

Appendix A. Climate Emergency Community Deliberative Processes

Options Appraisal

May 2020

Contents

1. Introduction.....	Page 1
2. Community Engagement methods review.....	Page 2
2.1 Opinion Poll.....	Page 2
2.2 Community Appraisal.....	Page 3
2.3 User Panels.....	Page 4
2.4 Participatory Strategic Planning.....	Page 5
2.5 Focus Groups.....	Page 6
2.6 Feedback Kiosks.....	Page 7
2.7 Citizens Advisory Groups.....	Page 8
2.8 21 st century town meeting.....	Page 10
2.9 Area Forums.....	Page 11
2.10 Citizens Assembly.....	Page 12
2.11 Positive Deviance.....	Page 14
2.12 Conversation Cafes.....	Page 16
2.13 Crowd Wise.....	Page 17
2.14 Crowd-sourcing.....	Page 18
2.15 E-Panels.....	Page 19
3. Case Studies.....	Page 20
4. Scoring Methodology.....	Page 24
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	Page 27
6. References.....	Page 28

1. Introduction

Following the climate emergency declaration made in July 2019, and the commitment to reduce the borough’s carbon footprint to net-zero carbon by 2030, Wokingham Borough Council adopted a Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) in January 2020. This was followed by a detailed report in July 2020. The council also committed to communicate and engage with residents, businesses, schools, Town and Parish Councils, charities, the University of Reading, other organisations, and local authorities to work together to initiate education programmes, encourage behaviour change and to develop a Vision for a Net-zero Borough.

Overall, the Climate Emergency Action Plan aims to deliver “warmer homes, cleaner air, better health, more green spaces and support green job opportunities – as well as reduced emissions”¹. However, despite the Councils best efforts, many of the outcomes of the CEAP rely on factors which are outside the Council’s control. The effective delivery of this action plan depends on the influence and support of multiple agencies.

Moreover, the success of any action plan and its associated projects relies on thorough community engagement in order to properly empower people and meet their needs to lead to real behavioural change. Indeed, tackling the climate emergency in Wokingham will need active participation from its residents. It

will need secure, functioning and bold democracies, with leaders in every community, capable of enacting the societal changes that will be required of all of us. We recognise that Wokingham residents expect to be consulted and involved in the big changes that will affect the way they live their lives. Through the right consultative and participation methods, we want to hear their voices and to collect their views. Ideally, community engagement activity should take place in the developmental stage of drawing up proposals so that these ideas are captured early on in the processⁱⁱ.

Fortunately, engagement and public consultation are activities that Wokingham Borough Council have extensive experience, and frequently do, as a key element to produce and deliver policy or projects. The council regularly carry out survey work, liaise with pressure and action groups and implement methods for hearing and acting upon individual opinions on different matters.

The communication and engagement of the Climate Emergency Action Plan will be built upon the council's experience and from tried and tested tools and mechanisms delivered by other organisations and local authorities. To make the message clear, maintain engagement, inspire local people, harness the power of our communities, and ensure a wider acceptance of the CEAP it is critical to use the correct community participation methods.

Engaging with climate change will be a long-term activity. Climate change has been happening for a long time, but it is only recently that its impact is gaining the correct level of attention. Therefore, our response to it must be both immediate and long-term. The CEAP is a ten-year action plan, and a living document, and our engagement strategies will run through the duration of the plan and probably longer.

There are many innovating ways to enable the discussion, from digital platforms to forging community partnerships. To keep momentum, we need to stay in touch with and utilising up to date social media and emerging engagement, communications and educational products, services and techniques. We will also seek community engagement about specific local projects, such as solar farms, new green spaces, or new cycling routes.

Therefore, in order to assess the best options for such engagement, this desk-based review outlines some of the existing options for community engagement and scores them based on their varying qualities against the councils and publics criteria. By enabling this comparison, it not only highlights the breadth of options available but enables the best solution to be chosen for engagement within the climate emergency agenda. Existing successful case studies from other local authorities have also been sourced from to demonstrate the potential effectiveness of these approaches.

The council's resource for the development and delivery of these engagement methods have not been included into the assessment factors used for this exercise. Some of these are more resource intensive than others and will require the support of multiple teams within the council.

2. Community Engagement methods review

With a 10-year action plan, it is important to cover both the short and long term with the community engagement methods in order to collect feedback both initially and throughout to ensure the projects remain on track. Hence, several methods which cover all potential timeframes have been outlined here with their respective costs, scale and more key information, such that they can be compared and selected depending on the priorities and resources available.

2.1. Opinion Polliii

POLICY STAGE: Policy development

COST: Varies

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Short

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Varies

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Representative sample

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Online and Offline

Description:

Opinion polls are quantitative surveys carried out to gauge and compare people's views, experiences and behaviour. There are several different kinds of opinion polls, including questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, telephone surveys, online/email surveys, and deliberative polling.

Costs:

- The cheapest option is usually to buy a few questions on an existing survey, such as YouGov.
- Costs go up if the survey is created from scratch, carried out independently, completed face to face, etc.
- Compiling and analysing the data can also be costly.

Strengths:

- If done properly, will generate statistically significant data about wider public opinion.

Weaknesses:

- There is a potential for inaccuracy or bias, such as sampling error: the participants not being 'representative'.
- The wording of the questions asked may affect the findings.
- The findings may only provide part of the story and can be misleading.
- Opinion polls do not provide information about how or why the respondents think as they do or how this may alter over time.
- They do not allow for a two-way dialogue between the people carrying out the survey and the respondents.

2.2. Community Appraisal

POLICY STAGE: Agenda-setting

COST: Medium

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Up to a year
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Varied
PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Self-selecting
ONLINE / OFFLINE: Mainly offline

Description:

Community Appraisal is a method that includes gauging the viewpoints of members of a community on particular issues. Appraisals may be conducted to form a plan of action to resolve an issue or improve existing services. Whilst all Community Appraisals will vary in their application, many will include the following steps:

- Form a steering committee to take an oversight role.
- Write up a questionnaire which is to be distributed to households and later collected. As an alternative, software can be used.
- Sort the responses and compile a report of the findings.
- Distribute the report throughout the community to citizens and to decision-makers in local authorities. Attempts can also be made to convince the local media to discuss the issues raised by the report.
- Agree on actions to be taken that address the concerns raised by the report with the relevant bodies.
- Monitor developments and report back to the community with information about the progress of the initiatives.

Costs:

- Training for staff
- Organisational costs e.g., venue hire for meetings
- Report publication and distribution
- Software (optional)

Approximate time expense:

- It will take time to distribute and retrieve the questionnaires, given the number of people involved. Compiling and publishing a report based on the results may also be a lengthy process.

Strengths:

- You can discover what the needs of the whole community
- Residents can gain in confidence and skills
- Encourages communicative thinking

Weaknesses:

- Potentially too many conflicting interests

2.3. User Panels

Policy Stage: Implementation

COST: Varies

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Ongoing

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 1 - 24

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Representatives of wider interest groups (stakeholders)

Description:

User Panels usually take the form of a workshop and it is important to outline a clear purpose and the time required for participants' involvement right from the beginning. There also needs to be very clear lines of feedback between the Panel members and the decision-makers. You should use User Panels when:

- You are working with people who are not usually heard, for example those with learning disabilities, children, and the elderly
- You want to establish a two-way dialogue between service providers and users,
- You want to set up a sounding board for new approaches or proposals relating to services
- As a way of identifying emerging problems

Participants:

- A User Panel should be relatively small to allow quality interaction between participants. Some organisations recruit a large pool of users so that they can draw out smaller groups to be consulted on a particular issue.
- Groups can be targeted to reflect certain subgroups of users, such as people with disabilities, or ethnic minorities - it is best to include a diverse range of users in the Panel.
- Panel members should not remain on the panel indefinitely, after a while participants tend to become too knowledgeable about the service delivery organisation and may come to identify with it and so lose credibility with other users.

Costs:

- It depends on whether or not you have in-house facilitation skills, where the groups meet, how large it is and how often it meets.
- Panel members should at least receive expenses such as transport.

Approximate time expense:

- User Panels are usually ongoing (with participants being replaced as time goes on).
- A member of staff will need to provide support for the Panel.
- The accountability and credibility of the Panel can be increased if you allow time for representatives to refer back to wider user groups.

Strengths:

- Changes can be tracked over time
- Solution focused
- The Panel members are well informed on the issues

Weaknesses:

- Time consuming/long-term commitment
- The Panel is not necessarily representative
- A small number of people may dominate the group
- May not take into account relevant needs of non-users of services
- The panels will not deliver statistical information

2.4. Participatory Strategic Planning

POLICY STAGE: Agenda-setting

COST: £1,000-£9,999

LENGTH OF PROCESS: 2 days. Follow up after 6 months

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 5-50

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Representative sample

ONLINE/OFFLINE: Offline

Description:

This process is a consensus-building approach that helps a community come together in explaining how they would like their community or organisation to develop over the next few years.

Participatory Strategic Planning consists of four stages:

- First, the group determines their vision for the future of the organisation or community.
- Second, they describe the obstacles that are preventing them from reaching their vision.
- In the third stage they move on to agree methods that will help them get past the obstacles and reach the vision.
- The final stage is about implementation planning e.g. 'What shall we do in the first year?', and finally, 'What shall we do in detail in the first 3 months?'

Each stage uses a workshop process which involves brainstorming to generate ideas, gathering to explore the themes that emerge, and naming to develop the agreement of the group in each cluster. Each workshop involves a combination of working individually, in small groups and with the whole group. A trained and experienced facilitator is required (a team of two is preferable).

You should use Participatory Strategic Planning when you want to build a spirit of ownership and commitment in a group or when you want to reach consensus to move forward. Participatory Strategic Planning can deliver direct decisions as well as a clear idea of where participants want an organisation or community to go, consensus about directions, a community commitment to making things happen and a stronger sense of being a team. Participatory Strategic Planning cannot deliver the fine detail of plans which need to be developed in smaller groups.

Participants:

- 5 to 50 is the typical range but it can be more or less than that. The method works well with a mixed group of participants from all levels of the community or organisation.
- It is designed to be inclusive, so a diverse group of participants can take part.

Costs:

- A team of two trained and experienced facilitators or a two-day event would typically cost £2,000-£4,000 including preparation, facilitation and documentation in addition to a venue, catering, travel, board and lodging, as required.

Strengths:

- Flexible and applicable to multiple settings
- A remarkably quick way of enabling a diverse group to reach agreement
- Works for people with auditory as well as visual preferences
- Participants often find the process and outcome inspiring

Weaknesses:

- Requires trained and experienced facilitators
- Requires buy-in and commitment beforehand from people in power
- Requires hard work and commitment on the day and subsequently
- Requires all major stakeholders to be in the room

2.5. Focus Groups

POLICY STAGE: Policy development

COST: Low - Medium

LENGTH OF PROCESS: 2 hours

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 6- 12

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Representative sample

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Offline

Description:

A facilitator leads a guided discussion of 6-12 people to gauge their views and attitudes on the subject. The discussions are normally recorded and a report is produced of the process and results which is then distributed to the participants. Clients or other interested parties may observe the discussions. Focus Groups provide useful information on how people respond to particular questions or issues, but the short amount of time limits the depth of discussion that can be had.

Participants:

- The group needs to be small (6-12) for participants to feel comfortable in voicing their views.
- Members of the Focus Group can be selected to be demographically representative or of a specific sub-set of the population.
- It can be a good way of engaging marginalised groups e.g., people who are not native English speakers can be included through translators.

Costs:

- The cost of Focus Groups is generally not very high, unless you need to recruit participants through truly random selection, which can be costly.
- An incentive may have to be offered to citizens in order to get them to participate.
- Additional costs include venue hire (choose an informal setting where possible), catering and supporting arrangements, such as childcare.

Approximate time expense:

- It is important not to overlook the time required to plan the event, recruit the participants and write up and respond to the results.
- If the topic for discussion is complex or largely unknown to the participants you may need to provide reading in advance.

Strengths:

- High level of participant interaction due to the small size of the group.
- Can lead to a greater understanding of how people think about issues.
- Members can be specially recruited to fit (demographic) profiles.
- Good for getting opinions from people who would not be prepared to give written answers.

Weaknesses:

- Heavily dependent on a skilled facilitator.
- Easily dominated by one or two strong opinions.

- Some participants may feel inhibited to speak.
- Responses are not quantitative and so cannot be used to gauge wider opinion.

2.6. Feedback Kiosks

POLICY STAGE: Implementation

COST: Low

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Varies

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Open

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Self selected

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Online

Description:

Kiosks are electronically operated touch screen devices which can be placed in any space (most often they are seen in hospital waiting rooms and other public spaces). They allow service users/employees/visitors to provide feedback and answer survey questions. The information provided can then be analysed. Kiosks can be used for single events, in order to capture public opinion or feedback on that single instance, or on a permanent basis to monitor performance and measure changes in opinion over time.

Used for collating feedback with a view to improving public services. Feedback kiosks however are not especially suitable when more detailed feedback is required. There are instances when more benefit could be had from seeking a face-to-face approach, particularly if issues are complex or sensitive.

Participants:

- Anyone. Feedback kiosks can be aimed at specific groups, for example, service-users or customers, to gauge public opinion on a specific area.

Costs:

- There will be a need for initial investment to purchase and install the kiosk and there may be the need for bespoke software.

Approximate time expense:

- Low. Gathering the feedback is quick simple, as users are unsupervised and can have access to the kiosks at any time of day. Analysis may be more labour-intensive, depending on the quality of software purchased and the type of questions asked.

Strengths:

- Users can give real-time feedback unattended so, the required staff assistance is minimal.
- The information given is secure and confidential.

Weaknesses:

- Although they are low maintenance and do not require much staff involvement, this can result in lower participation rates than for example, a Personal Digital Assistant. Their location needs to be carefully considered to maximise respondents.
- They could also be a barrier to those less used to using technology.

2.7. Citizen Advisory Groups

POLICY STAGE: Implementation

COST: Low
LENGTH OF PROCESS: Ongoing
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 10-30
PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Varies
ONLINE/OFFLINE: Offline

Description:

Citizen advisory groups involve members of the public who sit as a committee to inform and advise decision making over an extended period of time. Advisory groups can create effective and on-going dialogue that allow issues and concerns to be explored in depth, and ideally addressed, while the participants are still involved. Advisory groups can take many different forms depending on the exact purpose of the group. The group may meet either over a couple of days as a one-off event, or regularly over a longer period. The selection of participants is crucial. Those who are most affected should be considered first and there should be an attempt to benefit from a spread of expertise amongst the participants. Participants should be provided with all the necessary information to reach informed decisions on issues. Participants should understand that there is a goal to be sought and the different values, problems and benefits of each decision should be weighed accordingly when attempting to reach it. The participants' decisions and/or recommendations should be respected. Whilst this ought to apply for every instance, it is of particular importance for those groups that meet over a long period of time and cover a spread of issues. If the participants feel their time is being wasted they will not attend or contribute.

Participants:

- Can either be a representative sample of the local population, representatives of particular groups (for example, older people) or specific individuals, such as community leaders.

Costs:

- The events themselves are usually not that expensive, but the cost of recruiting, supporting and rewarding the participants can be high.

Approximate time expense:

- Allow a minimum of three months to set up and run an advisory group.
- The scale of the project undertaken and the level of expertise required to grasp the issue can affect the time required.

Strengths:

- Can provide an early warning of potential problems and be a useful sounding board to test plans and ideas.
- Regular meetings over extended periods of time give participants a chance to get to know each other, which can help discussions.
- Citizens can introduce a fresh perspective to discussions, encouraging innovation.
- Citizen involvement increases accountability in governance due to the more transparent process.

Weaknesses:

- Requires a long-term commitment from participants; hence recruiting and retaining participants can be difficult.
- Can appear exclusive to those who are not included.
- Involves only a small number of people and therefore does not provide statistically significant data.
- Participants can become less representative over time; advisory groups may need to be renewed regularly.

2.8. 21st Century town meeting

POLICY STAGE: Policy development

COST: High

LENGTH OF PROCESS: 1 day

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 100 to 5,000

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Varies

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Combination

Description:

21st Century Town Meetings bring together between 500 and 5,000 people, to discuss local, regional or national issues. By using technology, this method combines the benefits of small-scale face-to-face discussions with those of large group decision making.

This method uses technology to overcome the common trade-off between the quality of discussion and the size of the group. The participants are split up into groups of 10-12 people, where they have facilitated small-group discussions. Each facilitator uses a networked computer to instantly collate ideas and votes from the table. This information is sent to a central point where a team summarises comments from all tables into themes that can be presented back to the room for comment or votes. Each participant also has a keypad which allows them to vote individually on themes or questions. The results of these votes are presented in real time on large screens for instant feedback from participants. The computers and voting pads generate volumes of useful demographically sortable data. This information is often quickly edited into a report which is printed and given to participants, decision-makers and journalists at the end of the event.

The whole process can either take place within one room, or groups can gather in many locations around the country or the world. Often, the participants are selected to be demographically representative of the whole population.

The interchange between the small- and large-scale dialogues is powerful as it allows participants to discuss the issues in a small manageable setting, whilst maintaining the legitimacy of a process involving large numbers of people. The immediacy of the vote also creates transparency during the meeting

These meetings are especially useful for engaging citizens in planning, resource allocation and policy formulation. They have been used to create recommendations around a number of different issues, including:

- The redevelopment of the World Trade Center site in New York.
- The rebuilding of New Orleans following hurricane Katrina.
- Assessing the state of healthcare in California.
- Balancing the U.S. federal budget.

Participants:

- One of the key distinguishing features of 21st Century Town Meetings is the high number of participants involved.
- Most events are open to all citizens, although it is often necessary to target hard-to-reach sectors of the population to ensure a representative group of participants.

Costs:

- A 21st Century Town Meeting is a very intensive process. Designing, planning and coordinating an event involving hundreds, or even thousands, of people requires a substantial

budget. Furthermore, the individual tables need to be run by skilled facilitators and the use of technology adds to the cost.

Approximate time expense:

- The scale of the events and the amount of information generated, which needs to be ordered and then presented back to the room, requires a lot of staff time and planning. The high profile of most 21st Century Town Meetings also means that there are additional tasks in dealing with the media and decision makers.

Strengths:

- Combines a large number of participants in considered dialogue
- Gathers clear and instant information on what participants think about an issue, including demographic data on what different groups feel
- Immediacy and scale of the event can energise the participants
- Can capture the imagination of the media and the public more widely

Weaknesses:

- High cost
- Can raise expectations to unrealistic levels if not managed well
- Reliant on technology
- Works better on salient issues

2.9. Area forums

POLICY STAGE: Implementation

COST: Low

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Ongoing

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Small group

Description:

Area Forums are meetings held locally, often hosted by the local council. Forums are typically comprised of local residents, councillors, senior representatives from the local authorities, the Police, Primary Care Trusts and other key local organisations, to debate key topics and answer residents' questions face-to-face.

The Area Forum workshops are normally run in the evenings and are chaired by a local councillor. Very often a Chief Officer also attends each meeting and ensures that the recommendations made are properly fed back into the council's decision-making processes. Area Forums concentrate their conversations on the topics of particular concern to local communities in the area. The outcomes are reported to Area Forum members either on an individual basis or via an Area Forum newsletter, which is distributed to members after each meeting; the minutes from each meeting are normally available online. You do not have to be a member of an Area Forum to attend, but you are encouraged to join so that you can be regularly updated about meetings and developments that have occurred as a result of your input.

Participants:

Area Forums are generally made up of a cross-section of the local community, normally divided by ward including:

- Local residents and businesses

- Local amenity society and residents' association representatives
- Tenant management organisations
- Special interest groups
- Voluntary organizations
- Representatives of the police and health authorities

Costs:

- Council buildings or community centres are normally used as the venue.
- Costs are incurred in staff time for planning and attending the meetings, as well as responding to participants.

Approximate time expense:

- Area Forums are an ongoing process of engagement with the local community.
- Each Forum meets somewhere between every two months or every quarter.

Strengths:

- Can provide citizens with information on Council services and Council policies affecting the local area.
- The forums encourage openness and transparency around Council decisions.
- Discussions can be tailored to the concerns of local residents.
- Area forums provide a direct channel between elected representatives and the communities they represent.
- The opportunity for citizens to monitor feedback from the actions they raised during the meetings.

Weaknesses:

- Area Forums tend to be attended by the 'usual suspects' although many organisers try to attract young people in particular and residents from minority communities.
- Individual workshops may be dominated by one person or a particular viewpoint.

2.10. Citizens' Assembly

POLICY STAGE: Decision-making

COST: High - £60,000+

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Several days

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 50 - 250

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Civic lottery (Random stratified sample)

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Either

Description:

A citizens' assembly is a group of people who are brought together to discuss an issue or issues and reach a conclusion about what they think should happen. The people who take part are chosen so they reflect the wider population – in terms of demographics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, social class) and sometimes relevant attitudes (e.g., preferences for a small or large state).

Citizens' assemblies give members of the public the time and opportunity to learn about and discuss a topic, before reaching conclusions. Assembly participants are asked to make trade-offs and arrive at workable recommendations.

Citizens' assemblies often adopt a three-step process of learning, deliberation and decision making. This is supported by a team of impartial facilitators who guide participants through the process, ensuring that everyone is heard and comfortable participating.

The participants learn about a topic through a combination of presentations from experts to cover the breadth of opinion on the issue being addressed (participants can also be provided with additional learning materials that introduce them to the topic being discussed before the Assembly starts). There is also time given for experts to answer questions from participants.

The second phase (deliberation) encourages participants to explore their own opinions on what they have heard and develop a wider understanding of the opinions of others. Experts will usually participate in this phase to provide additional information and clarification (but not opinions).

The final phase (decision making) of the Assembly involves participants coming to some conclusions on what they have learnt through the assembly process. It is important that citizens' assemblies do not manufacture a false sense of consensus; thus, alongside agreed positions, individual voting can be used to collect the views of all participants. This ensures that minority voices are heard as well as the majority. Citizens' assemblies are often overseen by an independent Advisory Group. They support the preparations for the citizens' assembly, including topic selection, process design, and the materials that will be used during the citizens' assembly meetings. A key responsibility of this group is to ensure that assembly participants are presented with factually accurate, comprehensive, balanced and unbiased information. Citizens' assemblies usually tend to be quite high-profile events. The relevant decision makers will often be present at the Assembly allowing citizens to present their findings directly.

This method can be used most effectively when the goal is:

- Examining broad policy objectives/ horizon scanning to create new ideas and propose solutions.
- Assessing policy options to develop recommendations.
- Gaining insight from the public about the efficacy of existing practice.

Citizens' assemblies have been used in the UK and other countries – including Australia, Canada and the United States – to tackle a range of complex issues. A citizens' assembly in the Republic of Ireland – established by the Irish parliament – addressed a number of important legal and policy issues facing Irish society. These included equal marriage, abortion and the opportunities and challenges of an ageing population.

Participants:

- Recruited randomly, to be broadly representative of the population

Costs:

- Recruitment of participants
- Location and logistics (finding a space big enough for the numbers of participants)
- Facilitation
- Participant expenses (travel and accommodation)
- Participant gift/honorarium
- Planning
- Communication and promotion

Strengths:

- The process can be high profile and provide a good way of drawing attention to an issue
- Can bring out diverse perspectives on complex and contested problems
- Decision makers brought face-to-face with citizens or those with lived experience of an issue
- Learning phase and deliberation with peers can help participants to understand, change and develop their opinions.
- Offers policy makers an insight on public opinion on a contested issue based on the public having access to thorough and unbiased information and time for deliberation

Weaknesses:

- Gaining a broadly representative group of people can be challenging and expensive
- The process for developing and planning an assembly is intensive and demanding on human and time resource
- Running a citizens' assembly is a highly complex process requiring significant expertise
- There is a danger of being seen as a publicity exercise if not followed by real outcomes

2.11. Positive Deviance

POLICY STAGE: Implementation

COST: Varied

LENGTH OF PROCESS: Long term

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Over 100 people

PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Local populations

ONLINE / OFFLINE: Offline

Description:

The Positive Deviance method is based on the belief that in every community that suffers from deep rooted problems, there are some (the 'deviants') who are innovative in dealing with the issue. Despite having access to the same resources, the positive deviants have developed ways of dealing with problems that through a process of learning can be shared by the whole community.

The process typically involves:

Recognition: Community members must first come together and recognise the issues that need to be addressed.

Definition: Having recognised the problem, community members must gather information to assess its scale and to identify the different solutions adopted by members of the community. People who are adopting unusual behaviours which create positive outcomes are identified as the positive deviants.

Positive Deviance Inquiry: This stage involves observing the deviants with a focus on their behaviour, actions and attitudes in dealing with the problem. Rather than turning the deviant into a local celebrity, the inquiry is intended to empower ordinary community members. This is achieved by recognising that if a neighbour, no different in status or resources from oneself can tackle the problem, then so too can any other community member.

Acting into a new way of thinking: Having identified the strategies of the deviants, the community chooses an approach to the problem to adopt. Activities are then designed to help spread the information or skills required amongst community members. This stage is not intended to merely teach best practices; it is supposed to foster a new mentality by 'acting into a new of thinking' through the use of the designed activities.

The outcome: The success of the designed activities in changing the communities approach to the problem will be assessed over time. This can be done through conventional methods (statistics) or through those specifically tailored to a community or the problem. The point here is to measure the progress made towards the previously outlined goals and to maintain the drive behind the activities.

Participants:

- Positive Deviance relies on a community-wide effort to tackle problems or at least those who are immediately involved with or affected by the issue.
- The cooperation of deviant individuals or groups is also fundamental to success. The number of participants can depend on the size of the community but usually 100 people plus

Costs:

- Positive Deviance is usually a community-led initiative and so can be done cheaply, but only with the dedication of a lot of people.
- If local authorities, police or health services are leading the project then organisational and administrative costs need to be factored in.
- Implementing agreed solutions may also be costly.

Approximate time expense:

- The time expense of community members who initiated the project will be high.
- The length of the project will vary depending on the issue at hand. The first use of Positive Deviance in Vietnam was concerned with malnutrition of children and lasted two years. Since many deep-rooted community problems are social in nature (domestic violence, anti-social behaviour, etc.), measuring progress could also take years.

Strengths:

- Highly participative
- Provides local solutions to local problems
- Solutions are achieved through existing resources (the positive deviants)
- Empowering
- Develops the skills and capacity of participants in dealing with common problems

Weaknesses:

- Based on premise that deviants exist
- Relies on deviant cooperation
- Old habits and responses to problems may be difficult to overcome

2.12. Conversation Cafes

Policy stage: Agenda-setting

Cost: Low

Length of process: 1-2 hours

Number of participants: 10 - 12

Participant selection: Self-selecting

Online / Offline: Offline

Description:

'Conversation Cafe' can refer to activities that involve informal, hosted, drop-in discussions in cafes, bookshops and other public places. The conversationcafe.org organisation in the US suggests the following process:

- Assemble up to 8 people plus host; agree on a hearty topic, find a talking object that is to be passed around, and set a time (1-2 hours). The host explains the process and agreements.
- Round 1: Pass around the talking object e.g., a cushion; each person speaks briefly to the topic, no feedback or response.
- Round 2: Again, with the talking object, each person deepens their own comments or speaks to what has meaning now.
- Dialogue: Open, spirited conversation. Use the talking object if there is domination, contention, or lack of focus.

- Final Round: With the talking object, each person says briefly what was meaningful to them.

Participants:

- Anyone - the process is usually open to anybody who is interested in the topic.

Costs:

- All that is needed is a space to host the conversation, usually a café or other public space, a talking object and somebody who is willing to host the discussion.

Approximate time expense:

- A Conversation Cafe usually lasts between 1-2 hours.

Strengths:

- Informal, Open, Flexible.
- Encourages learning, listening and sharing views.
- May inspire people to take action.
- Stimulates debate.
- Meet new people.

Weaknesses:

- Does not lead to any particular goal.
- Cannot be used to reach a decision.
- Likely to only encourage certain participants.

2.13. Crowd Wise:

Policy stage: Decision-making

Cost: Low

Length of process: 1/2 - 1 day

Number of participants: Varies

Participant selection: Varies

Online / Offline: Offline

Description:

Crowd Wise is a community participation method for making shared decisions such as setting priorities, allocating budgets or responding to a consultation. It produces outcomes which the participants are more likely to support or accept as consensus emerges through a combination of discussion and voting on a set of previously formed options.

A range of options is developed. This is important because decisions are rarely a matter of black and white. The options reflect the views of the participants. The options are either developed by the participants, or, if they were prepared before the discussion, they are adapted to reflect the values and interests of the participants. Discussion leads to options being adapted to widen their appeal, and sometimes to mergers between options.

Consensus emerges through a combination of discussion and voting. The voting reflects people's preferences on all the options. This contrasts with majority voting where people vote only for one option. The chosen option is often a composite of some or all of the original options. People can find common ground. This means that people are less likely to be polarised. No-one votes against any option: they vote

for all the options, to different degrees. In addition, people have an incentive to engage with the other participants, to understand how they can make their preferred option more appealing to others. Crowd Wise uses a form of voting called 'consensus voting'. All participants are invited to rank the options in order of preference, the higher the preference, the greater the number of points. The votes are counted. The higher the number of points earned by the top option, the greater the degree of consensus. The voting shows how much consensus exists. If there is not enough, that is a sign to continue the process.

Participants:

- Lots of people can take part, both in developing and discussing the options and in voting. It can be carried out with a group of 15 people or 1500 people.

Costs:

- Costs can vary depending on the size of the group.
- A larger group may require venue hire.
- Approximate time expense:
- It can work for a single event of 2-3 hours or over a long period of time through several sessions.

Strengths:

- Avoids polarisation of views.
- Allows you to take decisions that work for everyone.
- Helps people to better understand other peoples' positions.
- Involves service users.
- Develops policies and strategies.

Weaknesses:

- Some may be uncomfortable with the 'compromises'.
- Can take longer if consensus is not reached.

2.14. Crowdsourcing

Policy stage: Agenda-setting

Cost: Low

Length of process: Varies.

Number of participants: Varies but can be very high.

Participant selection: Self-selecting

Online / Offline: Mainly online

Description:

Crowdsourcing seeks to harness collaboration for problem-solving, innovation and efficiency. It is underpinned by the concept of openness; often an open call is made for contributions, and then any solutions or outcomes are freely distributed. It seeks to take advantage of increasing global inter-connectedness, particularly via the internet, and use this to find innovate and creative solutions. What makes crowdsourcing unique is that it utilises both bottom-up processes to achieve top-down goals; it is not just consultation, where solutions are already framed, but an opportunity for deep participation with lowered barriers. Crowdsourcing is a predominantly online practice, although it can be carried out offline. Users can edit books or web pages, post products or items, provide information or edit others' work. Crowdsourcing can be used for a variety of tasks, from calls for labour, to specific requests, such as crowd-voting and crowd-funding, or open competition, a search for answers or solutions.

There are also the following specific types of crowdsourcing:

- Crowd-voting – when a website gathers many opinions and judgement on a certain topic.

- Crowd-sourcing creative work – this can span projects such as graphic design, architecture, and illustration.
- Crowd-sourcing language-related data collection – this is simply gathering vocabulary for use in dictionaries. It is particularly useful for publishing archives of words in languages not usually documented.
- Crowd-funding- this is the practice of calling out for funding from the public for projects that may not be able to receive funding through conventional means. A particular example of this is websites that seek to obtain funding to make films and other creative projects.

Participants:

- The very nature of crowdsourcing is that it seeks to open itself up to involving as many people as is possible to reach a solution or goal. Therefore, anyone is welcome to contribute in the process of crowdsourcing.

Costs:

- The costs of crowdsourcing will vary greatly depending on the type of task in question. Costs will stem from collating ideas, paying for labour or executing the actual solution.

Approximate time expense:

- The time expense again varies greatly depending on the scope of the task. The larger and more complex it is, the more time needed to allow individuals to contribute well-developed ideas.

Strengths:

- It is a collaborative process, which can involve a large amount of people at a relatively meaningful level.
- It can reach large numbers of people across the world.
- Its open nature brings transparency throughout the process and result.

Weaknesses:

- The value and impact of the work put in by the crowd can be wasted if the project takes a different direction.
- There are potential ethical implications attached to low paid crowd-workers.
- It can be very time consuming.
- There may be more incentive for contributors to complete tasks quickly rather than thoroughly.
- There can be a lack of iteration between the crowd and the co-ordinator.

2.15. E-Panel

Policy stage: Implementation

Cost: Low - Medium

Length of process: One off or months / years

Number of participants: 500+

Participant selection: Representative sample

Online / Offline: Online

Description:

e-Panels are a way for councils or other organisations to carry out regular online consultations with a known group of citizens. The most well-established e-Panel is YouGov. It was established by a market

research company in 2000 to provide research for public policy, market research and stakeholder consultation. YouGov currently has 350,000 panellists and can focus its research on particular groups if necessary.

Councils have adopted this idea to have a way of consulting a group of people on a regular basis using a range of technology. It provides a quick and potentially cheap way of staying in touch with a group of citizens.

Market research companies tend to focus their e-panel activities on online surveys but other interactive technologies such as discussion forums or VIP messaging have since been introduced. These help create a sense of online community and enable e-panel members to participate in the consultation process, suggesting topics for discussion that the council might not have considered.

Participants:

- e-Panels can be tailored to distinct audiences, depending upon the purpose of the consultation. Therefore, anyone with access to the internet is a potential participant.

Costs:

- If there is the technology and web space already in place, then costs can be very small. In some cases, the only cost incurred would be for the time it takes to recruit the participants, set the questions and analyse the results of the e-Panel consultation. However, if it was decided that a dedicated website needed to be built (which is not a necessity), then the costs could greatly increase.
- Incentives may also be considered. YouGov for example, has a point collection scheme which panellists can eventually exchange for £50 or a store voucher.

Approximate time expense:

- Time requirements involve recruiting the participants, setting the questions, sending them out, chasing responses, analysing responses and writing up the results.
- Most e-Panels are ongoing over several months or years, although they can also be a one-off event.

Strengths:

- They can increase discussion and awareness about an issue.
- They can be used alongside offline initiatives.
- They can increase participation in local democracy, particularly amongst young people or those who are time poor.
- The online platform enables local authorities to reduce their administrative costs since no paper questionnaires or postage is required. There are limited additional costs to run a focus group or live chat (just the cost of online facilitators). Data input is not necessary and analysis is generally quicker and can be immediate depending on the type of software being used.
- Allows anyone to contribute in their own time.
- Allows different views to be aired and discussed.
- Engages people that may not normally be involved in face-to-face consultations.

Weaknesses:

- As with all online methods, e-Panels exclude people without ready access to the internet.
- If too much is asked of participants, such as too many follow-up emails from e-Panels, then participants may become uninterested.
- If topics require specialist knowledge or insight, then e-Panels may not be able to deliver the depth of debate required.

- They do not empower participants.

3. Case Studies

Case Study: Camden Council local Climate Assembly in July 2019^{iv} Similar to (2.10)

The **first session** focused on background information about climate change and the situation in Camden; **the second** looked at ideas for actions that could be taken in the home, at neighbourhood or council level; **and the third** focused on developing, prioritising and agreeing actions at all those levels. The Council's Commonplace platform also received 225 submissions to the Citizens Assembly from local people and organisations. The Council also worked with the Camden Climate Change Alliance to collect around 600 further ideas for action from local businesses.

The Citizens Assembly produced a list of 17 key actions, all of which had at least 75% support from its members. These were forwarded to a full Camden Council meeting in October 2019 and received unanimous support from Councillors of all political parties: Camden Council supports Citizens Assembly actions. Following more widespread community engagement, these actions set the direction of the Camden Climate Action Plan 2020-2025, which was published in June 2020.

An Evaluation of Camden Citizens Assembly was carried out by the Evaluation Team at University College London. Involve has also produced further information about Citizens Assemblies and Juries on Climate Change.

Case Study Durham County Council^v – Similar to (2.1) Opinion Poll

Consultation was undertaken between 19 September and 31 October 2019. It involved public and staff surveys, and meetings/presentations with Area Action Partnerships, Town and Parish Councils and special interest groups such as Extinction Rebellion. Over a thousand responses were received ranging from a simple questionnaire return to more comprehensive responses. In addition, the council coordinated specific schools and young people-based sessions during the period. The Council ran two sessions at County Hall for small groups of children to come together to share their ideas during collaborative workshops for primary and secondary aged pupils on one of the School Climate Strike Days.

In addition, through the council's ECO2 Smart Schools Programme they worked with their charity partner OASES (Outdoor and Sustainability Education Specialists) to go into 27 schools (nearly 400 pupils) to work with classes and eco-groups and gather their thoughts and feedback on how to become carbon neutral. The overwhelming feedback was that they wanted to get on with it and move faster.

The large volume of responses indicates a strong interest in the issue of climate change, and the details reveal support for the council's overall approach. Priorities identified for the council include reducing the need for travel, more renewable energy, existing buildings to be energy efficient, and new buildings to be as low carbon as possible. Priorities countywide include tree planting, reducing waste, more renewable energy, walking and cycling. It was clear from the responses that there was considerable appetite for partnership working, especially with utility companies. Arising from the consultation responses a two-year costed action plan was developed.

Doncaster^{vi}: Similar to (2.1) Opinion Poll

Doncaster have run a number of engagement activities including conferences and surveys, such as the 'Doncaster Talks' survey, with a great response from the community. Some of the key points from this survey are highlighted below:

- 451 responses received.

- 98% of respondents are extremely or somewhat aware of 'climate change' and 'global warming'.
- 61% said tackling climate change is extremely important to them, 30% said it is somewhat important.
- When asked what information would be useful to them, the top themes respondents cited were general information (e.g., more practical tips, resident's information pack), information about waste and recycling, information about how to make good choices regarding products and companies to use and information about local groups or initiatives such as organised fly tipping.
- 87% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the need for big changes to address climate change.
- When asked whether Doncaster should target resources on a few specific areas in the borough or spread resources evenly across all areas, respondents placed the emphasis almost halfway between the two options, but slightly closer to spreading resources evenly across the borough.
- 63% of respondents say the council should focus on improving the energy efficiency of its existing Council houses and building new homes to high environmental standards, while saying no to building developments that are not at the highest environmental standards even if this results in those developments not going ahead.
- 75% of respondents think they have enough information to take action in response to climate change.

Guildford Borough Council^{vii} (Planning Services Environmental Projects team) – Similar to (2.4) Participatory Strategic Planning

As a result of a building development near to Kingpost Parade, funds became available for environmental improvements to the area through a negotiated planning contribution from the development. A consultation took place in 2010 to find out what improvements residents and the community thought most important at the shopping parade. Owners of the shops were contacted and flyers left with tear-off strips for comments. A gazebo was erected on the site to attract shop visitors, and a website page was created to register responses. A meeting was also held at the Sutherland Community Hall where local people could look at the plans and ask any questions they had about the project. Detailed plans have since been drawn up based upon the comments received and these will be publicised via the Burpham Community Association and by direct contact with the Parade businesses and residents. Notices of the intended work will also be pinned up to inform shoppers and passers-by, shop keepers and residents notified and the website page updated.

South Gloucestershire^{viii}: Climate Emergency Community Engagement Group – Similar to (2.3) User Panels or (2.7) Citizen Advisory Groups

CVS South Gloucestershire and the council are jointly coordinating community engagement events, working with groups as well as individuals and businesses across the district to scale up action in our area. This group meets to discuss how to work together and scale up our area wide response to the climate emergency. A steering group consisting of members from different communities and organisations help to shape the group's agenda. This helps by:

- Working with communities to find and deliver their own solutions.
- Providing high quality support services to develop the capability and capacity of local voluntary and community organisations.
- Enabling communities to have a strong voice locally and further afield.
- Supporting communities and voluntary and community groups to come together to share knowledge and spread expertise.
- Supporting the development of leadership in our communities.

Leeds City Council^{ix} – Citizens Jury – Similar to (2.7) Citizen Advisory Groups

Leeds City Council declared a Climate Emergency on 27 March 2019, along with a commitment to work to make Leeds carbon neutral by 2030. In response, a Citizens Jury was set up and financed by Leeds Climate Commission, an independent advisory group with members from key local organisations and businesses. The Citizens Jury was run by Leeds Climate Commission working with Shared Future CIC, and tasked with producing recommendations to guide the future work of the Commission and other organisations across the city. An oversight panel was set up to ensure the process was unbiased and fair with a wide range of different local organisations from Extinction Rebellion to the Leeds Chamber of Commerce.

The panel made decisions about the recruitment process and the jury profile and selected 22 expert commentators who gave presentations to the jury and answered questions from them. Professional facilitators from Shared Future supported the jurors throughout the process. The Citizens' Jury began on 12 September 2019, running for a total of 30 hours over nine sessions, ending on 3 November. The jurors produced recommendations which were presented at a launch event on Monday 25 November 2019, and subsequently to Leeds City Council's Climate Emergency Advisory Committee in January 2020: Shared Future report on Leeds Citizens Jury.

The contribution of the Leeds Climate Change Citizens' Jury was referenced in Leeds City Council's Climate Emergency Update report of 7 January 2020, which described the council's work to date and set out a Climate Emergency Strategy, which will result in more than halving Leeds' carbon emissions by 2025. The report noted: "The citizen's jury did demonstrate that given exposure to the evidence in an intensive environment, the majority of people became engaged and recognised the role they can play. This will be hard to replicate for the population as a whole but an essential part of the city's strategy must be a determined and on-going programme of awareness raising in order to influence personal behaviour change."

York^x: Similar to (2.11) Positive Deviance

In promoting greener lifestyles, "high potential" neighbourhoods were targeted with regard to reducing CO₂ emissions from transport and housing. The sample population was based on those residents who lived on streets in two selected areas. Questionnaire surveys on household consumption over a 12-month period were used before the intervention to measure its effect on the household carbon footprint in the areas of home energy, travel, consumables etc. Participants were recruited on the doorstep from the selected neighbourhoods in November/December 2009.

Approximately 500 households were targeted in the two areas and residents were then invited to a neighbourhood workshop where their carbon footprint was calculated based on their completed questionnaire survey. Those residents who could not attend the workshop were invited to return the completed questionnaire by post. All residents who had completed and returned their questionnaire survey were invited to a local team meeting where they received an assessment of their carbon footprint and a chance to meet fellow participants. The personalised carbon footprint showed their total carbon footprint, where they were in relation to other members of the team and highlighted actions they could take to achieve a 10 per cent reduction in their CO₂ e emissions.

The participants were asked to complete a second questionnaire at the end of the intervention period. The post-intervention questionnaire survey examined activities of the last six months and this was standardised over a 12-month period to allow a comparison of change. The results therefore provide an estimate of the potential reduction in CO₂ e emissions if the behavioural change achieved in the six-month intervention period were continued for the rest of the year. The 49 participants who completed the challenge have an estimated average carbon footprint reduction of 2.0 tonnes of CO₂ e/year. This is a total reduction of 11.3

per cent. The largest reductions were seen in the area of shopping, housing (heating and powering the home) with an average reduction of over 20 per cent in both cases. The area of food showed the smallest reduction (4.6 per cent)

4. Scoring Methodology

In order to assess the relative worthiness of each method, a number of key variables were selected which relate to the objectives of the overall community engagement, those being maximum engagement with the community, with a high level of detail and at the lowest cost and time expenses. These variables are:

- Cost
- Length of process
- Number of participants
- Feedback detail
- Discussion Potential
- Participant variation
- Communication of results (COR)

To quantify these variables for a quick comparison, a scoring matrix has been comprised which outlines the varying criteria each variable is being measured against, with higher scores being preferred (Table 1). Each method has then been compared against this matrix for each variable based on the information available to give an initial value (Table 2).

However, this does not factor in the various importance of each variable. In order to incorporate this key aspect, each variable has been assigned a weighting within a separate matrix (Table 3). While all these variables are important, as the primary goals of engagement are to get the views of the community as much as possible and in the most detail possible, with lower time and cost expenses due to budget availability, these are the variables which have been attributed relatively higher weightings.

By then combining the two, multiplying the variables scores against the weighting, it outlines the overall score for each engagement method (Table 4). From this the total scores can be compared to identify the best options moving forward.

Table 1. Scoring system for engagement options:

Table Rating	5	4	3	2	1
Cost	Under £1000	Up to £5000	Up to £10000	Up to £20000	£40,000 +
Length of process	4 weeks	8 weeks	12 weeks	16 weeks	32 weeks +
Number of participants	2000+	Up to 1000	Up to 250	Up to 100	Up to 50
Feedback detail	Detailed, descriptive information addressing specific issues.	Predominantly written responses with useful ideas and discussion points.	Mixed quantitative and qualitative information.	Mainly numerical based but with opportunity for some suggestions.	Purely statistical.
Discussion Potential	Lots of discussion between participants and chance for feedback to be reinput into the decisions.	Moderated format to ensure all opinions are heard and all points discussed equally.	Participants encouraged to work together to discuss solutions.	Opportunity provided for participants to discuss issues as a group.	Done on an individual basis
Participant variation	Very varied, engagement from multiple sources with different viewpoints.	Largely varied backgrounds/agendas etc with moderation to ensure all opinions are heard and all points discussed equally.	Reasonably mixed group, with opportunity for all present to voice their opinions.	Still largely led by activists but with more general public members at least aware and involved.	Low variety, usual suspects present, dominated by a few individuals, often with similar agendas.
Communication of results (COR)	Easy to demonstrate the outcomes with a quick feedback turnaround.	Allows for clear graphs or visual data. Or delivers clear actions to communicate.	Quality of results is good but can be difficult to understand and take some time.	Large amounts of data with mixed and conflicting responses.	Very slow results and difficult to relate the results into useful communication.

Table 2. Weightings of decision variables. Relative importance of the factors: 5 - very important and 1 - unimportant:

Weighting	5	4	3	2	1
Cost		x			
Length of process		x			
Number of participants	x				
Participant variation			x		
Feedback detail		x			
Discussion Potential				x	
Communication of results (COR)			x		

Table 3. Initial assessment of options:

Community participation method	Cost	Length of Process	Number of Participants	Participant variation	Feedback Detail	Discussion Potential	COR	Total
Opinion Poll	4	4	4	3	2	1	5	23
Community Appraisal	3	1	3	4	5	4	4	24
User Panels	4	1	1	5	5	5	3	24
Participatory Strategic Planning	4	5	1	4	3	5	3	25
Focus Groups	5	5	1	3	5	5	4	28
Feedback Kiosks	4	3	4	3	2	1	5	22
Citizens Advisory Groups	4	2	1	4	5	5	4	25
21 st century town meeting	1	5	5	4	3	4	1	23
Area Forums	5	4	1	1	5	5	3	24
Citizens Assembly	1	3	3	5	5	4	1	22
Positive Deviance	4	1	3	3	5	5	4	25
Conversation Cafes	4	4	2	2	4	5	4	25
Crowd Wise	3	3	5	4	3	2	4	24
Crowd-sourcing	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	24
E-Panels	4	4	4	3	2	1	5	23

Table 4. Overall matrix of combined assessment with weightings:

Community participation method	Cost	Length of Process	Number of Participants	Participant variation	Feedback Detail	Potential for Discussion	COR	Total
Opinion Poll	16	20	20	9	8	2	15	90
Community Appraisal	12	5	15	12	20	8	12	84
User Panels	16	5	5	15	20	10	9	80
Participatory Strategic Planning	16	25	5	12	12	10	9	89
Focus Groups	20	25	5	9	20	10	12	101
Feedback Kiosks	16	15	20	9	8	2	15	85
Citizens Advisory Groups	16	10	5	12	20	10	12	85
21 st century town meeting	4	25	25	12	12	8	3	89
Area Forums	20	20	5	3	20	10	9	87
Citizens Assembly	4	15	15	15	20	8	3	80
Positive Deviance	16	5	15	9	20	10	12	87
Conversation Cafes	16	20	5	9	16	10	12	88
Crowd Wise	12	15	25	12	12	4	12	92
Crowd-sourcing	16	20	20	9	12	6	9	92
E-Panels	16	20	20	9	8	2	15	90

5. Conclusions

Table 4 is colour coded to highlight the relative scores and associated preferences for each method based on all the criteria and weightings, with 7 green options being highest, 5 yellow following them, and 3 orange being the least preferred. This was originally intended to be an even split of 5 in each category, however due to the similarity of some of the options, they have been counted together and have skewed such numbers slightly. I.e., Crowd-wise and Crowdsourcing are very similar in the context due to the crowd-voting element contained within the processes, while e-panels and opinion polls are effectively the same for these purposes. Therefore, these would be the priority options recommended to use in future community engagement approaches as they will maximise the return.

Even though the high scoring options were close total scores, they achieved their totals in very different ways in terms of the different variables which they did best in. Indeed, this summary table shows clearly how good each option is for each variable, meaning that depending on preferences for these variables, the large selection available here allows for the best option to be selected to meet each requirement, which may vary depending on the topic.

By following these recommended engagement methods and acting on the subsequent feedback, it will help improve the council's action plan and identify new actions to close the carbon emissions shortfall identified in the Climate Emergency Action Plan. Moreover, simply engaging with the public and businesses through many of these methods both helps raise awareness of issues and can promote behavioural changes towards this goal.

Throughout this process it is important to include and communicate often with other relevant council bodies, such as the planning team, transport, and environmental services among others, as the success of resulting actions will rely on their involvement.

6. Recommendations

The goal of this assessment is to understand what more can the council do to encourage behavioural change amongst residents. Based on these results, the primary recommendation to engage with residents would be focus groups, being the only option to score over 100, out of a possible 130.

This option provides great opportunities for detailed discussion into topics, where attendees can bounce ideas off each other and generate new unique solutions to issues which the council may not have considered previously. Such high detail qualitative data is particularly useful to fully understand the motivations behind behaviours, what influences decisions and some of the barriers which may be preventing adoption of measures.

This method will allow targeting of relevant stakeholders to join specific workshops on a topic they may specialise in, such as teachers on schools or distribution companies for transport, benefitting from expert knowledge in these areas. These groups are also a low cost option with a relatively quick turnaround, both from conception and analysis stages, but also for the sessions themselves, being reasonably short and so causing minimal disruption to the council and residents involved.

Responses from these groups could also be used as starting points for other engagement options to gauge the wider responses to suggestions, such as integrating them into the below e-panels, for maximum effectiveness.

These e-panels would be the second option we would recommend pursuing as soon as possible, thanks to their similarly high score and particularly their ease of use, both for the council in terms of analysis and for residents to complete, being all done online so safe during the ongoing COVID-19 situation, also saving running costs of printing, delivery, staff and venues in the process.

This process will provide a large amount of usable data which can be utilised not just for developing a greater understanding of residents thoughts, but also for important carbon accounting figures and potentially for use in marketing material. This option is one of the simplest and most open available, meaning it should be accessible by all, enabling everyone to input their ideas and feel included in the process, greatly increasing the likelihood they will be engaged in any climate related actions, helping to close the gap to achieve a net zero carbon Borough by 2030.

By combining focus groups with e-panels and using the ideas garnered from the focus groups within the questionnaires, it ensures high quality feedback, eliminating the only potential downside of this option, so, maximising the benefits gained. This remains one of the lowest cost options and a very quick process in terms of creating the questions and gathering results, alongside completion for users, meaning engagement will be higher thanks to this simplicity.

7. Next Steps

Officers will develop an approach to deliver community deliberative processes based on the work done to assess engagement methods.

Key areas for discussion will be identified, following the CEAP priorities and largest emitters:

- Drive less – reducing car ownership, modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling more, transitioning to electric vehicles;
- Energy– reduce energy consumption by adopting better behaviours, improving our homes, adopting green technologies;
- Waste - reduce the amount of waste generated and improve our recycling behaviours;
- Food - eat less meat and dairy products, consume seasonal produce;
- Conscious consumption - shop local, use less plastic, avoid fast fashion, staycation;
- Support biodiversity - plant or adopt a tree, support local gardens, give home to nature.

They will also discuss motivations, influences, aims and barriers.

Because climate emergency is a high profile issue the value of public engagement to inform decision making has been given a lot of current emphasis by both local and central government. However, public deliberative process should be a corporate response, and the council should look at engaging with the community across a number of topics going forward.

8. Resources

The cost to deliver the recommended community deliberative process will be identified through the suggested approach. It is expected that there is an associated cost from engaging skilled facilitators with experience in planning the discussion guides, analysis of results and the recruitment of relevant and diverse participants. Some costs may arise from producing marketing materials, administrative capabilities, and use of venues if the events are hosted publicly.

There is an assumption that participants will be volunteers, a scenario which is not unlikely due to the level of interest in this topic within the community, however, were incentives to be required, this would increase the cost.

Internally, it will require noticeable time in preparation and analysis, consideration will be given to some of these engagement methods being more resource intensive than others and will require the support of multiple teams within the council.

9. References

- ⁱ <https://ashden.org/news/how-can-councils-engage-citizens-in-climate-action/>
- ⁱⁱ <https://www.apse.org.uk/apse/assets/File/Engagement%20Survey%20Doc%202021%20Final.pdf>
- ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.involve.org.uk/resources/methods?show=pager&page=0%2C1>
- ^{iv} <https://www.apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/local-authority-energy-collaboration/apse-energy-publications1/climate-emergency-public-engagement-survey/>
- ^v <https://www.apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/local-authority-energy-collaboration/apse-energy-publications1/climate-emergency-public-engagement-survey/>
- ^{vi} https://dmbcwebstolive01.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/Environmental/Documents/Doncaster%20Talks%20Environment%202020%20-%20response%20analysis%20summary_.pdf
- ^{vii} www.guildford.gov.uk/kingpostparade
- ^{viii} <https://www.southglos.gov.uk/environment/climate-change/climate-emergency-community-engagement/>
<https://cvs-sg.org.uk/>
- ^{ix} https://www.leedsclimate.org.uk/sites/default/files/REPORT%20V1.1%20FINAL_0.pdf
- ^x https://mediamanager.sei.org/documents/Publications/Rethinking-development/SEI-Green-NeighbourhoodChallenge-Project_report.pdf

This page is intentionally left blank