

Climate Change Citizens' Jury – Oversight Panel

Introductory Meeting

Thursday 29th July 2021 – 12-2pm, via Zoom

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. A Climate Change Citizens' Jury: what is it and how will it work? (see 'Background' paper attached)
3. The role of the Oversight Panel and its membership. Are the right people here? Terms of Reference. (see page 5 of attached)
4. Recruitment methodology and criteria for Citizens' Jury participant selection:
 - Stratified sampling profile (suggestion on page 4 of attached)
 - Marginalised voices
 - Recruitment Methodology
5. The Jury process – online/in person
6. Question for the jury to consider
7. Implementing the recommendations
8. Any Other Business

Attendees

Panel Members:

Number	Organisation/Group	Name
1	Southwark Council	Councillor Helen Dennis
2	Southwark Council	Chris Page
3	Southwark Council	Councillor Adele Morris
4	Member of Parliament	Helen Hayes
5	Citizens Advice Southwark	Chris Green
6	Community Southwark	Chris Mikata-Pralat
7	Lay Chair of Camberwell Deanery	Sonia Phippard
8	Southwark Youth Advisor	Rachel Segbenu
9	Extinction Rebellion Southwark	Eloise Waldon-Day
10	Southwark Law Centre	Harpreet Aujla
11	Southwark Group of Tenants Associations (SGTO)	Jack Lewis
12	Lendlease	Miles Lewis

13	Team London Bridge	Jack Skillen
14	Veolia	Rachel Butler
15	Southbank University	Patrick Christie
16	Fossil Free Southwark	Karrim Jalali

Also attending, but not part of the panel:
 Jenny Willis, Shared Future (Presenter)
 Pete Bryant, Shared Future (Presenter)
 Jayne McFayden, Shared Future
 Tom Sharland, Southwark Council (Note taker)

1. Introductions

Group introductions from all panel members.

2. A Climate Change Citizens' Jury: what is it and how will it work? (see 'Background' paper)

Shared Future introduced themselves and confirmed their role in the process; not for profit organisation, experienced in deliberative forums across the UK, including several focused on climate change.

An explanation of the citizens' jury process was provided. A jury is a smaller version of a citizens' assembly, both are examples of deliberative forums. Leeds, Kendal and Lancaster are examples of recent citizens' juries that Shared Future have delivered.

Juries use a random selection process where a cross section of the local community has the right to apply for membership. The jury should be representative of the local population.

The jury process gives time to fully understand complex issues. Ideally 30 hours of deliberation, as per this project. This allows extensive explanation of issues and in depth discussion.

The process involves a series of meetings, 'witnesses' and 'commentators' bring knowledge to the jury and help their understanding of complex issues. 'Observers' are also permitted to attend sessions.

Recruitment of jury members – an open, clear invitation is sent out directly to a random selection of properties across the borough. Residents can use a telephone number or website to register interest. The Sortition Foundation are then used to randomly select a group of residents that meets the agreed demographic parameters (set out by the Oversight Panel). This includes a question around individual's level of concern on climate change used to provide information at a national level.

Shared Future facilitate the meetings, ease concerns and ensure that jury member's opinions are heard and contributions encouraged. An Introductory session starts the

process, followed by themed meetings with attendance from commentators. The Oversight Panel are key to agreeing the makeup of the commentators.

The jury will determine the topics covered following the introductory session of the meetings, to aid understanding and ensure they shape the areas of focus.

Following the detailed discussion, the jury works together to discuss and write a series of recommendations. The recommendations are then prioritised by the jury via a voting process and included in a summary report.

3. The role of the Oversight Panel and its membership. Are the right people here? Terms of Reference. (see page 5 of supporting paper)

Shared Future introduced the role of the Oversight Panel. The primary role is to check that the process is fair, to sign off the recruitment process, setting of agenda, and supporting the jury through the process e.g. helping to identify commentators. Example given of the Leeds Oversight Panel.

Briefing paper circulated ahead of the meeting, with draft terms of reference. Opportunity to discuss the role and make-up of the panel.

A group discussion followed, with a number of key points:

Organisation:

- Concerns that the process has been rushed and that there is a lack of academics and experts on the panel, who would be key in insuring the selection of presenters.
- Concerns that certain members have only been added at short notice and that there is a lack of local expertise. Friends of the Earth were included despite having no local representation in several years. There are better placed local community organisations who can inform the process.
- Apologies given for the rushed nature, initial invites were sent out asking for additional members of the panel to be suggested, rather than presenting a fixed list. A stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken with the council to gather the initial list, this follows the usual process for establishing the panel.
- Confirmation that South Bank University will be able to canvass academic colleagues to find an appropriate person who can be involved going forward.

Membership:

- Concerns over the inclusion of Lendlease and Veolia, who could have financial gain to be made from the decisions made by the jury and potentially diluting the recommendations. It was noted by panel members that businesses have resigned from other oversight panels due to conflicts of interest, for example Drax. Taking businesses with us is important, but concern that they don't have to be part of the panel.

- Response from businesses that they want to be involved and contribute positively to the process. However, also don't want to burden the process, delay or complicate decision making of the group. Suggestion that business could better present their interest in the process, and be upfront about any conflict of interest. Some members were happy to contribute in a conversational capacity if that is the decision of the group.
- Concerns that the process must be legitimate and robust. Concerns about the legitimacy from the very beginning. The voice of the global south is also imperative and was missed until suggested. There is no community energy voice, this feels like an oversight. Council's involvement also questioned.
- Request made to carry out a vote, to consider the inclusion of Lendlease and Veolia.
- Confirmation that the council did grapple with who should and shouldn't be on the panel. Ideally a mix of those concerned about the future of the borough and/or in a position to potentially implement recommendations. There are potential conflicts from many members. Important that everyone in the room has a stake in the future of the borough. Nervous about trying to dilute down or remove voices at this stage of the process.
- Suggestion that membership of the panel remains, but voting is reserved for only certain members? Rather than voting, a preference was expressed to work on a consensus basis as with other oversight panels.
- There was unease expressed about ignoring the advice of experts who have previously managed these processes and removing voices from the process before we've had a chance to discuss the issues.
- Point made that to a degree legitimacy can work both ways, the panel could be seen to be lacking if it didn't include private sector members for example. The panel should be seen in its entirety, overall balance can give confidence externally. There is room for debate, should not be afraid of differing opinions. It is important that the panel are enabling that jury to do its role; we are not an end in itself.
- **Decision:** Put to the group, to have Veolia/Lendlease as part of the group, but in a not voting capacity. **Group in agreement.**

Role of the Panel:

- Confirmation that you can be on the Oversight Panel and a commentator if deemed appropriate.
- Confusion around the role of the group regarding implementation.
- The panel has consideration of the commentators and to ensure the expertise is representative, which has the biggest influence on the jury. The panel is key to selecting those experts. It is impossible to compile an oversight panel that covers every single specialism, and additional support can be called on when required. There needs to be enough climate change expertise (academic and practical) alongside other representation

to create trust in the Oversight Panel, but also recognise the jury will shape a lot of the process.

- The focus should be citizens who are involved, and that they have confidence in the process.

Administration:

- **Action:** Briefing Paper and Terms of Reference circulated prior to the meeting. **Anything of concern please let Shared Future know.**
- Discussion about the rotating chair principle and how this would work in practice? Open to all, panel members should express an interest prior to the next meeting. **Action: express an interest ahead of the next meeting to undertake role of chair.**
- Question as to whether notes of this meeting be published? It was confirmed that they can. **Action: include meeting notes on the citizens' jury section of the Southwark Council website.**
- Question from the group, do the oversight panel meetings tie in with specific points in the programme? It was confirmed that ideally the next meeting should be following recruitment, but also reactive to the process of jury meetings, depending on how they progress.

4. Recruitment methodology and criteria for Citizens' Jury participant selection:

- Stratified sampling profile (suggestion on page 4)
- Marginalised voices
- Recruitment Methodology

Shared Future confirmed that the key point for discussion is selection criteria, rather than numbers attributed to each category, which can be finalised later after responses are received. Draft profile provided in meeting papers, the list of categories can be longer, but this creates additional challenges in recruiting. Open to conversation, can also reduce the criteria if required. It was confirmed that the jury invitations are sent on a random basis to selected postcodes.

Question raised from the group about how to include those residents who may live in poorly insulated and low energy efficient properties. How does the panel provide oversight of these issues, and consider them in recruitment?

Confirmation provided over the indices of deprivation, which is a pre-determined geographical ranking. It was agreed this addresses some concerns, but that housing tenure could also be considered to broaden scope. **Action: Shared Future to review options for considering housing tenure in demographics.**

Concerns raised about barriers to engagement and encouraging response. Will there be social media, texting, email – what are the different options? Shared Future confirmed they work with the Comms at the Council to raise awareness. The oversight panel can help to inform this process, and feedback is welcomed on how to increase awareness locally. This is particularly important is certain groups are underrepresented when responding.

Question from the panel, can you confirm how do you account for non-binary in the gender split presented? Shared Future confirmed that Sortition Foundation have found it very difficult to find accurate figures.

Outstanding question about age, one of the group advocated increasing the % of lowest age group, as climate change will impact them the greatest. Is there support for this? No agreement, however, **decision from the group that minimum age limit should be reduced to 15.** Safeguarding processes in place.

Shared Future confirmed that they loan laptops, dongles and have a tech support team – to talk through the process and support jury membership for those that do not have IT access. Lack of technology should not be a barrier.

5. The Jury process – online/in person

Confirmed that a hybrid approach is proposed with evening sessions online and weekend sessions in person, subject to Covid restrictions.

6. Question for the jury to consider

Limited time for discussion and agreement, with additional questions proposed by members of the group. Agreed wording is required in order to send out recruitment letter. **Action - Let Shared Future know any changes to draft questions, or suggested new questions.**

Action – Shared Future to consider how best to agree overarching question given limited time in the meeting for conversation.

Comment made that we want to attract a broad representation, language is very important and do not want to frighten people off by using complex language. Suggestion of an additional hour-long meeting to agree the question.

Aim for an overarching question, and allow citizens flexibility to move the conversation in the direction they see fit.

7. Implementing the recommendations

Not discussed due to time constraints.

8. Any Other Business

The Chair thanked panel members for their contributions; it has shown the need for discussion and consensus. Thank you for your time and input so far. Look forward to seeing you in the next meeting.

Shared Future are happy to have offline conversation as required through the process.