

## Climate Change Citizens' Jury – Oversight Panel

### Meeting #2

Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 – 3-5:30pm, via Zoom

### Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Update since last meeting on Oversight Panel membership and Terms of Reference
3. Recruitment methodology and criteria for Citizens' Jury participant selection – update since last meeting
4. Question for the jury to consider
5. The Jury process – timing
6. Implementing the recommendations
7. Initial thoughts on commentators for the process
8. Next steps and timings for Oversight Panel
9. 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	Community Southwark	Chris Mikata-Pralat
5	Lay Chair of Camberwell Deanery	Sonia Phippard (Chair)
6	Extinction Rebellion Southwark	Eloise Waldon-Day
7	Southwark Law Centre	Harpreet Aujla
8	Southwark Group of Tenants Associations (SGTO)	Jack Lewis
9	Lendlease	Miles Lewis
10	Team London Bridge	Jack Skillen
11	Veolia	Rachel Butler

12	Southbank University	Dr Aaron Gillich
13	Southbank University	Prof Obas Ebohon

Also attending, but not part of the panel:

Jenny Willis, Shared Future (Presenter)

Pete Bryant, Shared Future (Presenter)

Jayne McFayden, Shared Future (Presenter)

Maria, Shared Future (Observer)

Tom Sharland, Southwark Council (Note taker)

Apologies:

Karrim Jalali, Fossil Free Southwark

Rachel Segbenu, Southwark Youth Advisor

Helen Hayes, MP

Chris Green, Citizens Advice Southwark

### 1. Introductions

Welcome from Sonia Phippard, chair of the meeting.

Group introductions from all panel members.

A welcome was given to the two new panel members from Southbank University.

### 2. Update since last meeting on Oversight Panel membership and Terms of Reference

Recap of actions from last meeting, included in the meeting notes provided.

Confirmation that the ToR have been updated to include reference to voting, but only if required due to time limitations. The preference remains for group discussion and agreement wherever possible.

Reminder that the role of the oversight is to facilitate the best possible jury process.

No further comments on ToR and Meeting Notes, both agreed.

**ACTION: Publish meeting #1 notes on council website as part of update on jury process.**

### 3. Recruitment methodology and criteria for Citizens' Jury participant selection – update since last meeting

Discussion at the first panel meeting requested including housing tenure as part of the selection criteria. Response from Shared Future - This has now been added.

Further suggestion to include those people in temporary accommodation within the housing tenure selection criteria. Response from Shared Future – this can be added if appropriate statistics are available to confirm the proportion of those residents in temporary accommodation in the borough.

**Action: Shared Future to review housing statistics and include temporary accommodation if feasible.**

Further question on increasing the % of residents from the youngest age group. Response from Shared Future - Tend to over recruit in areas of greatest drop out, which includes younger members of the jury. However, the usual practice is to select a representative group of the population. This is important for the legitimacy of the decision making. The split of age brackets can be looked at to ensure the youth voice is fully represented.

**Action: Shared Future to consider age grouping split and how this impacts membership of the jury.**

Additional question as to whether people working in Southwark could be included in the jury, this is not currently a question asked during recruitment. There was some support for including a question on whether people work in the borough, but also a general view that this should not be seen as part of the selection criteria for the jury.

Group discussion followed on the merits of including a question on working in the borough. There was a recognition that a number of groups are in place for residents and businesses to feed into the Climate Emergency. The jury does need the broadest representation, but there was recognition that we can't cover every possible combination.

Residents are of crucial importance. A question was raised if a business representative could be part of the panel, rather than putting this pressure on potentially a small number of individuals who work in the borough and happen to be on the jury.

Response from Shared Future: these processes have not traditionally asked about occupation, we don't want this to distract from people applying. There are other options for businesses to engage in the Climate Emergency.

Concern from the group that it could appear that a qualification/job that is needed to be a jury member, which could stop people applying. Support for businesses being brought in as commentators, to allow oversight and input into the process.

Assurance was given from the council that businesses will be able to involve themselves in the process in other ways and that commentators could include a business representative.

Agreement from the group that business engagement is vital and must be considered throughout the process. However, we should not ask potential jury members at the outset whether any of them worked in the borough.

Question from the group as to whether the recruitment letter will the letter be shared? Response from Shared Future – yes, this will be shared ahead of it being posted.

**Action: Shared Future to circulate the recruitment letter once agreed.**

#### 4. Question for the jury to consider

An interim meeting was held to review the draft list of questions and select a preferred option. Meeting notes, including an explanation for the decision, were provided to the group ahead of this oversight panel meeting.

*‘How should Southwark change to tackle the emergency of climate change fairly and effectively for people and nature?’*

It was asked if anyone who wasn't at the interim meeting would like to raise any questions?

Question for Shared Future - with a number of different questions across multiple juries, has there been any analysis on higher response rates due to certain questions? What has worked for other juries?

Response from Shared Future - so many different reasons for varying response rate, makes it very hard to undertake analysis of different questions resulting in different response rates.

There was concern that the selected question does feel slightly clunky. ‘How should Southwark change’ is not easy to understand. Also, there is no economic element to the question, possible area for improvement?

Support from the group for the reference to ‘people and nature’ to pick up the ecological aspects.

Agreement that there is a slightly clunky start to the question. Discounted ‘What should we do’ or ‘What do we in Southwark need to do’ to avoid too much focus on individual action.

The group looked back at the previous versions of the question. Could we use ‘What action could Southwark take’ or ‘What action needs to be taken’ at the start of the question.

Challenge that the reference to ‘Southwark’ may not be well-understood – either because it would be limited to the council or because people identified with a more local area.

Support for use of the word ‘change’ to highlight the need for transition. Also a desire to move away from ‘we’ to focus wider than the individual. This is why the group supported the draft question.

‘What needs to change in Southwark...’ suggested as a possible alternative to the start of the question.

Shared Future asked if there were any concerns with changing the start of the question? No objection at the meeting.

Concern that the word change appears twice and also suggest that 'climate change emergency' should be used.

*'What needs to change in Southwark to tackle the emergency of climate change fairly and effectively for people and nature?'*

**Action: Amended question circulated to the group for agreement. No initial objections to the change.**

#### 5. The Jury process – timing

Recognised that the failure to agree the question and selection criteria at the first meeting has led to delay in recruitment over the summer, which has had a knock on effect to overall timescales.

Shared Future therefore developed 'Timeline Option 1' following concerns on the potential delay, to help move the process forward. Crucial to ensure that those selected for the jury, who need equipment, have enough time to be sent a laptop, trained on zoom etc. Also can't shorten the recruitment process, this will only serve to devalue the jury. 4<sup>th</sup> November is earliest the jury meetings could commence. Shared Future expressed a preference to stick with the original timeframes (Option 1). This also made the better use of the natural break over Christmas.

Shared Future expressed a desire to get the process started ASAP, but it should be noted that option 1 only saves two weeks total.

Questions raised from the group – does the start date go on the letter? Why is the process online?

Response from Shared Future – Yes, the dates do go on the letter, to allow jury members to plan. The intention is to start online, with in person sessions at points in the programme. This will depend on Covid restrictions and the feelings of the selected group about meeting, don't want to press for in person meetings too quickly.

The council confirmed that the report would go to the same Cabinet meeting in March 2022 under either timing option. A preference to start early but the end dates don't have a significant impact. Don't want to rush the process for minimal gain in time if it isn't necessary.

There was a suggestion from the group that a local, community based IT centre could be used to help host members of the jury, if home internet is a challenge. This suggestion was welcomed.

Question from the group regarding who decides what goes forward and why has Cabinet been decided? This is only part of the council decision making process. Where do the recommendations go for other groups? To be covered later in the

meeting - the council is one recipient, but many will need to act on the recommendations.

Overall a slight preference for launching sooner rather than later if it is practical. Does one over the other lead to a better process. Option 1 could be more balanced. What is the preference from Shared Future?

Shared Future – initially selected option 2 to provide a break after the introduction. Therefore specific topics after Christmas – more time to identify commentators and to not have a break between those sessions and making recommendations.

**Decision: Option 2 – agreement to progress.**

Oversight panel members in the jury process – very welcome as observers. Easier to accommodate online, in person this is usually restricted to 2/3 per session. This is usually welcomed by jury members.

Venue – required if in person sessions can happen. Suggestion for venues gratefully received.

**Action: Group to suggest possible venues for in person meetings.**

## 6. Implementing the recommendations

This needs to be worked through to ensure jury members are confident the recommendations will be considered.

The meeting papers provided a draft statement from the council of what happens and when. However, this is not just about what the council does. Important that all stakeholders will consider how they respond. Upfront agreement from key stakeholders, from MPs to local groups. These commitments ideally need to be made at the start of the process, i.e. now. In other juries these statements were published on the project website to demonstrate legitimacy.

**Action: all groups to consider what they can commit to with regards to support for the process and action in response to future recommendations made by the jury.**

The council will provide an initial response in March 2022, then a full response following the local elections in May 2022. A range of other meetings could also be utilised. Would be interested to discuss putting out a request to other big institutions not involved in the oversight panel, to support the process.

The group stressed that ownership and action is imperative. 'Considered' could be strengthened in the council's statement. Crucial to have a statement that focuses on action and that is serious about the implications of not moving quickly enough. Positivity, enthusiasm and commitment from the council is very important.

Members of the group stressed that a much stronger commitment from the council is needed. Concern that this is going to be lost, possibly from new councillors etc. How does this fit with the climate strategy, what timelines will be assigned to different

actions? How will the strategy be updated to reflect the jury's outcomes? Is there a budget for communications to support this process? We need to ensure the recommendations are taken seriously.

Further question on if it has been fixed that is taken to Cabinet? The council owns the piece of the work, but doesn't necessarily own all the outcomes. What can be done beyond the council? Vital that this work isn't lost due to the usual complaints about residents not being heard. Important that all have ownership.

It was confirmed that it is certainly not the intention that the council is the sole actioner.

The council confirmed it will progress as quickly as possible, although the election does present challenges on timeframes. The council will use the recommendation as part of a review of climate change strategy and action plan.

Request for Southwark Council to think about how far they can go with the political limitations, and ensure progressive action.

A question from the group on how can we get more people to supportive of the process early. Opportunity for the oversight panel to promote the group more widely through local networks.

Kick-off pledge meeting could help to raise awareness. Local campaigning will be ongoing. Launch event possible in March ahead of election?

**Action: Possible suggestion of a pledge summit, to allow others to sign and support?**

**Action: consider what we will do with the actions? Who else we need to bring into the process?**

Challenge for BID groups to commit their businesses to action. Need to find the right words to embed the recommendations in upcoming strategy work.

Encouragement for the council representative to be optimistic about the process. Council has huge transformation opportunity, need to push the limits of what the council can do. Cross party participation in this process to take this initiative on-board and run with it.

Southwark council has huge enthusiasm, but just wanted to make people aware of the restrictions that are in place over an election period. Frustration expressed from some members of the group at the delay to this point over 2+ years and now the election appears to force additional delay.

Agreement to work around to deadlines to progress as much as we can, the climate emergency is not waiting so we do need to act with urgency.

A question was raised on public awareness – confirmation on what is going to be done to raise awareness of the process? Confirmation on comms plan?

**Action – council to confirm comms plan for promotion of the jury.**

## 7. Initial thoughts on commentators for the process

An initial discussion to agree the steps for selecting the commentators for the introductory sessions. An interim group could meet to discuss and set out a way forward.

The initial jury meetings are key for the panel to consider. Commentators for later meeting will be informed by the jury.

A request from the group was made for the topics that will be discussed?

Session 1 – Introduce the jury process.

Session 2 – Introduction to climate change. What is it, the science, the evidence, where emissions are coming from? The knowledge of the jury will be very mixed. Trying to give people a grounding in the subject.

The group asked how many speakers are usually required?

Response from Shared Future - Ideally no more than 3 or 4 per session. In order to give the commentators a meaningful length of time. Presentations are rarely longer than 15-20 minutes, to allow time for questions and discussion from the jury.

Suggestion of a google sheet, to review and agree collectively. Can a shared resource be set up to review and agree?

**Action: Set up shared google sheet to capture feedback on potential commentators.**

Vital to explain the facts behind the climate emergency in clear, simple terms. Then we will need the council to present the specific impact in the borough. Where do emissions come from in the borough, for example? Don't want to crowd the meeting with lots of experts. Then also need to focus on making the potential mitigation 'real' and relevant to people's lives, as well as ensuring there is an overview of the wider implications of climate change, especially as it impacts the most deprived, both in the UK and in the global south.

Hugely important that it is pitched clearly to the group.

Comment from the group that technical nature of the problem, must be well communicated, particular around timelines. Personal, direct impacts on daily life in Southwark.

Question from the group – do we need people with a connection to Southwark? Share Future response - Wherever possible, yes, we would want people to have a local connection, but the most important requirement is knowledge on the subject matter.

Question from the group, is the commentators attendance voluntary (i.e. no payment). Response from Shared Future - Yes.

The group also expressed a desire to hear from younger voices and that of the global south.

TBC – additional meeting to discuss long list of commentators could be useful.

**Action: hold a date for an interim meeting, in case it is needed.**

#### 8. Next steps and timings for Oversight Panel

Next panel meeting – end of Oct, beginning of November (possible interim).

**Action – requested that meeting dates for panel meeting 3, 4 and 5 to be put into diaries. Two options for next meeting provided, with most populate date selected.**

#### 9. Any Other Business

As much publicity as possible prior to the recruitment letter being sent is a good thing.

**Action: Shared Future requested bio for each individual on the panel, to be included on the project website.**

Question from the group if Lendlease / Veolia are happy to still be involved following the feedback in the first meeting. Yes – broadly in support and want to stay positively involved in the process.