]. For example, they were just really crystalising things, like, be bold and brave, we need action and ambition... it was a real call to action to the councillors. Like, 'We vote for you to do this. We know this is really difficult stuff, but that's what your job is, so you need to take the hard decisions, and not keep deflecting it.' [...] That actually was super powerful for councillors to listen to the*

*livestream or the recording afterwards. Many councillors had felt they couldn't come because I believe they were in purdah. So they could listen to it live or listen to the recording. That was very powerful, hearing assembly members voices."*

### 3.8 Achieving impact: commissioner action on mini public recommendations

Standard practice: Briefings for relevant staff and/or politicians prior to the engagement process.  
Attendance of key individuals as observers during the process.

Most interviewees take steps to create impact beyond those described as standard practice, as indeed is often the case for national climate assemblies too. Despite their efforts in this area, several interviewees commented that they would like to talk to others in the sector about how to improve mini publics' impact.

One interviewee neatly captured one of the challenges faced by organisations in achieving impact for mini publics:

*"The assembly is happening. It goes through the decision-making bodies, they commission us, etc., and then you get in the room and you're like, 'Cool, why are we doing this process? Why have you chosen an assembly? Where is this all going?' It's like, 'I don't know.'"*

Innovations presented in Section 3.6 are also relevant to this Section.

#### 3.8.1 Working with commissioners to think about how recommendations will feed into their decision making processes in advance: various

Most interviewees work with commissioners to think about how the recommendations will feed into their decision making processes. Some have dedicated meetings or workshops with commissioners early on in the mini public process to talk just about this issue. The action planning process described in Section 3.8.2 below is one outcome of such a process. Others include convincing commissioning organisations to set up working groups around each theme of recommendations emerging from the mini public.

#### 3.8.2 Asking for updates: various

Several interviewees keep going back to commissioning organisations after mini publics to ask what is happening with the recommendations.

#### 3.8.3 Involving participants in presenting back recommendations: various

Most interviewees felt that involving participants in presenting back recommendations to commissioners and others made the recommendations more impactful. See Section 3.6 above.

#### 3.8.4 Accountability mechanisms involving participants: various

Several organisations reported commissioners setting up 6-monthly or yearly follow-up sessions with participants to report on progress against the recommendations and/or ask for additional input.



### 3.8.5 The role of transparency: Ipsos UK in Oxford

Ipsos UK reflected on the role of transparency in ensuring commissioners follow through on mini public recommendations:

*"...they were sort of beholden to it because they'd been so transparent about the process. They'd been very transparent in the local press. They'd invited media scrutiny of it. They'd live streamed the plenary sessions at least, live streamed those online, so they went outside the room. They made quite a song and dance of the thing happening and I think it would have been difficult for them just to shelve it. There would have been too many questions then from their opposition I guess about saying, 'You've just spent nearly £100,000 of council money on this and then you've put it on a shelf.'"*

### 3.8.6 Carefully identifying what is open to change: various

Some interviewees believe that mini public recommendations are likely to have most impact when they are focussed on areas that are genuinely open to change. TPXimpact and Involve both described processes – in Barnet and Devon, respectively – that had required lots of careful work with decision-makers to understand where the mini publics should best focus and/or what types of output were genuinely needed (see Section 3.14.1). Interviewees noted the criticism they have sometimes faced for taking this approach:

*"I think that's been one of the big criticisms that have come from some of the campaign groups locally - people like Extinction Rebellion, I've seen in other places. You're maybe limiting conversation too much, but I think you need to weigh up that with the actual practicability and the delivery potential of what comes out of these processes."*

For example, in Devon, the commissioning body set up the citizens' assembly to look at three contentious areas that the wider public consultation on the draft Devon Carbon Plan had not resolved. The rest of the draft plan was not open to change in the same way. The assembly therefore focussed on the three contentious areas. Assembly members did have a limited chance to input on the wider Devon Carbon Plan. At assembly members' request, there was a session towards the end of the mini public in which they fed back wider messages to the commissioning body, having been given copies of the draft plan to read prior to this session.

### 3.8.7 Involving the oversight panel and/or commissioning body in recommendation drafting: various

In Warwick and Blackburn with Darwen, Shared Future checked with jury members if they could share their draft recommendations with members of the oversight panel. They then gave members of the oversight panel the opportunity to add comments (with a limit of around 300 characters in total) to the draft. Shared Future told the jury members that they didn't have to take the comments on board:

*"We worked very hard with the jury to say, 'Look, you can have this, but you can completely ignore it if you want, there's no problem,' and we only used it with them because we felt that they were working really well as a group and had the confidence to be able to say, 'No,*

*interesting, but you're all right, thanks.' So we did that with Warwick and we've also done it with Blackburn, and I think it worked really well."*

TPXimpact has also explored commissioner feedback on emerging recommendations, asking councils to provide some input and reflection on what it would take to deliver them. They also reported building input on recommendations into the sessions via World Café formats, and asking speakers for their views. Again, they do this carefully:

*"I think that's really important that you don't shut things down, but you just give people information."*

### **3.8.8 Leveraging the fact it's a standing assembly: Demsoc in Newham**

In Newham, Demsoc told the commissioners that it wouldn't work to start the second assembly without talking about what had happened as a result of the first one. This was effective in encouraging the council to publish a formal response which Demsoc then put on the assembly microsite:

*"So if people were thinking, why am I here? We've still got the other one. What's changed? What's happened? They could go and read up on some of the actions that the council were taking forward."*

Demsoc reported, however, that they still couldn't find evidence of the assembly's impact on the council's main website.

## **3.9 Achieving impact: wider action on mini public recommendations**

The interview script did not define 'standard practice' in this area, although several national climate assemblies have looked to create impact on actors beyond their direct commissioners.

In the UK, bringing a range of local actors on board is particularly relevant to local climate mini publics. Councils have very little direct control over emissions in their local area. Making progress on emissions reduction therefore necessarily involves working with other local organisations and individuals.

Some of the innovations presented in Section 3.6 are also relevant to this Section.

### **3.9.1 Bringing key partners on board: various**

ERS Cymru had, for a number of years, been talking to a member of staff at the housing association United Welsh who was keen to do a citizens' assembly, initially on housing. This member of staff eventually managed to get a small amount of funding for the assembly through a wider piece of work on retrofitting homes. Once it was decided that this would be a climate assembly, it was clear that the assembly was likely to make recommendations that sat outside the remit of the housing association. The staff member worked to bring the other housing associations on board, and ERS Cymru worked to involve the local authority and Public Service Board:

*"We met with the leader, and some cabinet members, and they were like, 'Mmm hmm.' Then we met with the chief executive and she was much keener. She put a member of her*

*team on the steering group, and then we were basically like... 'Can we have this bit of data? Can we have that bit of data? Can we have the logo?' Then eventually, as it built momentum and got more press, I think the councillors then realised, 'Oh... we actually need to do something here.' [...] I wouldn't necessarily say that a lot of the partners in it were commissioners, they were just partners that we brought on board as the process went [along].*

The involvement of the Public Service Board was a “quite unique” development in Wales. The Boards were set up following the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act and tend to be “very opaque, and quite hard to access.” In this case, a representative from the PSB came to steering group meetings and talked about “how the Public Service Board would respond.”

DEG reported similar relationship with its local authority:

*"It was, kind of, a Field of Dreams thing, 'Build it and they [the local authority] will come.' So we built this thing, and of course, they're really interested, so they want to get involved. So yes, we're becoming increasingly involved with the local authority."*

### **3.9.2 Action planning: TPXimpact in Barnet**

In Barnet, TPXimpact will be bringing together the wider community to do action planning around the mini public's recommendations:

*"...it shouldn't be the responsibility of an assembly to do action planning because they don't have the power and resources to do it, but you can set the direction for the planning that does need to happen, and then involve the people that actually can do the stuff to think about that more deeply, not just sit with the council to have to do it. So, yes, facilitating that, and then thinking about the way that you also involve the members of that process, should they want to continue their involvement..."*

This idea came from TPXimpact and they agreed with the council how they were going to do it early in the planning for the assembly process.

### **3.9.3 Advisory group membership and design: various**

Several interviewees reported that one of the criteria for choosing advisory group members was their ability to go on to help with implementing the recommendations. In Kendal, members of the group included officers and Councillors from the Town, District and County Council, the local MP, people from the local university, and representatives from a range of local partnerships and community groups. Panel members had to commit to helping to implement the Jury's recommendations in order to be part of the panel. After the mini public finished, the group formed a “Recommendations Panel” that meets every 6 months to assess progress against the recommendations, and look at how to work together to deliver them. They focus particularly on recommendations that are less straightforward to deliver.

For each Rethinking Water jury on water, Involve ran workshops for the advisory group to help their members work together to input to and/or agree various aspects of the design of the jury. This had the effect of improving and deepening relationships between advisory group members themselves, on what are often highly contentious local issues:

*“As a result, I know that at least one of those advisory groups went on to create a working group to basically act on the recommendations, be held to account collectively for the recommendations from that local area, and then to continue working collaboratively into the future.”*

#### **3.9.4 Pledges: various**

In Kendal, the town council had a pledges page:

*“So before the process had started, local organisations, following the town council's lead, were asked to pledge how they would respond to the recommendations, so 'In so many months we will go through all the recommendations and respond as to how we're going to implement them or not.’”*

In the end, however, only three organisations (including the council) responded to the recommendations.

DEG is also trialling asking for local pledges:

*“...we're also asking people to sign a pledge, people in the community. The pledge is purely to say, 'I'm going to read the action plan that is produced by our Community Climate Assembly.' We're asking businesses and councillors and people in the local area to sign that pledge as a means of trying to build up a database of people we can send it on to. Then they get a nice little certificate they can stick up as well, to say we're supporting [the assembly]...”*

#### **3.9.5 Inviting key people to the final mini public session: DEG in GwyrddNi**

For their final mini public sessions, DEG have opened out the invite to “people that we think it would be really important ... to get on board, whether they're people who are already doing environmental projects or may have an interest, etc., they can come in and then share some of their learning or make connections with the groups who've been interested in developing these kinds of projects.”

### **3.10 Achieving impact: supporting ongoing participation by, and the empowerment of, mini public members**

The interview script did not define ‘standard practice’ in this area, but it is an important aim for some of the organisations we interviewed.

Some interviewees reported encouraging and supporting participants to link up with each other, or providing training to support participants to lobby decision makers around their recommendations. Others focussed on ensuring participants could take part in future commissioner-led activities – some of which have been innovative in and of themselves in helping mini public members and others to continue their participation and support the implementation of recommendations.

Several organisations noted that they had tried more innovative practices on other local processes, including mini publics on non-climate-related topics. These included providing mini public members with CV support and interview coaching, signposting them towards suitable jobs, and creating

resources to help participants engage other people on the topic (this latter idea didn't get a huge amount of take up).

DEG's ABCD approach makes the impact on participants and the change that creates a really central part of their process.

### **3.10.1 Encouraging participants to stay active: Shared Future, multiple locations**

Shared Future reported that they usually do some work towards the end of local climate mini publics to help participants think about what happens next:

*"So near the end of the process, we usually explore with them about what next. Usually there's been some murmurings of 'What am I going to do on a Monday night now? Maybe we should carry on.' So what we usually do is we usually try to plant the seed a little bit about what other juries and assemblies have done. Sometimes we've brought in jury members from previous projects to say, like the Copeland people, to say, 'What we've done is we've set up this and it's worked well!..."*

Shared Future have also brought in commissioning body staff to meet participants, where they are able to support their ongoing involvement. For example, all the climate juries in Cumbria are half-funded by the local authority and half by the Lottery. The lottery funding also includes paying for a community support worker.

*"So towards the end of Copeland, what we also did was we brought that community support worker attached to the Lottery project in for ten minutes just to explain a little bit about what she could do. So she talked about how they [the commissioning body] could help identify funding opportunities. I think they paid for the group to have a Zoom account and they're in an online forum for the county, for the Lottery project, and they regularly contribute to that."*

Some of the jury members also went on to form a reading group on climate change at the local library.

### **3.10.2 Linking participants up with one another: various**

Some interviewees reported linking participants up with one another so that they could take forward activities themselves. For example, in Newham, one assembly member asked Demsoc to be linked up to her microgroup to talk to them about what could be done to combat isolation locally. Demsoc sent her request to all assembly members and seventeen got back in touch saying they would be happy to get involved.

In Blaenau Gwent, participants set up a Facebook group to stay in touch with one another. Some of them then sought updates from the the Council and Public Service Board about action of their recommendations. They posted these in the Facebook group for other participants to see.

Some interviewees reported asking participants after a session or two whether they would like to be part of a WhatsApp group. Some of these WhatsApp groups continued long after the mini publics

ended. Not all mini public members had or wanted WhatsApp and so not all took part in these channels.

### 3.10.3 Organising lobbying training: Shared Future, Copeland

In Copeland, Shared Future worked with Hope For The Future to organise training for participants on lobbying their MP, who was a Shadow Transport Minister at the time.

### 3.10.4 Staying in touch forms: various

Most organisations give participants 'staying in touch' forms at the end of mini publics that allow them to stay in touch with the commissioning body and/or the organisation running the mini public, if they want to. Some organisations know that participants have gone on to take part in surveys or activities on issues beyond climate through the commissioning body.

### 3.10.5 Commissioner-led opportunities to stay involved: various

As noted in Section 3.7.4 commissioners of several mini publics have set up 6-monthly or yearly follow-up sessions with participants to report on progress against the recommendations and/or ask for additional input.

In Kendal, the council has also formed a volunteer network, made up of interested individuals from the jury itself, people who contributed to the jury's crowdfunding campaigns, and people who signed up to be kept updated on the jury website. The network includes 256 people. These community volunteers have so far helped with activities including the town's solar audit and the design of the Zero Carbon Kendal website. They have also provided the council with communications and technical support.

### 3.10.6 Participant impacts as a central aim: DEG for GwyrddNi

For DEG, its ABCD approach means that the impact on participants and the community is a central aim. The following two interview extracts emphasise that difference in approach:

*"The whole time we're stepping back and stepping back further and further and further, hoping that the community themselves will then take charge of it."*

*"Yes, I think, for me, actually before all that [getting partners to take forward recommendations], it's softer stuff, isn't it, but really, really important to this, is about people making the connections together. So what we've heard over and over again is how fantastic it is to come into a room and talk to people who are also interested in making changes. Where some people thought they were sitting at home all alone, feeling miserable about climate change or anxious about climate change, or about the things that needed to be done. All of a sudden, they're hearing - they didn't realise there was all this stuff happening already in their area, and there's other people really interested, and they've made these connections. That in itself is inspiring people to make changes. What we've seen, in two areas now, we have people running a community kitchen once a month, to run a community meal event open for everybody, using waste food ... - you know, just little things like that are starting up and happening. So all that is about creating - we already had pretty good communities, but there was a split, often, between environmental actors and, for want of a better term, the indigenous community. Quite often, it tended to be English-speaking incomers who might move to the area for environmental reasons, would then try*

*and run environmental projects. That would happen in, kind of, a separate population to Welsh speakers who wouldn't necessarily relate, because you're coming from totally different angles. So a big chunk of our work is bridging that divide."*

### 3.11 Achieving impact: embedding participation and deliberation

Embedding skills and practices around participation and deliberation is a key aim for some of the organisations interviewed. The interview script did not define 'standard practice' in this area, but most organisations approached the task through a mixture of training, mentoring and observation opportunities.

#### 3.11.1 Training, coaching and mentoring: various

Several interviewees reported trying to embed skills around deliberative methods in both commissioning bodies and the wider community. Organisations had tried approaches including:

- **Informal conversations** with the officials involved in the mini public around various key skills sets;
- **Facilitation training** for people from the commissioning body, partner organisations, and/or civil society groups. For some organisations this included training people who then facilitated at the mini public itself, but no one limited this training just to people who would be involved in this way. Involve noted that some of its trainees have gone on to join the pool of freelancers it reaches out to for its wider work. These individuals have now facilitated at various local and national mini publics. Some organisations expressed reservations about training volunteers and councils officers to facilitate at the mini public itself because of concerns about the quality of their facilitation:

*"I find that [newly trained facilitators talking too much in their groups] really irritating because it defeats the object. You're spending all that money, and you end up listening to them talking instead of the participants. Obviously, some aren't bad, I've come across some great facilitators, but generally, I'm nervous about that [training volunteers or council staff]."*

- **Wider training including in deliberative and participatory methods** for people from the commissioning body, partner organisations, and/or civil society groups. For some, this was done in conjunction with the facilitation training – for example, Involve in Bristol. For TPXimpact it is more about a programme of sessions all the way through the mini public process.

Some organisations combined this training with observer programmes at assembly events, particularly where these were held offline.

#### 3.11.2 Leveraging where funding comes from: ERS Cymru in Blaenau Gwent

Involve had run a citizens' assembly (not on climate) for Senedd Cymru a year before the Blaenau Gwent climate assembly, but the use of citizens' assemblies in Wales and the Welsh Government's interest in them "had kind of plateaued since then." In this context, the fact that the funding for the



Blaenau Gwent climate assembly had come, in a roundabout way, from the Welsh Government provided a way to reignite their interest:

*“So, the money that we got was essentially originally from Welsh Government. It went to a network of housing associations ... to retrofit housing, and as part of that I think I mentioned they had the 50k engagement fund, which... [a member of staff] managed to get just for this project [the Blaenau Gwent climate assembly]. So... we basically wrote to Welsh Government, to the relevant ministers, and said by the way, this funding is being used for this climate assembly, and we think you should come and speak to the assembly. We then were able to show relevant Welsh government ministers [what the assembly was like]. We had two speak to the assembly... so they actually saw it for themselves. So, we used it [the assembly] as [a way of] building of Welsh government ministers’ understandings [of citizens’ assemblies], and trying to get them to commit to the process too.”*

### 3.12 Achieving impact: supporting local organisations and the local economy

The interview script did not define ‘standard practice’ in this area, but some of the interviewees noted that they tried to support the local economy through the mini public process.

#### 3.12.1 Providing training for local organisations: various

As already noted in Section 3.10.1 above, several interviews provided training for local organisations as part of mini public processes.

#### 3.12.2 Using local services: various

By definition, most mini publics used local venues, local caterers and other local services as part of their work. In Blaenau Gwent, ERS Cymru also used a local design firm to design the assembly’s final report. In Selby, Involve and its partners used a local organisation to build the assembly’s website.

### 3.13 Engaging members of the public beyond mini public participants

The interview script did not define ‘standard practice’ in this area. Instead it asked interviewees if mini publics they had run had involved wider public engagement, either before, during or after the mini public process.

In addition to the practices noted below, DEG’s aims for GwyrddNi mean their work is rooted in wider community engagement at every stage of the project.

#### 3.13.1 Media activity: various

Several interviewees reported seeking local media coverage around the mini public. Some involved mini public members in this work. For the Newham standing assembly, this included supporting participants to get involved in coverage by national publications the Municipal Journal and Big Issue. DEG’s work gets regular local coverage.

#### 3.13.2 Youth assemblies and workshops: various

Several mini publics had accompanying youth processes.

- In **Brighton**, the council ran a young people's assembly more or less in parallel with the adult assembly. The council used and adapted some of the materials from the adult process for the youth process, but Ipsos UK isn't aware of any other link between the two assemblies.
- In **Barnet**, TPXimpact will be running a parallel youth process for 20 young people. The youth process will interact with the citizens' assembly at various points, including sharing their vision for the area and emerging recommendations. The aim is for the two processes to co-publish a report.
- In **Copeland**, Shared Future ran a process for young people alongside the citizens' jury, called Copeland Youth (please see the box below).

#### Interview extract: Shared Future – Copeland Youth

"So, in Copeland, it's a long district along the west coast of Cumbria, very deprived, and there's a number of youth groups that are rural and urban and they're run by three different youth organisations. So we met with them and said, 'Look, this is what we're doing, we want meaningful involvement from young people, how can we make this happen?' We agreed that we and the youth workers would design together some activities that they could then use in their own youth groups. So the idea being that ... [the] young people are going to do these activities in a situation where they feel comfortable, with people that they trust, i.e. the youth workers, rather than some fancy new thing where they're having to step right out of their comfort zone. So we designed ... maybe six hours... worth of activities.

They were quite excited about it because they sometimes struggled for activities to do; but they knew that they could use them whenever they want, so they could do a three hour thing, and they could do a ten minute thing, or whatever, and the outputs would feed into the Copeland jury. We did it in a way that the information that the Copeland jury was getting was also summarised in a creative way so that the young people could have similar conversations. So they did some mapping, for example, and we got them to map their own communities. Then not until about two hours into that process did we tell them it was about climate change, so that they couldn't self-select and think, 'I'm not going to do that,' or 'I'm going to do that because it's about climate change.' Then after that they had to watch a bitesize video on climate change, and then we printed off this pack of photos that were like prompts for conversations, and some percentages on pieces of paper, and they had to talk about what did they think the relevance of these photos were to climate change and what's happening locally, and to match any of the photos with any of the percentages, which allowed lots and lots of conversation.

Then they were presented some stuff that says, 'This is where the emissions are,' and then they talked about solutions and prioritised some solutions and they could hear some solutions from other processes as well to help them on their way. Eventually, they came up with a list of ideas. That happened I think in eight different youth groups across the west coast and that then fed into the jury.

[It didn't feed in]... as well as it could have. It was also at the time of COVID, and all the youth groups are really financially on their knees and it's a long thin district, so it takes an hour to drive from one end to the other, and they were like, 'Well, if we were to come to the assembly, we will have to close our youth groups that night, and we don't want to do that.' So instead they produced a PowerPoint with some stats and none of the young people wanted to be filmed, so that was presented to the jury. We did give the jury members an opportunity to go to any of the youth groups and meet up with the young people in one week; but none of them took it up.

### 3.13.3 Pre-assembly engagement: various

There have been a number of subnational climate mini publics that were preceded by wider public engagement activities.

In many cases, local authorities ran this engagement themselves or through other contractors before commissioning the mini publics. They used the outputs to inform the mini public in various ways. For example:

- In **Camden**, the council ran a residents' survey on its Commonplace platform, worked with local schools and collected ideas from local businesses. All three forms of engagement aimed to gather ideas about how Camden and its residents could tackle the climate crisis. The Council selected 200 of these ideas (out of the 600 it collected in total) for consideration at the mini public, choosing them to represent the diversity of the ideas it received.
- In **Bristol**, the citizens' assembly was preceded by focus groups and a survey. Through the focus groups, the council asked a diversity of local residents about how Covid-19 and lockdown had impacted their lives. They used what came out of the focus groups to inform the questions in the survey. Over 6,500 residents responded to the survey which asked them about how their lives had been affected by Covid-19. The council used the survey results to determine the topics for the citizens' assembly.
- In **Devon**, the Devon Climate Emergency Response Group commissioned the climate assembly to look at three contentious issues that had not been resolved through its wider consultation on the draft Devon Carbon Plan. See Section 4.

In some cases the interviewees and their partners ran the pre-engagement themselves. Sometimes this was to inform various aspects of the mini public. In others it was more about communicating the fact the mini public was happening and why. For example:

- In **Selby**, Involve and its partners used a range of methods to collect input from local residents and stakeholders. These included online and offline surveys, community conversation events (visiting pre-existing local groups and organisations), workshops and meetings. This pre-engagement collected ideas for how to tackle climate change locally, and well as people's aspirations for the local area (what they wanted to see stay the same and what they wanted to see change). Where residents said they wanted to see change but were not sure what to suggest, the partners researched what had been done elsewhere. The

partners turned ideas collected in the pre-engagement and the results of the research into the ideas sheets used at the mini public (see Section 3.3.4).

- In **Cambridge**, as well as a live website, there was a range of press and social media activities to raise awareness of the assembly and drive comments to the website. This included producing a short video to promote the citizens' assembly. Involve also ran a Twitter Q&A to try to raise awareness, and reach / address some of the questions raised about the assembly before it started. The Twitter Q&A didn't go well:

*"It was a way to try and reach out and dispel some of the myths about what the citizens' assembly was trying to do. But I am not sure it achieved that – we just reached established people who were maybe negative to start off with and twitter wasn't the best way to have that engagement. I worried that anyone observed the Twitter Q&A might have been put off rather than engaged."*

In **Kendal**, the council ran two crowdfunding campaigns to help fund the mini public itself. This is described in more detail in Section 3.18.1.

#### 3.13.4 Concurrent engagement: ERS Cymru in Blaenau Gwent

In Blaenau Gwent, ERS Cymru and its partners used Pol.is to ask local communities for ideas about how to tackle climate change in the local area. This work included the council tweeting about Pol.is, and about initiatives such as the Polish chat the partners held on the platform. The partners didn't get a huge volume of responses through Pol.is, but did collect some useful ideas, and some very engaged members of the public used the platform a lot.

ERS Cymru also noted that some members of the steering groups for the assembly – which included young people and representatives of the large 50 years+ community locally – helped share information about the assembly with their peers.

Some of the youth engagement discussed in Section 3.12.2 was also concurrent engagement.

#### 3.13.5 Post-assembly engagement: various

Various forms of wider engagement (beyond that with mini public members themselves) have happened after local climate mini publics finished. This wider engagement had different purposes (the examples given below are illustrative rather than exhaustive; many other local climate mini publics have also involved post-assembly engagement):

- **Monitoring and further input:** Recommendations from the Camden Climate Assembly were unanimously supported by Councillors from all political parties. One of the actions was to 'establish a Climate Emergency scrutiny panel made up of experts and residents'. This has since been enacted, and Camden's Climate Panel has just been recommissioned a second time to run for another two years until 2025. The residents who take part in the panel are purposely not the same residents who took part in the original assembly.
- **Consultation:** The commissioning body in Devon fed the outputs of the Devon Climate Assembly into the next stage of finalising its Devon Carbon Plan:

*“They used that [the outputs] to then put proposals forward into the draft plan that were acknowledged as having come from the assembly, including the rationale. Then that went out to their wider public consultation to finalise the Devon Carbon Plan.”*

- **Communication:** In Barnet, there is going to be a mural on a wall showing the recommendations and vision of the assembly, as a living record of what was said. Some interviewees expressed interest in using other arts-based methods to engage local communities in the results of climate mini publics, but no one had yet it.

### 3.14 Evaluation

Standard practice: Participant feedback forms at the end of events. Possibly an independently commissioned evaluation.

In general interviewees had not innovated in the area of evaluation, and some acknowledged it as a weak point in their work. Where formal evaluations had taken place, for example where mini publics were part of wider projects, interviewees were not always convinced that the evaluations had been helpful:

*“I wasn't a super fan, to be honest, just because I felt like I don't think they knew the assembly process well enough. It was fine. It's just sometimes I think it critiqued things that would never have been something that you could have achieved.”*

Some organisations noted that they had started to innovate in the area of evaluation but had not yet applied this to subnational climate mini publics.

Four small innovations noted by interviewees have been tried at national climate assemblies.

#### 3.14.1 Distance travelled surveys: Demsoc, multiple locations

Demsoc noted that they have used surveys at the start and end of mini publics to assess the ‘distance travelled’ by participants – for example, any changes in democratic participation, and any changes in attitudes towards (a) the issue or (b) achieving change on the issue in the local area.

#### 3.14.2 Interviews with participants: Ipsos UK, Brighton

In Brighton, Ipsos UK did some follow-up interviews with a handful of participants a few weeks after the mini public finished “to get a more qualitative feel for how they felt about the process and the difference they felt it had made to them.”

#### 3.14.3 Exploring why people didn't engage: DEG for GwyrddNi

DEG are working with a post doctoral student for four months to look at local people who haven't engaged in the project and why that was. Specifically it is looking at whether using different language could have helped, and what language that would have had to be.

#### 3.14.4 Informal evaluation: various

Some interviewees use more informal evaluation measures, like stickers on chart as people leave the room, to assess how processes are going.

## 3.15 Commissioning and commissioners

The interview script did not define 'standard practice' in this area. Instead it asked interviewees whether their commissioners had done anything innovative that they had not already mentioned.

Interviewees' answers covered the different sorts of outputs commissioners ask for, commissioners' attendance at mini publics, how commissioners have taken forward recommendations and how implementation works for mini publics without a commissioner (i.e. where projects were led by participation and/or climate organisations using funding from charitable trusts and foundations).

### 3.15.1 Different kind of required output or outcome: various

Several interviewees mentioned mini publics that they felt had required different outputs and/or outcomes than some of the national climate assemblies:

- Mini publics in **Newham** and **Camden** involved drafting recommendations according to who was going to deliver them (e.g. the council, business, local communities).
- In **Devon**, Involve did a lot of careful work to make sure the type of output produced by the assembly was useful to the commissioning body and could therefore be impactful. As noted in Section 3.14.1, the Devon assembly was focussed on three contentious areas of the draft Devon Carbon Plan that a wider public consultation had failed to resolve:

*"In Devon, ... [i]t wasn't so much recommendations. What they were developing, at least in some of the streams, were much more around some conditions of acceptability. That's really what the outputs were, and actually because of the context, because they were working within that quite established framework of the draft plan, actually that was the most valuable type of outputs, because it was essentially what are the things that would need to be in place to increase the acceptability of various sorts of ... proposals or actions. [...] The process was still very similar, but actually the types of outputs were quite different. [...] That was how we tried to really make sure they could have that impact, ... within that context of this being very embedded in [the]... process of developing a wider Devon Carbon Plan that had had multiple stages of engagement.... It [the assembly] had a real clear slot and real clear next step of what would happen after that.... They [the commissioning body] thought about this well before they commissioned it [the assembly], and had done quite a bit of research there. Also, [we used] the early workshops we ran with them to really make sure everyone was on the same page about that, knew what they were getting out of it [the assembly] at the end and how they could use it, and ...[how] it would inform the next step."*

- In **Cambridge** there were already a set of proposals - like closing the road to cars, and restricting / removing parking - on which the commissioning body wanted the assembly's view. The assembly voted on those core proposals. Once they knew the results of that vote they then looked at "what sort of considerations needed to be put in place to make those fair,

or to make those viable....". The assembly members also generated their own supporting measures for ideas that they thought would make a difference:

*"They might have been things like, encouraging use of electric bikes, last mile delivery by bike (rather than lorries coming into the centre of Cambridge, leave them outside, and deliver goods by bike for that last mile), or things that were probably smaller, and more granular. Other supporting measures were things like increasing bike storage at park and rides. They were smaller things that were really important to participants, but probably by themselves were not going to resolve the congestion issues of Cambridge."*

- Ipsos UK are unsure if **Glasgow** Council were looking for a policy outcome from their climate mini public. They noted that the Council timed the assembly so that the announcement of its recommendations coincided with COP26 and suggested instead that, "It felt like it was part of their broader thinking about how Glasgow becomes a more sustainable city."

### 3.15.2 Commissioners coming to the mini public: various

Commissioners coming to the mini public is a feature of most, if not all, subnational climate mini publics in the UK, and has also been part of the national climate assemblies run here and elsewhere. Examples from the interviews include:

- In **Blaenau Gwent**, the chief executive of the local authority - who was also the chair of the Public Service Board - spoke to the assembly at its start, middle, and end, to reaffirm that they were observing and listening to the process. ERS Cymru reported that this was "quite helpful" to the process.
- In **Newham**, Demsoc noted that the standing citizens' assembly was a flagship initiative for the mayor. This meant the mayor felt ownership of it and was keen to be involved at both its beginning and end. At the beginning they gave a formal welcome, introducing themselves and the assembly and saying why the assembly was important from their perspective. At the end, the mayor came to hear the recommendations first-hand. However this went less well:

*"Yes, so they'd come in, and instead of being like, oh, that's really interesting and asking questions to explore what assembly members felt, they talked about what the council was already doing and what they were doing and all of that stuff. [...] I don't think they particularly engendered trust because they were so sort of self-agenda driven."*

### 3.15.3 A systematic approach to implementation: various

After the Adur and Worthing Climate Assembly, the council went through the assembly's recommendations and agreed who was leading on each of them. It then looked at which other external stakeholders were working on that area and what was currently happening, engaging with over 200 local organisations. The implementation of the recommendations lost momentum during Covid but has since picked back up.

In Kendal, the Council has redirected two thirds of its staff time to work that responds directly to the jury recommendations, including the creation of a Development and Delivery Manager role dedicated to the implementation of the jury's recommendations and a new Projects Officer to help shoulder



the load. In its February 2022 budget meeting, the Council agreed to a rise in council tax (equating to £2.50 a year for a house in Band D) to pay for a raft of projects many of which respond to the jury recommendations.

### 3.15.4 Not having a commissioner and the role of grant funding: various

The two mini publics solely funded by grant funders (i.e. that were independent from state institutions) are Our Zero Selby and GwyrddNi. Both were led by climate and/or participation organisations who developed the ideas for the projects and raised funding for them through bids to charitable trust and foundations. The projects are seeking both further grant funding and action from organisations involved (e.g. as partners or in advisory groups) to allow them to implement the mini public recommendations. In Selby, the project partner based in Selby itself (Selby District Association of Voluntary Service) is leading this process.

DEG's work is more ambitious in scale:

*"So yes, we started calling them [the outputs we were seeking to achieve from the assemblies] community climate manifestos, but as the process went on, people just liked to call them action plans.... There's an action plan for each area, and there will probably be a, kind of, overarching regional action plan as well, where if all five areas say they want to do something on community energy, then working together would make sense. Then our funders, so we're funded by the Climate Action Fund. This is a development grant that we have at the moment, so we'll be going back to them for a full award, which will help us to deliver on those action plans. Some of the action plans may already be, in part, being delivered by partners. So they will then be adopted by the partners to deliver outside of the Climate Action Fund application as well."*

## 3.16 Participant wellbeing

We asked interviewees the following question about participant wellbeing:

*"What steps do you take, if any, to ensure participant wellbeing beyond: (a) the design and facilitation of the engagement process itself, and (b) onboarding and communication with participants between, during and after sessions? For example, this might include the use of quiet rooms, counselling services, and/or communications training."*

Interviewees' responses suggested that the following steps are now standard features of most, if not all, subnational climate mini publics in the UK:

- Quiet rooms, staffed by someone with relevant experience;
- Signposting to (local) mental health services;
- Communications training that has a wellbeing slant.

Other small but significant steps to improve participant wellbeing mentioned by interviewees included providing:

- A prayer room (e.g. in Cambridge)
- A creche (e.g. in Camden)

- Gender neutral toilets (e.g. in Barnet)
- Mindfulness exc

Some organisations have also used trauma informed approaches to help respond to challenging individuals or situations.

In addition to the above, interviewees highlighted five other areas of their practice.

### 3.16.1 Home groups: Shared Future in North of Tyne

In North of Tyne, Shared Future reported using home groups:

*“So home groups would be like, 'You're going to start the session in this group, and then maybe at the end of the day you'll go back into this group, and then the next session you'll start in this group and you'll finish the day in that group.' So it's kind of like when you go on a residential sometimes, you'll have a group that starts and you talk about 'How are you feeling about today, is it all cool?' At the end it's like, 'Did that go all right? Is there anything that we need to know about?' So they start to build relationships a bit.”*

### 3.16.2 Micro groups: Demsoc in Newham

Demsoc tends to use micro groups in its online processes. Micro groups are smaller groups of assembly members who meet between assembly weekends. Demsoc see them as the online equivalent of having a chat in the break at an in-person assembly and a chance to socialise with other mini public members.

Talking about micro groups, Demsoc noted:

*“That's a midweek thing where they're in a smaller group. It's a cosy group. They're fixed, so they know the other participants, and they've got a good relationship, and they've got one dedicated facilitator. So that's golden space for doing that kind of reflection, and 'Oh God, I just really don't get that. What was that person going on about, or let's watch this together.”*

Part of each micro group session might be structured, but part of it isn't:

*“So as part of the process plan, session planning, there's a micro group session plan, if we want them to definitely ... watch this video on unconscious bias, watch this animation on critical thinking, discuss this bit of the topic with your group, give us your ideas for improvements. So, so some of it's structured. Often it's structured because it's too much to do in the weekends, so it's like an overspill. Also, we try and plan in a lot of just breathing time, being time.”*

Demsoc asks assembly members if and when they would be available for micro group sessions during onboarding and assigns them to groups on that basis.

### 3.16.3 Religious considerations: TPXimpact in Barnet

TPXimpact talked about the how religious considerations are influencing the timing of assembly sessions in Barnet, where there are large Muslim, Jewish and Christian populations.

*“Essentially, sessions on Fridays and Saturdays, they’re just - yes, they can’t be a thing. Then Sundays, of course, the Christian community. That’s really difficult, so we’ve had a real struggle finding timings when everyone can come together for weekend sessions. So we are still going to go ahead with some Saturday sessions because, simply, we couldn’t do it on a weekday basis, but we’re having to make available other opportunities for people to come together if they can’t attend those sessions for religious reasons. We’ve mixed up the days that the sessions happen more than I have in other processes. [...] So, yes, that’s actually been a really helpful and insightful process to go through with councils, and it’s been really interesting to see the difference of opinion across the different religious communities about what’s okay and what’s not okay.”*

### 3.16.4 Climate cafés: DEG for GwyrddNi

DEG runs climate cafés in the local areas where it is holding assemblies. These are spaces that are open to any members of the local community to come and talk about climate issues. They also serve a function for assembly members who want a space to talk about how they are feeling between assembly sessions.

### 3.16.5 Wellbeing coaches: DEG for GwyrddNi

DEG offers participants sessions with wellbeing coaches if they are struggling.

*“So all they had to do was let us know and we also shared the contact details of the coaches so they could get in touch with them directly without having to tell us at all and then the coaches would arrange a session, a one-hour session with them for a chat. We originally set it up so they were particular times for people, you know, ‘Oh, there’s going to be a coaching clinic on Monday from nine till 12,’ but that wasn’t working. So in the end, it just became more ad hoc, where people could get in touch when they wanted to, and the coaches would arrange something with them.”*

## 3.17 Technology platforms

Covid-19 resulted in several mini publics moving online and online working has continued to be more frequent since the pandemic than it was before it. Most interviewees use Zoom as the main platform for online mini public meetings, citing its ease of use for participants. Beyond Zoom, there is also a lot of consistency in which other technology platforms interviewees use. These include:

#### For participant liaison

- Text Magic
- WhatsApp (less used)
- Basecamp (for microsites)
- Google sites (for microsites)
- Google forms (for forms)
- Survey monkey (for forms)

#### For mini public sessions themselves:

- Google docs
- Jamboards
- Concept Board
- Whiteboards on Zoom (P.T.O.)

#### For facilitator liaison during sessions:

- WhatsApp

#### For wider public engagement around the mini public:

- Your priorities
- Pol.is (although no one had achieved a volume of responses through this platform)
- Councils’ own platforms

- Slido
- Mentimeter
- Reetro.io (described as a “more accessible jamboard” and used by one organisation)
- Miro (although lots of interviewees commented that they didn’t think this was a suitable platform for work with participants)
- Mural (a bit like Miro and used by one organisation)

Interviewees also noted that several good guides to digital platforms exist, including the one put together by People Powered.

Out of the above, it was participants’ practice around microsites that most highlighted some differences in practice between organisations.

### 3.17.1 Microsites: various

Several interviewees reported using microsites for at least some of their subnational climate mini publics. Mainly, organisations use them to make available:

- Session details including Zoom links;
- Who speakers are;
- Speakers’ presentations.

Most organisations reported that only small numbers of mini public members used the sites, but felt they were important to cater for participants’ needs:

*“For some folk, who maybe don't read quickly or don't absorb information quickly or absorb it less quickly than others, I think online certainly lends itself to giving people access to material in their own time. So we made sure that all the materials, the recordings of the presentations, written supporting material, Q&A responses, were all online and available for our participants in a hub so they didn't just have to do everything in session. The extent to which people took that up or took advantage of that opportunity is debateable but it was there.”*

Similarly, most organisations uploaded speakers’ presentations to the microsite *after* the relevant mini public sessions, although there were exceptions (see Section 3.3.1). For those who uploaded them afterwards, this was for both practical and theoretical reasons:

*“It was afterwards, for two reasons. One was a practical reason. Not everything is always available as early as you'd like it from contributors. That last minute, 'Can you send me that video please?'. Then we didn't want to prime ...[the] keen folk within any given assembly population. Someone would then go, 'Oh, I'll go and watch that online,' and then they'll do some homework and they'll come massively more prepared than everyone else. Then you either have to upset those participants by trying to dial them down in the conversation and then they're like, 'But what about all my homework that I want to display to you?' or you let them go and it intimidates everyone else as they know all this stuff. The concern is that you ... end up with disparity of understanding and a preparedness in your participants. So that's the reason we didn't make stuff available online [in advance], from a theoretical point of view. The practical view is that sometimes it just wasn't available.”*

For those who uploaded them before sessions, it was to help cater for different learning styles (see Section 3.3.1).

The exception to the low take-up of the microsites was Demsoc. Demsoc include various pieces of additional information on their sites, including details of participants' micro groups (i.e. who else is in them) and who facilitators are. However what made the difference in terms of participants' use of the sites was Demsoc's use of galleries.

### 3.17.2 Microsite galleries: Demsoc, multiple locations

Demsoc described their use of microsite galleries as follows:

*"So Adur & Worthing, we trialled this, it really worked, [so we] took it into assembly one for Newham and then assembly two. That is to have an assembly members gallery, and that's a space for them to put in photos, poems, recipes, anything they want about anything. Usually, it's connected in with the theme, but it might not be. Usually, it's why this theme is important for them. How does that affect their lives? So we have all sorts of pets and goodness knows what on the gallery. That was a way to engage people. People checked it to see if I'd put their photos on yet, and they just loved the gallery, so that drew them in, retained them, and on the back of that, they'd be able to check who they'd been listening to [during assembly evidence sessions]."*

Demsoc don't link individual participants to their inputs. Instead they have a thank you list at the front of the gallery that lists the first names of the participants who have shared content. If participants then choose to share content that identifies them, that is up to them.

There is more discussion of how Demsoc used the microsite gallery as part of evidence presentation in Section 3.3.9.

## 3.18 Working to a budget

Towards the end of the interview, we asked interviewees the following question:

*"Have you or a commissioner you worked with done anything you would see as innovative that we have not already mentioned in order to run a climate assembly or mini public within a tight budget?"*

The results highlighted some interesting practice.

### 3.18.1 Crowdfunding: Shared Future in Kendal

Kendal Council is a Town and Parish Council and therefore has very limited resources. It funded its climate jury by:

- Putting in some of its own money;
- Securing additional funding from the next tier up of local government and the tier above that;
- Crowdfunding, both for the jury itself and for a film about the jury's work.

The crowding secured donations from around 180 people, which then also gave these individuals “an extra stake in trying to make sure the recommendations were implemented.” Some of them are now part of the volunteer network described in Section 3.9.5.

### 3.18.2 Supporting a council to run their own mini public: Shared Future in Shipley

Shipley Town and Parish Council didn't have the funds to commission an organisation to run their mini public for them. However they were able to pay Shared Future for some advice and support. The division of responsibilities between Shared Future and the Council worked roughly as follows.

**Recruitment – DIY Sortition:** The Council printed off the invitations. Then they got volunteers to deliver the letters to every single household in Shipley. They collected people's responses, possibly via a google form, and put them into a spreadsheet. Then a local volunteer who was a quantitative researcher professionally and had retired did the work to draw out the reflective sample of the local population for the mini public.

**Design:** Shared Future helped with some of the macro design, including through their involvement in the oversight panel. They also supported some of the micro design through the calls with facilitators between sessions (see directly below).

**Facilitation** The Council recruited volunteers, with advice from Shared Future about who they might want to approach and the skills they would need. Shared Future then did one day's facilitation training with the volunteers, and also co-facilitated the first session of the mini public and the session on writing recommendations. After each session, Shared Future ran a debrief call with the facilitators for an hour-and-a-half, covering “how did it go, what worked well, what didn't work so well, what do we need to talk about and how are we going to do next week's session?” This approach worked well:

*“They did it. They've done an amazing job and had to deal with some really tricky facilitation situations. The town council now is thinking of using that as an approach on other issues.”*

**Oversight panel:** Shared Future went to all of the oversight panel meetings.

### 3.18.3 Making use of partners' staff and hardware: ERS Cymru in Blaenau Gwent

Blaenau Gwent was another citizens' assembly with a very limited budget. ERS Cymru worked closely with their partner organisations to make the assembly possible:

*“I think I've already mentioned some of the ways that we saved money. So, we got volunteers for facilitators [from the partner organisations]. So, they were paid obviously as part of their actual day-to-day roles. We made sure that their line managers would all sign off on it, but we didn't specifically pay them out of our budget. They got their normal, they got time off in lieu, or annual leave as a result. The other things we did to save money, in terms of tech, we obviously used what tech the housing associations already had. If people required a laptop, or if they required a dongle, it was literally [a staff member] rooting in a back cupboard in the IT room, to see if they had spare. We didn't pay speakers, we couldn't afford to pay speakers, we paid assembly members, and that was a big chunk of our budget. They probably weren't paid at the rate that you'd see in Scotland, for example.”*

## 4. Outline case studies

The following tables present outline case studies of the subnational climate mini publics that interviewees referred to in their interviews. This is not a comprehensive list of subnational climate mini publics in the UK, or indeed of all the subnational climate mini publics in the UK run or supported by the organisations who took part in the interviews. A more comprehensive list can be found here. Nonetheless we hope this is helpful in providing some context for the content of this report. The case studies are included in alphabetical order by organisation and then location, as follows.

### The Democratic Society

- Adur and Worthing Climate Assembly
- Newham Permanent Citizens' Assembly

### Electoral Reform Society Cymru

- Blaenau Gwent Climate Assembly

### Datblygiadau Egni Gwledig (DEG)

- GwyrddNi

### Involve

- Bristol Citizens' Assembly
- The Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly
- Camden Climate Assembly
- Car Dependency Citizens' Jury
- Devon Climate Assembly
- Kingston Citizens' Assembly on Air Quality
- Rethinking Water Citizen Juries
- Our Zero Selby

### Ipsos UK

- Brighton and Hove Climate Assembly
- Glasgow Citizens' Assembly on the Climate Emergency
- Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change

### Mutual Gain

- Newham Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change

### Shared Future

- Blackburn with Darwen People's Jury
- Citizens' Panel on Home Energy Decarbonisation
- The Copeland People's Panel on Climate Change & Climate Change and Young People in Copeland
- The Furness Citizens' Jury on Climate Change
- The Kendal Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2020)
- The Lancaster District Climate Change People's Jury (2020)
- The Leeds Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2019)
- The North of Tyne Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change (2021)
- Shipley Citizens' Jury
- The Social Housing Tenants' Climate Jury (2021)
- The Southwark Citizens' Jury on Climate Change (2022)
- The District of Warwick People's Inquiry on Climate Change (2020-21)

### TPXimpact

- Barnet Climate Assembly
- Blackpool Climate Assembly



## 4.1 Adur and Worthing Climate Assembly (2020)

<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	The aim for the Climate Assembly was to explore actions already taking place and make recommendations to tackle, mitigate or address climate change for the councils to take forward in the two boroughs.
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	How can we in Adur and Worthing collectively tackle climate change and support our places to thrive?  What does this mean for the way we live and our local environment?
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>	The assembly was held online across five days, all on Saturdays and Sundays, for a total of 25 hours.  Also, engagement of 4-5 hours total as additional 'micro group' time, held for one-hour online, between each weekend.
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b>	50 members of the public.
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	Assembly members looked at all topics, but also split into smaller micro groups to review them in a less formal way.
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	Adur & Worthing Borough Councils
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	Adur & Worthing Borough Councils
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	<a href="https://www.demsoc.org/projects/adur-worthing-climate-assembly">https://www.demsoc.org/projects/adur-worthing-climate-assembly</a>

## 4.2 Newham Permanent Citizens' Assembly (2021-22)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>Following a Democracy and Civic Participation Commission in 2020, The London Borough of Newham committed to listening to its residents and involving in its decision making via the first ever permanent Citizens' Assembly in England.</p> <p>From here, the Council's main aim was for the assembly to lead the way in participatory democracy, by debating the issues residents are most concerned about.</p> <p>A secondary aim of this engagement was to bring people together with key stakeholders to make clear recommendations for the council, its partners and communities to act upon.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p><b>Assembly one</b> 1. 'How can we work together to make our parks and green spaces even better for residents and visitors? How do we ensure that everyone has access to green quality spaces?'</p> <p><b>Assembly two</b> 2. 'How can we make sure that our local neighbourhoods are vibrant communities where people can work, meet, shop and access the everyday services they need within a 15-minute walk or cycle from home?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The first assembly was held online across five days, all on Saturdays and Sundays, for a total of 25 hours.</p> <p>An extra 4-5 hours of 'micro group' time for all participants was held, as a one-hour online meeting between each weekend.</p> <p>The second Assembly, at the suggestion of Members from the first Assembly, introduced half-days on a Sunday. This equated to three full Saturdays, 3 half days on Sunday, also totally 25 hours. Again, an extra 4-5 hours of 'micro group' time between each weekend.</p> <p>An additional engagement element was added to the timeline, inviting assembly members to undertake walking tours to review a range of neighbourhoods. Evidence was captured in a gallery on the assembly members' microsite and shared back as insight to the assembly by 80% of participants.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>45 - 50 members of the public at each assembly.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics in the main assembly sessions. They also tackled topics as smaller groups within their micro group meetings.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>The Mayor of Newham, Rokhsana Fiaz</p>

Who did the funding come from?	The London Borough of Newham Council
Link to where we can find more info online	<a href="https://www.demsoc.org/projects/newham-permanent-citizens-assembly">https://www.demsoc.org/projects/newham-permanent-citizens-assembly</a>

### 4.3 Blaenau Gwent Climate Assembly (2021)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To engage citizens in Blaenau Gwent on issues around climate change in their local area</li> <li>• To support citizens in Blaenau Gwent to develop recommendations to tackle climate change in their local area</li> <li>• To encourage the local authority to engage citizens in the area on important issues and to actively consider how to respond</li> <li>• To demonstrate a local deliberative democracy project in Wales can work and use to build profile of deliberative democracy in Wales.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>What should we do in Blaenau Gwent to tackle the climate crisis in a way that is fair and improves living standards for everyone?</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p> <p>By the 'nature' of sessions we mean: - Were they all day, half day, evening sessions? - Were they online or offline? - Did participants meet between the main sessions?</p>	<p><a href="https://cynnalcyrmru.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/BG-Climate-Assembly-public-agenda-3.pdf">https://cynnalcyrmru.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/BG-Climate-Assembly-public-agenda-3.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sessions were held online due to the pandemic.</li> <li>• No meeting between sessions.</li> <li>• Session 1- Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 (19:00-20:30)</li> <li>• Session 2- Saturday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2021 (10-16:30- inc lunch break)</li> <li>• Session 3- Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2021 (10-16:30- inc lunch break)</li> <li>• Session 4- Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021 (19:00-20:30)</li> <li>• Session 5- Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2021 (10-16:30- inc lunch break)</li> <li>• Session 6- Saturday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2021 (10-16:30- inc lunch break)</li> </ul>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>47</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All participants looked at all topics: housing, nature / green space and transport.</li> <li>• However, for developing recommendations participants voted on which topic they preferred to do the initial drafting. While all participants got to then carousel to the other groups and discuss/amend the recommendations they did spend the most time on these initial topics and then return to them at the end.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was a slightly unusual process as it wasn't commissioned as such. ERS Cymru met with Steve Cranston (then United Welsh Housing Association) to discuss deliberative democracy back in 2018/19.</li> <li>• He then approached ERS and Cynnal Cymru to discuss the idea of doing a climate assembly in Blaenau Gwent.</li> <li>• From that we co-wrote funding bids, which did not receive funding, but managed to get a small amount of funding from the engagement pot of a wider bid of all the housing</li> </ul>

	<p>associations in the area (funding from Welsh Gov to retrofit HA homes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As such, the other three housing associations in the area were brought into the project.</li> <li>• We (SC, ERS and CC) then worked to engage the local authority and the local public service board to buy them into the process.</li> </ul>
Who did the funding come from?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indirectly from Welsh Gov who funded a retrofit project for housing associations, which included a small amount of money for engagement.</li> </ul>
Link to where we can find more info online	<p><a href="https://cynnalcymru.com/blaenau-gwent-climate-assembly/?cn-reloaded=1">https://cynnalcymru.com/blaenau-gwent-climate-assembly/?cn-reloaded=1</a></p>

#### 4.4 GwyrddNi (2018 – present)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>GwyrddNi is a community-based, community-led climate action movement that brings people together in five areas of Gwynedd to discuss, share and act locally to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Our assemblies provide an opportunity for people to come together to discuss, listen, share, talk, learn and decide together what they – as a community – want to do locally to tackle climate change.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>How can we in (community name) respond locally to climate change?</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Assembly meetings in 5 areas = 20 assembly meetings</p> <p>Areas delivered in a way that suited the community, so that there were several options delivered including full days, half days and evening sessions.</p> <p>Each meeting was hybrid with people in the room and online.</p> <p>People met between sessions as the process developed.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>We aimed for 50 people in each area but did not achieve that in each area. Numbers generally dropped off as the process progressed.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Both</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>No one.</p> <p>GwyrddNi is delivered by Datblygiadau Egni Gwledig (DEG) in partnership with five other local, community organisations; Partneriaeth Ogwen in Dyffryn Ogwen, Cyd Ynni in Dyffryn Peris, Siop Griffiths in Dyffryn Nantlle, Cwmni Bro in Bro Ffestiniog, and Ynni Llŷn in Pen Llŷn.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>GwyrddNi is funded by the National Lottery's Climate Action Fund</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://linktr.ee/gwyrddni">https://linktr.ee/gwyrddni</a></p>

## 4.5 Bristol Citizens' Assembly

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure that the emerging recovery plan [from COVID] to deliver Bristol's future, both short-term (2020 and 2021), and over the coming years, will reflect the ideas and priorities of citizens and community stakeholders.</li> <li>• By empowering citizens to participate fully in the recovery planning process, to give the public confidence that their opinions will shape future decision making in the city.</li> <li>• To develop skills and experience within Bristol City Council to enable the council to take a greater role in planning and facilitating future deliberative processes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>How do we recover from COVID-19 and create a better future for all in Bristol?</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p> <p>By the 'nature' of sessions we mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were they all day, half day, evening sessions?</li> <li>- Were they online or offline?</li> <li>- Did participants meet between the main sessions?</li> </ul>	<p>24 half-day sessions in total (with each participant taking part in 12 of them – see the next answer). All the sessions were online and all at weekends (i.e. each weekend comprised of 2 sessions on a Saturday and 1 on a Sunday).</p> <p>Participants met for 'warm-up calls' to introduce them to the process and familiarise them with the Zoom platform prior to the first meeting.</p> <p>Participants didn't meet between sessions but there was an online hub set up using the Basecamp platform where participants could discuss the topics and where we could share information and gather feedback.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>60 members of the public</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>There were three topics in total:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Climate change and homes</li> <li>2. Health inequalities</li> <li>3. Transport</li> </ol> <p>After the first 3 sessions, the group of 60 split into three smaller groups of 20 to look at one of the 3 topics over 2 weekends (6 sessions). They came back as a single group for the final weekend (3 sessions).</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Bristol City Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Bristol City Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-do-we-recover-covid-19-and-create-better">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-do-we-recover-covid-19-and-create-better</a></p>



## 4.6 The Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly brought together randomly selected residents from Greater Cambridge and the wider travel to work area, with the aim of developing recommendations on how to reduce congestion, improve air quality and provide better public transport.</p> <p>This was one of three assemblies that formed part of the UK Government's Innovation in Democracy Programme. Established by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (MHCLG), the aim was to support three local authorities to involve residents in local decision-making through piloting citizens' assemblies.</p> <p>Whilst the Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly had local aims and benefit, it also served a wider purpose of learning against national aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the capability of local people to have a greater say over decisions that affect their communities and their everyday lives;</li> <li>• Encourage new relationships and build trust between citizens and local authorities;</li> <li>• Strengthen local civil society by encouraging participation in local institutions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'How do we reduce congestion, improve air quality and provide better public transport in Greater Cambridge?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The citizens' assembly met in-person over two full weekends and took part in over 24 hours of learning, deliberation, and decision-making.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>53 members of the public</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants looked at all of the topics together.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Greater Cambridge Partnership</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Greater Cambridge Partnership and UK Government's Innovation in Democracy Programme</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/how-can-congestion-be-reduced-greater-cambridge">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/how-can-congestion-be-reduced-greater-cambridge</a></p>

## 4.7 Camden Climate Assembly (2019)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The aim of the Camden Climate Assembly was to develop an approach for how Camden can best tackle the climate crisis.</p> <p>Asked to develop a series of actions at each scale - home, neighbourhood and council - the assembly recommendations set the direction of the Camden Climate Action Plan 2019.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>“We are now facing a climate and ecological crisis. How can the council and the people of Camden help limit the impact of climate change while protecting and enhancing our natural environment? – What do we need to do in our homes, neighbourhoods, council and country?”</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The citizens’ assembly met in-person over three sessions. This consisted of two three-hour evenings and one six-hour Saturday.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>Over 50 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants looked at all of the topics together.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Camden Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Camden Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/what-can-camden-do-address-climate-crisis">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/what-can-camden-do-address-climate-crisis</a></p>

## 4.8 Car Dependency Citizens' Jury (2021)

<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	The aim of the engagement was to develop recommendations to reduce car dependency in Belfast.
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	How can car dependency and levels of car use in Belfast be reduced?
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>	Two full consecutive days in-person.
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b>	19 (from a recruited group of 20)
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	All looked at all topics.
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	School of Public Health at Queens University Belfast
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	Medical Research Council Public Health Intervention Development and HSC Research and Development Office Northern Ireland
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	<a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-car-dependency-and-levels-car-use">QUB website</a> <a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-car-dependency-and-levels-car-use">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-car-dependency-and-levels-car-use</a>

## 4.9 Devon Climate Assembly (2021)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>In 2019 a partnership of public, private and voluntary organisations in Devon came together to form <u>Devon Climate Emergency</u> and endorse the principles of the <u>Devon Climate Declaration</u>, which set out an ambition to tackle climate change across Devon. In order to put people at the heart of Devon's action on climate change, the Devon Climate Assembly was commissioned.</p> <p>The Assembly followed on from a public consultation as part of the Interim Devon Carbon Plan. This set out actions for tackling climate change, but also identified three areas of contention that needed further work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of onshore wind in the Devon Renewable Energy Strategy</li> <li>• Reducing car use in Devon</li> <li>• Encouraging, or requiring, people to retrofit their homes, properties or business premises to reduce carbon emissions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>"How should Devon meet the big challenges of climate change?"</p> <p>While this question is broad, the assembly focussed on the three areas of contention outlined in the box above.</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The Assembly met for three blocks of online meetings during Summer 2021.</p> <p>In total this involved 9 meeting days, and a total of 25 hours together, typically made up of 2 hours on a Wednesday evening, 4.5 hours on a Saturday and 2.5 hours on a Sunday.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>66 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants reviewed all the topics together.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Devon Climate Emergency Response Group</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Devon County Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-should-devon-meet-big-challenges-climate">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-should-devon-meet-big-challenges-climate</a></p>

## 4.10 Kingston Citizens' Assembly on Air Quality

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>In response to its Climate Emergency declaration the Council said this cannot be solved without the engagement and action of other parties, including residents, communities, businesses and partners.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a series of actions since the declaration. One of the key actions was to commission Kingston's first Citizens' Assembly to focus on air quality.</p> <p>The aim for this assembly was to develop recommendations on how to collectively improve air quality in the borough.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'How do we collectively improve air quality in the Borough?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Two full weekends in-person.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>38 members of the public</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants reviewed all the topics together.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/how-can-air-quality-be-improved-kingston">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/practice/how-can-air-quality-be-improved-kingston</a></p>

## 4.11 Rethinking Water Citizen Juries

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p><b>Purpose:</b> To continue to protect and restore our environment, it is crucial to engage the wider population in place-based management to shape practices and deliver changes in behaviour.</p> <p><b>Aims:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help understand the ways in which people value water;</li> <li>• Enable influencers to understand the shape of local climate action, by providing insight into what people want in rural, urban &amp; at national scales; and,</li> <li>• Provide a mandate to make change happen by developing principles and recommendations for local environmental action within the context of climate resilience.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>How do you connect with water in your local environment and what needs to be changed in the future to benefit people and wildlife?</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>We ran 5 citizens' juries between 2020 - 2021.</p> <p>All sessions were held online. Participants did not meet between sessions but did have access to a shared Microsite where all the videos and other information from the sessions could be found.</p> <p>Each jury followed the same format of six meetings across two weeks. Two of the meetings were held during weekday evenings and the remaining four were held across two consecutive Saturdays e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Session 1 - Thursday 7pm - 9pm</li> <li>• Session 2 - Saturday 10am - 12:30pm</li> <li>• Session 3 - Saturday 2:30pm - 4:30pm</li> <li>• Session 4 - Thursday 7pm - 9pm</li> <li>• Session 5 - Saturday 10am - 12:30pm</li> <li>• Session 6 - Saturday 2:30pm - 4:30pm</li> </ul>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>Each jury recruited 22 participants, although a few dropped out over the course of the project.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants explored all topic, until the final weekend. During the final Saturday the final six topics were split across three groups, with each group examining a and creating a recommendation for two of the six. These recommendations were then swapped between groups for comments.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>The Environment Agency</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>The Environment Agency</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-we-work-together-improve-water">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-we-work-together-improve-water</a></p>

## 4.12 Our Zero Selby (2021-22)

<p><b>Purpose</b> i.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>To produce a prioritised list of projects under each of five themes (buildings, nature, food, travel, waste) that local residents would like to see taken forward to help Selby reach net zero.</p> <p>The mini public followed a programme of extensive resident and stakeholder engagement to collect ideas to take to the mini public.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>What do we want the future of Selby to look like, as the UK steps up its efforts to tackle climate change?</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Three days in-person, both days of one weekend and then a separate Saturday. Days ran approximately 10am-4pm.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>40 local residents, recruited to be demographically reflective of the local area. 14 representatives of local organisations (e.g. the District and County Council, Selby District Disability Forum, Citizens Advice, Selby Abbey, Drax) took part alongside participants on the last day to share information useful in the making final decisions about recommendations.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants split into groups to examine each theme and then between days 2-3 groups rotated through all five themes so every participant explored each theme in detail.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>No one. This was a grant funded project involving a partnership of organisations: Forum for the Future, Selby District Association of Voluntary Services and Involve.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Energy for Tomorrow Fund, Friends Provident Foundation, Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, and Treebeard Trust</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-communities-lead-transition-net-zero">https://involve.org.uk/our-work/our-projects/pioneering-innovation-practice/how-can-communities-lead-transition-net-zero</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.OurZeroSelby.org.uk">www.OurZeroSelby.org.uk</a></p>



## 4.13 Brighton and Hove Climate Assembly

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The climate assembly looked at transport as it is one of the city's biggest sources of carbon emissions.</p> <p>Over the 5 sessions the climate assembly members heard evidence, deliberated, and developed recommendations for actions the council and wider city can take to become carbon neutral by 2030.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>"How can we step up actions to reduce transport related carbon emissions in the city?"</p> <p>Covering: climate change, public health, and the local context for sustainable transport.</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>5 sessions of 3 hours, mixing weekday evenings and Saturday mornings.</p> <p>All online – first all-online assembly in the UK</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>50 recruited</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Brighton &amp; Hove City Council.</p>
<p><b>What was the budget?</b></p>	<p>£91,260</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Brighton &amp; Hove City Council.</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/brighton-hove-climate-assembly">https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/brighton-hove-climate-assembly</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/brighton-and-hove-climate-assembly">https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/brighton-and-hove-climate-assembly</a></p>

## 4.14 Glasgow Citizens' Assembly on the Climate Emergency

<p><b>Purpose</b> i.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>In Glasgow City Council's draft Climate Emergency Implementation Plan, targets were set for becoming a net zero city by 2030 and for net zero emissions by 2045.</p> <p>With the UN Climate Change Conference, COP26, coming to Glasgow in November 2021, Glasgow City Council undertook public engagement with citizens to understand their priorities for the legacy of COP26 for the city, how the Council can effectively work with citizens to effect the far-reaching changes needed to reach net zero, and their views on a 'just transition' to net zero.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>"How can we work together in Glasgow to tackle the climate emergency by 2030?"</p> <p>Focus on four topics: the circular economy; the green economy, jobs and skills; home energy; and food and diet.</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>5 sessions, all online. The sessions each lasted 3 hours and were scheduled on a mixture of weekday evenings and weekends.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>55 recruited, 51 attending by the final session.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Glasgow City Council.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Glasgow City Council.</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/cop26citizensassembly">https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/cop26citizensassembly</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/glasgow-citizens-assembly-report-climate-emergency">https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/glasgow-citizens-assembly-report-climate-emergency</a></p>

## 4.15 Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>To engage citizens in addressing the issue of climate change, and consider the measures that should be taken in Oxford.</p> <p>To be the first UK city to hold a citizens assembly on climate change.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>"The UK has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?"</p> <p>Focus on 5 key themes: waste reduction, buildings, transport, biodiversity &amp; offsetting and renewable energy.</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p> <p>By the 'nature' of sessions we mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were they all day, half day, evening sessions?</li> <li>- Were they online or offline?</li> <li>- Did participants meet between the main sessions?</li> </ul>	<p>4 x all day sessions, held across two weekends, three weeks apart.</p> <p>Face to face, offline.</p> <p>Participants did not meet between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>50 recruited, 41 attended all 4 sessions.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Oxford City Council.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Oxford City Council.</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20011/environment/1343/oxford_citizens_assembly_on_climate_change">https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20011/environment/1343/oxford_citizens_assembly_on_climate_change</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/oxford-citizens-assembly-climate-change">https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/oxford-citizens-assembly-climate-change</a></p>

## 4.16 Newham Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change (2020)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>Newham declared a climate emergency in 2019 and introduced a raft of environmental measures to tackle global warming, poor air quality, and waste.</p> <p>The purpose of the Newham Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change was to develop recommendations to feed into and shape the Climate Emergency Action Plan.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'How can the council and residents work together to reach the aspiration of being carbon zero by 2050 at the latest?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The assembly members came together in-person for four sessions for three evenings and one weekend over January and February 2020.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>43 members of the public</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants looked at all of the topics together.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>The London Borough of Newham Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>The London Borough of Newham Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Participedia case study</a></p>

## 4.17 Blackburn with Darwen People's Jury (2023)

<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	The aim of the Jury was to meaningfully involve the public in identifying the ideas, strategies and actions needed to deliver Blackburn with Darwen Council's climate action plan.  This is by forming a set of recommendations on what organisations and residents across the borough could be doing to help tackle the issue of climate change.
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	'What do we need to do in our homes, in business and our local area to respond to the climate change crisis?'
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>	30 hours across two months in-person on a Monday evening (including two full Saturdays)  There was no engagement between sessions.
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b>	26 people were recruited onto the jury.
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	All participants looked at all the topics
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	Blackburn with Darwen Council
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	<a href="https://theshuttle.org.uk/peoples-jury/">https://theshuttle.org.uk/peoples-jury/</a>

## 4.10 Citizens' Panel on Home Energy Decarbonisation (2022)

<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	<p>This project was a collaboration between Lancaster University and the Climate Change Committee (CCC).</p> <p>The aim of the Citizen's Panel was to help inform the CCC's advice to the government, by determining which types of interventions and support would be acceptable to homeowners and would deliver the necessary pace of change to meet the 2050 target.</p>
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	'What needs to happen to bring home energy use in line with the need to tackle climate change?'
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>	<p>Seven sessions in-person, including 12.5 hours on Tuesday evenings and twelve hours over two Saturdays.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b>	24 members of the public.
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p> <p>They also had the opportunity to guide the process and help control how session time was prioritised and which issues were discussed in more detail.</p> <p>CCC analysts also joined some of the discussions towards the end of the process in a co-design approach.</p>
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	Lancaster University
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	Lancaster University
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	<a href="https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/findings-of-a-citizens-panel-on-home-energy-decarbonisation-university-of-lancaster/">https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/findings-of-a-citizens-panel-on-home-energy-decarbonisation-university-of-lancaster/</a>

## 4.11 The Copeland People’s Panel on Climate Change & Climate Change and Young People in Copeland (2021)

<p><b>Purpose</b> i.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The Copeland People’s Panel on Climate Change in 2021, was a deliberative process run as part of the work of the Zero Carbon Cumbria Partnership.</p> <p>The main aim was to work together as a mini public, to make recommendations on how to address the climate emergency in the region. Commitment to act upon recommendations made by the People’s Panel was in place from Copeland Council and partners, as part of Copeland Vision 2040</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>‘What action should we take in our homes, businesses and local area to respond to climate change?’</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The Copeland People’s Panel was an online engagement activity, with thirty hours spread across two months in ten sessions. Typically, these were on a Wednesday in the evening.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p> <p>Alongside the People’s Panel, seven youth groups across Copeland took part in a series of four workshop activities facilitated by local youth workers that brought together 62 young people aged between 11 and 19 aimed at ensuring that young people’s voice on this crucial topic is heard by policy makers and was also considered by members of the People’s Panel.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>30 members of the public.</p> <p>62 young people from seven youth groups from seven towns and villages in the Borough of Copeland.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>People’s Panel members and Copeland Youth participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Zero Carbon Cumbria Partnership</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>National Lottery Climate Action Fund and Copeland Borough Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p>The Copeland People’s Panel on Climate Change <a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Copeland-report-v0.4.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Copeland-report-v0.4.pdf</a></p> <p>Copeland youth group activities: <a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/young-people-copeland-climate/">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/young-people-copeland-climate/</a></p>



## 4.12 The Furness Citizens' Jury on Climate Change (2021-22)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The aim of the Furness Citizens' Jury was to tackle climate change from the perspective of a small but representative sample of the local population, providing crucial insights into how Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council should respond to the climate emergency.</p> <p>Council was keen to learn how to meaningfully involve the public in identifying the ideas, strategies and actions needed in their climate emergency response, through this jury process.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'What should happen in the Furness area to address the emergency of climate change?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Jury members worked together online over a three-month period on a Tuesday evening.</p> <p>In total, they covered thirty hours in ten sessions.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>20 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council - Zero Carbon Cumbria Partnership</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>National Lottery Climate Action Fund and Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council.</p> <p>The Citizens' Jury is one of a series of citizens juries taking place across the County of Cumbria as part of the Lottery funded Zero Carbon Cumbria Partnership.</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Furness-Citizens-Jury-on-Climate-Change-Report-Final.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Furness-Citizens-Jury-on-Climate-Change-Report-Final.pdf</a></p>

## 4.13 The Kendal Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2020)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>In April 2019 Kendal Town Council declared a Climate Emergency. The aim of Kendal Climate Change Citizens' Jury engagement was to bring citizen voice into the challenge that policy makers were experiencing, in response to the climate emergency. The motion passed by Council included a pledge to 'make Kendal carbon neutral by 2030' and also to 'commission a Citizen's Jury to provide insights from residents on how to reach net-zero by 2030; with the outcomes of the Jury forming the basis of a detailed action plan'.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'What should Kendal do about Climate Change?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The Kendal Climate Change Citizens' Jury was the UK's first Jury or Assembly to be completed entirely online.</p> <p>Jury members met for twenty-six hours of deliberation over a course of ten sessions on a Thursday evening. Meetings were held online every two weeks.</p> <p>Participants did not meet between the main sessions.</p> <p>Between sessions, jury members were asked as individuals to complete practical activities in preparation for their next meeting. One example, ahead of session 9, was for participants to bring an item (thing, photograph etc.) that would help them to explain to others one thing they wanted others on the jury to think about.</p> <p>Another between session activity was for Jury members to visit the Your Priorities website over a six week period, to read through their draft recommendations, write (audio, or video record) points for or points against each recommendation and if appropriate add any new recommendations.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>20 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Kendal Town Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>The Citizens' Jury was funded by Kendal Town Council, South Lakeland District Council, Cumbria County Council and two crowdfunding efforts; one to raise money for the core budget and another to amplify jury recommendations by making a film.</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://www.kendalclimatejury.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Shared-Futures-Final-Report.pdf">https://www.kendalclimatejury.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Shared-Futures-Final-Report.pdf</a></p>

## 4.14 The Lancaster District Climate Change People’s Jury (2020)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>Alongside its commitment to reduce carbon emissions to zero by 2050 the Council declaration included a commitment to ‘convene a citizens’ assembly to help identify how our activities can be made net-zero carbon by 2030’</p> <p>The People’s Jury was formed with the aim to examine the response to the climate emergency so far and produce recommendations that will be used to guide the future work of the council and a range of other organisations across the district.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>‘What do we need to do in our homes, neighbourhoods and districts to respond to the emergency of climate change?’</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>This Jury was held as a combination of in-person and online, over the course of 15 sessions.</p> <p>The first six sessions of the jury were held in person on a Monday evening.</p> <p>With the advent of COVID-19, the process moved online for sessions 7 - 15 and met every two weeks, again on a Monday evening.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>30 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Lancaster City Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Lancaster City Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Lancaster-District-Climate-Change-Peoples-Jury-report-1.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Lancaster-District-Climate-Change-Peoples-Jury-report-1.pdf</a></p>

## 4.15 The Leeds Climate Change Citizens' Jury (2019)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The aim was for local residents to design a response to the zero carbon vision for Leeds City Council as part of the Council's Climate Emergency declaration.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'What should Leeds do about the emergency of climate change?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p> <p>By the 'nature' of sessions we mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were they all day, half day, evening sessions?</li> <li>- Were they online or offline?</li> <li>- Did participants meet between the main sessions?</li> </ul>	<p>Eight evening sessions, followed by a full day on a Sunday. They were all in-person.</p> <p>Participants met for structured sessions:</p> <p><b>Session 1:</b> Welcome and setting the scene</p> <p><b>Session 2:</b> An introduction to climate change (the science and impacts)</p> <p><b>Session 3:</b> The contribution of Leeds to climate change</p> <p><b>Session 4:</b> How do we effect change?</p> <p>At the end of session 4 participants were invited to consider which three topics they would like to investigate in more depth in sessions 5, 6 and 7. Sessions 8 and 9 focused on participants writing their own recommendations.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>25 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Leeds Climate Commission</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>University of Leeds</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/REPORT-V1.1-FINAL.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/REPORT-V1.1-FINAL.pdf</a></p>

## 4.16 The North of Tyne Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change (2021)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The North of Tyne Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change was set up with the aim of identifying the ideas, strategies and actions needed to tackle climate change.</p> <p>The North of Tyne Combined Authority has a convening role – enabling conversations between citizens, communities and sectors about the type of economy and society they want in the future, and what can collectively be done to make it happen. This includes creating mechanisms to ensure their work is inclusive and that citizens have a real voice.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'What should we do in the region to address climate change and its causes fairly, effectively and quickly?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Online sessions over one month, comprising 30 hours of discussion and deliberation.</p> <p>There were five midweek evening sessions, a Saturday morning and two full day Sunday sessions.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>49 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>Participants looked at all themes but also had the chance to work in small groups on specific topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>North of Tyne Combined Authority (NTCA).</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>NTCA Cabinet</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/NTCA-Citizens-Assembly-on-Climate-Change-report.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/NTCA-Citizens-Assembly-on-Climate-Change-report.pdf</a></p>

## 4.17 Shipley Citizens' Jury

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>Shipley's new Town Council declared a Climate Emergency as one of the first things it did. The aim of the council's Climate Emergency and Environment Committee was to hear what people think can be done about it.</p> <p>The purpose of the engagement was for a representative body of local people to meet, explore and understand the issues and generate ideas to limit the impact of climate change.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'How can we work together in Shipley to limit climate change and its impacts while protecting our environment and health?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>Nine weeks in-person on a Wednesday evening and one full day.</p> <p>There was no engagement between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>25 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants considered all topics</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>This unique process was run by Shipley Town Council (led by Cllr Paul McHugh) drawing heavily on local volunteers and resources with some advisory support from Shared Future.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>A small amount of funding came from a Lottery grant</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://shipleytowncouncil.gov.uk/citizens-jury/">https://shipleytowncouncil.gov.uk/citizens-jury/</a></p>

## 4.18 The Social Housing Tenants' Climate Jury (2021)

<p><b>Purpose</b> i.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>The aim of the Jury was to explore how to tackle, in homes and neighbourhoods, the incredibly challenging and complex issue of Climate Change.</p> <p>Prominent within this inquiry was the current and pressing issue of retrofitting homes in social housing with materials and technologies to improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>'How can tenants, social housing providers, and others work together to tackle climate change in our homes and neighbourhoods?'</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The Jury worked online for twenty-eight hours across eight Tuesday evening sessions and two Saturday morning sessions.</p> <p>There were also a few individual 'homework' tasks given to the Jury outside of the sessions, for instance:</p> <p>"Take a walk in your own neighbourhood, or if it's difficult for you to take a walk have a good look out of your window and look with your eyes and ask yourself - what's going on around here that could be helpful in tackling climate change? What's not so helpful in tackling climate change?"</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>30 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Northern Housing Consortium (NHC) in partnership with five Housing Associations: First Choice Homes Oldham, Karbon Homes, Salix Homes, Thirteen Group, and Yorkshire Housing.</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>The engagement was funded by the five Housing Associations</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Tenants-Climate-Jury-Report.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Tenants-Climate-Jury-Report.pdf</a></p>



## 4.19 The Southwark Citizens' Jury on Climate Change (2022)

<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	The aim of the Southwark Citizens' Jury on Climate Change was to undertake a deliberative process as part of Southwark Council's work to support the borough to address the climate emergency and achieve net zero by 2030.
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	'What needs to change in Southwark to tackle the emergency of climate change fairly and effectively for people and nature?'
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>	Thirty hours online as a jury across three months, on a Thursday evening.  Additionally, two in-person full day sessions on Saturdays brought people together at key points in the process.  Participants did not meet in between sessions.
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b>	25 members of the public.
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	All participants looked at all topics.
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	Southwark Council
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	Southwark Council
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	<a href="https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Southwark-Citizens-Jury-on-Climate-Change-report.pdf">https://sharedfuturecic.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Southwark-Citizens-Jury-on-Climate-Change-report.pdf</a>

## 4.20 The District of Warwick People’s Inquiry on Climate Change (2020-21)

<p><b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement</p>	<p>Warwick District Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and developed its first Climate Emergency Action Programme in 2020.</p> <p>The aim for the Warwick District Climate Change People’s Inquiry was for residents to deliberate on issues related to climate emergency and make recommendations that will shape and refresh the Council’s Climate Emergency Action Programme.</p>
<p><b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b></p>	<p>‘What do we need to do in the Warwick District to help address Climate Change by 2030?’</p>
<p><b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b></p>	<p>The group met for some thirty hours of deliberation over the course of ten sessions held via zoom. Meetings were on Thursday in the evening.</p> <p>Participants did not meet in between sessions.</p>
<p><b>How many members of the public took part?</b></p>	<p>30 members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b></p>	<p>All participants looked at all topics.</p>
<p><b>Who commissioned the engagement</b></p>	<p>Warwick District Council</p>
<p><b>Who did the funding come from?</b></p>	<p>Warwick District Council</p>
<p><b>Link to where we can find more info online</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Case study here</a></p>

## 4.21 Barnet Climate Assembly

*This case study will be added to the report once the assembly has finished.*

## 4.22 Blackpool Climate Assembly

*This case study will be added to the report once the assembly has finished.*

## Appendix One: Interview script

- Thank you agreeing to do the interview
- **Have you already read this introduction and are you happy with it?** *Note: if interviewees have read it and are happy with it, the interviewer will only run through the points in red font below.*
- Involve is conducting this research on behalf of KNOCA. The aim to explore at how subnational climate assemblies and mini publics in the UK to-date have been commissioned, run, followed-up and evaluated. KNOCA is particularly interested in practice that is different from how national climate assemblies have often been run.
- During this interview, I am going to ask you about different parts of an engagement process (e.g. recruitment, how you decided what evidence participants should receive). For each question, I'll give a description of what we are considering "standard practice" for the purposes of this interview, and ask if you have tried anything different (it could be small changes or larger ones). If you haven't, we'll move on to the next question. If you have, I'll ask you to tell me about it briefly and may ask some follow-up questions to make sure I have understood what you or those working with you did.
- Tips on where to focus in your answers:
  - We won't have time to talk about each innovation you have tried in detail. Instead **we are looking to understand the types of innovation that have been tried to help KNOCA gain a picture of the areas in which innovation are and aren't taking place and the sorts of innovation that are happening;**
  - If you have tried lots and lots of different practices, then **we would recommend focussing on the innovations you think it might be most useful for other practitioners to know about.**
  - KNOCA is more interested in **innovations that you think are worth repeating** than ones you wouldn't try again.
  - Some of the questions talk about 'a project' you have run. But if you have been involved in more than one relevant project, please draw on examples from across this work.
  - If we have time, at the end of the interview there are some cross-cutting questions that we will ask you too.
- What you say in the interview will be used to inform a short report that Involve will write, outlining (1) the types of innovations that have been tried in the UK and (2) briefly, each innovation that has been tried and where to find more information about it. This will be published on the Involve and KNOCA websites and circulated to KNOCA members.
- We won't name you personally in the report but would like to attribute innovations you have tried to your organisation. **Would that be okay?**
  - We will send you the draft report to check before we publish it to make sure you think it is accurate and will do our best to make any changes you suggest prior to publication.
- **Is it okay to record and transcribe this interview so I don't have to take lots of notes as we speak?** We won't share the recording or transcription outside of Involve and we will delete both once the report is finalised.
- I will aim to finish the interview by the time indicated in your calendar invite. **Confirm that's okay.**

- **Are you all good with the criteria for what we are counting as subnational climate assemblies or mini publics for the purposes of this research?** [If yes, continue] [If no, post them in the chat and give the interviewee time to read them]
- **Any questions before we start?**

## Questions

There are a total of 15 possible questions.

### 1. What subnational climate assemblies and mini publics has your organisation run?

Notes:

- We are just looking for the names of the processes at this point
- If you have already sent back the completed tables for your processes, we will just confirm the names of these processes with you

### 2. Thinking about how you recruited participants and who those participants were, have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: A sortition process delivered by a professional organisation (e.g. Sortition Foundation) that recruits a broadly representative sample of the local population, possibly purposely oversampling certain demographic groups. This is followed by an onboarding process to prepare participants to take part. Participants receive some sort of honoraria for taking part and have their expenses covered. Other than being reserves for if a participant drops out, there is no further communication with people who said they would like to take part but were not selected as participants.*

Notes:

- Please include in your answer anything you have done to attract people who you feel often don't put themselves forward for assemblies or mini publics

### 3. Thinking about the process for deciding what evidence participants received (other than from each other) and who presented that evidence to them, have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: Attempt to provide evidence that is balanced and covers the broad range of views and perspectives that exist. The evidence presented and who presents it is agreed by the commissioning body and/or some sort of advisory group. Consideration is given to the demographic diversity of those presenting. Evidence is generally from the commissioning body, academics, businesses and civil society groups, rather than being about lived experience.*

### 4. Thinking about how evidence was given to participants (other than from each other), have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: Evidence presented by speakers, usually talking to PowerPoint presentations. This is done online, in-person or pre-recorded. There are Q&As with the speakers after they present. Some written information may also be given to participants prior to engagement sessions.*

Notes:

- Please include in your answer anything you have tried to accommodate different learning styles.

5. Thinking about the sorts of facilitation techniques you used, particularly before the point where participants started to draft recommendations, have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: Facilitation techniques are discussion and word-based. They ask participants to, for example, think about pros and cons, what's most important etc. This is either recorded by participants themselves on post-its or worksheets, or written up by a facilitator (e.g. on flipcharts).*

Notes:

Please include in your answer anything you have tried to:

- Accommodate different learning styles
- Manage power dynamics in the room (beyond setting conversation guidelines and having table facilitators)

6. Thinking about how you asked participants to develop and agree their recommendations, have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: Participants draft recommendations themselves in plenary or in small groups, sometimes with facilitator support. Where this is done in small groups, there is a process of refining the recommendations involving the other participants. Once the wording of the recommendations has been agreed, they are voted upon by all participants in a secret ballot. All recommendations receiving more than a certain % of votes are recorded as passed.*

Note: We are aware that unlike many national climate assemblies, local assemblies have often had limits on the number of recommendations participants were allowed to put forward for a final vote. If you have done this, please tell us about it as part of your answer to this question.

7. Thinking about how the recommendations were presented back to the commissioner and/or other stakeholders involved, have you tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: The recommendations are written up and included in a project report, which is given to the commissioner and possibly also circulated to other stakeholders involved.*

Note: We are aware that, like some national climate assemblies, participants in local assemblies have sometimes been involved in presenting their recommendations to the commissioners. If you have done this, please tell us about it as part of your answer to this question.

8. Think about what happened across the lifetime of the project(s) – i.e. what happened before, during and immediately after the engagement process. Did you or others try anything different to:

- Help ensure participants' recommendations had impact on the decisions they were intended to inform;
- Try to embed awareness of and/or skills relating to deliberative and participatory engagement amongst commissioning body staff or others?

If yes, what was tried and what led you/others to try it?

*Standard practice: Briefings for relevant staff and/or politicians prior to the engagement process. Attendance of key individuals as observers during the process.*

9. Think about what has happened since the end of the project. Have you or others done anything since to:

- Hold commissioners to account for implementing the recommendations;
- Try to embed awareness of and/or skills relating to deliberative and participatory engagement amongst commissioning body staff or others;
- Support other changes (e.g. in participants' own lives, or amongst stakeholders)?  
If yes, what has been tried and how did it come about?

Note: We are interested in:

- Whether participants have been involved in holding the commissioner or others to account for implementing the recommendations
- Whether participants have been involved in implementing the recommendations
- Whether participants have been supported to make any changes in their own lives linked to the topic discussed at the assembly
- Whether there has been work with the commissioner or others involved to embed a deliberative or participatory way of working more broadly in what they do
- Anything else you think is important to mention in this area

10. Have you been involved in any subnational climate assemblies or mini publics that sought to engage members of the public beyond participants in the climate assembly or mini public itself? If yes, what was tried?

Note: We are interested in:

- Engagement with the wider public that helped to shape, or fed into, the climate assembly or mini public
- Engagement with the wider public that aimed to test, or further develop or prioritise, the recommendations coming out of the climate assembly or mini public
- Significant communications activities (to the best of your knowledge)
- Anything else you think is important to mention in this area

11. Thinking about evaluation, have you / the processes you've been involved in tried anything different in this area? If yes, what have you tried and what led you to try it?

*Standard practice: Participant feedback forms at the end of events. Possibly an independently commissioned evaluation.*

Note: We are particularly interested in anything you have done around evaluating the impact (broadly defined) of a subnational climate assembly or mini public.

12. Other than what we have already covered, has anything struck you as really unusual or interesting about how any of the processes you've been involved in were commissioned, your relationship with the commissioner, or how the commissioner responded to the recommendations?

Note: we are interested in anything you feel is significant around:

- The commitment made by the commissioning body/ies at the start of the process to respond to the recommendations
- Whether any recommendations were binding
- How the commissioning bodies responded to the recommendations
- Any unusual governance arrangement



- Any unusual level of involvement in the delivery process
- Anything else you think is noteworthy - e.g. ways of creating internal buy-in to the work and recommendations, ways of overcoming departmental silos, ways of leveraging budget to implement the recommendations, ways of feeding back to participants, ways of keeping recommendations alive over time, etc.

13. Have you or a commissioner you worked with done anything you would see as innovative that we have not already mentioned in order to run a climate assembly or mini public within a tight budget?

14. We are interested in briefly understanding your approach to the following areas:

- a. How much influence. If any, do you give participants over the topics the assembly or mini public covers and the evidence they hear? Why?
- b. Do you include exercises that ask participants to reflect on their own experiences of topics, in isolation from the evidence they have heard? If yes, why and at what point in the process do you do this?
- c. Do you include exercises that ask participants to reflect on how they feel (as opposed to what they think) about recommendations during the process of developing, prioritising and voting on recommendations? If yes, why and what do you do?
- d. What steps do you take, if any, to ensure participant wellbeing beyond: (a) the design and facilitation of the engagement process itself, and (b) onboarding and communication with participants between and after sessions? For example, this might include the use of quiet rooms, counselling services, and/or communications training.
- e. Have you used any technological platforms that you would recommend other than Teams, Zoom, Jamboard, Miro, MentiMeter, and Sli.do?

15. Is there anything else you have tried that we haven't yet covered that you feel would be of interest to other practitioners? This could include innovations from processes that were not about climate change but which you think could be tried in a subnational climate assembly or mini public in the future.

Additional cross-cutting questions (if time)

16. Are there any particular areas where you think further innovation in subnational climate assemblies or mini publics is needed? Or where you would be particularly interested to hear what other practitioners have tried?
17. What do you think are the most common barriers, if any, to innovation in practice around subnational climate assemblies and mini publics?
18. What do you think are the most common enablers, if any, to innovation in practice around subnational climate assemblies and mini publics?

## Appendix Two: Case study template

### What criteria does an engagement process need to meet to be covered by this research?

For the purposes of this research, KNOCA considers any project that meets the following criteria as in scope:

- **The process took place at a sub national level.** In the UK context, UK-wide or devolved-nation-wide processes are excluded; everything else is included;
- **Climate change was a key part of the rationale for the engagement and how it was framed.** However the process does not have to have been all about climate change. Nor does it have to have covered every aspect of climate change. Mini publics about issues like transport, retrofit or energy might well meet this criterion, for example;
- **Participants were recruited to reflect the make-up of the local population.** This includes processes which intentionally over-sampled certain demographics;
- **Participants were asked to take on board new information about the topic,** beyond discussing the issues with each other;
- **Effort was put into ensuring the evidence given to participants was balanced;**
- **Participants deliberated together and then reached one or more recommendations or conclusions;**
- **The process lasted at least 2 days (or equivalent).** For example, it may have taken place over several evening sessions.

### What relevant engagement processes has your organisation run?

Please either fill out the table on the next page for any relevant processes your organisation has run, or send [sarah.allan@involve.org.uk](mailto:sarah.allan@involve.org.uk) links to the relevant project pages or reports so that the Involve team can fill it out for you.

There is also an example of a completed table on the final page of this document.

Name of project:

What we'd like to know	Answer
<b>Purpose</b> I.e. what was the aim of the engagement	
<b>Overarching question participants were asked to answer</b>	
<b>No. and nature of engagement sessions</b>  By the 'nature' of sessions we mean: - Were they all day, half day, evening sessions? - Were they online or offline? - Did participants meet between the main sessions?	
<b>How many members of the public took part?</b> If your process also included stakeholders as participants (as opposed to as speakers etc) please say that here too	
<b>Did all participants look at all topics or did they split into groups?</b>	
<b>Who commissioned the engagement</b>	
<b>What was the budget?</b>	
<b>Who did the funding come from?</b>	
<b>Link to where we can find more info online</b>	