

HOW DOES THE FRAMING OF CLIMATE CHANGE AFFECT THE CONCLUSIONS REACHED IN CLIMATE ASSEMBLIES?

Draft Research Briefing, 1 June 2021

Dr Chris Shaw, Research Programme Lead, Climate Outreach

Dr Susie Wang, Researcher, Climate Outreach

Briony Latter, PhD researcher, Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, Cardiff University.

*NOTE: This draft Briefing has been prepared on a short timescale for the launch of the Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA) to inform discussion and debate amongst network members. A final version of the briefing will be produced that reflects on feedback from the launch and further evidence. **Please do not cite this draft briefing without permission of the authors.** Please send any comments on the draft to info@knoca.eu.*

KNOCA is a new European network for sharing best practice on the design and implementation of climate assemblies. The network will host events and produce a range of practical resources, as well as coordinating research activities. We welcome individuals and organisations with experience or interest in either commissioning, running or analysing these processes and their outputs in Europe. Please reach out to us to share, discuss and inform best practice and new developments in climate assembly design, delivery and analysis.

1. Key insights

- Research on deliberative processes like citizens' assemblies suggests that distinct policy remits make processes more tangible to participants.
- The remit of climate assemblies has been broad and focused almost exclusively on mitigation. Most assemblies have had to break into smaller workstreams to work on specific aspects of the climate agenda.
- There is no neutral way of framing climate change. The choice of information and how it is presented always represents a particular viewpoint.
- Values are as important (if not more important) than technical knowledge in making judgements about climate change.
- People learn in different ways. Presentation styles in climate assemblies tend to rely on standard presentation techniques such as powerpoint that privilege particular participants.
- The solutions-focused orientation of climate assemblies is an effective way of bringing everyday people into deliberations on complex issues like climate.

2. Recommendations

- Assemblies should also be designed to inform climate action for adaptation
- Rather than a single assembly dealing with extensive agendas, commissioners should consider parallel or sequenced assemblies on more specific aspects of the climate crisis to enable richer proposals from citizens.
- The design of assemblies needs to provide space to recognise and explore values as much as technical questions.
- Allowing participants a say in who presents increases the autonomy of participants
- The move to online assemblies opens up new ways of presenting and digesting information. Commissioners and designers need to explore how best to combine the best of face-to-face and online environments as we move out of Covid restrictions.
- Willing participants should be supported to act as peer communicators at the end of the assembly, and beyond.
- Research and evaluation programmes of assemblies should focus on how climate change is framed within assemblies, how this is experienced by participants and how this supports the decision-making process of commissioners and other political actors.

3. The challenge

The successful implementation of climate change policy is shaped by a range of political, social, scientific, technical and psychological factors. If climate assemblies (CAs) are to contribute to successful climate action it is important that the recommendations emerging from CAs are grounded in a process that accounts for these factors. It is not enough that the process runs smoothly and that all participants report enjoying being part of the assembly (important as these things are). Consideration also needs to be given to the extensive evidence base on how people engage with the complexities and uncertainties emergent from the climate science/policy interface. Issues for consideration in the design of a CA that should be shaped by this evidence include the scope and topics that will be covered, the narratives and framing of the information, the messengers through which information is conveyed and the ways in which participants engage with the topics.

This briefing begins by summarising the kinds of climate action that national level climate assemblies in Europe set out to achieve and how those climate action remits were selected. The subsequent sections address how decisions are made about how to frame the information provided. Framing, for the purposes of this briefing, covers themes such as what information to present, what elements of that information are prioritised, who is chosen to present the information and what formats are used to communicate the information. The discussion draws on the literature which highlights the importance of values in determining how people respond to information about climate change, and the way framing embodies certain values or assumptions about the world.

4. What are the remits of national level CAs in Europe?

CA remits can, in theory at least, address policies to mitigate climate change, adapt to the impacts or both, though it is notable that to date no national-level CA has focused solely on adaptation issues. (See *Appendix 1* for a summary of remits and processes employed in European national level CAs). These approaches each come with their own implications for the processes and outputs.

Within the short history of national-level CAs, the tendency has been to adopt broader objectives. For example, Citizens' Assembly UK (CAUK) asked the question, 'How can the UK reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050?'. The French CA broadened this remit further, adding in considerations of justice: 'How to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 40% by 2030, in a spirit of social justice?'. The Jersey Climate Conversation was broader still, with the date for action left open: 'How should we work together to become carbon neutral?'. A well defined policy remit, such as "how can the the electricity supply be decarbonised by a particular date", is arguably likely to lead to more detailed and actionable outcomes aligned with existing climate action goals and a process that is easier to navigate for participants. Research shows that deliberation processes are most successful when there are distinct policy questions that need to be answered, and these questions need to be specific enough to allow for in-depth conversation around tangible implications and processes (Devaney et al., 2020).

A number of CAs have made efforts to specify normative descriptions for how objectives should be achieved, embedding themes such as fairness, justice and balancing multiple interests, for instance, that climate change action is done in a "an effective and fair way" (Scotland), "a spirit of social justice" (France) and in a manner that is "good for us, good for our environment and good for our country" (Germany).

For broader or more abstract aims, such as ensuring climate policies are fair or just, it may be more difficult to build productive engagement and distinct outcomes. Perceptions of fairness are an important part of ensuring public acceptance of policies, with policies perceived as unfair unlikely to win broad public support (Sovacool et al., 2017; Moberg et al., 2018). From a climate mitigation perspective there is a large literature on the differing understandings of fairness and justice in energy transitions which may be difficult for lay audiences to engage with in the time allowed within an assembly (for discussions of these complexities see Jenkins et al., 2016; McCauley, Heffron and Jenkins, 2013; Sovacool and Dworkin, 2015; McCauley and Heffron, 2018; Walker, 2012; Caney, 2016). Both Scotlands' CA and CAUK had specific expert input on questions of fairness, developing principles to guide their development and choice of recommendations. The extent to which questions of fairness developed within a CA can be said to provide the basis for developing a policy agenda for a just climate response is an important consideration. If the assembly chooses to address fairness in adaptation, is fairness to be considered only within the borders of the country concerned, or are more cosmopolitan perspectives on justice to be brought into play, given the impacts of climate change will fall disproportionately on the world's poorest (IPCC, 2001)? Ultimately, it is important to make a judgement call on whether to focus on narrower framings which can produce clear and quicker results, but which may exclude wider related issues, or choose a broader framing that allows for more topics and perspectives but may be slower and lead to less tangible recommendations (Bryant and Stone, 2020).

Yves Dejaeghere, Director of the Foundation for Innovation in Democracy in Europe (FIDE) explains the challenge as follows:

"You can size up remits to almost global scale if you want, but in interaction with assembly-time, a very large framing of the remit will lead to a possibly banal output. Give people a weekend to discuss the future of Europe ... and you will get what I call "koala bear" recommendations...they are nice and cuddly ("the EU must be inclusive" "the EU must show solidarity" "the EU must tackle inequality", "the EU must do more on the Climate"). Everything nice and all, but nothing specific enough so it's actually controllable afterwards..." (Yves Dejaeghere, email, 17th March 2021).

One of the challenges of a broad remit is that most CAs, with the exception of the Irish and Finnish initiatives, have had to separate participants into a number of sub-topics. For example, in France this was transport; food; consumption; work and production; housing. Scotland broke into four workstreams: diet and lifestyle; homes and communities; work and travel. This may allow the CA to cover more topics, but may also reduce legitimacy of decisions made.

“Now, these small subgroups actually make policy-recommendations for an important subfield of national policy (“energy”) but de facto consist of two dozen citizens...The French convention split 150 citizens up in 5 subgroups, that were therefore maximum 30 citizens. That does drive down the representation and legitimacy, but also possibly the quality. (Yves Dejaeghere, email, 17th March 2021)

If the model of a learning phase, deliberation phase and recommendation phase leads to divisions of the assembly into small sub groups with potentially deleterious effects on the quality and legitimacy of the outputs then it may be of value to have assemblies deal with narrower or tighter agendas, separating elements in different assemblies or exploring alternatives to the assembly structure.

The exact balance of directed focus and flexibility in assembly remit will in many cases depend on the perspective of the policy actors commissioning the CA (the German CA appears to be an exception, where the remit was set by the foundation funding the work, though with significant input later on from German policy actors [IFOK, email, 24th May 2021]). In each case, there is a tension between connecting the task and recommendations with specific outcomes, and allowing assembly participants agency and scope to explore new options and bring in their values and priorities (Kahan and Carpenter, 2017). For instance, engaging citizens too late in the process of policy development – when fundamental elements can no longer be changed and where there is little space for assembly participants to make a difference – is disingenuous and can erode trust (Devaney et al., 2020). Structural differences in the autonomy afforded participants can be seen by comparing Scotland’s Climate Assembly, where three weekends were allocated to participants to review and refine recommendations they had crafted themselves, and CAUK where participants made decisions over one weekend primarily on policy options that had been pre-prepared by organisers. Not ensuring adequate agency for participants may not only have an effect on the outcome of CAs, it may erode the integrity of the participatory process. Regardless of whether a broad or narrow framing is chosen, the process should be framed clearly and simply so that assembly participants know what is expected of them (climateXchange, 2020).

5. Implications of different ways of framing climate change in CAs

This section examines the implications of different framings climate change, for example whether the topic is framed as a technical or political issue, and what values are – either implicitly or explicitly – embedded in that framing.

There are no “neutral” ways of communicating about climate change (Capstick et al., 2020). Information always represents a particular viewpoint, and so care needs to be taken to understand the implications of various choices. All information is ‘framed’ in some way - framing simply means using language to convey an idea in a particular way, or in a certain light (Nisbet, 2009).

Climate change can be framed in many ways (e.g., as a scientific issue, an environmental issue, an economic issue, a technical issue, a public health issue, a justice issue or a moral or spiritual issue; Badullovich, Grant and Colvin, 2020). Different framings of climate change mean highlighting or downplaying different aspects of the issue (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2021). These choices have implications for how people engage with the topics, and ultimately the choices they make. For

example, framing climate change in ways that foreground issues that are difficult to engage with, such as complexity, and uncertainty, risk overwhelming citizens and increasing feelings of hopelessness and helplessness (Chapman et al., 2016; O’Neill et al., 2013).

Knowledge about the details of climate science, climate policies and technical issues (themes dominant in CAs) is not what the social sciences literature has identified as the most important factors shaping people's attitudes to climate risk and climate policies. Values, worldviews and political ideology are much more fundamental in shaping views about energy and climate change than knowledge of policies or technical matters (Bouman et al., 2021; Corner and Clarke, 2017; Hornsey, 2021). It is crucial to attend to the role values play, for two reasons. The way climate change is framed to the assembly participants can alter how it is understood, and how decisions and deliberations proceed. For example, if the framing of the issues carries an ideological imprint then that may cause the proposal to be rejected on those grounds, rather than because of any substantive concerns about the policy itself. Secondly, given that public audiences outside of the CA will judge the outcomes on the basis of their values and worldviews, if those elements of the understanding and deliberation have not been built into the process, subsequent communications (a key aspect of CA remits) will not be informed by knowledge of how values have shaped the responses. As a result public acceptance of the recommendations may be low, and hence undermine the ability for climate action to be taken on the basis of the recommendations.

6. What kind of information is presented in CAs?

Decisions about what information to present in the CAs held to date (see *Appendix 1* for summaries of the information presented in different CAs) are largely driven by the policy actions the process is designed to support.

“The Danish Climate Assembly agenda was written by the relevant Danish ministries, and the format was designed to fit the Danish situation and the specific fact that Denmark has a law based yearly process on climate action plan decision-making. It is not an “overview” of the problem and its solutions Denmark needs – it is a qualified discussion of the single elements of the transition, their mutual connections/interdependencies.” (Email communication, Danish Board of Technology, 21st May 2021)

Organisers of climate assemblies will involve climate experts in different ways – whether as co-designers of the process (e.g. in CAUK) or as advisors, providing recommendations on content and potential speakers. There remains a risk though that the kinds of information selected for inclusion may be more closely aligned with the needs of the policy actors rather than the participants and thus may not be an accurate representation of what concerns participants most about climate change and climate policies. Danish practice is of interest here as organisers provide participants with a list of potential expert witnesses, leaving it up to participants to decide who is most relevant to their interests and giving them space to request specific expert input.

Certain elements of the communication of climate change, from the complexity of its physical dimensions, feedback loops, and interactions of different systems, to distant time horizons and scientific uncertainty, can make climate change difficult for lay audiences to relate to. According to psychological research, all of these elements can work to undermine people’s engagement with the issue, and promote “wait and see” attitudes, and are used as reasons for inaction (Budescu, Por and Broomell, 2012; Sterman, 2008). Discussing near-term impacts and policies and actions, (as opposed to long-term policy goals such as atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases in 2050) as well as discussing the intermediate steps needed to achieve distant goals and policies can be helpful in engaging participants with the near-term climate policy agenda (Spence, Poortinga and Pidgeon, 2011;

Wang et al., 2021). Given that CAs focus on solutions and provide participants with a clear near-term pathway for taking action, the risks of inaction may be overcome in this setting.

As well as acknowledging a range of value positions, deliberative processes need to be attuned to the substantial body of research that shows that people's perspectives are sensitive to the way in which climate change is communicated. This covers both the discursive and visual imagery used to illustrate and communicate climate change (Hart and Feldman, 2016).

A common division in the framing of climate change is between its causes and impacts, and actions to address it (often termed 'solutions'). Climate assemblies are solution-focused by design. Focusing on solutions can enable greater consensus - and foster support for policies because they often address multiple benefits, not just to the climate (e.g., transit-centered development for health and quality of life, as well as reduced carbon emissions; Kahan and Carpenter, 2017; Bain et al., 2016; Myers et al., 2012). However, trade-offs may still need to be made. When "solutions" are highlighted, citizens can envision a positive future and work towards a concrete goal, building a sense of collective and individual efficacy (Roser-Renouf et al., 2014).

There's also evidence to suggest that there is greater interest in solutions among the public. The Irish citizens' assembly included a period of public submissions from a wider audience than those who participated directly in deliberations, and thus was able to gauge public interest in various topics (Devaney et al., 2020). The most common topics submitted were about national policy, emissions reduction, renewable energy and community engagement - notably all remedies and actions to address climate change, rather than impacts or causes.

7. Who should present the information?

Climate assemblies use a range of messengers to communicate information to members including academics, experts, activists and campaigners, and other stakeholders. It is important to identify and use messengers who are going to be trusted by the participants (Markowitz and Guckian, 2018). There are often differences between countries, for example, a high proportion of the British population trust professors and scientists to tell the truth (83% and 82% respectively) compared to 60% for civil servants and only 16% for government ministers (Ipsos MORI, 2020). However, people in Germany and Norway trust institutions to transform the energy sector more than they do in the UK and France (Steentjes et al., 2017).

Scientists are well trusted communicators on climate change (National Academy of Sciences, 2017). The challenge is not to bombard people with science as they will find it difficult to engage with the material on this basis. Trust is also driven by the extent to which a communicator speaks authentically, drawing on their own experiences and perspective (ibid).

The selection of speakers is another area in which the participatory process can contribute. For instance, while the majority of speakers for the Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat were selected by the governance committee, members of the assembly were also able to suggest speakers (Eymard, 2020). Allowing participants a say in who presents may help to ensure that trusted messengers are represented and lend greater legitimacy to the process. However, as a general rule speakers are chosen by a steering committee or advisory board which does not include public representation but is made up of various experts (Yves Dejaeghere, email, 17th March, 2021).

It is also important that the voice given to presenters does not detract from deliberation time. CAs can vary greatly both in the allocated and actual time given for expert feedback compared to deliberation.

For example, a review of the Irish citizens' assembly described this process in the Irish Citizens' Assembly:

"The ICA's chair, the Hon. Ms. Justice Mary Laffoy, in conformity with her habitus of Supreme Court judge, led the debates with an assertive approach, leaving little space for contestation to arise among participants, which can be a problem from an 'agonistic perspective of democracy'... Her use of time tended to favor expert lectures, which often ran over their allocated time, over the small groups and plenary session deliberation time... Jack Blaney in British Columbia adopted a 'liberal approach,' letting "members talk as much as they wished even if this meant going over time." (Courant, 2021)

8. How should the presentation of information be structured?

Deciding how much information to provide and how to structure the assembly to give participants time to address the issues remains an unresolved challenge:

"For Climate assemblies, how much can citizens 'chew' in a few weekends and get valuable recommendations out? In some instances from the evaluations of the French Convention, some citizens seem to have found it a bit a daunting task...The less time you give for a larger subject, the more experts will be in the driver seat as citizens do not have an amazing amount of time to work themselves into all the subtleties of all the sub questions of everything that comes with climate policy" (Yves Dejaeghere, email, 17th March 2021)

Much of the literature on climate change framing also comes from unidirectional communications, where information is transferred from the source to the recipient (Badullovič, Grant and Colvin, 2020). However, citizens' assemblies, as well as wider society, involve two-way, or multi-dimensional forms of communication from a multitude of actors. By starting from a point of *deliberation* rather than *persuasion*, the different ways in which climate change is framed and the meanings associated with them can be scrutinised (Romsdahl, 2020). In the context of CAs, this can be a starting point to open up dialogue and generate constructive discussion.

Within the category of climate change 'solutions', previous citizens' assemblies have focused on consumption emissions, and split topics according to major sectors (transport, residential, food, purchasing). Others have chosen to look at select elements of both the production and consumption side, (e.g., energy systems and electricity vs. household usage). Detailed consideration of consumption emissions may be particularly important for national-level CAs debating policies such as 'net zero', as consumption-based accounting includes emissions that are imported from other countries, but consumed domestically (e.g., goods), and exported internationally (Davis and Caldeira, 2010) - both important to ensure that recommended policies do not simply offshore emissions to other nations. However, the exact delineation of these topics may depend on the scope and aims of the assembly, for instance, whether the scale at which the assembly operates (e.g., city or local authority level, state or national level) has oversight of energy production processes.

It has been suggested that key considerations when addressing solutions in citizens' assemblies include allocating an equal amount of time for each presentation by experts and stakeholders, to avoid the appearance of bias or favouritism (Gerwin, 2018). Yet how the decision that these topics or sub-topics are deserving of equivalent treatment is not made clear, and the idea of balance seems to be more normative than based on a robust evidence base. As Yves Dejaeghere asks, "are food and housing actually equal parts of the problem?" (Yves Dejaeghere, email, 17th March 2021). In the

case of the UK CA, the thematic division with equal attention paid to each theme was seen as necessary to ensure the assembly produced outcomes that are suitable for climate action, namely produced insight Parliament could more easily use to scrutinise government climate action (Sarah Allan, Involve, 21st May 2021). It seems the time needed to allow the whole assembly to address every issue is prohibitive (Sarah Allan, Involve, 21st May 2021).

9. What formats should be used to present information?

Citizens' assemblies may benefit from using a range of presentation methods (Breckon, Hopkins and Rickey, 2019), both physical and digital. While standard presentations and Q&A sessions are typical, activities incorporating physical materials such as flip charts and Post-it notes can be used to vary the type of engagement. There are also methods such as visioning (e.g. imagining what a future scenario might look like), participatory mapping (working on a map in a group to address local issues), learning experiences (e.g. activities and visits outside of the assembly), scenarios (used in UK and Scotland CAs) and art forms (Bryant and Stone, 2020).

While some forms of creative public engagement with climate change such as art and improvisation have usually been used for raising awareness rather than deliberation, these are still useful and innovative methods of communicating climate change with people (climateXchange, 2020). Science animations are particularly suitable "for conveying complex and abstract facts" (Boy, Bucher and Christ, 2020, p.14), and therefore may be well-suited for climate change communication. "Narrative explanatory films" – videos which address a scientific question mainly through moving images and storytelling as well as providing information – are a suitable presentation format as they keep the viewers' attention well and help them to acquire a high level of knowledge (ibid.). Research has also shown that decision-makers respond well to "interactive, non-technical approaches" to presenting climate change information such as photographs, case studies and direct personal experience of issues (Reis and Ballinger, 2020, p.6). Research on climate change imagery outlines several principles for effective visual communication of climate change, including showing humans, the scale of climate change causes and emotionally powerful impacts, including local impacts, and emphasise the need to understand the target audience and show new stories (Climate Visuals, n.d.; Chapman et al., 2016).

Emotions can play an important role in climate change communication. For example, although climate change can cause anxiety (Cunsolo et al., 2020), fear can be effective if used alongside efficacy or hope (Kleres and Wettergren, 2017; Nabi, Gustafson and Jensen, 2018). It has been argued that climate assemblies should "foster emotionally intelligent participation" where people's hopes and fears can be addressed and they can engage emotionally with climate change (Mellier and Wilson, 2020). This claim is aligned with the point stressed in this briefing paper, that people make sense of climate change from the position of their values. The framing of climate information in the assembly should attend to this fact.

Finally, in the current global context, citizens' assemblies may need to adapt to online formats and alter how climate change information is communicated. The Climate Assembly UK and one meeting of the Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat were among the first citizens' assemblies to be conducted online. From these examples, we have learned that many key elements of citizens' assemblies were able to operate without modification, such as listening to and questioning speakers, small group discussions and voting, and the same amount of time could still be spent on each activity virtually. Adjustments may also be required for people with visual impairments or other needs which could impact their engagement in an online assembly (climateXchange, 2020). With these considerations in mind, online citizens' assemblies may also offer a range of benefits, such as greater inclusivity and accessibility for participants and experts from dispersed or remote locations, a wide range of digital technologies supporting different forms of learning, deliberation, and decision-making, and a lower carbon footprint and overall cost of operation (Sandover, Moseley and Devine-Wright, 2020).

10. Future network activities

The findings of the Briefing suggest a number of avenues for further network activity in relation to framing.

- Further analysis of the implications of design choices in existing climate assemblies for how climate change was framed, both for participants and policy makers.
- Consideration of how other forms of learning can be integrated into climate assemblies – for example from work on imagining futures.
- Design and pilot different approaches to framing, structure and remits in order to clarify for policymakers and delivery bodies the variety of options available and how these can support learning and deliberation within assemblies.
- Research on how to align the framing of climate communication within the assembly space with the way climate change is communicated and encountered by the public outside the assembly process so that a common language and set of objectives can be identified and used by key stakeholders and influencers.
- Draw lessons from other climate deliberation spaces on how climate assemblies can integrate more “bottom up” design or consider how climate assemblies can be integrated with other forms of climate deliberation to support climate action.
- We know participants are enthused by the experience of participation and often become evangelists for climate action. How can the assembly transformation be replicated at scale easily and cheaply to build that engagement across societies?
- Try new approaches to designing the content of assemblies to broaden the meaning of climate action, by improving knowledge of the net zero future, the climate risks it presents and the adaptations needed to cope with it.

11. Research methods

A rapid desk review of the peer reviewed literature was conducted for this research brief to provide an overview of current knowledge and understanding on different aspects of the practice of climate assemblies and climate communication. This was supplemented with review of a number of reports, as well as informal interviews and emails exchanges with researchers and practitioners from across Europe. This allowed the authors to gain additional insights about a number of aspects of the assemblies including how the task was framed to participants, facilitation and recommendations. The authors are indebted to Yves Dejaeghere, Federation for Innovation in Democracy (FIDE) for his valuable insights and guidance during the writing of this paper.

Appendix 1. Summary of climate assembly remits and structures

| Table 1. Summary of key climate change citizens' assemblies at the national level | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Topic | Length | Year | Remit/Goal | Structure | Mode of comms | Speakers | Topics | Decision making |
| Ireland Citizens' Assembly | 2 meetings (each over 2-day weekends) | 2016 | How the State can make Ireland a leader in tackling climate change? | After an introduction there were presentations by experts, civil society and advocacy groups. Members then took part in roundtable discussions and Q&As before voting and providing recommendations. | Presentation, roundtable discussions, public submissions | National, international experts, advocates | Sectors (transport, energy, agriculture) and Ireland's emissions profile | Recommendations which received the majority of votes by members were made to the Houses of the Oireachtas. |
| Climate Assembly UK | 6 meetings (3 online, each over 2-day weekends) | 2020 | How can the UK reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050? | Members listened to multiple presentations, followed by discussions. On the last weekend, members reviewed the decisions they had made over the last five weeks. | Presentations, group discussions | Academics, stakeholders | Climate change impacts, reducing consumption emissions, net zero society policy options, electricity, removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere, coronavirus, science and ethics of climate change, travel, home, consumption, land use, food, farming No discussion of targets | Members chose between the options presented in the scenarios. Only the members who worked on specific workstreams voted on the recommendations in those areas. Where the whole assembly worked together on recommendations, all members of CAUK voted on them. |
| Citizens' Assembly of Scotland | 8 meetings (4 virtual, each over 2-day weekends) | 2019-2020 (final 2 meetings postponed) | How should Scotland change to tackle the climate emergency in an effective and fair way? | Sessions 1-5: members reviewed background material, heard expert presentations, had group discussions and Q&As, then created draft recommendations to share Sessions 6-8: Members reviewed work from the first five sessions to review and refine visions and recommendations | Presentations, group discussions of different sizes | Convenors (social entrepreneur/campaigner and leader of religious community), academics and other experts | Climate change causes and impacts, mitigation and adaptation, Scotland's climate emissions, negative emissions, work, travel, lifestyle, diet and land use, fairness, homes and communities, consumerism, work practices | Assembly members voted on goals and recommendations |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat, France | 6 meetings (each over 3-day weekends) | 2020 | How to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 40% by 2030, in a spirit of social justice? Objective: Define measures that will be submitted directly either to a referendum, a vote in Parliament or implementation | Session 1: established the CA's mission and defined five working groups to focus on different topics. Members heard from government official Session 2: Mostly group discussion, convening together at the end. Opportunity to speak to public Session 3: Interviewing 60 experts via groups and "speed dating" Session 4: Group work on proposals, speech by President Macron Session 5 and 6: Finalising and reviewing proposals | Plenary and group discussions | "speakers were suggested by the Governance Committee, but citizens also requested for some other speakers" (Eymard 2020) | Participants split into five thematic areas: housing, labor and production, transportation, food, and consumption | Proposals were developed by the five working groups, and then new groups were formed (comprising members of all five working groups), who reviewed each proposal. |
| Bürgerrat Klima, Germany | 12 virtual meetings online (8 x 3 hour meetings + four full day meetings) | 2021 (ongoing) | How do we shape climate policy: good for us, good for our environment and good for our country? | Three sessions as a large group to understand the overall topic and the four fields of action. Members are then allocated in small groups to the four fields of action. Work in progress is shared from the four fields throughout the CA. Presentations are given at the start of each session, followed by a Q&A. | Presentations, Q&A, group discussions of different sizes | Scientists, people from civil society and businesses | Transport, buildings and heat, energy production, and food | All members agree on the recommendations and the report. The assembly is still underway at time of writing. |
| Jersey's Climate Conversation | 14 virtual meetings (2.5 hours each) | 2021 | How should we work together to become carbon neutral? | Content divided into four blocks by theme, the first three all consisting of virtual expert presentations and factsheets. The final block focused on members agreeing and prioritising recommendations. | Rotating group discussions, presentations | Academics, researchers, people with direct experience of the issue, other stakeholders, campaigners | Climate change issues facing Jersey and contribution of household consumption and local businesses to Jersey's emissions | All members presented recommendations and agreed to recommend a date by which Jersey should become carbon neutral & level of emissions reduction by this date. Report is unpublished at time of writing. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Danish Citizens' Assembly on the Climate | Phase 1 Full weekends at start and end (whole assembly); 1 evening meeting for each of 5 themes with additional time where requested. 2 evenings for discussion of draft recommendations (whole assembly). | 2020-2021 | To inform the process of transition in Denmark and specifically the annual Climate Action Plan process. | First weekend – learning about climate change and Danish policy, votes on pre-set questions on politically topical issues (e.g. green taxation, building in landscape, bio-resources and agriculture) and brainstorm to generate thematic areas. Members randomly allocated to 5 themes to generate recommendations: financing and taxes; agriculture and bioresources; transportation; behaviour, public participation and public education; technology and landscape. Feedback on draft recommendations from other members and “challengers.” Final editing and voting in last weekend. | Thematic workstreams self-organised and self-facilitated. Intervention from lead facilitators. Presentations | Unknown | Financing and taxes; agriculture and bioresources; transportation; behaviour, public participation and public education; technology and landscape | Recommendations drafted by members in sub-groups of thematic workstreams. Opportunity for feedback and editing by other members. Two “challengers” with expertise in energy modelling and public administration provided feedback. Vote on recommendations. |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Bibliography

- Badullovich, N., Grant, W. and Colvin, R. (2020). 'Framing climate change for effective communication: a systematic map', *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(123002). Doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/aba4c7
- Bain, P. G., Milfont, T. L., Kashima, Y., Bilewicz, M., Doron, G., Garðarsdóttir, R. B., . . . Corral-Verdugo, V. (2016). 'Co-benefits of addressing climate change can motivate action around the world', *Nature Climate Change*, 6(2), 154157. Doi: 10.1038/nclimate2814
- Bouman, T., van der Werff, E., Perlaviciute, G. and Steg, L. (2021). 'Environmental values and identities at the personal and group level', *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 42, pp.47-53. Doi: 10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.02.022
- Boy, B., Bucher, H. and Christ, K., (2020). 'Audiovisual Science Communication on TV and YouTube. How Recipients Understand and Evaluate Science Videos', *Frontiers in Communication*, 5(608620). Doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2020.608620
- Breckon, J., Hopkins, A. and Rickey, B. (2019). *Evidence vs Democracy: How 'mini-publics' can traverse the gap between citizens, experts, and evidence*. [online] The Alliance for Useful Evidence. Available at: <https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/Evidence_vs_Democracy_Report_Final.pdf> [Accessed 14 April 2021].
- Bryant, P. and Stone, L., (2020). *Climate Assemblies and Juries: A people powered response to the climate emergency*. [online] Shared Future. Available at: <<https://pcancities.org.uk/sites/default/files/Shared-Future-PCAN-Climate-Assemblies-and-Juries-web.pdf>> [Accessed 14 April 2021].
- Budescu, D. V., Por, H. H. and Broomell, S. B. (2012). 'Effective communication of uncertainty in the IPCC reports', *Climatic Change*, 113(2), 181200. Doi: 10.1007/s10584-011-0330-3
- Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (2021). *Public Engagement for Net-Zero: A Literature review. Centre for public impact*. [online] Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Available at: <<https://gulbenkian.pt/uk-branch/publication/public-engagement-for-climate-change-a-literature-review/>> [Accessed 24 May 2021].
- Caney, S. (2016). 'The Struggle for Climate Justice in a Non-Ideal World', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 40(1), pp. 9-26. Doi: 10.1111/misp.12044
- Capstick, S., Demski, C., Cherry, C., Verfuërth, C. and Steentjes, K. (2020). *Climate Change Citizens' Assemblies*. CAST Briefing Paper 03.
- Chapman, D. A., Corner, A., Webster, R., & Markowitz, E. M. (2016). 'Climate visuals: A mixed methods investigation of public perceptions of climate images in three countries', *Global Environmental Change*, 41, pp. 172-182.
- Climate Visuals. n.d. *Climate Visuals*. [online] Available at: <<https://climatevisuals.org>> [Accessed 21 April 2021].
- climateXchange, 2020. *Understanding and engaging the public on climate change*. [online] Edinburgh: Ipsos MORI. Available at: <<https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/37207>> [Accessed 20 April 2021].
- Corner, A. and Clarke, J. (2017). *Talking Climate: From Research to Practice in Public Engagement*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Corner, A., Lewandowsky, S., Phillips, M. and Roberts, O. (2015). *The Uncertainty Handbook*. Bristol: University of Bristol. <https://climateoutreach.org/resources/uncertainty-handbook/>
- Courant, D. (2021). Citizens' Assemblies for Referendums and Constitutional Reforms: 'Is There an "Irish Model" for Deliberative Democracy?', *Frontiers in Political Science*. 2 (591983). Doi: 10.3389/fpos.2020.591983

- Cunsolo, A., Harper, S., Minor, K., Hayes, K., Williams, K. and Howard, C. (2020). 'Ecological grief and anxiety: the start of a healthy response to climate change?', *The Lancet: Planetary Health*, 4(7). Doi: 10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30144-3
- Davis, S.J. and Caldeira, K. (2010). 'Consumption-based accounting of CO2 emissions', *PNAS*, 107(12), 5687-5692. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0906974107
- Devaney, L., Brereton, P., Torney, D. et al. (2020). 'Environmental literacy and deliberative democracy: a content analysis of written submissions to the Irish Citizens' Assembly on climate change', *Climatic Change*, 162, pp. 1965–1984. Doi: 10.1007/s10584-020-02707-4
- Gerwin, M., (2018). *Citizens' Assemblies: Guide to democracy that works*. [online] Kraków: Open Plan Foundation. Available at: <https://citizensassemblies.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Citizens-Assemblies_EN_web> Accessed 25 May 2021].
- Hart, P.S. and Feldman, L. (2016). 'The Impact of Climate Change–Related Imagery and Text on Public Opinion and Behavior Change', *Science Communication*, 38(4), pp. 415-441. Doi: 10.1177/1075547016655357
- Hornsey, M., (2021). 'The role of worldviews in shaping how people appraise climate change', *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 42, pp.36-41. Doi: 10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.02.021
- IPCC. (2001). *Climate Change 2001: A synthesis Report. A contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC*, ed R.T. Watson and The Core Writing Team. New York: Cambridge University Press: 12.
- Ipsos MORI. (2020). *Veracity Index 2020*. [online] Ipsos MORI. Available at: <<https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/ipsos-mori-veracity-index-2020-trust-in-professions>> [Accessed 12 April 2021].
- Jenkins, J., McCauley, D. Heffron, R. H. Stephan, R. and Rehner, R. (2016). 'Energy justice: A conceptual review', *Energy Research and Social Science*, 11, pp. 174–182. Doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2015.10.004
- Kahan, D. and Carpenter, K. (2017). 'Out of the lab and into the field', *Nature Clim Change*, 7, pp. 309–311. Doi: 10.1038/nclimate3283
- Kleres, J. and Wettergren, Å. (2017). 'Fear, hope, anger, and guilt in climate activism', *Social Movement Studies*, 16 (5), pp. 507-519. Doi: 10.1080/14742837.2017.1344546
- Markowitz, E. and Guckian, M. (2018). 'Climate change communication: Challenges, insights, and opportunities' in Clayton, S. and Manning, C. (eds), *Psychology and Climate Change*. London: Academic Press, pp.35-63.
- McCauley, D. and Heffron, R. (2018). 'Just transition: Integrating climate, energy and environmental justice', *Energy Policy*, 119, pp.1–7. Doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2018.04.014
- McCauley, D., Heffron, R. and Jenkins, S.K. (2013). 'Advancing energy justice: the triumvirate of tenets,' *Int. Energy Law Rev.*, 32(3), pp. 107–110.
- Mellier, C. and Wilson, R., (2020). *Getting Climate Citizens' Assemblies Right*. [online] Carnegie Europe. Available at: <<https://carnegieeurope.eu/2020/11/05/getting-climate-citizens-assemblies-righthttps://carnegieeurope.eu/2020/11/05/getting-climate-citizens-assemblies-right-pub-83133ht-pub-83133>> [Accessed 20 May 2021].
- Moberg, K. R., Aall, C., Dorner, F., Reimerson, E., Ceron, J.-P., Sköld, B. et al. (2018). 'Mobility, food and housing: responsibility, individual consumption and demand-side policies in European deep decarbonisation pathways'. *Energy Efficiency*, pp.1–23. Doi: 10.1007/s12053-018-9708-7.
- Myers, T. A., Nisbet, M. C., Maibach, E. W. and Leiserowitz, A. A. (2012). 'A public health frame arouses hopeful emotions about climate change', *Climatic Change*, 113(34), pp. 1105 - 1112. Doi: 10.1007/s10584-012-0513-6
- Nabi, R., Gustafson, A. and Jensen, R., (2018). 'Framing Climate Change: Exploring the Role of Emotion in Generating Advocacy Behavior', *Science Communication*, 40(4), pp.442-468. Doi: 10.1177/1075547018776019

- Nisbet, M.C. (2009). 'Communicating Climate Change: Why Frames Matter for Public Engagement', *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 51(2), pp. 12-23. Doi: 10.3200/ENVT.51.2.12-23
- O'Neill, S. J., Boykoff, M., Niemeyer, S. and Day, S. A. (2013). 'On the use of imagery for climate change engagement', *Global Environmental Change*, 23(2), pp.413-421. Doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.11.006
- Reis, J. and Ballinger, R. (2020). 'Creating a climate for learning-experiences of educating existing and future decision-makers about climate change', *Marine Policy*, 111. Doi: 10.1016/j.marpol.2018.07.007
- Romsdahl, R., 2020. 'Deliberative framing: opening up discussions for local-level public engagement on climate change', *Climatic Change*, 162(2), pp.145-163. Doi: 10.1007/s10584-020-02754-x
- Roser-Renouf, C., Maibach, E. W., Leiserowitz, A., and Zhao, X. (2014). 'The genesis of climate change activism: From key beliefs to political action', *Climatic Change*, 125(2), pp.163-178. Doi: 10.1007/s10584-014-1173-5
- Sandover, R., Moseley, A. and Devine-Wright, P., (2020). *A Rapid Review of Evidence and Best Practice Prepared for the Devon Climate Emergency Response Group and the Devon Net Zero Task Force. Contribution to the Devon Climate Emergency*. Exeter: University of Exeter. Available at: <<https://www.devonclimateemergency.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Rapid-Review-Online-Deliberation.pdf>> [Accessed 24 May 2021].
- Sovacool, B. and Dworkin, M. (2015). 'Energy justice: Conceptual insights and practical applications', *Appl. Energy*, 142, pp. 435-444.
- Sovacool, B. K., Burke, M., Baker, L., Kotikalapudi, C. K. and Wlokas, H. (2017). 'New frontiers and conceptual frameworks for energy justice', *Energy Policy*, 105, 677-691. Doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.005
- Spence, A., Poortinga, W., and Pidgeon, N. (2011). 'The psychological distance of climate change', *Risk Analysis*, 32(6), 957972. Doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01695.x
- Steentjes, K., Pidgeon, N., Poortinga, W., Corner, A., Arnold, A., Böhm, G., Mays, C., Poumadère, M., Ruddat, M., Scheer, D., Sonnberger, M., Tvinnereim, E. (2017). *European Perceptions of Climate Change: Topline findings of a survey conducted in four European countries in 2016*. Cardiff: Cardiff University. Available at: <<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/98660/7/EPCC.pdf>> [Accessed 21 April 2021].
- Walker, G. (2012). *Environmental Justice*. London: Routledge
- Wang, S., Hurlstone, M.J., Leviston, Z., Walker, I., and Lawrence, C. (2021). 'Construal-level theory and psychological distancing: Implications for grand environmental challenges', *One Earth*, 4, pp. 482-486. Doi: 10.1016/j.oneear.2021.03.009