Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

November 2019

Oxford Citizens Assembly on Climate Change

A summary report prepared for Oxford City Council

Contents

Headlines

There was strong support in the Citizens Assembly for reaching 'net zero':

- The majority of Assembly Members (37 out of 41) felt that Oxford should aim to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050.
- There was widespread belief that Oxford should be a leader in tackling the climate crisis.
- Assembly Members found a great deal of encouragement in the examples of what is already being done across Oxford to address climate change and meet the goal of becoming 'net zero'.
- Enhanced biodiversity was central to the overall 'net zero' vision of Oxford with increased flora and fauna in the city, along with more cycling, walking, and public transport, and far fewer cars.
- The buildings sector should adopt improved building standards, widespread retrofitting, and more domestic and non-domestic energy needs being met by sustainable sources.

However, it's important to consider the caveats to this broadly optimistic and positive image:

- Around one in four to one in three Assembly Members rejected the most ambitious – and, therefore, challenging to achieve – visions of a future Oxford.
- They were also perturbed by the extent to which the burden of change was – in their eyes – being placed on individuals.
- There was, therefore, a sense that the council needs to communicate a shared vision and strategy to reaching 'net zero' that shows the roles played by local and national government, businesses, and individuals.
- There was also a demand for more education and information provided for the wider public in Oxford to help them understand what they can personally do to help. Specifically, Assembly Members wanted more information about how to recycle correctly.
- Ultimately, there was little consensus on *when* before 2050 'net zero' should be achieved.

Executive Summary

Background

Oxford City Council declared a climate emergency at the start of 2019. As part of its attempts to tackle this, the council decided to act quickly and become the first city council in the country to hold a citizens' assembly on the issue. Ipsos MORI was commissioned to conduct this work.

The Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change recruited 50 residents of the city of Oxford. Participants attended two full weekends of deliberation and discussion over the 28th and 29th September and the 19th and 20th October 2019. They were tasked with deciding how to respond to the following question: **"The UK has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?"**

To do so, they focussed on five key areas relating to carbon emissions in Oxford: waste reduction, buildings, transport, biodiversity & offsetting, and renewable energy. To help understand and deliberate on these issues, Assembly Members listened to expert presentations, had question and answer sessions with experts, discussed the issues with fellow Assembly Members in small breakout sessions and larger plenary sessions, took part in creative exercises, and voted on key questions.

Key messages from Assembly Members

- The majority of Assembly Members (37 out of 41) felt that Oxford should aim to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050. However, even among those who agreed with this, there was little consensus on when Oxford should aim to reach 'net zero' instead. Instead, Assembly Members felt that rapid action was required, that the speed of action depended on the specific area under consideration, and that interim targets would help measure progress.

- Assembly Members were very aware of the scale of the problem and the need for change. Both the scale and the need for change were greater than they had anticipated before the Assembly, yet what they heard – from experts and from fellow Assembly Members – encouraged them that change was possible.

- Assembly Members responded particularly positively to the examples of what is already being done across Oxford to address climate change and meet the goal of becoming 'net zero'. There was limited awareness of this among Assembly Members, however it gave a sense of what could be done – which helped counter the fear that things have gone too far already or that the scale of the challenge makes reaching 'net zero' an intractable problem.

- Discovering that something is already being done encouraged them to think that even more could be done. This strongly suggests that communicating more about what is already being done can help foster enthusiasm and optimism.

- When imagining a 'net zero' Oxford, Assembly Members envisioned Oxford having become a leader in tackling the climate crisis. In achieving this, Oxford would become a more liveable city, with better communities, happier, healthier people, and a cleaner and more pleasant environment to live in – all without sacrificing residents' standard of living. There is an opportunity here for the council to harness this strong civic pride – Assembly Members felt that, as an affluent city with access to the expertise of the university, Oxford *should* be leading the way.

- Enhanced biodiversity was central to the overall 'net zero' vision of Oxford with increased flora and fauna in the city. Assembly Members foresaw major changes in transport provision in Oxford with cycling, walking, and public transport prioritised over private motor vehicles.

- There would be key changes in the buildings sector with improved building standards, widespread retrofitting, and more domestic and non-domestic energy needs being met by sustainable sources. Assembly Members anticipated future Oxford residents would have more sustainable patterns of consumption with less waste and increased levels of recycling.

- However, it's important to consider the caveats to this broadly optimistic and positive image. Around one in four to one in three Assembly Members rejected the most ambitious – and, therefore, challenging to achieve – visions of a future Oxford. For these Assembly Members, the most ambitious scenario typically felt impractical, unrealistic, and represented too great a change from their current lifestyles. Bringing these more sceptical or reluctant citizens with you will be vital to meeting the 'net zero' challenge.

- Assembly Members were also perturbed by the extent to which the burden of change was – in their eyes – being placed on individuals. They wanted to know what large businesses and government were doing to change their ways – and, in the latter case, to support individuals and communities to meet 'net zero'. Related to this, there were many questions about how changes – new heating systems, retrofitted homes, solar panels – will be paid for.

- There was, therefore, a sense that the council needs to communicate a shared vision and strategy to reaching 'net zero' that shows the roles played by local and national government, businesses, and individuals.

- There was also a demand for more education and information provided for the wider public in Oxford to help them understand what they can personally do to help. Specifically, Assembly Members wanted more information about how to recycle correctly.

Theme by theme

Waste reduction

- Recycling, reducing, and re-using waste were important goals for Assembly Members. They felt that individuals and organisations should be encouraged to consume and produce less, respectively.

- Yet there was confusion over how recycling currently works in Oxford. Assembly Members demanded more education and information in order to ensure households recycled effectively.

- There was a mixed response to some of the potential solutions discussed including: reducing bin size, charging people for their waste collection, freecycling, and share/repair schemes.

Buildings

- Assembly Members found it surprising that the largest proportion of emissions came from buildings – they typically assumed transport or industry would create the greatest emissions.

- A mix of developers, private landlords, individuals, Oxford City Council and central government were felt to be primarily responsible for reducing carbon emissions in buildings.
- There was a perceived need for a balanced approach to decreasing emissions from buildings while simultaneously working to resolve the current affordable housing and homelessness crisis in Oxford.
- Assembly Members firmly believed that it's more cost effective if all new builds are built to sufficiently high standards, rather than paying the prohibitively high cost of retrofitting.

Transport

- Encouraging behaviour change with a shift away from private car use was seen as key – people can feel reliant on their car. Implementing infrastructure changes (i.e. more and safer cycling infrastructure) and technological changes was also important.
- A unified strategy for transport planning between Oxford City, the County Council, and public transport providers was important to Assembly Members. Incentivising public transport use and consideration of how vulnerable groups (especially children and the elderly) can get about were important areas to address when encouraging a move away from cars.

Biodiversity & offsetting

- Assembly Members were very positive about creating more biodiversity and green space around Oxford. Creating more green space and planting more trees was considered an 'easy win' and visible to the whole community.
- There were questions about whether 'offsetting' could effectively address carbon neutrality, and if it allowed those who can afford it to continue polluting.
- Assembly Members identified a tension between setting aside land for green space while, at the same time, allowing for new housing to be built.

Renewable energy

- There was surprise at how much Oxford has already done about renewable energy.
- Electricity was viewed as more expensive than gas, and there were concerns about the affordability of solar panels.
- It was felt that too much emphasis is currently placed on the individual to take the initiative. The council and national government need to play a more direct role in helping households to make the transition away from gas and to new sources of power.
- Assembly Members were open to compromise in deciding where renewable sources would be placed – neutralising climate change was ultimately seen as more important than the aesthetics of Oxford's skyline.

Introduction

This report summarises the headline findings and recommendations from the Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change which was conducted over two weekends in Autumn 2019.

Background and aims

- In January 2019, Oxford City Council unanimously passed an amended motion declaring a Climate Emergency.[1] As a result of this, Oxford City Council became one of the first local authorities in the UK to establish a Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change. In total, 50 Oxford residents who broadly reflected the demographic profile of Oxford were recruited to the Assembly. Around 42 of these recruited Assembly Members attended on each day of the Assembly – see the appendix for further detail on the profile of Assembly Members on each day of the Assembly.

- The Assembly aimed to help address the issue of climate change by considering the measures that residents felt should be taken in Oxford in order to achieve 'net zero' [2].

- An advisory group created by Oxford City Council provided additional guidance and oversight of the Assembly. This group consisted of Oxford City councillors and representatives from environmental and local democracy groups, local community organisations, academic experts, and local businesses.

- The main aim of the Citizens' Assembly was to answer the following question: **"The UK has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?".** The council was particularly interested to understand the sacrifices and trade-offs people would be prepared to meet to deliver net zero

- After discussions with key stakeholders at Oxford City Council, it was decided that the Assembly should focus on five themes related to climate change which the Council had some control and influence over. These were: Waste Reduction, Buildings, Transport, Biodiversity & Offsetting, and Renewable Energy.

Methodology

- The Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change was led by Oxford City Council. As an independent research agency, Ipsos MORI was commissioned to recruit, coordinate, and conduct the Citizens' Assembly.

- A Citizens' Assembly is a body of selected citizens who meet to learn about, discuss, and make recommendations on a particular issue through a process of structured deliberation[3].

[1] http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?AIId=22137

[2] 'Net zero' means that total emissions are equal to or less than the emissions removed from the environment. This can be achieved by a combination of emission reduction and removal by offsetting.

[3] https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/housing-communities-and-local-government-committee/citizens-assembly-faq-17-19/

- The Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change was conducted over two weekends – the first of which was on Saturday 28th and Sunday 29th September and the second on Saturday 19th and Sunday 20th October 2019. Each session lasted from approximately 9:30am until 5:30pm.

- In total, 50 residents of Oxford were recruited as Assembly Members. These 50 residents were broadly reflective of the demographic profile of the city of Oxford in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, disability, and postcode area.

Recruitment

- To recruit Assembly Members, quotas were set for key demographic criteria including gender, age, ethnicity, disability and area of Oxford residency. Other variables were monitored but not used as selection criteria such as social grade, educational attainment, working status, length of Oxford residency, and environmental and political attitudes to ensure a range of participants were included that broadly reflected the views of the wider Oxford population.

- There were two phases of recruitment for the Citizens' Assembly. First of all, members were recruited from the existing Oxford City Council Citizens' Panel – itself recently recruited by Ipsos MORI on a randomised stratified basis. The gaps in the profile of members recruited this way were filled via a second stage of free-find on-street recruitment (see below for more detail on these two stages of recruitment).

- All participants were recruited by Ipsos MORI specialist recruiters. A purposive sampling approach was adopted, whereby key quotas were set, and participants were recruited according to these using a screening questionnaire.

- The final Assembly Profile for both weekends can be found in the Appendix which illustrates the demographic breakdown of the Assembly Members.

Stage one: Building the Oxford City Council Citizens' Panel

- The Oxford City Council Citizens' Panel is an existing bespoke panel of Oxford residents recruited by Ipsos MORI, used to conduct various ad hoc research studies covering various policy areas. To create this initial panel, a random sample of 13,500 household addresses from across the city was drawn from the Postal Address File (PAF) for the Oxford City Council area and a postcard was sent inviting up to two household members to register online to become panel members. Therefore, every household had an equal chance of being recruited to the panel, from which the assembly members were then drawn. This approach was chosen because Ipsos MORI has a wealth of experience in conducting large scale postal sampling, and it is a reliable recruitment method with the best chance of securing a feasible response rate factoring in the budget limitations and time restrictions present in this case. A second stage of recruitment was undertaken a few weeks after the postcards were sent out, to boost the number of panel members and to target certain demographic groups in order to ensure the panel better matched the profile of the population of Oxford. For this phase, Ipsos MORI's experienced face-to-face interviewers were sent out on street in various locations in the city, to hand out a further 13,000 postcards over the course of a week.

- The participants were required to complete a short online survey, recording key demographic details to monitor the profile of the panel and to attempt to recruit a range of permanent Oxford residents. Potential panel members were also screened for postcode details to ensure only permanent residents of Oxford could register.

Stage two: Recruiting for the Oxford Citizens' Assembly

- The majority of Assembly Members were recruited from the online Oxford City Council Citizens' Panel. Individuals were sent an email invitation asking if they would like to be part of the Citizens' Assembly which outlined the dates, practical information including what would be required of them, and notified that participation in the Assembly would include a £300 honorarium payment. It was important to specify this at the first invitation to ensure a broad range of people were recruited, and not just those who were particularly interested or engaged in the topic already.

- Once panel members expressed their interest and availability on the Assembly dates, experienced recruiters then used a screener questionnaire when interviewing panel members to gather further demographic information that was be used to complement our knowledge of the profile of the Assembly, such as educational attainment, social grade, and household size.

- Where there were still profile gaps within the Assembly composition, and invitations to the online panel had been exhausted, we then topped up the sample with targeted on-street recruitment to reach these required groups. Groups we recruited in this way are typically under-represented in panel recruitment approaches like this included those aged 18-24 and BAME residents.

The Assembly – deliberation and voting

The structure

- When 'in session', the Assembly Members were split into six tables of approximately eight members each. On each of the six tables, discussion was facilitated by experienced and senior moderators from Ipsos MORI. A detailed discussion guide was used to structure the conversations and ensure all the topics were covered uniformly. A professional note taker was also assigned to each table to transcribe the discussions. Assembly Members were assigned to different tables – at random – each day in order to ensure they were exposed to as wide a range of opinions as possible from fellow members.

- The first weekend consisted primarily of presentations from expert speakers on each of the five themes, each followed by panel discussion with other experts. This was followed by group discussions among Assembly Members, culminating in plenary summaries from each table. Each of the presentations and panel discussions was livestreamed on Facebook and all of the slides were made available on the City Council website.

- The second weekend consisted of the deliberation and voting phase. Assembly Members had further group and plenary discussions around each of the themes. This culminated in a series of voting exercises on a range of topics relating to each theme. Finally, Assembly Members voted on whether or not they felt Oxford should be more ambitious in relation to the 2050 'net zero' target.

Voting and preference exercises

- Within each of the five key themes, Assembly Members were presented with three visions of possible futures for Oxford, each listing a series of potential co-benefits and trade-offs. These scenarios represented different levels of ambition in reaching 'net zero' in Oxford – scenario A being the least ambitious and showing least change from

how things are currently, scenario C being the most ambitious and representing the greatest change to the way people live now.

- For each future scenario, the table moderators guided the Assembly Members through an exercise that established the extent to which they felt the co-benefits might benefit Oxford as a city and the extent to which the trade-offs would be hard for Oxford to achieve – this data is included in the appendix of this report.
- Assembly Members were then asked to vote on which of the future scenarios they would like to live in – this data is included in the relevant thematic chapters below.
- The future scenarios were developed by Oxford City Council.
- Assembly Members were also asked to vote on a series of specific questions – the results of which can be found throughout this report and summarised in the Appendix – as well as the key question about whether or not Oxford should seek to reach 'net zero' before 2050.
- The full results of the preference and voting exercises can be found in the Appendix of this report. All the stimulus used in the assembly can be found along with the discussion guides used by moderators.

Interpretation of findings

- When considering these findings, it is important to bear in mind what a qualitative approach provides. It explores the range of attitudes and opinions of participants in detail. It provides an insight into the key reasons underlying participants' views. Findings are descriptive and illustrative, not statistically representative. Often individual participants hold somewhat contradictory views – often described as 'cognitive dissonance'.
- Participants are provided with detailed information over the course of the weekends, and thus become more informed than the general public – particularly so given the highly immersive nature of a citizens' assembly. The volume and richness of the data generated allows for a detailed picture to be developed of the range and diversity of views, feelings, and behaviours which can be used to develop conclusions and recommendations.

1 Waste Reduction

Key findings

- **Recycling, reducing, and re-using waste were important goals for Assembly Members.**
- **They felt that individuals and organisations should be encouraged to consume and produce less, respectively.**
- **Yet there was confusion over how recycling currently works in Oxford. Assembly Members demanded more education and information in order to ensure households recycled effectively.**
- **There was a mixed response to some of the potential solutions discussed including: reducing bin size, charging people for their waste collection, freecycling, and share/repair schemes.**

Summary of table discussions

Recycling, reducing, and re-using waste were important goals for Assembly Members. They felt that individuals and organisations should be encouraged to consume and produce less, respectively.

- There was a mix of views in terms of who was responsible for waste reduction and this varied between supermarkets, manufacturers, private companies, the Government, and consumers.
- While Assembly Members acknowledged that there was a need for individuals to consume less, thus generating less waste, there should be a greater emphasis on reducing waste further up the chain, led by manufacturers and supermarkets, rather than the apparent focus on changing individuals' consumption and waste generation.

"Change needs to happen earlier up the chain…creating less waste [for people to recycle] to begin with." (Female, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX3)

Table 1.1: Who should have most responsibility for dealing with waste?

	Results
Producers of goods	30
Consumers	7
Local councils	5

- As shown above, almost three in four Assembly Members (30 out of 42) thought that the producers of goods should have the most responsibility for dealing with waste. This was followed by seven who thought that consumers were most responsible followed by five who thought that Oxford City Council should take the most responsibility for waste reduction.

There was confusion around how recycling in Oxford works and a demand for more – and clearer – information to help ensure households recycle correctly.

- Assembly Members felt that it was important to make recycling and waste reduction simpler and easier. The current system was described as too complex and confusing, placing too much onus on individuals to get it right. In particular, which materials could or could not be recycled was unclear to Assembly Members.

- Linked to this, the public also felt they needed more education and information from Oxford City Council about how to recycle and reduce waste correctly. There was some awareness that leaflets had been sent out previously but knowledge of this was far from universal. Assembly Members expressed great surprise that entire streets of recycling can be destroyed by one person mistakenly putting general household waste into their recycling bin.

  "I've read all the stuff, everything online, produced by the council and it's still unclear." (Female, 60-64, White, ABC1 and OX1)

- Assembly Members acknowledged the difficulties associated with encouraging people to change their behaviour. University students were viewed as poor recyclers, so incentives might be necessary encourage recycling. One possible solution raised to address this was holding events via the university to help students recycle and re-use their unwanted household items and furniture – i.e. near the start or end of term.

  "I think this is a difficult thing because we are talking about behavioural change. It might be relatively cheap to do, but it feels like it is difficult to get that change." (Male, 30-44, BME, ABC1 and OX4)

There was a mixed response to some of the potential solutions discussed – reducing bin size, charging people for their waste collection, and freecycling and share/repair schemes.

- There was vocal opposition to introducing smaller bins due to concerns around a potential increase in fly-tipping and how larger households might cope with this. Similarly, charging people for their waste collection was felt to disproportionately affect low income groups.

  "I don't think [reducing bin size] will solve the issue of waste. They just won't have anywhere to put it. They will fly tip." (Female, 25-29, BME, ABC1 and OX3)

- More promotion was felt to be needed around freecycling and sharing/repair schemes in the city. These were received positively but there was a broad lack of awareness of the range of such initiatives that are currently available. Assembly Members were generally receptive to this idea – it appealed as a way of addressing climate change while also helping their community and getting to know their neighbours.

"The repair cafes…I never knew they existed." (Female, 20-24, BME, C2DE, OX4)

- Overall, Assembly Members felt that any waste reduction solutions needed to meet multiple user needs across the city including low-income and vulnerable groups. For example, there was a desire for supermarkets to distribute more food to the homeless.

Table 1.2: Currently Oxford City Council offers three sizes of green waste bins for fortnightly collections. Should Oxford City Council withdraw the largest size of green waste bins from all households in order to encourage more recycling?

	Results
Yes	25
No	14
Don't know	2

- As the above table illustrates, around nearly two thirds of Assembly Members (25 out of 41) thought that the Council should withdraw the largest size of green waste bins from all households in order to encourage more recycling. However, that still left almost four in ten (16 out of 41) Assembly Members who opposed this action.

Scenario preferences

Table 1.3: Scenario voting results for waste reduction

Waste Reduction	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A *(least ambitious)*	2
Scenario B	9
Scenario C *(most ambitious)*	29

- The table above details how Assembly Members voted on the three different scenarios for the waste reduction theme – with scenario C representing the most ambitious (and challenging) of the three possible futures, and scenario A the least ambitious. The majority of Assembly Members (29 out of 40) wanted to live in scenario C compared to only 9 and 2 wanting to live in B and A respectively. The possible reasons for these choices are discussed below.

Current scenario

When presented with the current situation on waste reduction in Oxford, Assembly Members generally agreed that it was unsatisfactory and that more should be done to reduce, recycle, and re-use waste.

- Oxford's present rate of recycling (around 50% of household waste recycled) was felt to be insufficient, with a desire expressed for benchmarks and comparisons with other cities and the setting of ambitious targets.

  "We should be aiming for 90% [recycling rate]." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- Assembly Members demanded more programmes and information to educate people on recycling, though providing this information in different languages was cited as a key barrier to overcome.

  "Some of the issues are language barriers, maybe the council could create leaflets in different languages, that would help with education." (Male, 65+, BME, ABC1 and OX4)

- There was general agreement that more needs to be done to encourage the use and awareness of sharing, refill, repair, and other waste reduction programmes that exist in Oxford.

- There was some openness to implementing more radical changes, such as having shared bins.

- Businesses and institutions were not seen as fulfilling their fair share of recycling responsibilities. Subsidising businesses to incentivise them to recycle more was a possible solution proposed to address this.

- There was acknowledgement of some of the possible trade-offs that may be encountered when reducing food packaging such as less hygienic storage and the need for products to be brought to market and sold quicker – which may, in turn, lead to an in frequency of food shopping and an increase in food waste.

- Incentivising better waste management was seen as difficult and the need for deeper cultural change around climate change action was felt to be critical. Suggestions to achieve this included changing household behaviours by educating children in school, more active programme for educating students when they arrive at university, and ensuring new homeowners are educated on recycling and waste reduction.

Scenario A

Assembly Members generally did not like scenario A as it was seen as far from ambitious enough in terms of its goals.

- It was seen as unimaginative with limited changes and Assembly Members felt that this scenario would materialise anyway within a few years without drastic or deliberate interventions.

"This is no change really, or just continuing a change that's sort of already happening." (Male, 45-59, White, C2DE and OX4)

- Assembly Members suggested that scenario A could be used as a useful 'interim step' towards more ambitious change that Oxford should aim to achieve within a relatively short space of time – two to three years, for example.

- A recycling rate of over 60% was seen as a positive increase (from 50% at present) but it not ambitious enough in the long-term.

  "[Scenario A] is where we should aim to get to by year 3. Recycling is over 60%...good but not good enough." (Female, 65+, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- There was a mixed response to reducing the number of rubbish collections, implementing smaller bins, introducing a set amount of bins per street – these ranged from Assembly Members who were open to these measures whereas others had lukewarm through to negative responses. Opposition tended to focus on concern about what would happen in the event of bins becoming full long before collection.

  "The smaller bins...is not a good idea at all. What do you do if you fill up the bin?" (Male, 25-29, White, ABC1 and OX3)

- One innovative solution proposed was to address waste reduction on a wider street or community level via things like communal compost bins.

  "I think a communal compost bin would be a really good idea." (Female, 16-19, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- Assembly Members were unhappy with the perceived emphasis on changing consumer or individual behaviour, with not enough pressure put on businesses to address how they generate waste. The business obligations in this scenario were not seen as meaningful due to a lack of enforceable requirements.

- Assembly Members liked the public promotion to reduce consumption and the use of repair and recycling shops but felt there was not enough mention of these initiatives in the scenario and subsequent discussion.

- There was some push back on the idea of seeing waste as a resource due to concern that this could discourage waste reduction.

Scenario B

Scenario B was received more positively and was generally preferred by Assembly Members in comparison to scenario A. They felt it encouraged the public to take personal responsibility for waste reduction as well as putting more pressure on businesses to do the same. The trade-offs were broadly accepted but there were some concerns raised about fly-tipping and charging for waste collection being unfair to low-income groups.

- This scenario was seen to give greater thought to achieving behavioural improvements which led to a debate about creating rewards and penalties to drive behaviour change. Charging for waste collection was felt to encourage behaviour change in the public.

"Yes, and it shouldn't be paid for. It discriminates against those who find it difficult to pay." (Female, 65+, White, ABC1 and OX1)

- Assembly Members suggested effective incentives might involve rebates on council tax and be adjusted to suit different groups' needs to minimise the adverse effect on low-income or vulnerable groups. Schemes such as charging for plastics bags in supermarkets were cited as very effective initiatives that had successfully led to behavioural change.

- However, those who opposed this idea viewed it as a means of punishing people for poor waste management, which could have a negative effect on those on low incomes and lead to increased instances of fly tipping.

"I think if residents pay by weight, there will be more fly tipping. It won't work out very well in the end." (Male, 45-59, BME, C2DE and OX4)

- Although the scenario incorporated references to greater business responsibility, Assembly Members still felt that there was not enough emphasis on businesses to improve their behaviour, reducing waste packaging.

"There has to be more requirement for businesses to change because without that you're reliant on the options businesses provide." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX4)

Scenario C

There was widespread support for this scenario, and it was received the most positively of all of the three future scenarios presented. However, there were also concerns that it might be too ambitious. It raised questions about how this goal could feasibly be reached and the possible trade-offs including health and sanitation problems from communal bins or risk of fly-tipping. Assembly Members also wanted greater clarity on the financial costs of implementing this scenario.

- Some ideas were generally received positively such as the introduction of community bins which may involve adopting what was described as a 'European model' of having a communal bin at the end of the street for all households to use collectively. Assembly Members were receptive to this provided there was sufficient support for those with disabilities.

- Assembly Members also liked that there were greater obligations required of businesses in this scenario.

- Concerns were raised by Assembly Members who wanted bins emptied when they are full. There was a worry that failure to do this might lead to health and sanitation problems and increased fly-tipping.

"If paying for residual waste, people would tip their waste into someone else's bin." (Male, 65+, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- A scenario which fell somewhere in between scenarios B and C was suggested. Scenario C was seen as overly challenging and unrealistic to some Assembly Members with several negative trade-offs needed in order to achieve the co-benefits.

- For these Assembly Members scenario C was too extreme and 'utopian' as they couldn't see how the behaviour change described could actually be achieved in practice.

"The sentiment is right but I'm not quite sure if it's actually achievable." (Male, 30-44, BME, ABC1 and OX4)

Additional suggestions

Assembly Members also made some suggestions of their own about how to help reach 'net zero'. Examples under the waste reduction theme included:

- More communications explaining that less frequent refuse collections would increase funds for other projects.
- Installation of (more) recycling bins in the city centre including in all public parks.
- Create a 'shop' at Redbridge household waste recycling centre to allow some items to be re-used, re-sold, or donated rather than thrown away.
- To help with waste reduction in the city centre, give people free bus tickets if people recycle their rubbish.
- Communal compost bins.
- Residents should be given council tax credit for recycling.

2 Buildings

Key findings

- **Assembly Members found it surprising that the largest proportion of emissions came from buildings – they typically assumed transport or industry would create the greatest emissions.**
- **A mix of developers, private landlords, individuals, Oxford City Council and central government were felt to be responsible for reducing carbon emissions in buildings.**
- **There was a perceived need for a balanced approach to decreasing emissions from buildings while simultaneously working to resolve the current homelessness and affordable housing crisis in Oxford.**
- **Assembly Members firmly believed that it's more cost effective if all new builds are built to sufficiently high standards, rather than paying the prohibitively high cost of retrofitting.**

Summary of table discussions

Assembly Members found it surprising that the largest proportion of emissions came from buildings. Rather, they had assumed transport or industry, not buildings, would be responsible for most emissions.

- Holding people to account for building efficiency was viewed as a major challenge and there was general agreement that incentives or co-benefits such as saving money on energy bills were needed to improve energy efficiency in buildings.
- The extent of the impact on health of poorly designed residential property from things like damp or mould was a shock to Assembly Members.

A mix of developers, private landlords, individuals, Oxford City Council and central government were felt to be responsible for reducing carbon emissions in buildings.

- Assembly Members felt that there needed to be a mix of subsidies and stronger rules from local and national governments to achieve this. While local action was important to them, they were concerned that Oxford City Council's power was limited. Consequently, there was a belief that national standards imposed by central government would also be required to affect change.
- As the data below shows, there was unanimous agreement that the Government should introduce national policy that requires new homes to be built to net zero standards.

Table 2.1: Currently national policy does not require that new homes are built to net zero standards. Should the Government introduce this standard?

	Overall results
Yes	42
No	-
Don't know	-

- There was interest in how Oxford City Council might encourage private landlords to raise their standards without passing rising costs onto the renters. Related to this, there was an added challenge around how best to encourage private renters to raise their energy efficiency and usage standards.

"It seems a bit ridiculous, with the new builds, in the near future you'll have to go back and retrofit again so it seems absurd that you wouldn't start there." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX1)

Table 2.2: (homeowners only) If you are a homeowner, would you be prepared to retrofit your home and bear the costs? (Average cost is £25,000 per home)

	Overall results
Yes	19
No	10
Don't know	6

- Of the Assembly Members who were homeowners, the majority (19 out of 35) said that they would be prepared to retrofit their homes and bear the costs themselves, compared to ten who said they would not be prepared to do this, and six who didn't know.

- Assembly Members wanted to know more about what effect commercial and educational buildings had on emissions and what was being done about this. Again, this was in response to a fear that too much emphasis was being placed on the individual, rather than large organisations.

There was a perceived need for a balanced approach to decreasing emissions from buildings while simultaneously working to resolve the current homelessness and affordable housing crisis in Oxford.

- There was a challenging dynamic between the need for more affordable housing and the need for reducing carbon emissions. A crisis in affordable housing in the city and a need for more social housing was recognised across Assembly Members, with the issue being seen as important to all Oxford residents not just those on low incomes.

  "Personally, I think the priority needs to be in providing affordable housing and reducing the number of homeless." (Female, 16-19, White, ABC1 and OX2)

The substantial cost of retrofitting residential properties was seen as a significant prohibiting factor. Assembly Members also felt it would be more cost effective if all new builds were built to sufficiently high standards initially rather than retrofitting them retrospectively.

- It came as a surprise to Assembly Members that so many new builds still were not built to carbon neutral standards. They felt that there should be higher standards for new builds which should be led by implementing regulations requiring developers to comply with these standards.

- Assembly Members were shocked at how much it could cost to insulate or retrofit their own home. Not owning their property or not intending to stay in a property long enough to offset the cost were also cited as barriers to retrofitting.

  "My husband and I bought our first house in Oxford. My husband is in energy fitting housing business. We can't afford it. It's very frustrating. You can have the best values, but you can't be able to do it." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- To make an informed decision Assembly Members wanted more information about the cost of this for specific properties including their own, and the cost of constructing new builds to a high energy efficiency standard.

- Assembly Members felt that Oxford City Council should take more responsibility for retrofitting existing properties including commercial buildings and social housing. The council should also implement higher buildings standards for new builds as currently the onus was too much on the individual to bear the cost. There was discussion around the need for mass purchasing programmes to retrofit specific areas at a time which could bring down prices.

  "The main reason why we're reluctant to do things about these problems is a lack of money. Maybe we need to think differently, how to give people more money or how to pay for it in a different way." (Male, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX3)

Scenario preferences

Table 2.3: Scenario voting results for buildings

Buildings	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A *(least ambitious)*	3
Scenario B	7
Scenario C *(most ambitious)*	31

- As before, scenario C was the clear "winner" with over three in four Assembly Members (31) choosing to live in that future scenario with a distinct minority that are cautious about the most ambitious future scenario.

Current Scenario

The current scenario was described as a "low base" to be starting from. As Assembly Members felt that this suggested not enough was being done, they envisaged considerable scope for improvement.

> *"[The current scenario] is not great. There's definitely room for improvement in every area." (Male, 45-59, BME, C2DE and OX4)*

- Assembly Members felt it was clear what needs to happen to make buildings more efficient – unlike some of other themes. However, cost was the main barrier – people cannot afford to retrofit their own homes, even if in the long run it will be cheaper for them.

- Assembly Members also wanted greater clarity on the co-benefits of retrofitting and expressed a preference for raising building standards for new properties before retrofitting existing properties, partly as it would be considerably cheaper.

> *"If you are building a new house, then £3,000 seems like a drop in the ocean compared to redoing it at a later date." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX4)*

- There were mixed views over how much protection should be given to heritage buildings in Oxford. This ranged from those who felt that the climate emergency should be prioritised over heritage or aesthetics and, therefore, all buildings should be retrofitted and given solar panels. However, for those for whom the Oxford skyline was very important, a compromise was seen as prioritising retrofitting newer and less culturally important buildings first before historic buildings further down the line, if still necessary.

Scenario A

Assembly Members disliked and rejected this scenario as it was felt to lack ambition and was too close to the current situation (which they disapproved of), without creating any real change.

- Assembly Members were concerned about the financial and logistical imposition on the public which would be needed to retrofit properties.
- They also wanted greater clarity on how the scenario's vision would be achieved in practice and on the costs of retrofitting for different types of measures and properties.
- Cost was again cited as the major barrier to retrofitting. Suggested solutions included helping people to envisage their cost savings over a 25 or more-year period, providing loans to homeowners, developing an accredited retrofit supplier list to reassure people about the quality of work, and tighter regulatory requirements for private landlords.

> *"There may be financial solutions from central local government to do with helping people with loans and mortgages." (Male, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX3)*

Scenario B

There was greater enthusiasm for this scenario compared to scenario A, with the benefits outweighing the potential drawbacks. In particular, the co-benefits of reducing fuel poverty and loans for retrofitting were mentioned as key positives.

> *"Fuel poverty being almost eradicated is a biggie. That's brilliant." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)*

- This scenario was felt to be clearer in terms of setting a definitive target, as well as a pathway via providing loans, in order to achieve this vision.
- There were some questions raised regarding how the council was going to fund the loans – for example, would these be to the detriment to other council-led services and, if so, which ones? Assembly Members were unsure whether the loans were a viable approach for this reason.
- One suggestion given to bring down the costs of retrofitting was to create community buying schemes for particular areas or streets. This would, in theory, provide a 'mass discount' if several properties decided to undertake this at the same time. The council was cited as key to driving ideas like this.

Scenario C

Overall, this scenario received a positive response although there were questions raised about how realistic it would be.

- The new financing options to make actions more accessible and affordable – such as loans being available for full retrofitting and local energy and heating services – were received positively. Similarly, Assembly Members were very keen that all new builds are constructed to the ultra-high energy efficiency 'Passivhaus' standards.
- Although, in general, the trade-offs were not seen as 'deal breakers', Assembly Members were concerned about the negative impact on personal choice – individuals having to pay for this was seen to be a considerable burden.

"I didn't like that there is less personal choice. There has to be an option instead of being told you have to have this. If you don't want to have the heat pump, then you don't have to fit it. I don't use my heating so I wouldn't want to pay £15,000 for a pump that I won't use. I want some sort of individual choice on what I have." (Female, 25-29, White, C2DE and OX2)

- Assembly Members questioned how higher take-up of retrofitting could be achieved. They felt a coordinated effort would be required, one that also promoted other co-benefits such as improved health. They felt that, even if loans were available, the high overall cost would still be an issue.
- A notable omission from this scenario was discussion around landlord responsibility, with Assembly Members frustrated that the onus seemed to be being placed primarily on individual homeowners.

Additional suggestions

Some additional comments and questions under the housing and buildings theme included:

- Introduce more co-housing and house sharing.
- Tackle 'low hanging fruit' such as encouraging residents to turn the temperature down and control the temperatures in public buildings by heating them smartly.
- Costs could be saved by bulk buying materials like insulation.
- Look to local eco-friendly suppliers to provide things like locally sourced eco-bricks to help disincentivise the use of concrete and cement bricks.
- New buildings should be built on brownfield rather than greenfield sites. There should also be audits of brownfield sites.
- The council should focus on the energy emissions from public, institutional, and commercial buildings rather than residential properties.
- Stop installation of gas central heating in new builds.
- Co-working office spaces should be promoted in the city centre.

Retrofitting

- Public information and education resources about retrofitting options and costs is needed.
- There should be reliable standards via legislation for retrofitting that can be effectively introduced and maintained. There should be training and inspection of tradesmen for retrofitting work to assess the quality of workmanship.
- Landlords of private rental properties should be required to retrofit properties.
- A community infrastructure levy could be introduced to pay to retrofit older historic houses.

- The council should provide some help for local communities to retrofit houses collectively to bring costs down. This could be something as simple as a press pack in the form of a flyer on the possible pros and cons of retrofitting domestic homes and the costs versus benefits.
- Assembly Members wanted clearer costs for retrofitting that were more specific to their property so they could make informed decisions.
- Loans for retrofitting could be paid back through reduced energy bills which would help to reduce concerns about how to pay back large loans.
- Another suggestion to help homeowners pay for retrofitting their own homes includes grants and loans from the council, or perhaps money off council tax bills.
- Developers having to pay for retrofitting existing houses could be a condition for planning.

3 Transport

Key findings

- **Encouraging behaviour change and modal shift away from private car use was seen as key – people can feel reliant on their car.**
- **Implementing infrastructure changes (i.e. more and safer cycling infrastructure) and technological changes was also important.**
- **A unified strategy for transport planning between Oxford City, the County Council, and public transport providers was a key requirement for Assembly Members.**
- **Incentivising public transport use and consideration of how vulnerable groups (especially children and the elderly) can get about were important areas to address when encouraging a move away from cars.**

Summary of table discussions

Encouraging behaviour change and modal shift away from private car use was seen as key to addressing this issue, in addition to implementing infrastructure and technological changes. People make decisions and change transport behaviour based on price, convenience, and speed.

- Assembly Members felt strongly that travelling through the city centre in a private car, particularly at peak times and for journeys that go through without stopping, should be discouraged. They suggested that people need to be encouraged and incentivised to use other means of transport as the norm, as opposed to the car.
- There was also a suggestion of implementing a congestion charge and even banning cars in Oxford city centre – though those most reliant on their car to get around were strongly opposed to this.

Cycling was mentioned frequently and spontaneously as a key issue. While Oxford has relatively high levels of cycling, improving cycling infrastructure would help make it safer and encourage more vulnerable groups such as the elderly and children to use this mode of transport.

- Assembly Members stressed the need to improve safety for cyclists and felt cycling infrastructure was lacking in this regard. Addressing this was a priority for Assembly Members, even among non-cyclists. They suggested this would be a good place for the council to start addressing transport issues in Oxford as it was perceived to be relatively easy and cheap.

  "Statistically we have the second highest use of bikes in the country, so how do we build on that success and make it a much better environment for cyclists?" (Male, 30-44, White, ACB1 and OX1)

- The issue of bike theft was also cited as an issue and a free bike rental service was proposed, akin to so-called 'Boris Bikes' in London.

There were various solutions proposed to improve transport in the city, mostly around improving public transport provision.

- This could include cheaper fares on buses, integrated ticketing, routes that connect certain harder to reach areas, and revised bus routes so fewer go through the city centre. Park and ride schemes could also be made free – or, at least, cheaper – to incentivise use.

  "If you want people to use buses, you have to improve the public transport system. Where I live, we don't have direct transport." (Female, 65+, BME, ABC1, and OX3)

- Most of the information and discussion centred around the transport and commuting habits of Oxford residents and workers. However, Assembly Members felt that the carbon impacts of the tourist industry in Oxford, in particular the large coach loads of tourists should be considered alongside residents' transport habits.

There needs to be a unified strategy for transport planning between Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council, and public transport providers.

- Transport was an issue that Assembly Members felt the City Council could feasibly address. However, they also felt that there should be a more joined-up approach to transport planning between Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council, and public transport providers to create efficient, low cost, and green travel options.

  "Transport infrastructure and planning is done at a county level. It would be interesting to hear what the city itself can do." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

Cost-effectiveness of transport measures needs to be considered to incentivise use.

- Cost needs to be considered for all proposed measures as Assembly Members felt this could be prohibitive to implement for users, thus making the required shift in behaviour harder to achieve.

- Cost effectiveness could help encourage car users to take public transport. Assembly Members discussed how they used the car to transport their family because it was the cheapest option currently available.

  "I don't want to use the car, but with the impact on my pocket, it doesn't make sense [not to]." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX1)

It is important to also consider how vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly will be affected by changes in the public transport system and ensure the system is suitable for all.

- For example, electric vehicles and charging technologies need to be accessible and within people's budgets.

- There were concerns raised about vulnerable groups when it comes to changes in the public transport system – particularly children, the elderly, those with disabilities, and parents transporting young children. Any transport system would need to be accessible to all types of users.

Scenario preferences

Table 3.1: Scenario voting results for transport

Transport	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A *(least ambitious)*	2
Scenario B	12
Scenario C *(most ambitious)*	26

- As with previous themes, the most ambitious scenario – C – was the most popular. Once again, around one in three (14/40) are cautious about this option.

Current Scenario

The current situation regarding transport in Oxford was felt to be quite poor, with Assembly Members noting that there was a lot of scope for improvement. That said, the baseline was also felt to be a better starting point than for the previous two themes (waste and buildings).

- Assembly Members felt that traffic congestion was a major issue at present due to people's reliance on private cars to travel around Oxford. This was particularly a problem at peak times, including the morning and evening rush hours and weekend traffic. To overcome this, Assembly Members felt Oxford needed a more integrated public transport system and for cycling infrastructure to be improved.

  "The fact that the [cycling] routes into the city centre are well served but actually the routes around the city are pretty poor. It seems a big disjointed, it's too simplistic." (Female, 65+, White, C2DE and OX4)

- Related to traffic congestion from cars, poor air quality was cited as a major transport-related issue in the city, which could have knock-on effects for the public's health.

  "For two weeks I could taste the pollution in Oxford. I don't know if it was just me." (Male, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX4)

- There was also relatively low awareness of plans to implement a zero-emission zone in Oxford from 2020.

Scenario A

Scenario A was described as "a step in the right direction" which could set an acceptable target for Oxford to reach in the next two to three years. However, it was not felt to be ambitious enough for a twenty-year long-term goal such as reaching net zero, as it may not lead to real improvements.

"If it's the end goal it's really bad." (Male, 16-19, White, C2DE and OX4)

- Assembly Members were receptive to the co-benefits of this scenario, in particular better air quality and freeing up road space for community building projects such as green corridors, tree planting, cafes, and recreation.
- They also suggested that electric cars may not ultimately help address their concerns about transport in Oxford – they felt it would be better to aim for fewer cars in general rather than just replacing petrol or diesel vehicles with electric alternatives. However, they liked that the electric vehicle charging infrastructure was improving under this scenario – the lack of such was felt to be a major barrier to people buying electric cars.
- There were a few omissions in this scenario which were highlighted by Assembly Members. For example, there is no mention of emissions related to tourist coaches or school buses or transport provisions for vulnerable groups including the elderly and disabled people.

Scenario B

Assembly Members were generally supportive of this scenario overall though had concerns about how realistic it was and whether it was too limited in ambition.

"It's not as good as scenario C. It's a bit wet. It's not going far enough." (Male, 45-59, BME, C2DE and OX4)

- The trade-offs of increasing the cost and decreasing the accessibility of petrol and diesel cars received some pushback. For those most opposed, it was a 'deal-breaker' – they felt that personal freedom, convenience, and choice regarding when and how to travel was critical.
- Assembly Members felt that people would simply refuse to give up their cars because they liked driving, or because they simply could not manage without a car – for example, parents with young children. There was a strong sense that public transport would need to be much better and cheaper in order to incentivise modal shift.

  "Convenience of door to door travel has gone [in this scenario] and 80% of my time I use my car to drop kids to ballet, gymnastics and football. I couldn't manage without it." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX3)

- The point was again raised that replacing petrol or diesel cars with more electric cars should not be the end goal. Rather, Assembly Members felt Oxford should be discouraging car use in general. Indeed, there were concerns about how much "greener" electric vehicles are, with Assembly Members questioning how the electricity these vehicles use is generated and the emissions this causes.

  "I don't think electric cars should be cheaper. Based on the general numbers that we've just been told, the equivalent of using your electric car for an hour is the equivalent of the energy of five houses for that same time." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

Scenario C

This scenario was received positively overall. There was significant enthusiasm for some of the co-benefits, especially reclaiming space for the community from cars. That said, there were concerns about the extent to which this future could mean a curtailed sense of personal freedom.

- The trade-offs were received positively by some and were felt to be reasonable sacrifices to make to achieve the scenario overall and the associated co-benefits.
- The need for cheaper public transport was again discussed with free travel for all residents suggested.

  "It [public transport] should be free for residents." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- Similarly, to the previous two scenarios, discussion about school buses and transport for younger residents was felt to be missing from this scenario. Again, all the scenarios including C also need to be adjusted to take into account disability issues and ensure the transport system is accessible for all Oxford residents and visitors.

  "There is no mention of facilitating journeys to schools. Given how much the congestion drops in half term, it's so drastic, there should be discussion of the school bus system." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX4)

- That said, some of the trade-offs, such as the lack of personal freedom regarding travel choices, caused concern. Those most concerned about this felt that the loss of freedom associated with car ownership would be intolerable.

  "This seems like a more pleasant landscape for families and the city landscape. The trade-offs seem quite onerous. Less personal freedom...it's what sparks rebellion." (Female, 65+, BME, ABC1 and OX3)

Additional suggestions

Additional suggestions for change under the transport theme included:

- In order to increase walking and help those with pushchairs and wheelchairs, pavements should be level and dropped curbs should be replaced with ramped curbs.
- In addition to commuters and residents Oxford should also consider the impact of tourists and students on traffic and how to combat this. For example, tourist coaches could be banned from the city centre, either completely or at certain days/times.
- A light electric tram system was suggested to replace buses in the city centre.
- An electric cargo bike club could be introduced so share electric bikes among interested residents.
- Need to consider the carbon impact of school journeys as well as commuting. One suggestion for this could be co-ordinated public transport to and from schools.
- Improving cycle lanes would be relatively cheap and very helpful to present cyclists and would-be cyclists and would help to increase safety.
- Specialist transport provision needs to be considered for vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities, the elderly and people with young children. It is important to ensure that the transport provision in Oxford is suitable for all including those with mobility issues and that this is properly considered at the planning stage.
- Oxford could have a car-free day at regular intervals – perhaps monthly – to begin to change people's minds and over-reliance on the car.

- Oxford could join 'Riding Sunbeams[4]' to connect solar panels directly onto electrified rail routes to power the trains.

[4] https://www.ridingsunbeams.org/

4 Biodiversity and Offsetting

Key findings

- **Assembly Members were very positive about creating more biodiversity and green space around Oxford.**
- **Creating more green space and planting more trees was considered an 'easy win' and visible to the whole community.**
- **There were questions about whether 'offsetting' could effectively address carbon neutrality, and if it allowed those who can afford it to continue polluting.**
- **Assembly Members identified a tension between setting aside land for green space while, at the same time, allowing for new housing to be built.**

Summary of table discussions

Assembly Members felt offsetting carbon emissions failed to effectively address the challenges of reaching 'net zero' by 2050.

- They felt that offsetting shifts the primary focus away from the fundamental changes in behaviours that are cause of carbon emissions.
- There were concerns that those who can afford offsetting their carbon footprint will not need to change their energy consumption behaviour in the same ways that those who cannot afford to offset will.

  "It's a way for rich people to travel." (Male, 45-59, BME, C2DE and OX4)

- That said, as shown in the table below, the majority of Assembly Members (34 out of 41) would actively offset their carbon footprint, if the money raised was channelled into local renewable energy and biodiversity schemes – this suggests that misgivings about offsetting can – in part, at least – be addressed by focusing on how it fits with wider plans for reaching 'net zero'.

Table 4.1: Would you actively offset your carbon footprint if the money raised was channelled into local renewable energy and biodiversity schemes?

	Overall results
Yes	34
No	6
Don't know	1

Biodiversity, in contrast, was seen in a positive light by Assembly Members. They felt that it was sometimes overlooked by developers and planners in the context of the other themes discussed.

- Assembly Members mentioned that biodiversity ought to be considered within the context of the other themes discussed. For example, new construction work (whether commercial or residential) planting trees and creating green space need to be considered more than they are currently.

  "I think [considering them all together] really is key. It's putting that puzzle together. You can't think about them separately." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX1)

- Assembly Members recognised the need for balance biodiversity against the need for new housing. There was discussion that the council must "strike a balance" between the two by planting new trees and including green space when constructing new housing stock.

  "I think all new housing should be accompanied by some landscaping, so there are trees and greenery around. So many of the new blocks in Cowley are brick and concrete." (Female, 65+, White, C2DE and OX4)

Table 4.2: Which of the following two options should Oxford City Council prioritise?

	Overall results
Planting additional trees in public spaces in Oxford	28
Procuring land outside the city in partnership with neighbouring councils for large-scale tree planting	10
Don't know	4

- Regarding tree planting, more Assembly Members (28 out of 42) thought that Oxford City Council should prioritise planting additional trees in public spaces such as parks and streets in Oxford, as prioritising large-scale tree planting outside the city (10 out of 42).

Responsibility for biodiversity was felt to be spread across government and citizens.

- When asked who should be responsible for Oxford's biodiversity, Assembly Members believed that it should be shared among the city and county councils, the national government, and citizens themselves. It is worth noting that biodiversity (not including offsetting) was the theme which Assembly Members were most enthusiastic to have shared responsibility between government and citizens.

  "It feels like [biodiversity] is within the remit of the Council to actually do something." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- Improving biodiversity was perceived to be a "low hanging fruit" – something easy for the council to do as well as being an affordable solution.

  "Immediately you have a visual difference and it's not much to maintain. That could be done tomorrow." (Female, 65+, BME, ABC1 and OX3)

Oxford University should also be part of the biodiversity dialogue.

- Oxford University was seen as needing to play a crucial role in Oxford's biodiversity for two main reasons. First, the university is the largest landowner in Oxford including both developed and green space land. Second, the number of students is critical, as they can assist (as many already do) in helping cultivate land for biodiverse purposes.

Scenario preferences

Table 4.3: Scenario voting results for biodiversity and offsetting

Biodiversity and Offsetting	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A *(least ambitious)*	2
Scenario B	8
Scenario C *(most ambitious)*	30

- As with most of the themes, Scenario C received the most preferences.

Current Scenario

- Assembly Members were disappointed with the current situation, particularly referencing the lack of additional green space in Oxford.
- Some considered it strange that a significant amount of money is being spent to cut down woodland around Oxford – as part of the planned Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme – to deal with area flooding.

  "Yes, I think this is less rose-tinted. It seems a little bit ironic that we're spending £120 million and cutting down woodland to stop flooding." (Male, 20-24, White, ABC1 and OX4)

Scenario A

- The addition of any green space was seen as positive co-benefit. While scenario A was seen as a step in the right direction it did not feel like it was doing enough. Assembly Members tended to be very supportive of creating as much biodiversity as possible

  "I'd like to see every other parking space turned over to tree planting." (Male, 65+, White, ABC1 and OX2)
- The trade-offs within this theme felt minimal compared with the other discussed themes in the assembly. There was little financial cost to creating green space and it was seen as something the community as a whole can contribute to. Allocating space that could not be used for housing was one of the biggest trade-offs.

Scenario B

- Those that preferred this scenario did so because they felt there was a greater emphasis on protection in this scenario compared with scenarios A and C
- However, a number of Assembly Members felt there was little difference between Scenario A and B – they felt that all this scenario did was increase the ratio of trees planted to trees removed.

Scenario C

- Assembly Members emphasised that there needs to be a balance between green space and allowing more housing to be built. A large trade-off for this scenario was that it offers less space for housing to be built.
- Another trade-off seen in this scenario was that there was less focus on community responsibility. As discussed above Assembly Members felt that responsibility for biodiversity should be spread across the government and the local community.
- When it came to green roofs, there was some confusion as to why it was said that solar panels worked more efficiently on them.

5 Renewable Energy

Key findings

- **There was surprise at how much Oxford has already done about renewable energy.**
- **Electricity was viewed as more expensive than gas, and there were concerns about the affordability of solar panels.**
- **It was felt that too much emphasis is currently placed on the individual to take the initiative. The council and national government need to play a more direct role in helping households to make the transition away from gas and to new sources of power.**
- **Assembly Members were open to compromise in deciding where renewable sources would be placed – neutralising climate change was seen as more important than aesthetics.**

Summary of table discussions

Assembly Members recognised that cost plays a significant role in an individual's energy choices.

- Switching from gas to electric was seen as potentially expensive, so encouraging or incentivising households to do was seen as a major challenge. Additionally, purchasing solar panels was felt to be an unrealistic option for many households – particularly those on lower incomes.

  "I imagine there's a big upfront cost moving to electric, and it's about convincing people about the long-term benefits which is that it might be cheaper when you get your energy bill but you've got to make the investment." (Male, 25-29, White, ABC1 and OX3)

- Assembly Members considered that people need to be convinced of the benefits of energy efficiency from a financial perspective. There is a clear role for Oxford City or County Councils to encourage people to switch and providing information on the benefits of doing so.

The impact of solar panels was seen as higher than what many Assembly Members expected.

- The impact and energy efficiency of solar panels was much higher than many Assembly Members expected. They were surprised that it was possible to sell additional power back to the national grid. It was felt this could potentially make a big difference in reducing carbon emissions.
- While installing solar panels on private homes should be a priority, Assembly Members believed it will require encouragement, incentivisation, and the provision of clear guidance from the national government and council.

  "If the householder can't [afford to] pay for solar panels, who's going to pay for it?" (Male, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX3)

- There was a sense that installing wind turbines in a city like Oxford would be an eyesore, whereas renewables such as solar panels would be much more acceptable to the local population.

There was some debate among Assembly Members regarding the practicalities and aesthetics of installing solar panels on grass fields or historic buildings.

- Installing panels on newer buildings was seen as a high priority for Assembly Members. Nor did they want to rule out installing them on older buildings, though this should be done selectively.

  "[Climate] emergency trumps [preserving] historical medieval place." (Female, 65+, White, ABC1, and OX4)

- Assembly Members questioned how realistic it was to install solar panels on older or historic buildings. They would change the aesthetic feel for which the city is known for and there were assumed to be problems around whether older structures could support panels being installed.

Although Assembly Members were optimistic about solar energy, they felt that the council should consider other renewable sources as well.

- Assembly Members felt strongly that the renewables discussion was too focused on solar power. Other options such as wind farms and hydro power should also be considered.

  "We're being tunnelled to certain choices and not thinking about renewable energy as a whole. Wind farms and hydro, it's just solar panels all the way through." (Female, 60-64, BME, ABC1 and OX4)

- Assembly Members struggled to see how solar panels and "green roofs" could coexist.

Scenario preferences

Table 5.1: Scenario voting results for renewable energy

Renewable Energy	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A *(least ambitious)*	6
Scenario B	7
Scenario C *(most ambitious)*	27

- Once again, scenario C – the most ambitious – was the most popular with the Assembly Members, though close to one in three again preferred a less ambitious future scenario with fewer trade-offs.

Current Scenario

- Assembly Members were surprised at the amount already being done in Oxford regarding renewable energy. They were pleased to discover that a high proportion of homes and buildings already have solar panels installed and that local hydro-power plants are already in operation. These schemes were unheard of beforehand.

  "I never knew 2,000 homes in the city have solar panels. I haven't seen any. Hydropower, I haven't seen that." (Male, 65+, BME, ABC1 and OX4)

- Assembly Members felt that in the current situation there is too much responsibility on the individual to invest in renewable energy. There is not enough emphasis on government (national or local) to help incentivise the transition towards renewables. Assembly Members felt that, as things stand, this move is not a viable option to most households.

Scenario A

- Assembly Members liked that this scenario was more diversified than the current situation, which they felt was much more heavily focused on solar energy alone. They felt positive about the inclusion of wind power particularly.

- Despite this, there was a sense that Scenario A is largely "business as usual" or only a slight improvement over the current situation.

  "What does that even mean? They seem like numbers plucked out of the air. I would rather see incentives or regulations requiring commercial businesses to act, rather than a random area." (Female, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- Assembly Members also felt that cost was still a barrier in this scenario and that it does not clearly explain how people on low incomes will move from gas (which is seen as cheaper) to electricity.

  "This doesn't seem to mention converting from gas to electricity. For me, that's the most important part of this...electricity is more expensive than gas heating, so people particularly on low incomes, they can't move unless something is done to address that." (Male, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX4)

Scenario B

- Overall Assembly Members were more favourable towards this scenario's goals and appreciated the co-benefit of better physical and mental health.

- Trade-offs, however, became more evident in this scenario. In particular, Assembly Members felt that this scenario meant a great deal of disruption to Oxford's landscape through the addition of solar panels and windfarms. Further, there was a fear that installing renewable energy "farms" would contradict efforts to improve biodiversity and create green space.

  "The larger renewables are a red herring. In a place where we have very little land and we're trying to be more biodiverse, I don't think we can afford to put land into renewables." (Female, 45-59, White, ABC1 and OX4)

- There were questions about whether increasing renewable sources by the amounts indicated in scenario B should be entirely the responsibility of Oxford alone or could be shared with other surrounding areas.

Scenario C

- There was widespread support for this scenario. Assembly Members felt that the co-benefits which were shared with scenarios A and B should also clearly indicate that they will increase too (for example 'Physical and mental health improves further').

- There were concerns over how the city would look if too many panels and wind farms were created, though a compromise on aesthetics could be reached.

  "Oxford is very beautiful, and that is a human value as well. I think one should make a compromise. As you say, windmills are much more beautiful than pylons, but the windmill doesn't have to be in the high street." (Female, 65+, White, ABC1 and OX1)

Additional suggestions

Additional points mentioned related to the renewable energy theme included:

- Assembly Members expressed a desire for more facts relating to renewable energy which would be useful to refer to when making decisions. Example questions included: What is the threshold definition for fuel poverty? Is realistic that Oxford can generate sufficient renewable energy to meet local needs? How can the river be utilised more to create renewable energy?

- Focus on concentrating on switching gas to electricity and generating renewable energy locally.

- The government should take responsibility for providing solar energy to its citizens, rather than putting the financial and logistical burden on citizens themselves.

6 Vision of net zero Oxford

Key findings

- **When imagining a 'net zero' Oxford, Assembly Members envisioned Oxford having become a leader in tackling the climate crisis. In achieving this, Oxford would become a more liveable city, with better communities, happier, healthier people, and a cleaner and more pleasant environment to live in – all without sacrificing residents' standard of living.**
- **Enhanced biodiversity was central to the overall 'net zero' vision of Oxford with increased flora and fauna in the city mentioned across the Assembly Members' visions of the future.**
- **Assembly Members foresaw major changes in transport provision in Oxford with cycling, walking, and public transport prioritised over private motor vehicles.**
- **Cultural change would be strongly felt in individual local communities which had become better connected and more tolerant.**
- **There would be key changes in the buildings sector with improved building standards, widespread retrofitting, and more domestic and non-domestic energy needs being met by sustainable sources.**
- **Assembly Members anticipated future Oxford residents would have more sustainable patterns of consumption with less waste and increased levels of recycling.**
- **They described various co-benefits of their 'net zero' Oxford visions and felt it was important to communicate about these clearly to the public. This, in turn, would help incentivise people to change for reasons that are personally or socially beneficial as well as to tackle the climate crisis.**
- **While most of the visions focused on the positive co-benefits, Assembly Members acknowledged there would be some trade-offs from their vision such as the cost of implementing these various measures.**

- As part of the Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change, Assembly Members undertook a visioning exercise in which they were asked to either write a letter or draw a picture telling someone about what a future 'net zero' Oxford would be like. They were also asked to include the year of their vision on their letter or picture.
- A total of 40 letters and pictures were created and are analysed in the rest of this chapter. Please see the appendix for the full list of original letters and pictures.
- Please note that the quotes in this chapter are not attributed as the letters and pictures Assembly Members produced were anonymous.

Summary of key themes

In terms of an overall vision, Oxford was generally envisioned to have become a leader in tackling the climate crisis and by achieving net zero the city not only successfully tackled greenhouse gas emissions but also created a more liveable city –

one with better communities, happier, healthier people, and a cleaner and more pleasant environment to live in without sacrificing residents' standard of living.

- There was a sense that real societal and cultural change had taken place in order to achieve net zero and there were many co-benefits. For example, by addressing climate change they had also enhanced community cohesion and solved other issues such as the homelessness crisis.
- Oxford was portrayed as the 'envy of other cities', with thriving local communities and happy, healthy citizens who talk, help, and support each other.

  "Whenever I tell someone I am from Oxford, they're a bit jealous."

- The years suggested when their 'net zero' vision would be achieved was sooner than 2050 and exact dates ranged from 2030 to 2040.
- Assembly Members imagined feeling great pride that Oxford had decided to become a leader on climate change and believe that the council's action served as a catalyst for radical change in order to achieve 'net zero'.

  "I'm grateful to live in a place that took the climate crisis seriously."

- Ideally Oxford would have retained its current skyline, but the environment would be much cleaner and greener with more biodiversity from more trees, public parks and gardens.
- Oxford city centre itself would be quiet and peaceful with a slower pace of life and less air and noise pollution from traffic.

  "Less noisy, less polluted and less frantic."

Assembly Members foresaw major changes in transport provision in Oxford with cycling, walking, and public transport prioritised over private motor vehicles.

- Cycling and walking had been prioritised and made safer through major infrastructure improvements and increased provision segregated cycle paths. Cars had also been either banned or significantly reduced through a zero emissions zone in the city centre which meant that cycling had become much more commonplace and the preferred option over the car as everybody felt safe cycling around the city.

  "We've sold our car because I now finally feel safe enough to cycle around the whole city."

- Increased levels of cycling also meant residents were fitter and healthier and decreased car use had led to cleaner air and fewer instances of pollution-related health issues.

  "[There would be] no cars within the ring road for anti-pollution as much as climate change reasons."

- Other transport measures Assembly Members proposed included: pedestrianised streets in the city centre, a public car hire service, most vehicular transport being electrified – 'petrol cars are almost eradicated', local electric car manufacturing, large parts of the city being declared public transport priority zones, deliveries done by bike courier. A congestion tax would be imposed on private cars in the city, so road space is mainly allocated for taxis,

buses and other vehicles. Any freed-up road space is used for cycle lanes, footpaths or green space for the community.

"Petrol cars are almost eradicated."

- Working from home would become commonplace across different types of organisations eliminating the need for some commuting journeys.

Enhanced biodiversity was central to the overall 'net zero' vision of Oxford with increased flora and fauna in the city centre mentioned across the Assembly Members' letters and pictures.

- Assembly Members generally pictured more nature in the centre of Oxford. For example, there would be roads lined with trees and shrubs and more green space in the form of local parks, allotments, and woodlands. One suggestion included replacing car parks with woodlands and there would also be tree planting schemes to increase the number of trees. This increased greenery would then lead to more birds, hedgehogs, butterflies, and bees and make Oxford a nicer place to live and enable residents to feel closer to nature.

- As a result of increased biodiversity there would be less flooding in Oxford due to additional trees acting as natural flood defences.

"I rejoice to see so much colour and variety compared to how Oxford used to be…it's a small piece of paradise."

Local communities would become better connected and more tolerant.

- Assembly Members felt that Oxford as a whole would become more vibrant and accommodating, with better integrated communities based on sharing, equality, and local connection.

- Residential streets would be quiet and safe, creating a strong sense of community. In practice, this meant that neighbours knew each other more and shared items like gardening equipment and their children played together outside.

- There would also be sufficient social housing provision which will help alleviate some of the present-day issues in Oxford around homelessness and affordability of housing.

There would be key changes in the buildings sector, with improved building standards, more widespread retrofitting, and more domestic and non-domestic energy needs being met by sustainable sources.

- Green space in Oxford was preserved as a common public resource and building on greenfield sites would be prohibited; instead all building is done on brownfield sites.

- All new houses are required to be better insulated and built to 'Passivhaus' standards. Up to 80% of existing homes have been retrofitted, perhaps through government-funded loans. Similarly, solar panels for domestic houses have been provided for domestic buildings through the council's 0% interest loan scheme and solar panels have been added to many commercial buildings in the city centre.

- Domestic and industrial energy supplies were increasingly supplied by renewable energy sources such as heat pumps, windmills, offshore wind farms, solar panels, and hydroelectric dams which makes heating homes cheaper and more sustainable. More energy is also produced locally.

Assembly Members anticipated future Oxford residents would have more sustainable patterns of consumption with less waste and increased levels of recycling.

- Several options were suggested to reduce waste in Oxford including: more repair cafes, swap shops, and fewer shops selling tourist souvenirs.

  "We don't buy things and throw them away."

- In addition to individual changes, people will be motivated to waste less because products have become more expensive due to a 'carbon tax' being included in the selling price. Moreover, more plastic packaging has been replaced with biodegradables.

- There is more education and information provided to Oxford residents on waste reduction and recycling which has increased uptake of recycling and there has also been a reduction in bin collection frequency.

While most of the visions focused on the positive co-benefits, Assembly Members acknowledged there would be some trade-offs from their vision.

- Some of the transport changes may cause accessibility problems for vulnerable users including those with mobility issues who rely on private car use or taxis.

- Many of these measures will incur a significant financial cost which will need to be funded from sources like the Council budget, central government, businesses or local residents themselves. This also may mean that it is more expensive for tourists to visit Oxford.

  "I have less cash savings, but I have a greater sense of security."

- It will be important to ensure that the current standard of living does not decrease too greatly while implementing and funding these changes.

7 Should Oxford aim to achieve net zero sooner than 2050?

Key findings

- **The majority of Assembly Members (37 out of 41) felt that Oxford should aim to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050. However, even among those who agreed with this, there was little consensus on when Oxford should aim to reach 'net zero' instead.**
- **There was not a clear consensus on what Oxford should focus on first. Suggestions included 'quick wins' like transport improvements as this would be noticeable to residents to show that Oxford is doing something in response to climate change.**

Voting results

Table 7.1: The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?

	Overall results
Yes	37
No	4

- As outlined in table 8.1 above, the majority of Assembly Members felt that Oxford should aim to achieve net zero sooner than 2050. However, there were mixed views about this and even among those who agreed, there was little consensus on when Oxford should aim to reach 'net zero' instead.
- There were various reasons why Assembly Members were inclined to support a more ambitious timeframe for Oxford than 2050. For some, 2050 was seen as too far away, with a deadline of 30 years in the future not incentivising immediate action to address the climate emergency. After having attended the Citizens' Assembly and hearing from various expert speakers, Assembly Members were confident that Oxford had the technical capability and an engaged and ambitious public which will help them to achieve net zero sooner. The number of 'green' initiatives already taking place in Oxford also gave them a sense that the city was already ahead of the curve and was well-placed to push harder and faster to reach 'net zero'.

"Absolutely [we should aim for net zero before 2050]. I want to be ambitious. I think it is the right thing to do. Why wait until 2050? On lots of means. It's good for the environment. It'll be good for individuals. Good for health, wellbeing, mental health. The city will look lovely. I don't see any downside other than the pound signs." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX2)

- In addition, Oxford was seen as a relatively affluent and liberal city. As such, Assembly Members felt that cities like Oxford must aim to achieve 'net zero' quickly in order to protect future generations and poorer countries who are more negatively impacted by climate change. This would also help the UK to reach its overall target of 2050. Furthermore, Oxford's connection with a world-leading university means it should be a leader and set an example for the UK and the rest of the world to follow. Some suggested setting the target for say 2030 would also allow for 'slippage' and the target still being met within a reasonable timeframe, which would not be the case with a 2050 target.

"Oxford has the research and intellectual and academics to help us, so if we can't use best evidence, who can? We need to be leaders." (Female, 65+ White, ABC1 and OX2)

- In contrast, others were sceptical about the practicalities of being able to make the changes required to achieve 'net zero' by a date sooner than 2050. For these Assembly Members the realism and recognition of advice given by experts throughout the Assembly had highlighted the challenge in reaching 'net zero' by 2050 and they therefore thought it would be unrealistic to aim to do it sooner.

- Interim targets were suggested as a potential solution to this difference in opinion, with progressively more ambitious 'net zero' targets set for 2030, 2040, and finally 2050.

How views have changed

- Across the Assembly, the views of Assembly Members changed a little regarding their response to the whether or not Oxford should aim to achieve 'net zero' quicker than 2050.

- One way in which their views changed was from a 'yes' at the start of the Assembly to a 'stronger yes' by the end. At the beginning of the Citizens' Assembly, and despite being broadly supportive of the aim, Assembly Members had little sense of how it would be achieved. By the end of the Assembly, however, there were those who felt it would be possible for Oxford to hit the target before 2050. There was increased awareness of current initiatives in Oxford, and this gave people encouragement. In addition, the active engagement from all Assembly Members and meeting others with strong desires to set an ambitious target, helped make it feel possible to bring others on board and set ambitious targets.

"My view has changed. I thought we should do this, but I thought it was going to be a lot more difficult than I think now. It's a combination of things. They're underway. Projects we've seen where it's already worked. The amount of people I've talked to here that are enthusiastic. That's changed my attitude about how easy it would be to convince people." (Male, 30-44, White, ABC1 and OX4)

- Those who had a change of mind from 'yes' to 'no' cited financial reasons for the change as well as less faith in the methods for achieving 'net zero' as they had before. These Assembly Members felt that there were other pressing issues in Oxford such as homelessness, the housing crisis, and social care – for some people, an increase

in rent or council tax for retrofitting would not be feasible, for example. The solution to address the climate crisis needs to be fair to all including those on lower incomes.

What should Oxford do first?

- There was not a clear consensus on what Oxford should focus on first. Suggestions included 'quick wins' like transport improvements as this would be noticeable to residents to show that Oxford is doing something in response to climate change.

  "I think transport is more visible. Once you've done transport, you can see you're on the right path, and once they see that change, they'd be more likely to do other changes." (Male, 45-59, BME, C2DE and OX4)

- Others felt the immediate priority should be green space and conserving biodiversity, for example, banning the cutting down of trees.

- Overall, it was felt that the council should ensure that policy making is holistic and comprehensive and work with central government to drive change. Engaging with the wider public and relevant stakeholders would be integral to this.

8 Communications

Key findings

- **The various co-benefits should be communicated clearly to the public to incentivise people to change for reasons that are personally or socially beneficial as well as to solve the climate crisis.**
- **The council needs to communicate a shared vision and strategy to reaching 'net zero' that shows the roles played by local and national government, businesses, and individuals.**
- **There needs to be more education and information provided for the wider public in Oxford to help them understand what they can personally do to help. Specifically, Assembly Members wanted more information about how to recycle correctly.**
- **There was also a strong sense that there should be a focus on helping to raise awareness of existing initiatives such as share and repair cafes and shops to increase usage.**

Throughout the Assembly, there were various recommendations discussed regarding how Oxford City Council could best communicate these changes to the wider public in Oxford.

- Assembly Members recognised the various co-benefits of a 'net zero' Oxford vision and felt it was important for the council to communicate about these clearly to the public to encourage change for reasons that are personally or socially beneficial as well as to solve the climate crisis.
- This was particularly the case if the council decides to pursue some of the more ambitious scenarios – it will be important to explain why the co-benefits outweigh the associated trade-offs, rather than solely focusing on the environmental benefits. Some of the co-benefits that Assembly Members felt would especially resonate with the wider Oxford public included better communities, safer transport, less traffic, increased biodiversity, less waste, financial savings on energy bills, and less air pollution.
- Assembly Members were generally prepared to take action and make individual sacrifices in order to solve the climate crisis themselves. However, this needs to be a shared vision and led by the council. It is important to communicate that reaching a 'net zero' target will take a joint effort between local and national government, businesses, and residents.
- There needs to be more education and information provided for the wider public in Oxford to help them understand what they can personally do to help. Specifically, Assembly Members wanted more information about how to recycle correctly.
- There was a lack of awareness among Assembly Members about some of the initiatives that were already taking place in Oxford such as the share and repair cafes and shops. Some of the communications should focus on helping to raise awareness of these to increase usage.

- As well as 'traditional' communication channels, such as emails and letters, Assembly Members suggested a 'one stop shop' in the city centre where residents could go to find out information on any of the green initiatives going on in Oxford and how they can get involved. This would also help to bring together the various groups and schemes into one central place.

- Assembly Members felt that communications should be accessible and proactively pushed out to residents rather than referring people to the website or relying on them to search this out. It will also be important to measure progress and communicate this to the public. One suggestion for this was to actively measure progress against the 'net zero' target on the council website so people can see how this has improved over time and how much farther there is to go within the chosen timeframe.

- It will be important to consider how some people may feel about radical changes to where they live and their personal freedoms. This should be addressed sensitively in communications and avoid making people feel that the council is forcing change upon them. Instead the council should focus on removing barriers and incentivising behaviour change by making 'clean' choices easier, cheaper, and more convenient than the alternatives.

- It's also important to note that, even by the end of the Assembly, there remained some confusion over exactly what power the council has to legislate for, encourage, or enforce the changes needed.

9 Appendix

9.1 Voting results

Table 9.1: The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?

	Net Zero
Yes	37
No	4

Table 9.2: Summary of scenario voting results for all themes. Which scenario do you want to live in?

	Waste Reduction	Buildings	Transport	Biodiversity & Offsetting	Renewable Energy
Scenario A	2	3	2	2	6
Scenario B	9	7	12	8	7
Scenario C	29	31	26	30	27

Table 9.3: Scenario voting results for waste reduction

Waste Reduction	Co-benefits are good for Oxford	Trade-offs are difficult for Oxford	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A	13	41	2
Scenario B	47	65	9

Scenario C	139	88	29

Table 9.4: Scenario voting results for buildings

Buildings	Co-benefits are good for Oxford	Trade-offs are difficult for Oxford	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A	10	81	3
Scenario B	44	51	7
Scenario C	146	58	31

Table 9.5: Scenario voting results for transport

Transport	Co-benefits are good for Oxford	Trade-offs are difficult for Oxford	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A	18	54	2
Scenario B	52	54	12
Scenario C	125	86	26

Table 9.6: Scenario voting results for biodiversity and offsetting

Biodiversity and Offsetting	Co-benefits are good for Oxford	Trade-offs are difficult for Oxford	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A	7	77	2
Scenario B	56	36	8
Scenario C	126	72	30

Table 9.7: Scenario voting results for renewable energy

Renewable Energy	Co-benefits are good for Oxford	Trade-offs are difficult for Oxford	Scenario you want to live in
Scenario A	23	49	6
Scenario B	48	61	7
Scenario C	123	88	27

Table 9.8: Who should be responsible for change?

	Waste Reduction	Buildings	Transport	Biodiversity & Offsetting	Renewable Energy
Local government	62	58	79	65	45
National government	29	56	51	58	82
Businesses	50	36	28	21	37
Communities	23	16	11	37	17
Individuals	47	37	34	19	25

Table 9.9: How do we achieve change the quickest?

	Waste Reduction	Buildings	Transport	Biodiversity & Offsetting	Renewable Energy
Legal requirements or enforcement	11	21	12	28	9

Financial incentives	11	16	7	7	27
Financial penalties	8	2	6	1	0
Restrictions in choice	10	3	14	1	3
Personal conscience	4	1	2	4	2

Table 9.10: How do we pay for change?

	Waste Reduction	Buildings	Transport	Biodiversity & Offsetting	Renewable Energy
Fees and charges for local services (e.g. waste collection)	28	6	24	9	9
Council tax	24	18	25	22	13
National tax	21	29	27	32	35
Business tax	21	24	16	28	17
Loans and personal finance	-	28	6	3	26
Incorporate environmental costs into consumer goods and services	32	13	22	28	22

Table 9.11: How should land-use be best prioritised to achieve net zero quickest?

	Overall results
Housing and development	14
Green space (biodiversity)	22
Renewable energy	3
Did not answer	1
Other	2

Table 9.12: Question 1 - Currently national policy does not require that new homes are built to net zero standards. Should the Government introduce this standard?

	Overall results
Yes	42
No	-
Don't know	-

Table 9.13: Question 2 - The Government has already legislated to end the sale of petrol and diesel vehicles by 2040. Should the ban on new petrol and diesel vehicles be brought forward to 2030?

	Overall results
Yes	35
No	5

Don't know	2

Table 9.14: Question 3a (homeowners only) - If you are a homeowner, would you be prepared to retrofit your home and bear the costs? (Average cost is £25,000 per home)

	Overall results
Yes	19
No	10
Don't know	6

Table 9.15: Question 3b (tenants only) - If you are a tenant, would you be prepared to have your landlord retrofit your home paid for through your rent and lower energy bills over a number of years? (Average cost is £100 extra per month in rent)

	Overall results
Yes	7
No	6
Don't know	3

Table 9.16: Question 4 – If more re-use and return schemes were introduced in supermarkets and other shops in the city would you use them?

	Overall results
Yes	40
No	-

Don't know	1

Table 9.17: Question 5 – Would you actively offset your carbon footprint, if the money raised was channelled into local renewable energy and biodiversity schemes?

	Overall results
Yes	34
No	6
Don't know	1

Table 9.18: Question 6 – Which of the following two options should Oxford City Council prioritise?

	Overall results
Planting additional trees in public spaces in Oxford	28
Procuring land outside the city in partnership with neighbouring councils for large-scale tree planting	10
Don't know	4

Table 9.19: Question 7 – Would you potentially consider buying an electric vehicle as your next car?

	Overall results
Yes	23
No	6

Not applicable	11

Table 9.20: Question 8 – Who should have most responsibility for dealing with waste?

	Overall results
Producers of goods	30
Consumers	7
Local councils	5

Table 9.21: Question 9 - Currently Oxford City Council offers three sizes of green waste bins for fortnightly collections. Should Oxford City Council withdraw the largest size of green waste bins from all households in order to encourage more recycling?

	Overall results
Yes	25
No	14
Don't know	2

9.2 List of expert and panel speakers

On behalf of both Ipsos MORI and Oxford City Council we would like to take this opportunity to thank the following expert speakers who presented on various topics during the course of the Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change.

9.2.1 Introduction to Climate Change

- Why is climate change important? *Linnet Drury, Oxford Spires Academy/Climate Campaigner*
- What are the impacts of climate change? *Professor Myles Allen, Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford*
- How might climate change affect our lives? *Tara Clarke, Climate Outreach*

9.2.2 What can we do about it?

- What does 'net zero' actually mean? *Jenny Hill, Committee on Climate Change*
- Oxford's response to climate change so far. *Barbara Hammond, Low Carbon Hub*
- Inequality and climate justice: A global perspective. *Asad Rehman, War on Want*
- Oxford City Council's priorities and responsibilities for supporting our citizens and shaping our environment. *Tim Sadler, Transition Director Oxford City Council*

9.2.3 Theme 1 – Waste Reduction

- Speaker - *Trewin Restorick, Hubbub*
- Additional Panel Members:
    - *Maria Warner, Oxford Direct Services*
    - *Henry Owen, Community Action Group Network*

9.2.4 Theme 2 – Buildings

- Speaker – *Alex Baines, The Design Buru*
- Additional Panel Members:
    - *Rajat Gupta, Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development*
    - *Caroline Green, Oxford City Council*
    - *Dr. David Hancock, Independent Expert – Infrastructure Projects*

9.2.5 Theme 3 – Transport

- Speaker – *Llewelyn Morgan, Oxfordshire County Council*
- Additional Panel Members:
    - *Chris Benton, Pedal & Post*
    - *Luke Marion, Oxford Bus Company*
    - *Tim Schwanen, Transport Studies Unit*
    - *David Beesley, Oxford Office Furniture*
    - *Sukky Choongh-Campbell, Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders*

9.2.6 Theme 4 – Biodiversity and Offsetting

- Speaker – *Professor Kathy Willis, University of Oxford*

- Additional Panel Members:
    - *Edward Hanrahan, Climate Care*
    - *Fiona Tavner, Oxford Friends of the Earth*

9.2.7 Theme 5 – Renewable Energy

- Speaker – Professor Nick Eyre, Environmental Change Institute (University of Oxford)
- Additional Panel Members:
    - *Carole Souter, Oxford Preservation Trust*
    - *Barbara Hammond, Low Carbon Hub*
    - *Chris Jardine, Joju*

9.3 Online resources

The available presentations and slides have been uploaded onto the Oxford City Council web page for the Citizens' Assembly, which can be accessed here: www.oxford.gov.uk/citizensassembly

Other videos from the Assembly can be found here:
https://www.facebook.com/pg/OxfordCityCouncil/videos/

9.4 Assembly Profile

The final Assembly Profile for both weekends can be found in the tables overleaf which illustrates the demographic breakdown of the Assembly Members. Please note that the variables in Figure 9.1 (on page 58) were set as hard quotas, whereas, those in Figure 9.2 (on pages 59-60) were monitored throughout recruitment.

Figure 9.1: Assembly Profile – demographic quotas

	Quotas	Oxford – 2011 Census percentage	Recruited Achieved numbers	Recruited Achieved proportion	Attendance on first weekend				Attendance on second weekend			
					Achieved numbers on day 1	Achieved proportions on day 1	Achieved numbers on day 2	Achieved proportions on day 2	Achieved numbers on day 3	Achieved proportions on day 3	Achieved numbers on day 4	Achieved proportions on day 4
Gender												
Male	25	50%	25	50%	22	50%	20	50%	21	51%	21	50%
Female	25	50%	25	50%	22	50%	22	50%	20	49%	21	50%
Age												
16-19	4	8%	3	6%	2	6%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%
20-24	9	15%	8	16%	5	11%	4	10%	3	7%	3	7%
25-29	7	11%	7	14%	5	11%	4	10%	5	12%	5	12%
30-44	13	21%	13	26%	13	30%	12	29%	12	29%	12	29%
45-59	8	14%	9	18%	9	20%	9	21%	10	24%	10	24%
60-64	2	4%	2	4%	2	4%	2	5%	1	2%	2	2%
65 +	7	11%	8	16%	8	18%	8	19%	8	20%	8	19%
Ethnicity												
White	39	78%	37	74%	31	70%	31	74%	31	76%	31	74%
BME	11	22%	13	26%	13	30%	11	26%	10	24%	11	26%
Disability												
Yes	6	12%	6	12%	6	14%	6	14%	6	15%	6	14%
No	44	88%	44	88%	38	86%	36	86%	35	85%	36	86%
Area												
OX1	6	11%	5	10%	4	9%	4	10%	4	10%	4	10%
OX2	12	25%	12	24%	11	25%	11	26%	10	24%	10	24%
OX3	14	27%	9	18%	7	16%	6	14%	9	22%	9	21%
OX4	18	37%	24	48%	22	50%	21	50%	19	46%	20	48%
TOTAL			50		44		42		41		42	

Figure 9.2: Assembly Profile – monitored variables

	Recruited Achieved numbers	Recruited Achieved proportion	Attendance on first weekend				Attendance on second weekend			
			Achieved numbers on day 1	Achieved proportions on day 1	Achieved numbers on day 2	Achieved proportions on day 2	Achieved numbers on day 3	Achieved proportions on day 3	Achieved numbers on day 4	Achieved proportions on day 4
Social Grade										
ABC1	32	64%	31	70%	31	74%	31	76%	32	76%
C2DE	18	36%	13	30%	11	26%	10	24%	10	24%
Educational attainment										
Masters/ PhD or equivalent	17	34%	16	36%	16	38%	17	41%	17	40%
Bachelor's degree or equivalent	16	32%	16	36%	15	36%	14	34%	15	36%
Diplomas in higher education, HNC/HND/BTEC Higher or equivalent	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	2	5%	2	5%
A-level, Scottish Higher or equivalent	5	10%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%
Vocational qualifications such as Apprenticeships or City and Guilds (= NVQ1+2)	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	-	-	-	-
GCSEs / O-Levels / CSEs	9	18%	7	16%	6	14%	6	15%	6	14%
No formal qualifications	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%
Political views and engagement										
Conservatives	3	6%	3	7%	3	7%	3	7%	3	7%
Labour	21	42%	18	41%	17	44%	15	37%	16	38%
Liberal Democrats	6	12%	6	14%	6	12%	6	15%	6	14%

UKIP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Green	5	10%	5	11%	4	9%	6	15%	6	14%
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Did not vote	15	30%	12	27%	12	29%	11	27%	11	26%
Working status										
Looking for work/unemployed	3	6%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%
In education or training	3	6%	3	7%	3	7%	3	7%	3	7%
Self-employed	4	8%	4	9%	4	10%	5	12%	5	12%
Employed full-time	22	44%	17	39%	17	40%	15	37%	15	36%
Employed part-time	5	10%	4	9%	3	7%	5	12%	5	12%
Out of employment and not seeking work/long term sickness	4	8%	4	9%	4	10%	3	7%	3	7%
Retired	9	18%	9	20%	9	21%	8	20%	9	21%
Length of Oxford residency										
Short-term (less than 1 year)	5	11%	4	9%	4	10%	4	10%	4	10%
Medium-term (1-5 years)	10	21%	8	18%	8	19%	8	20%	8	19%
Long-term (5 years +)	35	68%	32	77%	30	71%	29	71%	30	71%
Environmental attitudes										
Environment/climate change is a top issue	22	44%	27	61%	26	62%	27	66%	28	67%
Environment/climate change is not a top issue	28	56%	17	39%	16	38%	14	34%	14	33%
TOTAL	50		44		42		41		42	

9.5 Scenarios

9.5.1 Waste reduction

Waste Reduction – Current situation

Current scenario

- Recycling rate is over 50%
- Residual waste continues to be burnt with some energy recovery
- Greater recycling relies on goodwill of residents
- Businesses are trialling public acceptability of removing packaging
- Refill and repair services are being trialled
- Clothing swap shops and clothing rental services are very small scale and are not the norm
- Waste is not seen as a resource

Co-benefits

- Residents have a degree of personal choice in how they dispose of and recycle their waste

Trade-offs

- Frequent waste collection means we have lots of rubbish lorry vehicle movements
- Residents and businesses need to have adequate space for bins

Waste Reduction – Scenario A

Scenario A

- Recycling rate is over 60%
- Residual waste continues to be burnt with energy recovery to create electricity
- Three weekly residual collection and smaller bins encourage waste reduction and separation
- Significant public promotion encouraging consumers to reduce consumption
- Reducing the amount of waste relies on the direct action of residents
- Some businesses are actively reducing packaging but it is not a requirement
- Refill and repair services are increasing in popularity
- Clothing swap shops and clothing rental services are increasing in popularity
- Waste is not seen as a resource

Co-benefits

- Smaller bins 'nudge' residents in to consuming less
- Residents given the opportunity to be proactive

Trade-offs

- Restrictions placed on waste disposal and recycling services force people into making different choices
- Residents and businesses need to have adequate space for bins
- Frequent waste collection means we have lots of rubbish lorry vehicle movements

Waste Reduction – Scenario B

Scenario B

- Recycling rate is over 70%
- Monthly residual waste collection and smaller bins encourage waste reduction and separation
- Businesses respond to demand for less packaging
- Residents pay for the weight of residual waste they throw away
- Waste enforcement is a council priority
- Refill and repair services are widespread
- Clothing swap shops and clothing rental services are widespread
- The value of waste materials as a resource (for energy generation or for remanufacture) increases

Co-benefits

- Savings made from reducing waste services benefits Council Tax Payers or creates funding for investment in other public services

Trade-offs

- Restrictions placed on waste disposal and recycling services force people into making different choices
- Disposal of waste is made more difficult which leads to frustration.
- Dependent on behaviour change in shopping habits eg taking own containers to supermarkets

Waste Reduction – Scenario C

Scenario C

- Recycling rate is over 85%
- Shops and retailers across Oxford proactively withdraw access to shopping bags and excess packaging
- Residual waste collection services have been withdrawn
- Waste recycling services are monthly or collected when full – most packaging materials have been phased out
- The City Council provides a share and repair service across the city
- Commercial operators are fined for producing excess waste including food waste to encourage waste reduction
- All domestic and commercial food waste is required by law to go to a biomass energy recovery plant
- Waste enforcement is a council priority ensure people use services correctly
- Refill and repair services are the norm
- Clothing swap shops and clothing rental services are normal
- The value of waste materials as a resource (for energy generation or for remanufacture) has been realised

Co-benefits

- Large savings achieved by phasing out waste and recycling services
- Better air quality from reduced vehicle movements
- Increase and growth in jobs and opportunities in refurbishment, and reuse, electronic and electrical engineering
- Recycling performance is high

Trade-offs

- Restrictions placed on waste disposal and recycling services force people into making different choices
- People have to buy fresh produce more regularly
- Emphasis on consumer behaviour change needed
- As some residents find waste disposal and recycling more difficult, the need for stronger enforcement and financial penalties increases

9.5.2 Buildings

Buildings – Current Situation

Current scenario

- 3000 (5%) of houses across Oxford have been retrofitted
- Planning requirements for new builds are marginally more ambitious than building regulations and only on larger developments.
- Electrification of heat only happens in new development
- The majority of homes and non-domestic buildings continue to be heated by gas
- Heat loss from the average house is significant
- Energy consumption from appliances and lighting is significant
- Energy improvement work focusses only on those in fuel poverty

Co-benefits

- Risk of adopting new technology too quickly and needing to replace it is reduced

Trade-offs

- Fuel poverty is a problem in the city
- Physical and mental health problems exist due to unhealthy buildings
- Retrofit costs are very expensive up to £25,000 per house
- Potential air quality improvements from not using so much fossil fuel within the city are not realised

Buildings – Scenario A

Scenario A

- 12,000 (20%) houses have been retrofitted
- Planning requirements for new builds are more ambitious than building regulations and still only on larger developments.
- The vast majority of homes and non-domestic buildings are still heated by gas
- 30% of cooking is electric
- Heat loss from the average house is reducing but not significantly
- Energy consumption of appliances and lighting is reducing

Co-benefits

- Heating bills reduce and energy efficiency improves
- Risk of adopting new technology too quickly and needing to replace it is reduced

Trade-offs

- Retrofitting costs are paid for by individuals and businesses
- Retrofit costs are very expensive up to £25,000 per house
- Reducing energy consumption from appliances and lighting is a personal choice
- In a new build, electrification of heat adds £3000 to the cost of a new property
- Retrofitting involves building work that is inconvenient
- Physical and mental health problems exist due to unhealthy buildings
- Potential air quality improvements from not using so much fossil fuel within the city are not realised

Buildings – Scenario B

Scenario B

- 36,000 (30%) of houses across Oxford have been retrofitted
- Loans are available for retrofitting homes
- All new builds are built to ultra high energy efficiency standards (such as PassivHaus)
- Electrification of heat becoming standard
- Less than 50% of homes (28,000) and non-domestic buildings are heated by gas
- 80% of cooking is now electric
- Heat loss from average house is reduced significantly
- Energy consumption from appliances and lighting significantly reduced through proactive upgrade
- Upgraded buildings are not too hot in the summer reducing the need for temporary Air Conditioning

Co-benefits

- Heating bills reduce significantly
- Fuel poverty almost eradicated
- Respiratory health improves
- Local jobs created and skill development in renewable energy industry
- The costs of retrofit have reduced as more experience is gained and technology improves

Trade-offs

- There is less personal choice on individual energy consumption for example home energy meters
- Individuals and businesses pay for electrification of heating and retrofitting through loans or from savings
- Potential air quality improvements from not using so much fossil fuel within the city are not completely realised
- Retrofitting involves building work that is inconvenient
- New builds built to ultra high energy efficiency standards (such as PassivHaus), cost 1-4% more to build relative to a home built to current regulations

Buildings – Scenario C

Scenario C

- 48,000 (80%) of houses across Oxford have been retrofitted
- Loans are available for full retrofitting of your home
- All new builds are built to ultra high energy efficiency standards (such as PassivHaus)
- Heat loss from existing houses has reduced significantly
- 100% of heating and cooking is now electric
- Energy consumption from appliances and lighting has significantly reduced
- There is no need for temporary Air Conditioning

Co-benefits

- Heating bills reduce significantly
- Fuel poverty is no longer a significant problem
- Physical and mental health has improved significantly as a result of living and working in healthy buildings
- Local jobs created and skill development in renewable energy industry
- A range of 'local' energy and heating services make cost of retrofit accessible and affordable
- Potential air quality improvements from not using so much fossil fuel within the city are completely realised

Trade-offs

- There is less personal choice on individual energy consumption for example home energy meters
- Individuals and businesses pay for electrification of heating and retrofitting through loans or from savings
- Retrofitting involves building work that is inconvenient
- Individuals and businesses may be in debt from taking out loans for retrofitting however there are cost savings from reduced energy bills
- New builds built to ultra high energy efficiency standards (such as PassivHaus), cost 1-4% more to build relative to a home built to current regulations

9.5.3 Transport

Transport – Current Situation

Current scenario

- Some efforts are being made to reduce parking places to discourage car ownership
- High density, car free and mixed use developments are encouraged
- Discounted permits are available for electric and hybrid vehicles
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure is being trialled
- Zero emission zone covers the city centre only and seeks to discourage petrol/diesel vehicles
- Bus companies are upgrading their fleet to the highest standard for petrol/diesel
- Working from home is not the norm
- Cycle, bus and pedestrian improvements are being implemented
- Public parking charges are high and there is a limited supply of public parking

Co-benefits

- Low emission and electric vehicles infrastructure and schemes are considered 'novel'

Trade-offs

- Freedom of car use across the city is maintained
- Mental and physical health is compromised by poor air quality

Transport – Scenario A

Scenario A

- Zero emission zone covers the city centre and seeks to discourage petrol/diesel vehicles
- On and off street parking is reduced
- 50% of cars are electric 14% petrol hybrid and 36% petrol/diesel
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure is growing
- Working from home is becoming more common where possible
- Petrol/diesel car ownership is being discouraged by cost of permits and access to parking
- Walking and cycling has doubled
- High density, car free and mixed use developments are encouraged
- Cycle, bus and pedestrian improvements increase
- Bus companies continue to upgrade their fleet to the highest standard for petrol/diesel

Co-benefits

- There is some opportunity to free up road space for green corridors, tree planting, cafés, recreation etc.
- Improved air quality
- Freedom
- Safer

Trade-offs

- Diesel and petrol vehicle is discouraged to accelerate hybrid and electric vehicle ownership
- Mental and physical health is compromised by poor air quality

Transport – Scenario B

Scenario B

- The cost of parking in the city is increasingly expensive to encourage public transport use
- Car parking charges for petrol/diesel vehicles are more expensive
- A zero emission zone is expanded to a number of the city's neighbourhoods to discourage use of petrol/diesel vehicles
- Working from home is normal if your job can be done from home
- 75% of cars are electric and 15% are petrol hybrids and 10% are petrol/diesel
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure is widespread
- 20% of all car journeys are now done by bus, bike or on foot
- 40% of journeys of less than 2 miles are done by bike or foot
- Safe cycle routes link the whole city
- Bus companies start to introduce electric buses
- All new development is car free, high-density and mixed use

Co-benefits

- Space freed up from parking given over to tree planting, biodiversity projects, recreation, outdoor cafes etc.
- Air quality is improved
- Respiratory illness is down
- Roads are safer, quieter and cleaner
- Physical and mental health benefits of improved air quality are realised

Trade-offs

- People have less personal freedom in deciding when and how to travel
- The cost and petrol/diesel car ownership across the city is more expensive
- Access of petrol/diesel vehicles to some parts of the city is restricted
- The convenience of door to door travel has gone
- Behaviour change in travel planning is required

Transport – Scenario C

Scenario C

- Zero emission zone is citywide, discouraging petrol/diesel vehicles in the city
- 100% of buses and cars are electric
- Car club vehicles are available for every 10 households
- Parking permits are more expensive to discourage car ownership
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure is universally accessible
- Working from home is normal where possible
- All new development is car free, high-density and mixed use
- The city centre is pedestrianised
- Safe cycle routes link the whole city
- 60% of journeys of less than 2 miles are done by bike or foot
- Freight consolidation is standard
- Workplace parking levies have been introduced

Co-benefits

- Savings in transport costs improve disposable income
- Incidence of respiratory illness reduced
- Public transport is very accessible
- Space freed up from parking can be used for biodiversity/ recreation/outdoor cafes/market spaces etc
- Physical and mental health benefits of improved air quality are realised

Trade-offs

- People have less personal freedom in deciding when and how to travel
- Legislation, land-use planning and enforcement restrict car ownership
- The convenience of door to door travel has gone
- Behaviour change in travel planning is required

9.5.4 Biodiversity and Offsetting

Biodiversity and Offsetting – Current Situation

Current scenario

- We continue to lose natural environments
- Inadequate protection of natural environment will cause major food shortages, natural disasters , flooding etc.
- Large scale tree planting projects are emerging
- Green roofs and green walls on buildings are not a requirement
- Retrofitting green roofs and green walls is being trialled on a very small scale
- Oxford Local planning policy aims to do more than national policy to protect biodiversity
- Biodiversity offsetting takes place through the planning system but not on all sites
- Local planning policy currently requires certain trees to be replaced if removed

Co-benefits

- Healthy ecosystems provide the following essential for life: Protection of water resources, soil formation and protection, nutrient storage and recycling, pollution breakdown and absorption, climate stability, recovery from natural disasters, food, medicines, future resources, research, education, recreation, cultural values, emotional values, carbon sequestration, crops, air quality, flood protection, cooling effect of trees.
- Low additional costs for developers so more housing is available at a lower price
- Respiratory and mental illness high because of poor air quality and lack of access to green space

Trade-offs

- Little contribution to improving air quality in Oxford
- No increase in green spaces
- No increase in green shade in the city
- Respiratory and mental illness high because of poor air quality and lack of access to green space

Biodiversity and Offsetting – Scenario A

Scenario A

- Inadequate protection of natural environment will cause major food shortages, natural disasters , flooding etc.
- Priority given to maintaining healthy ecosystems is increasing
- There is more legal protection for threatened habitats in national policy
- For all development, 1 acre of nature that is lost is replaced by 1.1 acres of new natural environment
- Large scale tree planting projects are increasing
- Green roofs and green walls on buildings are increasing
- Retrofitting green roofs and green walls on existing buildings is being trialled
- Any tree that is removed must be replaced

Co-benefits

- Healthy ecosystems provide the following essential for life: Protection of water resources, soil formation and protection, nutrient storage and recycling, pollution breakdown and absorption, climate stability, recovery from natural disasters, food, medicines, future resources, research, education, recreation, cultural values, emotional values, carbon sequestration, crops, air quality, flood protection, cooling effect of trees.
- Respiratory and mental illness high because of poor air quality and lack of access to green space

Trade-offs

- Little contribution to improved air quality in Oxford
- No increase in green spaces
- Slow increase in green shade in the city
- Respiratory and mental illness high because of poor air quality and lack of access to green space
- Price of development (housing etc) likely to increase because of offsetting requirements
- The price of development will better reflect its environmental cost
- Funding becomes available for local offset projects and habitat restoration projects

Biodiversity and Offsetting – Scenario B

Scenario B

- Maintaining natural environments is a priority
- Biodiversity loss has slowed down significantly and species populations are recovering
- There is more legal protection for threatened habitats in national policy
- For all development, 1 acre of nature that is lost is replaced by 1.15 acres of new natural environment
- Large scale tree planting and habitat restoration projects are widespread and are often funded by businesses and large organisations
- Green roofs and green walls on buildings are standard
- Retrofitting green roofs and green walls on existing buildings is becoming widespread
- Planning system revised to significantly increase protection and enhancement of natural environment.
- Any tree that is removed must be replaced with 5 trees

Co-benefits

- Healthy ecosystems provide the following essential for life: Protection of water resources, soil formation and protection, nutrient storage and recycling, pollution breakdown and absorption, climate stability, recovery from natural disasters, food, medicines, future resources, research, education, recreation, cultural values, emotional values, carbon sequestration, crops, air quality, flood protection, cooling effect of trees.
- Respiratory illness is reduced.
- Access to green space increases significantly
- Mental health issues have fallen
- More green space means people more likely to walk or cycle
- Solar panels installed over green roofs can work more efficiently

Trade-offs

- Price of development (housing etc) likely to increase because of offsetting requirements
- The price of development will better reflect its environmental cost
- Funding becomes available for local offset projects and habitat restoration projects

Biodiversity and Offsetting – Scenario C

Scenario C

- Maintaining, restoring and creating new natural environments is a priority
- Biodiversity loss is halted, species populations are recovering
- Access to green space has increased significantly
- Tree planting has reduced urban temperatures significantly
- Large scale tree planting and habitat restoration projects are normal and are often funded by businesses and large organisations
- There is complete protection for threatened habitats in the national planning framework
- For all development, 1 acre of nature that is lost is replaced by 1.25 acres of new natural environment
- Green roofs and green walls on buildings are standard
- Retrofitting green roofs and green walls on existing buildings is normal
- Any tree that is removed must be replaced with 10 trees

Co-benefits

- Healthy ecosystems can provide benefits such as: protection of water resources, soil formation and protection, nutrient storage and recycling, pollution breakdown and absorption, climate stability, recovery from natural disasters, food, medicines, wood products, future resources, research, education, recreation, cultural values, emotional values, carbon sequestration, crops, air quality, cooling effect of trees.
- Respiratory illness is dramatically reduced.
- Access to green space increases significantly.
- Mental health issues have fallen dramatically
- More green space means people more likely to walk or cycle
- Solar panels installed over green roofs can work more efficiently

Trade-offs

- Inadequate protection of natural environment will cause major food shortages, natural disasters etc.
- Price of development (housing etc) likely to increase because of offsetting requirments
- The price of development will better reflect its environmental cost
- Space for biodiversity is prioritised over other land use needs

9.5.5 Renewable Energy

Renewable Energy – Current Situation

Current scenario

- Less than 2,000 homes have solar panels
- 2 hydro power sites in the city are powering approximately 500 homes
- A large-scale battery storage project is being trialled
- Wind turbines are not considered a viable option for use in the city
- All domestic food waste is used to generate energy
- Planning powers restrict installation of solar panels where there is a potential visual impact
- Energy improvement work focusses only on those in fuel poverty
- Energy innovation projects do not take place unless there is government funding
- Energy continues to be controlled centrally
- Community energy projects are small-scale and are not the norm

Co-benefits

Proactive homeowners have the opportunity to sell electricity generated and can make £700 per year

Trade-offs

- Growth in renewable energy comes from those who can afford it or make money from it.
- Using land for housing and businesses is more important than land set aside for renewable energy
- Installing solar panels on your house typically costs £7,000

Renewable Energy – Scenario A

Scenario A

- 8000 homes have solar panels
- An area of commercial roof space equivalent to 85 football pitches have solar panels
- Hydro schemes increase their efficiency to generate up to 750 houses a year
- Renewable energy generation and storage projects are dependent on special one-off funding,
- Wind turbine trial projects take place
- Over 10% of Oxford's energy needs are generated locally
- Planning restrictions remain in place for renewables where there is a potential visual impact but application process is getting easier.
- Energy is largely centralised – there are some community-owned energy projects
- More food waste is captured from business to generate energy

Co-benefits

Proactive homeowners have the opportunity to sell electricity generated and realise an income of £700 per year

Trade-offs

- Growth in renewable energy comes from those who can afford it or make money from it.
- Installing solar panels on your house typically costs £7,000 but there are signs costs may fall
- Some land previously allocated to housing is used for renewables
- Physical and mental health is compromised by poor air quality

Renewable Energy – Scenario B

Scenario B

- 16000 of Oxford's homes have solar panels
- An area of commercial roof space equivalent to 140 football pitches have solar panels installed. This includes solar panels on carports at Park and Rides
- Hydro schemes on every river lock generate enough power for up to 1000 houses a year
- Organisations invest their own money in community renewable projects
- Over 50% of Oxford's energy needs are generated locally
- Local planning rules for renewables are relaxed maximising their potential wherever possible; wind turbines permitted
- Cooperative run local energy generation and distribution creates Oxford-based electricity supplier
- Cheaper and more loans available for domestic renewable installation

Co-benefits

- Proactive homeowners have the opportunity to sell electricity generated and realise an income of £700 per year
- Local jobs created and skill development in renewable energy industry
- Oxford markets itself as a place for trialling new technology
- Electricity bills do not increase as much as other parts of the country
- Communities benefit financially from the sale or surplus electricity for local environmental projects
- Physical and mental health benefits of cleaner air are realised

Trade-offs

- The city looks different as the historic Oxford skyline includes renewables seen from the street
- Land for renewables is given the same considerations as land for housing
- Installing solar panels on your house typically costs £6,000
- Disruption from required infrastructure upgrades

Renewable Energy – Scenario C

Scenario C

- 24,000 homes have solar panels installed
- An area of commercial roof space equivalent to 300 football pitches has solar panels installed
- Hydro schemes on every river lock and generate enough power for up to 1500 houses a year
- The vast majority of Oxford's energy needs are generated locally
- Cooperative run local energy generation and distribution creates Oxford-based electricity supplier that now also invests in community energy projects
- Local planning rules for renewables are relaxed maximising their potential wherever possible; wind turbines permitted
- Other sources of energy such as hydrogen become available
- Cheaper and more loans available for domestic renewable installation

Co-benefits

- Buildings generate the energy they need
- The 'Green' Technology Skills sector is strong.
- Electricity bills reduce as the city benefits from selling renewable electricity
- Oxford is more resilient to changes in electricity supply
- Physical and mental health benefits of cleaner air are realised

Trade-offs

- Oxford's skyline changes as renewables such as vertical wind turbines become more prevalent – though only for as long as they are needed – not necessarily permanently
- Renewables are allocated sites in the same way housing is
- Installed technology could be quickly overtaken by new technology
- Installing solar panels on your house typically costs £5,000
- Disruption from required infrastructure upgrades

9.6 Glossary of terms

Biodiversity	Biodiversity is the variety of plant and animal life on earth and is essential for maintaining healthy ecosystems that make human life possible.
Biomass	Biomass refers to the quantity or weight of organic matter in a given area. It can also be used to directly refer to the use of organic matter as a fuel such as for the generation of electricity.
Carbon	Carbon is a chemical element which is sometimes described as a building block for all life on Earth because it is found in most plant and animal life. It is also found in fuels like petrol, coal and natural gas, and when burned, is emitted as a gas called carbon dioxide.
Carbon Budget	Carbon budgets are used to manage the potential implications of a carbon constrained future. A carbon budget is the cumulative amount of carbon dioxide emissions permitted over a period of time to keep within a certain temperature threshold.
Carbon Footprint	The amount of carbon emitted by an individual or organisation in a given period of time, or the amount of carbon emitted during the manufacture of a product.
Citizens' Assembly	A Citizens' Assembly is a representative group of citizens who have been chosen at random from the population in order to learn about, deliberate and make recommendations on a particular issue.
Climate Change	A change in global or regional climate patterns attributed to the increased levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere produced by the use of fossil fuels.
Climate Emergency	The UK Parliament and approximately 67 other local authorities in the UK, including Oxford City Council, have declared a Climate Emergency. The declaration seeks to secure action to reach new targets of net zero emissions by 2050 or sooner.
Decarbonisation	Reducing the use of carbon intensive fossil fuels. For example, shifting the production of electricity from fossil fuel power stations to low carbon-energy sources such as nuclear or renewable energy, like wind.
Deep Retrofit	Upgrading the energy efficiency of a house using a whole house approach that takes a property from its current state to near net zero in one go.
Fossil fuels	Fuels such as gas, coal and oil that were formed millions of years ago from plant and animal remains. They contain carbon and can be used as a source of energy via combustion. The combustion of fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere which is causing climate change.
Freight Consolidation	Freight consolidation is when several small shipments, all being forwarded to the same location, are bundled and shipped together. It can help reduce vehicle movements and therefore reduce carbon emissions.
Greenhouse effect	The greenhouse effect is a natural process by which gases in the Earth's atmosphere trap heat from the sun and warms the earth's surface.

Greenhouse gas (GHG)	Greenhouse gases are gases in the earth's atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide and methane that trap the sun's heat and causes the greenhouse effect.
Natural Climate Solutions (NCS)	Natural Climate Solutions are natural biological processes that absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. The most widely known approach is to plant trees. Trees absorb carbon dioxide as they grow. Other Natural Climate Solutions include restoration of degraded coastal and marine habitats such as mangroves and salt marshes.
Negative Emissions	Negative emissions refers to removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. This can be achieved using Natural Climate Solutions (NCS) and Negative Emissions Technologies (NETs).
Negative Emissions Technologies (NETs)	Negative Emissions Technologies are physical, biological or chemical processes that remove greenhouse gases from the atmosphere such as direct air capture. Direct air capture involves removing carbon dioxide from ambient air using engineered technology.
Net Zero	Net zero means that any carbon emissions are balanced by absorbing an equivalent amount of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.
Off-setting	Carbon offsetting is a way to compensate for carbon emissions by funding an equivalent carbon dioxide saving elsewhere.
Retrofitting	Retrofitting in the context of buildings involves making modifications to existing buildings that may improve energy efficiency or decrease energy demand.
Renewable Energy	Renewable energy is energy harnessed from natural resources such as solar power, wind energy, tidal energy and geothermal heat. These resources naturally replenish.
Zero carbon house/building	A zero-energy building (ZE), also known as a zero net energy (ZNE) building, net-zero energy building (NZEB), net zero building is a building with zero net energy consumption, meaning the total amount of energy used by the building on an annual basis is equal to the amount of renewable energy created on the site.

For more definitions please visit the BBC's online Climate Change Dictionary:

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-48057733

9.7 Advisory Group

The Advisory Group oversaw the work of the Steering Group in preparing the information and advice for Assembly Members. The Advisory Group was chaired by Susan Brown and met several times before, in between and after the Assembly.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the Members of the Advisory Group for their invaluable input.

The Members of the Advisory Group are as follows:

- Cllr Susan Brown, Leader, Oxford City Council (Leader)
- Cllr Andrew Gant, Opposition Leader, Oxford City Council (Liberal Democrats)
- Cllr Dick Wolff, Member, Oxford City Council (Green)
- Cllr James Mills, Leader, West Oxfordshire District Council (Conservative)

- Professor Steve Fisher, Political Sociology, University of Oxford
- Professor Myles Allen/Professor Nick Eyre, Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford
- Richard Pantlin, Oxford Democracy Café
- Zuhura Plummer, Oxford Extinction Rebellion
- Mark Beard, Chairman/Mark Gregory, Bid Manager, Beard Construction
- Nigel Carter, Secretary/Hassan Sabrie, Chair, East Oxford United
- Yasmin Sidhwa, Artistic Director, Mandala Theatre Company
- Dr Alan Renwick, Deputy Director of the Constitution Unit, UCL

Cllr Tom Hayes, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford attended the Advisory Group as an observer.

City Council officers and representatives of Ipsos MORI also attended Advisory Group meetings.

9.8 Steering Group

The Steering Group comprise of the key officers from Oxford City Council responsible for delivering the Assembly (representatives from the Sustainability team and Communications team) and Ipsos MORI.

This group was responsible for the planning and operational issues associated with the Assembly. It also supported the Assembly in the efficient and effective discharge of its role and functions.

This group was chaired by Tim Sadler, Transition Director, Oxford City Council and met on a regular (at least fortnightly) basis.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the Members of the Steering Group for helping to successfully deliver the Assembly.

9.9 Assembly Members

Thank you to all of the Assembly Members who took part in the Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change for giving up two weekends of your time and actively participating in the discussions throughout the Assembly. Your views and input is very much appreciated.

The following Assembly Members have given their consent for their names and details to be published:

- Aline, OX3
- Alex Jenkinson, OX3
- Caspar, OX4
- Martin Kang'ara, OX3
- Natasha Robinson, OX2
- Sara Holdsworth, OX1
- Alexandra Berney-Stewart, OX2
- Shen Roddie, OX3
- Bob Ritchie, OX2
- MR, OX4
- Donald, OX4
- Haris Irshad, OX4
- Vivian Adzayawo, OX4
- David, OX2
- Laura, OX4
- Catherine, OX2
- Jonathon Coats, OX4

- Emma Howell, OX3
- John, OX2
- Tim Adye, OX4
- Pete Eallis, OX4
- Matthew, OX4
- Phil Davis, OX1
- George McConnon, OX4
- Shin-shin, OX4
- Mini Grey, OX4
- Phillip, OX3
- Eva, OX3
- Tendai Masawi, OX4
- Sara Lasenby, OX4
- Annie Moelwyn-Hughes, OX4
- Lorna, OX4
- Diana, OX3

9.10 Guidance given to Assembly Members

Following the second weekend of the Citizens' Assembly, all Assembly Members were sent the following information via email as a 'take home pack'.

Dear Assembly Member,

Thank you for participating in Oxford Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change and for giving up your time on two weekends. Your input into the process is very much appreciated.

Whether you have been concerned about climate change for a long time or if the Assembly has introduced you to the seriousness of the challenge we face, you may well be thinking about what you can do as a citizen now that the Assembly is over.

Here are some ideas and information that may be useful to you:

Presentation videos and slides

We will be uploading the available presentations and slides onto the Oxford City Council web page for the Citizens' Assembly, which can be accessed here: www.oxford.gov.uk/citizensassembly

Want to take some practical steps in your own life?

If you would like suggestions of what you can do as an individual, here are some links to websites you might find useful as starting points:

- Oxford Together On Climate Change https://change4climate.uk/action1/

- Low Carbon West Oxford
https://www.lowcarbonwestoxford.org.uk/5-things-we-can-all-start-doing-right-now/

- BBC Future's "Ten simple ways to act on climate change" - http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20181102-what-can-i-do-about-climate-change

- 52 Actions climate actions for individuals https://www.52climateactions.com/

- Friends of the Earth – 'What can I do to stop climate change?' - https://friendsoftheearth.uk/climate-change/what-can-I-do-to-stop-climate-change

- Bioregional One Planet Cities project - https://www.bioregional.com/projects-and- services/influencing-wider-change/one-planet-cities

Feeling a bit shaken up by the discussions about climate change?

If you have been affected by the information on climate change and would like some support, further reading and advice these sites may be useful:

- There is an 'Eco-listening circle' at the Quaker Centre every Wednesday between 6 and 7pm https://www.xroxford.org/event/eco-listening-space-4

- Climate Psychology Alliance https://www.climatepsychologyalliance.org/news/330-cpa-therapeutic-support

- Psychology Oxford https://www.psychologyoxford.com/climate-project-dr-patrick-kennedy-williams-eco-anxiety

Are you finding it difficult to talk with friends and family about climate change?

- Low Carbon Oxford North will be hosting two workshops on the topic of conversations about climate change with family and friends.

The first workshop will be taking place on Saturday 26 October, has been designed especially for Oxford Citizens' Assembly members, though all are welcome. https://www.facebook.com/pg/taketheco2outofox2/events

Are you considering joining a group?

Oxford and Oxfordshire have over 60 community groups working to create a low-carbon community.

- You can find your local low-carbon group here: https://cagoxfordshire.org.uk/oxfordshire-groups

Many of the groups have been working on climate change for years with a group of volunteers, and if you want to help they'll be very pleased to have you. If you just want to find out more without commitment, that is fine too.

You can chat to local groups at two upcoming events:

- Eco-Fair at the Church of St Michael and All Angels in Summertown on Saturday 23 November

- Oxford Green Fair at the Town Hall on Sunday 1 December

- Extinction Rebellion are holding an event on Wednesday 30 October for anyone interested in finding out more about their direct action approach to the climate crisis https://www.xroxford.org/event/how-to-join-extinction-rebellion-oxford

What about a workshop or information session?

- Many low-carbon groups host regular events and activities. For example, Low Carbon West Oxford is holding a series of events – including workshops for children and young people, resources for those working with children, and practical advice on energy use in the home. https://www.lowcarbonwestoxford.org.uk/calendar

- Oxford TNH Sangha is holding an day of mindfulness event on Saturday 9 November called 'Caring for Ourselves, Caring for the Earth'. The event will provide the opportunity to come back to the present moment and acknowledge your feelings about the climate crisis https://www.wegottickets.com/event/476284

Perhaps you're interested in using less stuff?

- Oxford has several repair cafés and other schemes which provide an opportunity learn how to repair items including household goods, bikes, clothes, jewellery, etc. See the example of the Rose Hill and Iffley repair café – www.youtube.com/watch?v=e4Hqs9lZmQI

- Share Oxford, a library of things which also holds regular repair cafés. https://shareoxford.org

Outdoors

Getting out into the natural world is known to help with general wellbeing and handling difficult feelings about our environment. Joining outdoor working parties is a great way to enjoy yourself and look after our green spaces at the same time.

There are at least two opportunities to help with tree planting in Oxford in November – Low Carbon Oxford North and Low Carbon West Oxford are each hosting tree planting. The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) runs a project called Wild Oxford which organises outdoor work parties to look after several beautiful green spaces within the city area. www.bbowt.org.uk/wildlife/living-landscapes/wild-oxford

Waste Facilities Visit

We received feedback after the first weekend that many of you would be interested in visiting some of Oxfordshire's waste facilities. We will organise a trip specifically for Assembly Members as soon as possible. We will be in touch with details via email if you signed up to stay in touch.

Contact

If you would like to support the City Council in its communications around the Citizens' Assembly and the Climate Emergency, or if you have any further questions about the assembly, please do get in touch with us at citizensassembly@oxford.gov.uk

Thanks once again for your participation.

9.11 Feedback from Assembly Members

At the end of the Assembly, Assembly Members were each given a short satisfaction survey to fill out. The results were as follows.

Figure 9.3: How positive or negative would you say your overall experience was of being a part of this Citizens Assembly, where 10= very positive and 0 = very negative?

	Overall results
0-5	-
6	2
7	2
8	4
9	13
10	20

Figure 9.4: How satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with how the chair and moderators conducted the Citizens' Assembly over the two weekends, where 10 = very satisfied and 0 = very dissatisfied?

	Overall results
0-5	1
6	2
7	4
8	2

9	11
10	11

Figure 9.5: And lastly, to what extent would you be in favour or opposed to using Citizens' Assemblies to address other issues that are important to Oxford City and its citizens, where 10 = very in favour and 0= very opposed?

	Overall results
0-5	1
6	-
7	1
8	6
9	5
10	28

9.12 Discussion guide

Weekend one

Guide Key:

General Instructions
Discussion questions asked to Assembly Members (AMs)
Other moderator instructions

Saturday 28 September

Arrival and Introductions

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
09.00 – 09.30	Arrival and breakfast	As people enter room: check seating plan, collect name badges, direct them to food area. Encourage AMs to meet and great with other AMs at their assigned table.
09.30 – 09.50	Introduction to the Citizens' Assembly	Tom Hayes of Oxford City Council to welcome Assembly members Chair to introduce self, Ipsos MORI and facilitators • Thank participants for taking part in the Citizens' Assembly. • Explain what a Citizens' Assembly is • Explain that each person present has something to bring to the Assembly – we are keen to hear opinions from all and to that effect, will break up the Assembly into small groups, enabling all to express themselves. • Explain that the topic of the Assembly is climate change o Reiterate we are not discussing whether climate change is happening; make reference to debunking the myths material The Assembly's purpose: to explore how Oxford City can best do its part to tackle climate change • Explain that they are on a table with other citizens from Oxford, collectively all AMs represent the profile of Oxford residents • KEY QUESTION FOR THE ASSEMBLY TO DELIBERATE ON: • The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050? • What trade-offs are we prepared to make? Explain to structure of the Assembly • Weekend 1: We will hear from a broad range of speakers, each with a different perspective on what individuals, businesses, and institutions can contribute or are responsible when confronting climate change. AMs will have the chance to ask them questions then discuss their thoughts with the moderators and other AMs in their group • Weekend 2: We will take the information from the first weekend, deliberate and vote on what might be done. Role of Ipsos MORI – independent research organisation, here to facilitate. • Everything you say is confidential – MRS rules. Explain tone and nature of discussion • Relaxed and informal • No right or wrong questions or answers

		• We are keen to hear about everyone's views • Please feel free to disagree with one another; just keep it polite • The moderator will make sure everyone gets a chance to share their opinion • Please try to avoid talking over one another • Plenty to get through, so the moderators may have to move people on from time to time Any other housekeeping – fire alarms, facilities, etc.
9.50 – 10.10	First group discussion	Moderators introduce selves with AMs at their table Moderators to reiterate ground rules Ice breaker discussion • Introduce to person next to you. Name + why decided to participate • Introduce pair to table • *Let's talk about some of the things that matter most to you. What issues would you say matter most to you?* o *Why is that?* o *Where does climate change fit in to those issues?* • *What do you think are the biggest climate change challenges?* o Talk about various aspects of climate change (e.g. CO2 emissions, melting glaciers, burning forests, polluted oceans, etc). o Talk about global level first then national/local • *KEY QUESTION: The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050?* o *What trade-offs are we prepared to make?*

Introduction to climate change

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
		Moderators to hand out note sheets to AMs and ask them to note down any reflections on what they hear during the presentations
10.10 – 10.20	What are the impacts of climate change? The scale of the problem global to local – Myles Allen	7-minute presentation

	(Environmental Change Institute)	
10.20 – 10.30	Why is climate change important? - Linnet Drury (Oxford Spires Academy)	7-minute presentation
10.30 – 10.40	How might climate change affect our lives? – Tara Clarke (Climate Outreach)	7-minute presentation
10.40 – 11.10	Group discussion reflecting on the climate change story so far	Moderators to give AMs three post-it notes and ask them to reflect on what they just saw and heard and to write down 2-3 words or phrases that come to mind – one per post-it note • Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening • Moderator collect post-its, grouping them by theme on the flipchart • Moderator to ask follow-up questions • *Explain to me why you chose that word* • *What are the most concerning issues for you when it comes to climate change?* o *Why is that? What about other issues not mentioned?* • *Who do you think should be held most responsible for dealing with climate change issues?* Moderator to write answers on flipchart o *Why did you say that?* o Ask about those not mentioned e.g. government, businesses, environmental agencies, the public o *What do you think they are doing? Probe for examples* o *What should they be doing? Probe for examples* o *What do you think makes them or prevents them to take action?* • *What common values do people need to tackle climate change?* o *How is this different at a global level compared to a local level?*
11.10-11.25	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down one question per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes)

		Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
11.25 – 11.35	Speakers feedback to full Assembly	Speakers respond to questions

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
11.35 – 11.50	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served

What can we do about climate change?

Time	Title	Facilitation
		Moderators to hand out note sheets to AMs and ask them to note down any reflections on what they hear during the presentations
11.50 – 12.00	What does net zero actually mean? – Jenny Hill (Committee on Climate Change)	7-minute presentation
12.00 – 12.10	Oxford's response to climate change so far - Barbara Hammond (Low Carbon Hub)	7-minute presentation
12.10 – 12.20	Inequality and climate justice: A global perspective – Asad Rehman, War on Want	7-minute presentation
12.20 – 12.30	Oxford City Council's priorities and responsibilities for supporting our citizens and shaping our environment – Tim Sadler (Oxford City Council)	7-minute presentation
12.30 – 12.45	Group discussion reflecting on the climate change story so far	Discuss reactions to previous presentations • Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening • Moderator to ask follow-up questions (allow 10-15 minutes)

		• *What stood out from those previous discussions?* • *What did you write down in your notes?* ○ *Why was that important to you?*
12.45 – 13.00	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down one question per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
13.00 – 13.10	Speakers feedback to full Assembly	Speakers respond to questions

Lunch

Time	Title	Facilitation
13.10 – 13.55	Lunch	Chair to point out where lunch will be served.

Reconvene

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
13.55 – 14.15	Set up afternoon sessions	AMs to meet back in their groups – moderators to help gather AMs back to their tables. Chair to reinstate detailed aims and objectives for the rest of the Assembly, introduce AMs to the climate change themes that will be discussed across the rest of the weekend, reiterate timings.

Theme 1: Waste Reduction

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
14.15 – 14.35	Presentation by Trewin Resorick (Hubbub) + 2 panellists	Chair to introduce speaker/panel participants and explain that they should take notes and write down questions/thoughts on the note sheets Presentation will last up to 10 minutes followed, by 3 minute discussion/commentary from each other panellist

14.35 – 14.50		Discuss reactions to previous presentations
		
		• Speakers and panellists to circulate while table discussions are happening
		
		• Moderator to ask follow-up questions
		
		• *What stood out from those previous discussions?*
		
		• *What did you write down in your notes?*
		  ○ *Why was that important to you?*
		
		• *What felt to you like the most important issues and arguments on waste that you heard?*
		  ○ *Why?*
		
		• *Who should be responsible for dealing with this?*
		
		• *How do you think these ideas fit with what's being done or could be done in Oxford today?*
		
		Themes and notes:
		
		How do we reduce our waste to deliver net zero?
		
		Potential solutions:
		• Charging consumers to dispose of their household waste
		• Reducing the size of household bins

14.50 – 15.05	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down one question per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
15.05 – 15.15	Panellists feedback to full Assembly	Speaker and panellists respond to questions

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
15.15 – 15.30	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served

Theme 2: Buildings

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
15.30 – 15.55	Presentation by Alex Baines (The Design Buro) + 3 panellists	Chair to introduce speaker/panel participants and explain that they should take notes and write down questions/thoughts on the note sheets Presentation will last up to 10 minutes followed, by 3 minute discussion/commentary from each other panellist

15.55 – 16.45		Discuss reactions to previous presentations
		
		• Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening
		
		• Moderator to ask follow-up questions
		
		• *What stood out from those previous discussions?*
		
		• *What did you write down in your notes?*
		  ○ *Why was that important to you?*
		
		• *What felt to you like the most important issues and arguments on 'buildings' that you heard?*
		  ○ *Why?*
		
		• *Who should be responsible for dealing with this?*
		
		• *Which of these ideas/concepts struck you the most?*
		  ○ *Why or why not?*
		
		• *How do you think these ideas fit with what's being done or could be done in Oxford today?*
		
		<u>Themes and notes:</u>
		
		How do we ensure our buildings are fit for the future?
		
		Potential solutions:
		• Retrofitting existing properties to improve their energy efficiency
		• Ensuring domestic and commercial landlords reduce their carbon footprint by adopting higher energy efficiency standards
		• New builds to be made zero carbon by ensuring all energy needs come from renewable sources
		Trade offs:

		• Impact on the building of affordable housing • Potential cost increases for energy bills
16.45 – 17.05	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down two questions per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
17.05 – 17.20	Panellists feedback to full Assembly	Speaker and panellists respond to questions

Closing

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
17.20 – 17.30	End of day reflection	AMs to break into their separate tables for 5 minutes. On postcards – collected by moderators at the end. • *What's the one thing you're taking away from the first day of the assembly?* Chair to close the day, thanking all for their contributions, and reiterating timings for the second day.

Sunday 29 September

Arrival and Introductions

Time	Title	Facilitation
09.00 – 09.30	Arrival and breakfast	As people enter room: check seating plan (NOTE: THERE IS A NEW SEATING PLAN), collect name badges, etc. Encourage AMs to meet and great with other AMs at their assigned table.
09.30 – 09.35	Introduction	Chair to summarise the previous day, explain the format of the second day and reiterate rules of the Assembly
09.35 - 09.40	Icebreaker	Ice breaker discussion while finishing breakfast • Introduce to person next to you. Name + why decided to participate. • Introduce pair to table.

Theme 3: Transport

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
09.40 – 10.10	Presentation by Llewelyn Morgan (Oxfordshire County Council) + 5 panellists	Chair to introduce speaker/panel participants and explain that they should take notes and write down questions/thoughts on the note sheets Presentation will last up to 10 minutes followed, by 3 minute discussion/commentary from each other panellist

10.10 – 11.00		Discuss reactions to previous presentations
		
		• Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening
		
		• Moderator to ask follow-up questions
		
		• *What stood out from those previous discussions?*
		
		• *What did you write down in your notes?*
		  ○ *Why was that important to you?*
		
		• *What felt to you like the most important issues and arguments on 'sustainable transport' that you heard?*
		  ○ *Why?*
		
		• *Which of these ideas/concepts struck you the most?*
		  ○ *Why or why not?*
		
		• *Who should be responsible for dealing with this?*

		• *How do you think these ideas fit with what's being done or could be done in Oxford today?* Themes and notes: How do we ensure a sustainable transport system for net zero? Potential solutions: • Greater road space for walking, cycling, and public transport • Providing access to an electric vehicle • Funding freight consolidation from public money e.g. council tax • Implementing a congestion charge zone which charges petrol and diesel vehicles to access the city centre at certain times Trade offs: • Less road space for cars • Less council tax spend on other services • Driving in the city centre will be charged
11.00 – 11.20	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down two questions per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
11.20 – 11.35	Panellists feedback to full Assembly	Speaker and panellists respond to questions

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
11.35 – 11.50	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served.

Theme 4: Biodiversity and Offsetting

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
11.50 – 12.10	Presentation by Prof. Kathy Willis (University of Oxford) + 2 panellists	Chair to introduce speaker/panel participants and explain that they should take notes and write down questions/thoughts on the note sheets Presentation will last up to 10 minutes followed, by 3 minute discussion/commentary from each other panellist

12.10 – 12.20		Discuss reactions to previous presentations • Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening • Moderator to ask follow-up questions • *What stood out from those previous discussions?* • *What did you write down in your notes?* o *Why was that important to you?* • *What felt to you like the most important issues and arguments on biodiversity and offsetting that you heard?* o *Why?* • *Who should be responsible for dealing with this?* • *How do you think these ideas fit with what's being done or could be done in Oxford today?* Themes and notes: What is the role of biodiversity and offsetting on the journey to net zero? Potential solutions: • Land use – the need for biodiversity enhancement e.g. planting trees • Offsetting carbon emissions locally Trade offs • Less land used for other needs e.g. housing and farming
12.20 – 12.35	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down one question per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
12.35 – 12.50	Panellists feedback to full Assembly	Speaker and panellists respond to questions

Lunch

Time	Title	Facilitation
12.50 – 13.35	Lunch	Chair to point out where lunch will be served

Theme 5: Renewable Energy

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions
13.35 – 14.00	Presentation by Nick Eyre (Environmental Change Institute) + 3 panellists	Chair to introduce speaker/panel participants and explain that they should take notes and write down questions/thoughts on the note sheets Presentation will last up to 10 minutes followed, by 3 minute discussion/commentary from each other panellist
14.00 – 15.05		Discuss reactions to previous presentations • Presenters to circulate while table discussions are happening • Moderator to ask follow-up questions • *What stood out from those previous discussions?* • *What did you write down in your notes?* o *Why was that important to you?* • *What felt to you like the most important issues and arguments on 'renewable energy' that you heard?* o *Why?* • *Which of these ideas/concepts struck you the most?* o *Why or why not?* • *Who should be responsible for dealing with this?* • *How do you think these ideas fit with what's being done or could be done in Oxford today?* <u>Themes and notes:</u> How do we ensure our energy system comes from renewable sources? Potential solutions: • Use of renewable energy technologies e.g. solar panels on buildings • Developers installing on-site renewables e.g. solar panels on all new builds

		• Generating Oxford's energy needs from local renewable sources • Heating homes from clean fuels/electric Trade offs: • Renewable technologies i.e. solar panels will be used – and be visible – in historic/ conservation areas • Stop all use of gas
15.05 – 15.25	Generate questions	Moderator to ask AMs to pair up and discuss questions that they would like to present to the speakers. Ask AMs to write down two questions per pair on a post-it note – include question and speaker it should be presented to. (allow 5 minutes) Moderator to collect post-it notes, flipchart, and theme. Table to agree on one key question to be asked. (allow 5 minutes) Full Assembly reconvenes with speakers and panel back in front of room. Chair will lead Q&A session calling each moderator to read off their group's questions. (Allow 5 minutes)
15.25 – 15.40	Panellists feedback to full Assembly	Speaker and panellists respond to questions

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
15.40 – 15.55	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served.

Wrapping up and closing

Time	Title	Facilitation Instructions / Moderator discussion questions

15.55 – 16.30	Weekend reflection	AMs to break into their groups
		
		• *Given everything we've heard over the past two days, let's think about the overall question: Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050? And what trade-offs are we prepared to make?*
		  ○ *What do you think now?*
		  ○ *What's changed since Saturday morning?*
		
		• *In what ways do you think the five themes we heard about this weekend address some of the general climate change issues that we discussed yesterday morning?*
		
		• *What were some of the ideas/issues that you thought were most convincing/interesting/practical?*
		  ○ *Why or why not?*

		• *Which did you think might be the most challenging?* ○ *Why or why not?* Ranking exercise: which areas would you prioritise? • Moderators to reiterate five themes • Hand out voting sheet listing the five themes • AMs to rank order the themes in terms of which you would prioritise – 1 = highest priority, 5 = lowest priority • Collate rankings from the tables • Discuss ranking on tables
16.30 – 16.45	Plenary feedback	Each table to feedback on their ranking and summarise discussion about it
16.45 – 17.00	What happens next?	Chair to walk through next steps: • Available online: All presentations / footage of each presentation; Advice for taking action as an individual; Sources of support • Chair will reiterate times and dates for second weekend and 'ground rules' for AM conduct and observers while they are in between weekend sessions • Task between now and then: Talk to family, friends, colleagues; How important is this to them?; And what do they think should be prioritised?; Rewatch presentations from this weekend – we'll remind you! • We'll explore these things at the start of the next session
17.00 – 17.15	Thank and close	Chair will thank participants for their time, thank staff, thank anyone else (Speakers? Venue? Observers?) Moderators/runners to distribute "thank you" payments to AMs

Weekend two

Saturday 19 October

Arrival and Introductions

Time	Title	Facilitation
09.00 – 09.30	Arrival and breakfast	As people arrive: collect name badges, direct them to food area. When they enter Assembly Room: check seating plan, direct them to seats Encourage AMs to meet and great with other AMs at their assigned table.
09.30 – 09.45	Welcome back by chair	Tom Hayes of Oxford City Council to welcome Assembly members Chair to welcome everybody back to Assembly • Thank participants for taking part in the Citizens' Assembly. • Remind AMs what a Citizens' Assembly is • Remind AMs that each person present has something to bring to the assembly – we are keen to hear opinions from all and to that effect, will break up the assembly into small groups, enabling all to express themselves. • Introduce the weekends' moderators and team Explain structure of the weekend o We will take the information from the first weekend, deliberate and vote on what Oxford City Council's policy/policies should be to tackle climate change. o Chair to reiterate that this weekend is where AMs will have their say in regard to the climate change policies that Oxford should prioritise. o Chair also to explain, that the decisions made in the CA will help guide the Council in its decisions. Remind AMs about the rules and tone for the Assembly. • Everything you say is confidential – MRS rules. • Relaxed and informal • No right or wrong questions or answers • We are keen to hear about everyone's views • Please feel free to disagree with one another; just keep it polite • The moderator will make sure everyone gets a chance to share their opinion • Please try to avoid talking over one another • Plenty to get through, so the moderators may have to move people on from time to time Any other housekeeping – fire alarms, facilities, etc.

9.45 – 9.55	Meet your new table	Moderators introduce selves with AMs at their table Moderators to reiterate ground rules Ice breaker discussion • Introduce to person next to you. Name + why decided to participate • Introduce pair to table
9.55 – 10.10	Reflections on the previous weekend	Recap of the first weekend and thoughts/discussions since that weekend • What were the things that you've been reflecting most on from the last weekend? o Why is that? o What made that stick in your mind? • Who did you discuss the issues with? (i.e. friends, family, colleagues, etc)? o What did they say? • What things did you discuss about with other people (friends, family, colleagues)? o What did they think? • How did these conversations affect how you feel about what we discussed during the first weekend? o What makes you say that? • If you did some extra reading or research over the past few weeks, what things did you read/learn about? o How has that affected your thinking on these issues? • Where are we now on the key question? The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050? o Quick show of hands – yes or no Moderators to flipchart result
10.10 – 10.15	Current view on key question	Moderators to share with rest of room

Behaviour change and thinking about the future

Time	Title	Facilitation
10.15 – 10.30	Behaviour Change – Nick Chater, University of Warwick	15 minute presentation
10.30 – 11.15	What 2030 might look like – Rob Hopkins, the Transition Network	45 minutes • Paired exercise: 2030 – smells, sounds, feelings • Rob talks about Totness and what the transition movement has achieved • "yes, but" vs "yes, and" • Rob talks about imaginative change he's seen elsewhere • Two volunteers to read out mayoral statement from 2030 about having achieved net zero by 2030

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
11.15 – 11.30	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served

Theme 1 Deliberation (Waste Reduction)

Time	Title	Facilitation

11.30 – 11.35	Weekend one summary discussion	Moderators to hand out summary of findings from weekend one and ask AMs to read. Moderator to also read summary aloud to AMs.
		• How do you feel about that as a summary?
		  o What bits did you find most interesting?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o What would you change?

11.35 – 12.25	Scenarios for the future	10 minutes on "business as usual" Moderator to hand out the "business as usual" scenario • Here is the current situation in Oxford regarding waste reduction. This shows what happens now, the current co-benefits, and the trade-offs this entails. • How do you feel about this situation? • What do you think should change, in light of what we discussed during weekend one? 30 minutes on three potential future scenarios Moderator to hand out the three different futures – A, B, C

		• Here are three different possible futures, with a description of what each might look like, plus the co-benefits and trade-offs associated with each.
		• REPEAT FOR EACH SCENARIO (ROUGHLY 10 MINS ON EACH): How do you feel about this future scenario?
		  o What are the things you like about it? Why?
		  o What about the things you are less sure about? Why?
		
		5 minutes to compare all three scenarios
		
		• Which one appeals to you the most?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o And which appeals the least?
		
		5 minutes to score the scenarios – hand out individual scoring sheets – each scenario listed, two boxes next to each – one for co-benefits, one for trade-offs
		
		• We now want you to score each scenario.
		• You have 5 blue tokens to indicate how much you think the co-benefits for each scenario will be good for Oxford. You can distribute these however you like across the scenarios – you may like the co-benefits of one far more than the others and so put all 5 tokens on that scenario. Or you may want to spread them across the scenarios.
		• You have 5 red tokens to indicate how difficult you think the trade-offs will be for each scenario – how difficult will they be for Oxford? You may think that one set of trade-offs is much harder than the others, so put all 5 red tokens on that scenario. Or maybe you would want to spread them across scenarios.
		
		Moderators to help AMs with scoring and to collect scoring sheets when done ("ballot box" on each table)

Lunch

Time	Title	Facilitation
12.30 – 13.15	Lunch	Chair to point out where lunch will be served – meat will be served today as there's another group using the facility, veggie/vegan tomorrow Team to collate results on wallchart – list each scenario, with co-benefits and constraints scores listed Chair to recap scores for the room per scenario as AMs reconvene after lunch

Theme 2 Deliberation (Buildings)

Time	Title	Facilitation

13.15 – 13.30	Weekend one summary discussion	Moderators to hand out summary of findings from weekend one and ask AMs to read. Moderator to also read summary aloud to AMs.
		
		• How do you feel about that as a summary?
		  o What bits did you find most interesting?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o What would you change?

13.30 – 14.45	Scenarios for the future	15 minutes on "business as usual"
		
		Moderator to hand out the "business as usual" scenario
		
		• Here is the current situation in Oxford regarding waste reduction. This shows what happens now, the current co-benefits, and the trade-offs this entails.
		• How do you feel about this situation?
		• What do you think should change, in light of what we discussed during weekend one?
		
		45 minutes on three potential future scenarios
		
		Moderator to hand out the three different futures – A, B, C
		
		• Here are three different possible futures, with a description of what each might look like, plus the co-benefits and trade-offs associated with each.
		• REPEAT FOR EACH SCENARIO (ROUGHLY 15 MINS ON EACH): How do you feel about this future scenario?
		  o What are the things you like about it? Why?
		  o What about the things you are less sure about? Why?
		
		10 minutes to compare all three scenarios
		
		• Which one appeals to you the most?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o And which appeals the least?
		
		5 minutes to score the scenarios – hand out individual scoring sheets – each scenario listed, two boxes next to each – one for co-benefits, one for trade-offs
		
		• We now want you to score each scenario.
		• You have 5 blue tokens to indicate how much you think the co-benefits for each scenario will be good for Oxford. You can distribute these however you like across the scenarios – you may like the co-benefits of one far more than the others and so put all 5 tokens on that scenario. Or you may want to spread them across the scenarios.

		• You have 5 red tokens to indicate how difficult you think the trade-offs will be for each scenario – how difficult will they be for Oxford? You may think that one set of trade-offs is much harder than the others, so put all 5 red tokens on that scenario. Or maybe you would want to spread them across scenarios. Moderators to help AMs with scoring and to collect scoring sheets when done ("ballot box" on each table)

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
14.45 – 15.00	Break	Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served Team to collate results on wallchart – list each scenario, with co-benefits and constraints scores listed

Theme 3 Deliberation (Transport)

Time	Title	Facilitation

15.00 – 15.15	Weekend one summary discussion	Moderators to hand out summary of findings from weekend one and ask AMs to read. Moderator to also read summary aloud to AMs.
		
		• How do you feel about that as a summary?
		  o What bits did you find most interesting?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o What would you change?

15.15 – 16.30	Scenarios for the future	15 minutes on "business as usual" Moderator to hand out the "business as usual" scenario • Here is the current situation in Oxford regarding waste reduction. This shows what happens now, the current co-benefits, and the trade-offs this entails. • How do you feel about this situation? • What do you think should change, in light of what we discussed during weekend one? 45 minutes on three potential future scenarios Moderator to hand out the three different futures – A, B, C • Here are three different possible futures, with a description of what each might look like, plus the co-benefits and trade-offs associated with each.

		• REPEAT FOR EACH SCENARIO (ROUGHLY 15 MINS ON EACH): How do you feel about this future scenario?
		  o What are the things you like about it? Why?
		  o What about the things you are less sure about? Why?
		
		10 minutes to compare all three scenarios
		
		• Which one appeals to you the most?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o And which appeals the least?
		
		5 minutes to score the scenarios – hand out individual scoring sheets – each scenario listed, two boxes next to each – one for co-benefits, one for trade-offs
		
		• We now want you to score each scenario.
		• You have 5 blue tokens to indicate how much you think the co-benefits for each scenario will be good for Oxford. You can distribute these however you like across the scenarios – you may like the co-benefits of one far more than the others and so put all 5 tokens on that scenario. Or you may want to spread them across the scenarios.
		• You have 5 red tokens to indicate how difficult you think the trade-offs will be for each scenario – how difficult will they be for Oxford? You may think that one set of trade-offs is much harder than the others, so put all 5 red tokens on that scenario. Or maybe you would want to spread them across scenarios.
		
		Moderators to help AMs with scoring and to collect scoring sheets when done ("ballot box" on each table)

Time	Title	Facilitation
While theme 4 is starting	Runners collate scores	Runners to collect scores and collate onto wallcharts

Theme 4 Deliberation (Biodiversity and Offsetting)

Time	Title	Facilitation

16.30 – 16.35	Weekend one summary discussion	Moderators to hand out summary of findings from weekend one and ask AMs to read. Moderator to also read summary aloud to AMs.
		
		• How do you feel about that as a summary?
		  o What bits did you find most interesting?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o What would you change?

16.35 – 17.15	Policy options	5 minutes on "business as usual"
		
		Moderator to hand out the "business as usual" scenario
		
		• Here is the current situation in Oxford regarding waste reduction. This shows what happens now, the current co-benefits, and the trade-offs this entails.
		• How do you feel about this situation?
		• What do you think should change, in light of what we discussed during weekend one?
		
		25 minutes on three potential future scenarios
		
		Moderator to hand out the three different futures – A, B, C
		
		• Here are three different possible futures, with a description of what each might look like, plus the co-benefits and trade-offs associated with each.
		• REPEAT FOR EACH SCENARIO (ROUGHLY 10 MINS ON EACH): How do you feel about this future scenario?
		  o What are the things you like about it? Why?
		  o What about the things you are less sure about? Why?
		
		5 minutes to compare all three scenarios
		
		• Which one appeals to you the most?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o And which appeals the least?
		
		5 minutes to score the scenarios – hand out individual scoring sheets – each scenario listed, two boxes next to each – one for co-benefits, one for trade-offs
		
		• We now want you to score each scenario.
		• You have 5 blue tokens to indicate how much you think the co-benefits for each scenario will be good for Oxford. You can distribute these however you like across the scenarios – you may like the co-benefits of one far more than the others and so put all 5 tokens on that scenario. Or you may want to spread them across the scenarios.
		• You have 5 red tokens to indicate how difficult you think the trade-offs will be for each scenario – how difficult will they be for Oxford? You may think that one set of trade-offs is much harder than the others, so put all 5 red tokens on that scenario. Or maybe you would want to spread them across scenarios.
		
		Moderators to help AMs with scoring and to collect scoring sheets when done ("ballot box" on each table)

Time	Title	Facilitation
While theme wrap up is happening	Runners collate scores	Runners to collect scores and collate onto wallcharts

Closing

Time	Title	Facilitation
17.15 – 17.30	Day reflection	AMs move back into full Assembly. Chair to reflect on lessons learned so far today – any interesting observations about scores on themes 1-3. Then on theme 4 once scores are available. Chair to thanks AMs for Day 3, explain Day 4's format.

Sunday 20 October

Arrival and Introductions

Time	Title	Facilitation
09.00 – 09.30	Arrival and breakfast	As people enter room: seating plan to be same as previous day, collect name badges, direct them to food area. When they enter Assembly Room: check seating plan, direct them to seats Encourage AMs to meet and great with other AMs at their assigned table.
9.30 – 9.45	Introduction	Chair to summarise the previous day, explain the format of the second day and reiterate rules of the Assembly
9.45 – 9.55	Meet your new table	Moderators introduce selves with AMs at their table Moderators to reiterate ground rules Ice breaker discussion • Introduce to person next to you. Name + one key takeout so far from the Assembly • Introduce pair to table

Theme 5 Deliberation (Renewable Energy)

Time	Title	Facilitation

09.55 – 10.05	Weekend one summary discussion	Moderators to hand out summary of findings from weekend one and ask AMs to read. Moderator to also read summary aloud to AMs.
		
		• How do you feel about that as a summary?
		  o What bits did you find most interesting?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o What would you change?

10.00 – 11.15	Policy options	15 minutes on "business as usual" Moderator to hand out the "business as usual" scenario • Here is the current situation in Oxford regarding waste reduction. This shows what happens now, the current co-benefits, and the trade-offs this entails. • How do you feel about this situation? • What do you think should change, in light of what we discussed during weekend one? 45 minutes on three potential future scenarios

		Moderator to hand out the three different futures – A, B, C
		
		• Here are three different possible futures, with a description of what each might look like, plus the co-benefits and trade-offs associated with each.
		• REPEAT FOR EACH SCENARIO (ROUGHLY 15 MINS ON EACH): How do you feel about this future scenario?
		  o What are the things you like about it? Why?
		  o What about the things you are less sure about? Why?
		
		10 minutes to compare all three scenarios
		
		• Which one appeals to you the most?
		  o What makes you say that?
		  o And which appeals the least?
		
		5 minutes to score the scenarios – hand out individual scoring sheets – each scenario listed, two boxes next to each – one for co-benefits, one for trade-offs
		
		• We now want you to score each scenario.
		• You have 5 blue tokens to indicate how much you think the co-benefits for each scenario will be good for Oxford. You can distribute these however you like across the scenarios – you may like the co-benefits of one far more than the others and so put all 5 tokens on that scenario. Or you may want to spread them across the scenarios.
		• You have 5 red tokens to indicate how difficult you think the trade-offs will be for each scenario – how difficult will they be for Oxford? You may think that one set of trade-offs is much harder than the others, so put all 5 red tokens on that scenario. Or maybe you would want to spread them across scenarios.
		
		Moderators to help AMs with scoring and to collect scoring sheets when done ("ballot box" on each table)

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
11.15 – 11.35	Break	Slightly longer break than usual! Chair to point out where tea and coffee will be served Team to collate results on wallchart – list each scenario, with co-benefits and constraints scores listed

Scenario preference

Time	Title	Facilitation
11.35 – 12.10	Reaction to scenario scoring	Each table to move anti-clockwise around the room and for each theme spend five minutes discussing the overall scoring results for each theme For each theme • How do you feel about these results? o What do you find most interesting? o What makes you say that? o What surprised you the most? Why? • FOR EACH THEME: Why do you think people scored this scenario this way? o EXPLORE SCORING FOR CO-BENEFITS AND TRADE-OFFS Individuals to vote on which scenario they think Oxford should aim for • For each theme, I would like you to mark on your ballot paper which scenario you want Oxford to aim for under each of our five themes • Then at end fold your paper and place in the "ballot box"
12.00 – 12.30	Scenario recommendation	Runners to collect and tally the results • While the results are being tallied for the room, I want to talk about what you think is the most important thing driving your choice of scenario. o Why did you vote in this way? o What mattered most to you? o Why did this matter? Moderator to flipchart feedback Chair to summarise recommendations voting – revealing here, if not already obvious, ambition levels and how these are reflected in the voting
12.30-12.45	Plenary feedback	Moderators to briefly feedback to room on recommendations discussions

Lunch

Time	Title	Facilitation
12.45 – 13.45	Lunch	Chair to point out where lunch will be served.

Responsibilities

Time	Title	Facilitation

13.45 – 14.30	Voting on responsibilities	Tables to discuss responsibilities – four questions to be answered per theme. Talk AMs through the four questions, then hand out the ballot papers. Give them plenty of time to do this – discourage conferring. Each Assembly Member to be given 25 stickers (5 for each theme) and distribute them among who they think should be responsible for change • Who should be responsible for change? 1. Local government 2. National government 3. Businesses 4. Communities 5. Individuals Assembly Members to choose one of the following for each theme • How do we most effectively achieve change the quickest? 1. Legal requirements or enforcement 2. Financial incentives 3. Financial penalties 4. Restrictions in choice 5. Personal conscience Assembly Members to choose top three options for each theme • How should we pay for change? 1. Fees and charges for local services (e.g. waste collection) 2. Council tax 3. National tax 4. Business tax 5. Loans and personal finance 6. Incorporate environmental costs into consumer goods and services Assembly Members to choose one option and write their answer on a post it note • How should land-use be best prioritised to achieve net zero quickest? 1. Housing and development 2. Green space (biodiversity) 3. Renewable energy Vote on these four questions using ballot papers Runners to collect and tally the results • Finally, we want you to think about where Oxford should start. Which of the themes – based on what you know and what you have heard over the course of the Citizens' Assembly – do you think Oxford should focus on first?

		○ What make you say that? ○ Why is this theme most important to focus on? ○ Why not one of the others? • What should we focus on first? 1. Transport 2. Waste Reduction 3. Biodiversity and Offsetting 4. Buildings 5. Renewable Energy • What individual things should we focus on first? • What should the Council start doing tomorrow?

Subsidiary exercises

Time	Title	Facilitation
14.30 – 15.30	Feedback exercise	Handouts 1. Write a letter OR draw a picture telling someone about what a net zero Oxford would be like including what it would look, sound, smell like etc. This should also include the year of your vision. Allow approx. 20-25 mins and then discuss as a table 2. Two volunteers from each table to volunteer to feed back their vision to the room

Break

Time	Title	Facilitation
15.30 – 15.50	Break	Runners to collect scores and collate onto wallcharts Tally "which theme to focus on"

Ten quick questions

Time	Title	Facilitation
15.50 – 16.10	Final voting exercise for comms messages	We have 10 quick questions the Council wants the Assembly's feedback on… Talk AMs through the questions and Assembly Members to circle one response per question 1. Currently national policy does not require that new homes are built to net zero standards. Should the government introduce this standard? • Yes

		• No • DK 2. The Government has already legislated to end the sale of all petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. Should the ban on new petrol and diesel vehicles be brought forward to 2030? • Yes • No • DK 3a. If you are a homeowner, would you be prepared to retrofit your home and bear the costs? Average of £25,000 per house • Yes • No • DK 3b. If you are a tenant, would you be prepared to have your landlord retrofit your home paid for through your rent and lower energy bills over a number of years? Average of £100 extra per month • Yes • No • DK 4. If more re-use and return schemes were introduced in supermarkets and other shops in the city would you use them? • Yes • No • DK 5. Would you actively offset your carbon footprint, if the money raised was channelled into <u>local</u> renewable energy and biodiversity schemes? • Yes • No • DK 6. Which of the following two options should Oxford City Council prioritise? a. Planting additional trees in public spaces in Oxford b. Procuring land outside the city in partnership with neighbouring councils for large-scale tree planting c. DK 7. Would you consider buying an electric vehicle as your next car? • Yes • No • N/A 8. Who should have <u>most</u> responsibility for dealing with waste? a. Producers of goods b. Consumers c. Local councils

		9. Currently Oxford City Council offers three sizes of green waste bins for fortnightly collections. Should Oxford City Council withdraw the largest size of green waste bin from all households in order to encourage more recycling? • Yes • No • DK On your ballot papers, please indicate your responses to each of these questions Runners to collect and tally ballot papers

Final vote

Time	Title	Facilitation
16.10 – 16.20	Final vote on key question	On tables • Our key question in all of this has been around whether or not Oxford should target "net zero" earlier than 2050. • The UK Government has legislation to reach 'net zero' by 2050. Should Oxford be more proactive and seek to achieve 'net zero' sooner than 2050? Yes • Please take a post-it and write yes or no – yes if you think Oxford should seek to achieve "net zero" sooner than 2050, no if you do not think this. • Then fold your post-it and place in the "ballot box" Discuss 3 final questions 1. Why did you vote this way? 2. Have your views changed since the start of the Assembly? If so, how? 3. What is the most important thing for Oxford City Council to bear in mind? Runners to collect up and quickly tally the results Moderators to feed back to the room Chair to share the results with the whole room

Closing

Time	Title	Facilitation
16.20 – 16.45	Wrap up	Chair to discuss what will happen next Rebecca Nestor, Director, Learning for Good Take home pack Sign-up sheet to if they want to be involved in future events, etc Thank you and close from Susan Brown Final thank you from chair TAKE HOME PAYMENT

Kelly Finnerty
Senior Research Executive
Kelly.Finnerty@ipsos.com

Paul Carroll
Associate Director
Paul.Carroll@ipsos.com

Glenn Gottfried
Research Manager
Glenn.Gottfried@ipsos.com

Holly Day
Graduate Research Executive
Holly.Day@ipsos.com

Gary Welch
Research Director
Gary.Welch@ipsos.com

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos-mori.com
http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI

About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute

The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methods and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.