

Climate Change Citizens' Jury – Oversight Panel

Meeting #4

Monday 13th December 2021 – 12-2pm, via Zoom

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Notes and actions from last meeting
3. Matters arising: i) communications ii) evaluation
4. Update on sessions so far
5. Commentators for topic sessions in the new year: 6 Jan, 13 Jan, 20 Jan (evenings 6.30 – 9pm on zoom)
6. Next steps and timings for Oversight Panel activity/meetings
7. Any Other Business i) Observer sign-up sheet & guidelines

Attendees

Panel Members:

Number	Organisation/Group	Name
1	Southwark Council	Councillor Helen Dennis
2	Southwark Council	Chris Page
3	Extinction Rebellion Southwark	Eloise Waldon-Day
4	Southwark Law Centre	Harpreet Aujla
5	Southwark Group of Tenants Associations (SGTO)	Jack Lewis
6	Lendlease	Miles Lewis
7	Karrim Jalali	Fossil Free Southwark
8	Sonia Phippard	Lay Chair of Camberwell Deanery (Chair)
9	Jack Skillen	Team London Bridge
10	Helen Hayes	MP
11	Elisha Osei	Southwark Youth Advisor
12	Rachel Butler	Veolia

Also attending, but not part of the panel:

- Jenny Willis, Shared Future (Presenter)
- Pete Bryant, Shared Future (Presenter)
- Jayne McFayden, Shared Future (Presenter)
- Maria Lucien, Shared Future (Observer)
- Tom Sharland, Southwark Council (Note taker)

Apologies:

- Dr Aaron Gillich, Southbank University
- Prof Obas Ebohon, Southbank University
- Chris Green, Citizens Advice
- Chris Mikata-Pralat, Community Southwark
- Councillor Adele Morris. Southwark Council

1. Introductions

Welcome from Sonia Phippard, chair of the meeting.

Main business for the meeting is item 4; to review the 3 topic sessions and confirm approach/speakers – ideally spend the bulk of the time on this item, but will give the required time to other points as necessary.

Request for any comments from meeting #3 meeting notes. Not received, notes approved.

ACTION: Upload meeting notes #3 onto the website.

2. Notes and actions from last meeting

All actions completed apart from those two issues covered in item 3 below.

3. Matter Arising

- i) Comms: Council Provided an updated on the latest:

Comms grid shared ahead of the meeting, to capture the council work underway and planned but to also allow for oversight panel members to input the relevant work they are doing.

Council work so far: two dedicated web pages for the jury, one overview page and the other to provide detail on the jury sessions (links to council YouTube channel).

Press release, social media, internal comms and an update in Southwark Life have all been completed.

Upcoming plans listed on the spreadsheet, including climate newsletter and ideas for the launch of the recommendations.

Feedback from the panel: How do we better engage with the voluntary sector? Panel member is liaising with Community Southwark and planning joint event, details to be added to spreadsheet to ensure synergy.

Request to build in more specifics on key messages, who are we trying to target, what are the target numbers etc. not just a list of tasks – the plan should be more detailed.

Action: Council to add in more detail from the wider (internal) Climate Change Comms Plan into the excel list shared with the oversight panel.

ii) Evaluation

Shared Future are tracking feedback from members of the jury as the sessions progress, to ensure the process is improved on an ongoing basis. Larger question pending on analysis of the process more widely, and how best to do this at the end of the process.

Oversight panel encouraged to submit feedback/ideas on evaluation opportunity.

Action: Panel members to contact Shared Future/council after the meeting, opportunity to help shape the process. Council to work to confirm evaluation process, including exploring the use of academics.

4. Update on sessions so far

Attendance stats shared prior to the meeting.

Aim of the jury is to retain 25 people, this included agreeing a long list of 29. However, three people have not responded to any contact, therefore have been removed from the long list. Different jurors have missed sessions so far, no consistent person missing. Still have 25 people in place.

Work ongoing by Shared Future to liaise with jury members, some of whom have extra needs of support.

Jurors will be sent a programme, with biscuits/tea etc to thank them for their input so far and encourage them to continue to attend in the New Year.

We have had some drop out from 50+ age bracket and those with disabilities, so these numbers are slightly lower than the target demographic.

Worth noting that half of the initial list of jurors did not start the process, a major challenge that has not been seen on other projects. These people had to be replaced to form the long list mentioned.

Recommendation from Shared Future not to recruit additional people now, due to challenges of integrating them into the group at this stage in the process.

Comments from the panel:

- Positive that we've managed to retain a broad range of people so close to the demographic. What number of people have dropped out consistently?
- Concern that we are lower on those with disabilities and lower socio-economic groupings. Not ideal for the jury.
- Are the jury aware of how representative they are as a group?
- Can we address the lack of certain groups through the selection of speakers/commentators?
- Agree with consensus not to add new people, but are we happy to proceed with this make-up. Not sure what else we can do at this stage?

Response from Shared Future:

Regarding attendance; three people didn't attend first session, who have attended since. One person attended first session and then missed sessions two and three through illness. It is expected these individuals will continue as part of the group.

Focus on IMD 1 & 2 has been a real challenge in terms of numbers of people applying and then also balancing with other demographics. Replaced a shortage in this area with IMD 3 & 4.

Initial phone call – explained why they've been selected, and the diversity of the group. The demographic list has not been provided to jurors so far.

The following suggestions were made regarding how can we make sure the recommendations are fair and that all voices are captured:

- Acknowledge the current status with the jury
- Acknowledge within the final report
- Include missing voices as speakers if possible – however, this is going to be very challenging.

The Oversight Panel expressed ongoing concern about the lack of social housing representatives attending the sessions.

Action: General agreement from the group of not introducing new members, but focus on supporting under-represented groups and looking at other ways and how this can best be done later in the process, picked up in the report and post-jury.

5. Commentators for topic sessions in the new year

Sessions will take place on the 6, 13 and 20 January 2022 – this is an urgent task. Reminder that in the introductory sessions, we focused on specific names, many of whom could not attend. Better focus of this session is to consider topics and types of people, rather than specific names.

Shared Future update:

- Important to always remember that we are facilitating discussions around the three topics selected by jury members in relation to the overarching question
- Each session will be a 2.5 hour zoom session
- Option i): Fewer speakers, group Q&A sessions and more jury consideration time
- Option ii): Having an overview presentation, then followed by up to four commentators who give briefer presentations followed by Q&A sessions (jurors could choose up to 2 Q&A sessions which would run simultaneously).
- A pre-meet on Housing/buildings took place on 8 Dec; wide ranging discussion, which proposed that the focus should be on the life cycle of buildings, including new-build and existing building retrofit. AG has offered to present the overview session if required.
- LETI was suggested, alongside the council as possible further speakers.

Housing/buildings

Feedback from the panel:

LETI is a good suggestion, also the UK Green Buildings Council as a possible speaker, oversight panel member has good contacts with CEO and can assist in arranging if required.

Also worth noting that a number of academics from LETI formed 'Part Z', related directly to the embodied carbon and the need for better regulation on this issue.

Important message from the panel is the things that need to be covered, Shared Future will then work on the juggling re the specific commentators.

Shared Future confirmed that the council input is very important but the timing is key so we don't get bogged down in only what is happening now and what the council is/isn't doing.

Recent Environment Scrutiny roundtable held at the council included a range of contacts who could be useful in presenting to the jury. We want the jury to think big, and one of the largest challenges is the heating and insulation of different housing stock. Challenges over funding, solutions, charging leaseholders for social housing changes are all decision the council must weigh up.

Could the council do a headline update of the work that is currently being done, and the actions around them, to set the scene without steering the jury too much in one direction?

Social housing – what level of detail should be given? Issues with heating systems, technical nature, cladding etc. – how much technical detail do we want to give to the jury, to help but not overwhelm with information?

There were disadvantages in giving the jury detailed information on current council plans and targets, as this could constrain thinking. It is important to give context in the realm of what councils can do and what their limitations are. Feeling that the climate strategy should not be presented as this limits thinking.

We don't want to anchor the jury too much, but there is a balance, we ideally want realistic recommendations. How do we fit in such a huge amount of information into one session, can we broaden the scope for those that want to learn more?

Broader concern expressed about missing co benefits and cross cutting themes. For example, pollution lands across all three areas, as does health and wellbeing. Can we ensure these themes are picked up through all sessions?

A question was raised on how we manage opposing points of view, for example developers. Do we want opposing voices in the conversation?

There was support for providing information about what powers a council has in the three different areas. An overview on powers and good practices is key across all three areas, and will encourage wider thinking.

Shared Future Response:

If not presenting, it could be useful to have someone from the council available to answer questions in the Q&A session. Experience from other councils is that jurors often like to know what is going on locally. There has been feedback from this group that they want to know what the council was is doing.

Overview of powers given at the meeting is a positive suggestion, to help frame the role of the council, national government and so on.

Previous juries have tended to have a scene setting piece from an academic or wider council perspective, this could be consistent across all three sessions.

Further comments from panel:

Group welcomes the idea of an overview, with limited council input. Then speakers on retrofit and new build, with speakers to ideally have some balance of viewpoints. Possibility of senior council representative availability for Q&A.

New build and retrofit will both need to be covered. Retrofit could be broken down by social, rented, owned (etc.). Opportunity on new build around policy development, so important to do both.

London Councils – have launched a programme of work called Retrofit London, could be useful to pull them into the meeting as a presenter.

Action: Shared Future to keep the group updated on draft agenda, following on from this feedback, which is very useful.

Transport

Shared Future update:

List the speakers who have been involved in transport topics at other juries:

Leeds – council, chamber of commerce, Leeds Climate Commission on airport development (topical local issue).

Warwick – Warwick University academic, Professor of Transport and Energy, Team Leader in Transport from the council, local bus operator, chamber of commerce.

As panel members are there any specific issues which need to be covered?

Comments from the panel:

- Disability speaker to be able to frame the challenges in this context. For example improvements to public transport and/or closing of roads to traffic. Important to hear this voice.
- TfL, current challenges around funding, does that need to be brought in? Very significant impacts on what can be delivered.
- Business perspective on freight, cargo bikes – lots of groups on the active travel could speak, but how much do we want to generate debate from a wide variety of perspectives?
- Commentator suggestion – Pedal Me, the cargo bike company. Passionate about active travel, but a business voice.
- Jeremy Leech – Living Streets, very active with the council. Has worked in partnership with the council on policy initiatives.
- Impact on Urban Health: could be a possible speaker, local focus on Southwark with research expertise.
- It is important that we help the jury understand the impacts of what is locally controlled.
- Including facts on the issue locally to help frame the conversation. Public transport and active transport need to be covered.

Shared Future Response:

Good starting point, as per Housing, agenda to be drafted.

Action: Shared Future to draft agenda for the meeting and ensure it is shared with group.

Business

Shared Future introduction:

Important to understand the mix of business in Southwark, maybe seek to include voices from big business down to more local businesses?

Other processes have used examples from other countries, this has worked in inspiring the jury to think beyond the action being taken locally.

Question from the panel:

The jury obviously want information on each topic, how much extra information do you provide outside of sessions?

Response from Shared Future:

If we give too much information outside the session it disadvantages members who may not have the time to listen and build knowledge. We can follow up on questions after the sessions and provide answers to help learning.

Feedback from the panel:

- Suggestion of a rep for Better Bankside, or possibly the Climate Group who are based in Southwark, could give an overview of decarbonisation for business.
- New Economics Foundation suggested as a possible. Trade Union voice could also add a useful perspective; GMB for a Green New Deal could also present in this context.
- Different business perspective, size of business important, and also not just private companies (e.g. NHS, universities etc.) – is this about employers also?
- Corporate Social Responsibility – could this be picked up as part of the big business conversation?
- Better Bankside and Sustainable Ventures could both be interesting speakers.
- Campaign against Climate Change Trade Union Group have spoken at an event recently and could be an interesting speaker.
- Feedback from national assembly is that a major national company used their slot to be too focused on their own work, needs to be kept slightly broader about wider business issues.
- Interested as to why business was chosen and where we should focus?
- Networks – possibly London First, or the GLA, to give an oversight of the business situation, rather than focus on individual business.
- Waste was the 4th issue, doesn't have a dedicated session, could this be built in to the agenda?
- Powers of influence important, but the wider economic model could be covered, for example Doughnut Economics.

Summary:

Important to cover employers of different sizes, alongside an overview as to who does what in Southwark. Commentators who bring in the element of challenge, but with a broader view than own business interest. Speakers from representative organisations rather than individuals, including a trade union representative.

Action: Shared Future to share draft agenda, alongside Google Doc to capture potential commentators.

Shared Futures response:

Business chosen due to emissions statistics and businesses as actors alongside government to direct individual consumer choices. Initially titled 'Big Business', but there was a recognition that smaller businesses are needed.

6. Next steps and timings for Oversight Panel activity/meetings

Reserve date on the 5th Jan – optional session as a follow up, keep in the diary to give an update for those who are available.

In person jury session scheduled for the 22nd Jan. Are we still planning for in-person, and using the same venue?

Shared Future response: Ideally in-person, most difficult session to do online. Regulations and guidance on covid will have to be followed, but also how members feel about meeting in person, and if people are comfortable to do so.

Question from the panel: Could the council encourage people to have a lateral flow / PCR test?

Share Future response: This was requested at the first meeting, as part of a detailed risk assessment. Maximum possible measures will be undertaken to allow the event to take place if at all possible. Judged closer to the time depending on situation.

Action: noted by the group to promote best use of the observer slots, and complete the Google Doc with ideas.

7. Any Other Business

Observer sign-up sheet & guidelines shared.

Possible that jury members are known to oversight panel members, there is guidance on this and how to deal with these interactions.