Proud Capital Vision Forum
A Carbon Lite Cardiff 2025: Carbon Reduction Scenario Workshop

Tuesday 10th March 2009

Summary of Discussions

_____

Workshop Objectives:

(i)   *To consider the different possible futures for Cardiff and what practical actions we will collectively need to take to reduce the impact of climate change*

(ii)   *To identify the actions and organisational commitments required for the transition of Cardiff to a Carbon Lite city*

1. **What are the big challenges** which come out of the scenario for Cardiff? What are the top five priority issues which have been identified?

Engagement	• How do we change public behaviour to help implement carbon reduction?
	• Are we putting enough effort into developing cohesion within communities (of place and interest) to respond to climate challenge and energy security issues?
	• How can we communicate clear messages to Cardiff communities that relate the Climate Change issue to Cardiff lives?
	• How do we influence the behaviours & choices of citizens?
	   o 'getting the message over'
	   o 'getting people out of their comfort zones'

Data and Intelligence	• Do we have sufficient data/information to make the correct long term decisions?
Governance	• How do we influence government to provide the tools to help/support partners implement carbon reduction? • What sort of governance arrangements do we need to establish now? • How can we reconcile the need for local accountability to & with diverse communities with the need to achieve co-ordinated and decisive action? • Who is the 'we'?

Resources and Prioritisation	• How do we obtain and change resource to do this? • Are we putting enough funding/effort/research into renewable energy/energy reduction technology? • Are we doing enough and are we prioritising our spending appropriately? – in relation to other cities, UK, world?
Infrastructure and Planning	• What infrastructure legacy are we developing? – appropriate for low energy transport (active travel)? Are buildings being adapted and/or designed for low energy use? • Do we need to grow food in the City?

2. Key issues:

• **Local intelligence is crucial** for informing any policy intervention. This local intelligence has to come out of direct engagement with communities and understanding the data held by different partner agencies. This is representative of the wider challenge of sharing data between partners to create a robust evidence base for policy.

• The **interconnected nature of the challenges facing the city** was emphasised, such as the connections between obesity, over-consumption, under-exercising, carbon footprints and climate change. As a consequence, opportunities exist for specific initiative & actions – e.g. micro-generation & power grids across hospital & housing developments – to establish 'resilience through diversity/disaggregating'.

• The **importance of employment and the potential for 'green' industries** to enhance socio-economic well being was highlighted, and represents a growth sector for the economy. In light of economic recovery measures, even a small proportion of the proposed stimulus packages spent on projects such as renewable electricity generation, energy efficiency and developing low-carbon technologies, would lead to significant gains for both the low carbon agenda and the long term competitiveness of the region.

• Public **partner organisation must understand the impact of their contribution** towards climate change and be prepared to pursue best practice policies that set an example and influence the behaviour of their many staff. This may include Carbon Reduction Strategies by Partnership members (efficiency drive) and 'energy descent action plans'.

• **Life cycle analysis needs to be embedded** in all decision making processes to obtain best long term options whilst **incentives are needed for local industries** to trade in carbon neutral processes.

• Encouraging '**local produce' sections in supermarkets**, opportunities/space within the City for farmers to sell directly to customers, and an emphasis on local food procurement were seen as key drivers of change.

• **Mainstreaming carbon reduction in all Partnership policies -** such as pursuing new developments that are carbon neutral and aligning financial management with energy consumption leading to carbon neutral procurement policies, etc.

3.   Recommendations for Partnership Action:

"Data and Intelligence"	• Collect and understand data. • Identify the big hits/problems immediately. • Scan best practice/technologies especially; with private sector and universities.
"Marketing and Awareness"	• Increase public awareness and change behaviours- 'social marketing'. • Engage with the general public and private sector. • Develop a Community & Business Awareness Strategy • Hold a 'Low Carbon Week' • Develop a 'Climate Change Roadshow' and attach to other big Cardiff events.
"Delivery"	• Develop a 'balance sheet' that considers the cost of 'action' and 'in-action'. • Develop an 'Action plan' – with clear relevance to Cardiff and Partnership accountability. • Develop a collective risk management methodology to identify synergies between partners
"Governance and Working Arrangement"	• Explore common resources (procurement, property portfolio • Common understanding amongst partners on climate change issues.

4.   Conclusion and Next Steps

It was agreed that the workshop had helped establish a consensus position amongst the partners on what constituted immediate action areas. In view of this, the recommendations for partnership action would be further developed into an action plan by the Carbon-lite workshop which would be considered at the next Vision Forum meeting on 28th April 2009.

Annex A- Detailed Summary of Group Discussions

"Rhymney" Table Feedback

1.   Big Questions

- Do we have sufficient data/information to make the correct long term decisions to implement the 9% reduction?
- How do we change public behaviour to help implement carbon reduction?
- How do we influence government to provide the tools to help/support partners implement carbon reduction?
- How do we obtain and change resource to do this?

Long Term Priorities/Issues

- Public/partner organisation understanding their positive contribution towards climate change and what action they can take to make a difference.
- Life cycle analysis need to be embedded in ALL decision making processes to obtain best long term options.
- Incentives are needed for local industries to trade in carbon neutral processes to compete with global markets.
- Strengthen local food sources and supplies with local authorities.
- There needs to be a high level influencing process for the planning process for biomass/energy from waste sites.

Short Term Priorities/Issues

- We can help stop it from getting worse.
- We jointly need to produce a 9% reduction plan urgently whilst protecting the vulnerable.
- Explain to communities/partners what a 9% reduction looks like and the steps they can take to achieve this with incentives.
- Approve only new developments that are carbon neutral or have a negative impact on climate change.
- Align financial management with energy consumption leading to carbon neutral procurement policies, etc.
- Rationing energy to households and buildings.
- Better use of car reduction plans 'no cars on road days'.
- Incentives for micro-regeneration schemes.
- Financial investments in long term carbon reduction/energy proposals.
- The Partnership need to lead by example.
- Strengthen local food sources by increasing the number of allotments and markets for purchasing local food.

2.   What actions could be implemented before 2025?

- Increase public awareness and change behaviours also known as 'social marketing'.
- Carbon reduction plans with buy in from all stakeholders.

- The partnership recognises that they need to work with international countries/communities to implement carbon reduction systems/technologies.

3a) Better understanding of impacts of the scenario
- Find out how much energy is used within the partnership and public. A survey could be included via neighbourhood profiling.
- Horizon scanning – how are other cities and countries tackling it?
- Understanding social impacts i.e. food, fuel, transport, integrating migrants.
- Need to understand the carbon reduction impacts of major development i.e. schools, hospitals, industries, etc.

↓

What the financial costs are for achieve this?

↓

How will it affect other sectors i.e. the most vulnerable?

3b) The most vulnerable business activities are food distributors, power availability, emergency services, health and social services, and public services.

   How – business continuity plans that include carbon reduction.
      - better understanding of the risks as climate change is a creeping elephant.

3c) Success would look like… ☺ good quality of life with better understanding.

   How – localisation/self sufficiency of energy and resilience.

3d) Leadership (leading by example); joint action plans; joint projects (Welsh Assembly Government currently being influenced through LSB to align future budgets.
- Greater links with private sector and identifying benefits for them to work with the LSB.

3h) Use of organisational strengths to influence public and other sector organisations.
- Support each other on difficult decisions especially in relation with the public.
- Share common climate change messages.

5. Key pieces of learning:
- Common understanding amongst partners on climate change issues.
- Best practice/technologies especially with private sector and universities.
- Collect and understand data.
- Identify the big hits/problems immediately.
- Engage with the general public and private sector.

<div align="center">

"Ely" Table Feedback

</div>

1. Big Questions

- Are we doing enough and are we prioritising our spending appropriately? – In relation to other cities, UK, world?
- What infrastructure legacy are we developing? – Appropriate for low energy transport (active travel)? Are buildings being adapted and/or designed for low energy use?

- Are we putting enough funding/effort/research into renewable energy/energy reduction technology?
- Are we putting enough effort into developing cohesion within communities (of place and interest) to respond to climate challenge and energy security issues?
- How can we communicate clear messages to Cardiff communities that relate the Climate Change issue to Cardiff lives?
- Do we need to grow more local food in the City?

2. What actions could we have taken to reduce exposure to scenario risks?

- Putting in place a planning framework to better accommodate renewable energy generation (wind turbines etc)
- Carbon Reduction Strategies by Partnership members (efficiency drive) – potential 'energy descent action plans'.
- Encourage 'local produce' sections in supermarkets, opportunities/space within the City for farmers to sell directly to customers, and change to public sector food procurement to purchase more locally grown.
- Develop a co-ordinated awareness/communication strategy that targets, schools, media and private sector.
- Take risks that reflect the urgency of the issue – technology development, transport and built infrastructure.
- Risk assessment exercise to identify the main areas for reducing exposure to climate change and energy security risk.

3. Actions

- Develop a 'balance sheet' that considers the cost of 'action' and 'in-action'.
- Develop a Community & Business Awareness Strategy
- Hold a 'Low Carbon Week'
- Develop a 'Climate Change Roadshow' and attach to other big Cardiff events.
- Develop an 'Action plan' – clear relevance to Cardiff with accountability.
- Explore common resources (procurement, property portfolio)

"Taff" Table Feedback

1. Big Questions

What sort of governance arrangements do we need to establish **now** if we are to avoid the need to flip into a controlling, militaristic model of governance at a later date?

How do we influence the behaviours & choices of citizens?
- 'getting the message over'
- 'getting people out of their comfort zones'

How can we reconcile the need for local accountability to & with diverse communities with the need to achieve co-ordinated and decisive action?

How can we play to **opportunities** and **benefits** to engage more positively with communities?

Who is the 'we'?

2.   Discussion areas

Initial response to the scenario: situation requires 'militaristic' governance – command & control - police in riot gear – rationing etc.

Leadership / engagement / communication with communities

- Use of market mechanisms & 'pricing externalities' – view that explanation is not enough *('rationality or rationing'?)*.
- Connection to fuel security issues & exposure to risks that are generated on a global level - dangerous, but may also help shift perceptions & understandings. People react to direct and immediate threats, while tending to 'discount the future'.
- 'The decisions & actions of insurance companies may be more influential than we are'.
- Recognition in discussions that market mechanisms tend to function very inequitably, and that this in turn may lead to social fragmentation & conflict ('solutions' triggering further problems').
- The politics of co-ordination around common purpose.

Working with/against powerful single-issue, populist politics.

Need to develop more appropriate decision-making procedures
Discussions began to identify opportunities and synergies - possibilities for 'killing two birds with one stone' - on 2, connected, levels – generic 'problems' & specific 'solutions' e.g.:
a) Connections between obesity, over-consumption/ under-exercising, carbon footprints & climate impacts
b) Opportunities within aspects of the scenario for specific initiative & actions – e.g. micro-generation & power grids across hospital & housing developments – reorienting health care to establish 'resilience through diversity/disaggregating', linking to localised employment & home working etc.

Discussion at several points re. the importance of employment/jobs - linking into (for e.g.) the importance of people having a sense of self-worth – as well as income, and the potential for 'green production' to enhance the feel-good factor in while also being crucial in its own right.

This question surfaced and re-surfaced throughout the discussions - with a general recognition of the need for good intelligence and knowledge management to identify, assess, and raise understanding and awareness of both broad patterns & trends and the details of their local & specific impacts & implications.

e.g. – it was recognised that diagram on emissions in the background inf. a) needed to be broken down into much more detail and b) needs to be mapped through on to impacts/consequences before it could be usefully and reliably used to inform decisions (e.g. of learning from experiences of 1974).

Discussions recognised that if we arrived in the scenario in 2025 without this intelligence & understanding it would be too late to start pulling it together - really need to be building up this picture **now**.

Thinking it through - & facilitator's observations

Tendency in discussions to focus on 'things that others need to be doing' - national government to individual citizens. Initial sense of impotence at the Cardiff Partnership level.

Some sense of the local governance role 2025 being more about addressing / mopping up / fire-fighting the fall-out – unless we can 'get on the front foot and establish proactive leadership **now**.

These issues surfaced as (disabling) 'yes, buts' in the discussions.
As such they look like highly significant strategic risks - and so need to be assessed and addressed as such within the Partnership's risk management arrangements, as and when established.

Recognising and discussing these kinds of positive externalities seemed to shift the whole tone of the discussions - leading to recognition that if it works that way for partner professionals it also suggests lessons for the way we communicate and engage with communities.

This led into discussion of 'tipping points' and how they come about – starting with the e.g. of the smoking ban.

In relation to the Partnership's risk management arrangements this highlights the importance of assessing & addressing upside as well as downside risks - 'if onlys' as well 'yes, buts' – keeping the whole tone upbeat & positive.
These discussions can be taken to indicate a need to build – and pull together – research evidence and local intelligence.

This can be linked to discussion points above re. engagement and communication.

High level research & knowledge re. generic patterns & trends are essential, but not sufficient. Need to consider 'manifestation & materiality' questions: a) 'How are these patterns/trends **experienced** in local communities (&/or how would/will they be in the future? (manifestations); and b) in what ways and how much do/will they **matter** to local communities? (materiality).

This local intelligence obviously has to come out of direct engagement with communities – and different partner agencies will each have their different, specific contributions to make due to their different relationship with citizens and communities (? worth mapping?)

In risk management terms, note the link between 'manifestations & materiality' and 'impact & likelihood' - suggesting a way of engaging communities directly in the Partnership's risk management arrangements.

Who is the 'we'? - Key 'meta-question' in relation to all the above questions.