Office for Public Management

Evaluation and learning from the 2050 public engagement programme

The Department of Energy and Climate Change

July 2011

OPM
252B Gray's Inn Road,
London WC1X 8XG

tel: 0845 055 3900
fax: 0845 055 1700
email: office@opm.co.uk
web: www.opm.co.uk

Client	The Department of Energy and Climate Change
Document title	Evaluation and Learning from the 2050 public engagement programme
Date modified	19th July 2011
Status	Final
OPM project number	8401
Author	Natasha Comber and Sanah Sheikh
Quality assurance by	Diane Beddoes
Contact details	
Main point of contact	Natasha Comber
Telephone	020 7239 7856
Email	ncomber@opm.co.uk

If you would like a large text version of this document, please contact us.

Contents

Executive Summary

OPM was commissioned to evaluate The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) three-strand public engagement programme on how the UK should meet its legally binding greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 80% by 2050[1]. The three strands were:

- an advisory youth panel, run from within DECC but managed independently
- three local deliberative dialogues designed and managed by Ipsos-MORI and Involve[2], which incorporated use and discussion of the 2050 Pathways Calculator
  - one-day workshops held in London and Cumbria and a half-day workshop in Nottingham
  - London and Nottingham workshops designed around paired or small-group use of the calculator: in Cumbria, each participant had access to their own computer
- a serious games interface, My2050, developed by Delib.

The programme was jointly funded by DECC and the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (ERC) and, under the requirements of the latter, independently evaluated. The findings from this evaluation will inform DECC's future public engagement programme and contribute to the Sciencewise-ERC aim of creating excellence in public dialogue.

Main findings

Many aspects of the three components of the 2050 engagement programme were a success. With some minor exceptions, the deliberative dialogue events met their objectives and participants enjoyed being involved in the process and valued the opportunity to learn about the issues from both experts and other participants. Initial engagement to the My2050 calculator has been very promising and the target audience - young people – have been engaged. Youth panellists enjoyed the set tasks and learned from their involvement in the panel, which they felt was well-structured and managed.

The primary shortcoming of the project overall was that the objectives were not clearly translated into the process or delivery and this led to confusion in some aspects of the work.

1 The Climate Change Act 2008 set legally binding emission reduction targets for 2050– a reduction of at least 80 percent in greenhouse gas emissions, http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/legislation/cc_act_08/cc_act_08.aspx

2 Involve was commissioned to develop a toolkit drawing on learning from this project and helping to take the discussion to the wider public.

Youth Panel

The panel meetings provided a stimulating environment for learning and discussion. They were well-structured and well-facilitated and helped to keep the Panel together as a whole. Site visits to relevant organisations such as DRAX were done by some of the Panel members, who found them interesting, informative and inspiring. Some panel members said that the visits had led them to change their views about different types of energy. Having the "DECC ticket" meant too that panel members were warmly welcomed and given insight into places that might otherwise have been closed.

All panel members were encouraged to contribute their ideas to the final report, which was written by a central writing group. A majority felt the final report was very good and were happy with its content – though some did feel that the report writing process was rushed.

Panel members learned from this project in two main ways. First, they developed knowledge about British energy infrastructure, which increased their confidence about discussing and leading debates on energy related issues. Second, they improved written, presentation, networking and communication skills. They felt this made them better placed to pursue the careers they wanted. They also felt inspired to stay involved with and do more in the way of campaigning for low carbon alternatives.

Recommendations for improving future youth panel activities

- **Define overall purpose and objective clearly**: take sufficient time at the start of activities like this to discuss and agree overall aims and the purpose of core activities. Agree minimum time commitment required and any opportunities for flexible commitment.
- **Agree a realistic timetable:** ensure milestones and deadlines are achievable without over-burdening panel members. This will help to motivate panel members and keep them involved through every stage of the programme
- **Be aware of 'spin'**: if young people think their involvement is 'PR' rather than substantive, the information they are given might be treated with suspicion
- **Take difference levels of knowledge into account:** provide ways for young people to develop their knowledge, if they wish and ensure that those who are less well-informed or less vocal in meetings can contribute effectively
- **Recognise and value excellent facilitation**, which can be crucial to the success of this type of project.
- **Feedback** to Panel members how their contribution is being used.

Deliberative dialogue workshops

The workshops were designed around the use of the 2050 Pathways Calculator and engaged community leaders in discussion about the issues involved in developing a 'pathway' to achieving the 2050 target of an 80% reduction in emissions. Workshop design incorporated plenary explanatory sessions; use of the calculator, either individually or in small groups; interaction with experts and small group discussion on specific themes.

Participants enjoyed the group discussions, which helped to develop their understanding of the issues, discuss the issues that concerned them and learn from others. The discussions also helped to inform their choices on the 2050 pathways calculator. Most participants found the calculator easy to use. It helped to stimulate their thinking on the issues and learn more about the benefits and disadvantages of different ways of generating and using energy.

Information to help participants consider the issues was provided on written briefing notes, through the 2050 pathways calculator and by experts from DECC. The input of DECC experts was highly praised by participants and observation showed they responded thoughtfully to participants' questions, without using jargon. People enjoyed using the calculator and clearly learned a great deal from taking part in these events.

People identified a number of impacts on them as a consequence of their participation in the workshops. They realised the scale of the challenge and understood more about what achieving the 80% target would entail, and its impact on public life and society. They learned more about the energy debate in general and the range of options available to meet the 2050 target. Some people said they would use the 2050 pathways calculator with their own communities.

Recommendations for improving future deliberative public dialogue using the 2050 pathways calculator:

- **Clear objectives**: agree a set of focused objectives prior to the design stage and ensure that these are compatible, if all objectives are to be met within a single workshop
- **Frame the day:** provide details about the wider context within which an event sits, how each event will contribute to the wider policy aims and ensure the purpose and length of each individual session is clear to participants
- **Expertise:** provide adequate expertise to support complex discussions
- **Length of events:** ensure events are long enough to cover the content without rushing participants. For half-day events, this might mean using My2050 and building discussion around this, rather than using the 2050 pathways calculator.
- **Consider who is in the room:** if participants are recruited as 'community leaders' rather than individuals, consider how process design can encourage people to "bring their communities into the room" and articulate the challenges that this might involve.

My2050

My2050 simulation is a 'serious game' which enables members of the public to create their own solution to meeting the 2050 emissions reduction target. It is a simpler version of the 2050 pathways calculator and be used as an introduction to its more complex partner or as a stand-alone tool.

The engaging nature of My2050, combined with its promotion on well-used sites and in social media drove a large number of people to the tool, generated a great deal of information. Over 10,000 pathways were submitted in 26 days in March, with 50,000 users in total. My2050 was targeted at people with limited knowledge and awareness of energy and climate change issues and at young people. Data suggest it had mixed success at this: whilst young audiences were reached, players tended to have more knowledge or interest in climate change than the general population.

My2050 was initially designed to allow interaction between players: however, the final version lacked this functionality. This limits its value as a stand-along mechanism for deliberative engagement. However, it does have value as a tool that can be used within the context of well-designed face-to-face deliberative dialogue.

Recommendations

- **Embed My2050 in other contexts:** these might include social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook), online tools such as webinars and face-to-face activities such as deliberative workshops
- **Encourage interaction:** if this functionality is not designed into the game in future, create a forum for players to debate their worlds with other users and experts (or perhaps encourage such debate in existing forums)
- **Prompts for discussion:** include prompts in My2050 for users to discuss their worlds with family members and friends, and then to re-consider their choices after these discussions
- **Target My2050 at community leaders involved with climate change:** engage with people already involved in promoting climate change at a local level to encourage them to use My2050 in their own activities: the toolkit will clearly be valuable here.

Conclusion

Future dialogue activities should be designed within the context of a more explicit understanding of deliberative engagement and how and why this differs from qualitative research. The Ipsos-MORI report does address the analysis of qualitative data. However, deliberative approaches are not equivalent to qualitative research and the assumptions that underlie the particular model of deliberation being used in any particular project can have implications for the approach to analysis that is taken (which might be different to the approach taken to qualitative research). For example, some theorists and practitioners position deliberation as an exercise in public reason: understanding the outputs of dialogue as the result of rational debate consequent upon the understanding of information provided could provide different conclusions and recommendations to understanding the same outputs as the result of (for example) participants' emotional responses to the same information or to the power dynamics underlying discussions. Surfacing the assumptions implicit in process design and delivery can provide additional insights into the data gathered. There is value in exploring where on the spectrum of approaches to deliberation any particular project lies, if only to ensure that the messages given to participants are transparent.

Deliberative dialogue is also about democracy, and a commitment to the right of citizens to contribute to the decisions that will affect their lives. This is markedly different to the commitments underpinning qualitative research. Careful attention to these issues will help to ensure that future activities in this area build on and improve the work done in this project.

1. Introduction

The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) launched the 2050 public engagement programme to open a public dialogue on how the UK should meet its legally binding greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 80% by 2050[3]. The engagement programme comprised three strands: an advisory youth panel; three local deliberative dialogues and 2050 pathways calculator; and the serious games interface, My2050 [4]. The youth panel was run from within DECC and managed by an independent panel manager; the local deliberative dialogues were designed and managed by Ipsos-MORI and Involve: Delib, a digital democracy company, was commissioned to develop the serious games interface, My2050. The programme was jointly funded by DECC and the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (ERC)[5]. Involve was also commissioned to develop toolkits based on the learning from these events.

In line with Sciencewise-ERC requirements, on 20th February 2011 DECC commissioned an independent evaluation of the 2050 public engagement programme. The aim of the evaluation was to assess each of the three strands of the public engagement programme and the programme as a whole.[6] The findings of the evaluation are intended to inform DECC's future public engagement programme and to contribute to the Sciencewise-ERC aim of creating excellence in public dialogue to inspire and inform better policy making in science and technology.

1.2 Evaluation aims and objectives

OPM was commissioned to evaluate three strands of the public engagement programme:

- the youth advisory panel
- the local deliberative dialogues which involved the use of the 2050 calculator
- the serious games interface, My2050.[7]

3 The Climate Change Act 2008 set legally binding emission reduction targets for 2050– a reduction of at least 80 percent in greenhouse gas emissions, http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/legislation/cc_act_08/cc_act_08.aspx

4 The engagement programme also included an online debate/ forum which was not supported by Sciencewise and which we were not commissioned to evaluate

5 The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre -(ERC) funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), helps policy makers to understand and use public dialogue to inspire, inform and improve policy decisions around science and technology. It consists of a comprehensive online resource of information, advice and guidance together with a wide range of support services aimed at policy makers and all the different stakeholders involved in science and technology policy making, including the public. The Sciencewise- ERC also provides co-funding to Government departments and agencies to develop and commission public dialogue activities. http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/

6 The toolkit is not included in this evaluation.

7 These three elements of the public engagement programme are described in Chapter 2.

The original evaluation aims were to: provide an independent assessment of each strand of the programme, against their agreed aims and objectives; provide an assessment of the engagement programme overall; facilitate shared learning within DECC; and, contribute to the Sciencewise-ERC aim of creating excellence in public dialogue to inspire and inform better policy making in science and technology.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

- gather and present objective and robust evidence of activities, achievements and impacts to support Sciencewise-ERC work in increasing understanding and awareness of the value of public dialogue
- establish mechanisms to enable DECC staff to reflect on lessons learned
- identify lessons from practice to support Sciencewise-ERC work in capacity building across Government, and the development of good practice in public dialogue.

In addition to meeting these objectives, the evaluation was asked to consider the following specific questions:

- the implications of the different methods used in the dialogue events for the credibility of the results of the projects (e.g. numbers of participants and who they are, locations for events, depth of discussions, information provided to the participants, quality of reports on dialogue event results)
- opportunities for follow up with participants, or opportunities for future engagement by them and/or others, or local action
- the potential for serious games to provide a deliberative engagement mechanism on complex issues, and to generate large samples of both qualitative and quantitative data, analysable by collection of basic demographic and attitudinal data
- the lessons from the design and delivery of the Youth Panel, and how the process could be improved in future
- lessons from engaging democratically elected local councillors or nominated representatives on boards or committees as representatives of public views.

1.3 Approach to evaluation

The 2050 public engagement programme was part funded by Sciencewise-ERC and therefore followed 'The Government's approach to Public Dialogue on Science and Technology' (described in more detail below). In addition, to support the objectives around supporting Sciencewise-ERC's work, the evaluation adhered to the principles and guidance of the 'SWP07 Requirements for evaluating Sciencewise-ERC Projects'[8] (laid out in appendix 1).

[8] Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (2008). *SWP07 Requirements evaluating Sciencewise-ERC Projects*. http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/TrackedDocuments/Funding-Docs/SWP07-Requirements-for-Evaluation.pdf?phpMyAdmin=oHPjaCSrPMAdI04AYEPthe913wb

The evaluation aimed to identify any immediate impacts on participants' thinking about public engagement and the issues being discussed. We were not able to gather evidence on policy impacts within the timescale of the evaluation. The evaluation did seek to identify ways in which the results of the processes would be used, where they would go, who would look at them and any indication of willingness to take the results of the processes into account in future policy thinking. Whilst the timescale of the evaluation does not allow us to provide clear evidence of these impacts, subsequent discussions with DECC and Sciencewise-ERC indicate a firm commitment to build on the learning from this project. We have also had a discussion with Involve about what lessons the deliberative element of this work can provide to them as they develop the toolkit. We have been able to identify the immediate impact on those taking part in the engagement programmes, i.e. participants who attended the events and young people who were members of the panel.

Approach to public engagement

The 2050 public engagement programme is part funded by Sciencewise–ERC. This brings it within the guiding principles for public dialogue on science and technology-related issues outlined in 'The Government's Approach to Public Dialogue on Science and Technology'.[9] This document defines public dialogue as "*a process during which members of the public interact with scientists, stakeholders (for example, businesses and pressure groups) and policy makers to deliberate on issues likely to be important in future policies"*. Some of this deliberation must be face to face; it must give all sides a chance to speak, question and be questioned by others and, it must take place far ahead enough of policy decisions to be able to feed into the eventual policy decisions. A key requisite of Sciencewise-ERC's public dialogue is that it must have a 'policy hook' with a clear understanding of who will be listening to the outcomes.

According to the Sciencewise-ERC, public dialogue must seek to ensure that:

- the conditions leading to the dialogue process are conducive to the best outcomes (Context)
- the range of issues and policy opinions covered in the dialogue reflects the participants' interests (Scope)
- the dialogue process itself represents best practice in design and execution (Delivery)
- the outputs of dialogue can deliver the desired outcomes (Impact)
- the process is shown to be robust and contributes to learning (Evaluation).

[9] Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (2008). *The Government's approach to public dialogue on science and technology.* http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/publications/

1.4 Methodology

Data was collected in the following ways:

- Review of documentation relating to the youth panel
- Observation of one youth panel meeting
- Qualitative telephone interviews with five youth panel members and the independent panel manager
- Paper-based self-completion questionnaires for people attending local deliberative events; these were filled out at the start and end of each of the events in London, Cumbria and Nottingham. We received completed forms from 39 respondents from the London workshop, 30 respondents from the Cumbria workshop and 19 participants from the Nottingham workshop.
- Observations of two local deliberative dialogue events, during which informal interviews were carried out
- Qualitative telephone interviews with five event participants
- Secondary analysis of data from over 10,000 of the first pathways submitted from the serious games interface, 'My 2050', analysed by Ipsos–MORI
- Three qualitative telephone interviews with stakeholders from Ipsos-MORI, DECC and Delib
- Learning workshop with stakeholders from DECC, Delib and Sciencewise.

How this report is structured

In this introductory chapter, we have described the evaluation aims, objectives and approach, the approach to dialogue and the role played by Sciencewise-ERC. We have also provided an outline of how evaluation data was collected and from whom.

In the second chapter, we describe the context and objectives for the 2050 engagement programme. We explain in detail the processes, structure and rationale for each of the engagement strands, including how each worked, what happened, who was involved and why, and how they were recruited.

Chapter three describes the findings from the evaluation of the youth panel and considers what worked well and less well in the youth panel. This chapter draws on information from a review of youth panel documentation, interviews with youth panel members and with the independent panel manager and observation of a youth panel meeting.

Chapter four describes the findings from the evaluation of the dialogue workshops. We describe what went well and less well in the events. Our evaluation is based on evidence from event observations, pre and post workshop evaluation forms collected from all three events; follow up interviews with event participants and with stakeholders, and Ipsos-MORI's report from the DECC 2050 pathways.

In Chapter five, we describe the serious games interface 'My 2050'. We explore the rationale underpinning the interface; how the interface was developed and who it is intended to be used by, and consider what has worked well and less well. We place particular emphasis on whether 'My 2050' has enabled the DECC to meet its stated aims and objectives.

In Chapter six we provide an overview of the main themes emerging in the main body of the report and discuss how and why the dialogue met or did not meet its objectives. We draw some broad conclusions and recommendations for building on this work in the future and also consider how and why the dialogue was consistent with the Sciencewise-ERC standards of good practice.

A note on terminology

This report refers to the Department of Energy and Climate Change as DECC. The deliberative dialogue workshops are described as 'workshops', the 2050 pathways calculator is referred to as the calculator and we refer to the serious games interface as 'My2050' and 'the simulation'. 'Participants' refers to people who have contributed to the engagement; 'evaluation respondents' refers to those who completed questionnaires or interviews as part of the evaluation of the engagement activities. People who used My2050 are described as 'players'. None of the quotes in this report are referenced in order to protect the anonymity of the small number of interviewees who were involved in the evaluation fieldwork.

2. The 2050 public engagement programme

In this chapter, we describe the context to the public engagement programme, the objectives for the programme as a whole and for each individual strand. We describe what happened in each of the engagement strands, including the processes, structure and rationale for each.

2.1 Context of the 2050 Public Engagement Programme

The 2050 public engagement programme and the development of the 2050 pathways calculator took place in the context of the Climate Change Act which was passed in 2008. This Act made Britain the first country in the world to set legally binding 'carbon budgets', aiming to cut UK emissions by 34% by 2020, and at least 80% by 2050, through investment in energy efficiency and clean energy technologies such as renewables, nuclear and carbon capture and storage[10]. In response to this Act, government produced The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan[11]. This pivotal publication presented, for the first time, a holistic picture of energy and climate change for the UK as a whole, plotting out how the UK proposed to tackle climate change and meet the 34% cut in emissions on 1990 levels by 2020. In their response to this paper, stakeholders from aviation and other industries, business and non-governmental organisations argued that it dealt only with the 'low hanging fruits', and that a ten year planning horizon did not sit well with business investment cycles, which can be up to 40 years. These challenges exposed the need to understand how to meet the longer term target of 80% reductions by 2050.

Following this feedback, a direct request came from Ed Miliband, then Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change. He identified a need to understand fully what meeting this target would entail, and for a bottom up approach which would allow public input into the choice of pathway, as opposed to the government providing a road map of how this target would be met. The 2050 pathways calculator was developed following this request.

The calculator is a tool for public engagement on the issues and options involved in meeting the 2050 target. It can be used to engage civil servants, politicians, and the general public in 'grown-up' conversations about how best to meet the target. The calculator allows the user to explore the consequences - in terms of security-of-supply indicators and greenhouse gas emissions - of different combinations of demand-side choices and supply-side choices selected to achieve the 80% reduction target. The intention of this approach is not to imply that the energy system could or should be centrally planned, but to help people understand the range of possibilities that are available; the trade-offs; the common themes shared by energy pathways that add up; and the scale of action required[12]. People using the calculator can see example pathways and explore the impact of different configurations of supply and demand, using real UK data.

[10] http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/what_we_do/lc_uk/lc_trans_plan/lc_trans_plan.aspx

[11] HM Government, The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan: National Strategy for Climate and Energy, July 2009.

[12] 'Sustainable Energy without the hot air' http://withouthotair.blogspot.com/2010/07/2050-calculator-tool-at-decc.html

Through the use of the 2050 pathways calculator, DECC hopes to strengthen and inform local and public participation, to understand communities' views and to start and sustain an informed debate around the 2050 challenge.

The stated objectives of the tool are to:

- understand the scale of the challenge and the tradeoffs involved
- enable publics to explore and test their own preferred solutions
- translate these solutions into action in their own lives and communities.

According to interviews with stakeholders, what is particularly powerful about this tool is that it allows users to test the assumptions which lie behind it, for example about rates of bio mass or electrification of cars. This means that people who are experts in one area can focus in on the detail and if they don't agree with this they can change the assumptions, which are laid out in an open source excel spreadsheet behind the calculator, and the user can see how this will impact on reductions. The quotes below illustrate the points about the context and rationale for the calculator:

> *"We thought, let's be honest that we are 40 years out and we have a range of options, so instead of setting one optimised path, let's take this long range and bottom up approach, let's do some real analysis on each sector and bring this all together in the calculator, and then the calculator spits out what the user has chosen."*

> *"Instead of government coming up with one world map which would have been automatically criticised the idea was to present all the ranges of what could happen and instead shoot the tennis ball into the public and stakeholders and say you tell us."*

2.2 Aims and objectives of the 2050 public engagement programme

The 2008 Climate Change Act committed to a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 80% by 2050, with 1990 as the baseline. Achieving this target will involve dramatic changes in many aspects of public life as well as significant developments in industry, transport, built and rural environments and increasing energy costs. All this will mean change for individuals and their local communities. Historically, the debate about what action should be taken to achieve this target has been at a national level with input from academics and business.

Methods of the public engagement programme

The 2050 pathways calculator is at the heart of all three components of the 2050 public engagement programme, though each uses it in a different way. The evaluation invitation to tender document (ITT) described the broad aims of these three components terms below:

1. To run a national Youth Panel dialogue and visioning process with 16-25 year old champions from key UK civil society organisations, from March 2010 to December 2010, representing a broad cross section of interests and backgrounds. Youth Panel activities were intended to inform policy owners in DECC and elsewhere in Government about which 2050 pathways these young people would choose to deliver on the 80% emission target.

2. To engage local community leaders through local dialogue events in London, Cumbria and Nottingham in an informed dialogue over the 2050 pathways in order to promote a debate within communities and investigate local attitudes to the climate change and energy challenge.
3. To develop a front-end to the 2050 Calculator which engages, informs and consults the user about the twin challenges of climate change and energy security, and provides strategic energy and policy options for them to consider, in the form of a digital 'serious games' interface for the 2050 Calculator. The aim of the serious game was to contribute to a wider aim to embed digital deliberative tools in the communications and engagement strategy of DECC, and the whole of Government's energy and climate change policy.

Table 1, overleaf, gives an overview of each engagement strand, the purpose of each and the activities involved. In the sections following table 1, detail about how each engagement strand was carried out is described.

Table 1: Overview of the purpose and activities of the engagement programme

	Purpose	Activities
Youth advisory panel	Dual purpose: • To advise DECC on the thoughts and proposals of the youth community • To relay information from the DECC out to the wider youth communities. For the 2050 pathways project: • To create a youth panel version of the energy pathway to reduce carbon emissions of 80% by 2050 and to feed into the development of the serious games interface	• Monthly panel meetings of a core of 16 members of youth organisations • Site visits • A final report outlining the youth panel's energy pathways to reach the 2050 80% reduction target • Take information gathered from site visits and panel meetings back to the organisations the panel member's represent.
Local deliberative dialogue events designed around using the pathways calculator	• To promote informed deliberative dialogue amongst local community leaders • To develop dialogue materials for the pilot; • To test whether and how engagement with the 2050 Calculator influences the attitudes of those who 'play' it • To gather feedback on the events themselves	• Three 2050 pathways local deliberative dialogue events in Cumbria, Nottingham and London, on the UK's energy and climate challenge and how best to reach the 2050 target. • Pilot the use of the 2050 Pathways Calculator • Test a variety of approaches including number of respondents per computer, full and half day events, and in a mix of urban and rural areas.
Serious games interface	• To provide a deliberative engagement mechanism on complex issues • To generate large samples of qualitative and quantitative data, analysable by collection of basic demographic and attitudinal data.	• Develop a 'serious games' interface/ digital tool to be disseminated on the internet for use with members of the general internet population • Targeted at those not previously engaged with.

2.3 Youth Panel

The youth advisory panel was established in February 2010 following conversations between DECC and a number of youth and environmental organisations and coalitions about the importance of engaging with young people on issues relating to climate change and meeting the 2050 emissions reduction target. DECC conducted widespread consultation in late 2009 and early 2010 to ascertain the most appropriate engagement format. An advisory panel was set up on the basis of findings from this consultation.

Panel members were recruited through organisations responding to the consultation and leaving their contact details for alerts about future opportunities for youth engagement. When the idea for a panel format emerged from consultation responses, these organisations were contacted and asked if they would like to be involved in the first panel meeting. The young people who attended this first panel meeting as representatives of these organisations were either self selecting or had been approached by the organisation to take part. After funding from Sciencewise was obtained, existing panel members decided to diversify membership, to include members from non-environmental organisations as well as individuals who weren't representing large organisations. To achieve this, panel members wrote a blog to invite young people to join the panel. This was circulated through DECC's existing networks and posted on the DECC website. In response, a representative from the British Youth Council joined the panel as did representatives from two eco schools, in South London and Bath.

The panel comprised 15 young people from a range of organisations including UK Youth Parliament, Oxfam Youth Board and Young Friends of the Earth. According to background documents the panel was set up to *"provide a direct route of communication between youth organisations in the UK, and DECC"* so that "*the voice and proposals of the younger generations are included in Government policy and decision-making; especially because decisions made by the DECC today will have a direct impact on the futures of young people."*[13]

Both the independent manager and background documents suggest that the panel was designed to allow two-way communications between DECC and the wider youth community. Its purpose is both to advise DECC on the thoughts and proposals of the youth community and to relay information about DECC's policy interests and decisions out to the wider youth community.

The remit of the panel in the first year of its existence was to explore and develop possible energy pathways to meet the 2050 emissions reduction target of 80%. According to the panel manager "*the calculator was the foundation of our work*".

[13] From: DECC Youth panel proposal final 250310

Main panel activities

The panel's activities over the course of the year included monthly meetings in London, visits to sites such as power stations and nuclear plants and writing up a report that was launched in December 2010.

Panel meetings

The panel meetings were held in London every month and tended to run for the whole day. The purpose of the meetings varied over the course of the year as the focus of the panel members evolved. The first few meetings were focused on discussion about the purpose of the panel and members took the time to identify and agree a set of guiding principles. Once the site visits[14] started, the panel meetings provided an opportunity for individual members to feed back their experiences of visiting the different sites and allowed the group to discuss the implications of what was learnt as part of these visits. Towards the latter part of the year, the meetings were largely focused on structuring, discussing and writing the final report. The meetings also often included guest speakers from DECC or from other organisations such as Greenpeace and were facilitated by an independent panel manager. During the report writing stage, an external facilitator was brought in to ensure the meetings were efficient and productive.

Site visits

A series of site visits[15] for the panel members was organised by the independent panel manager and DECC panel members were allocated to visits based on location and interest. The purpose of these visits, according to the panel manager, was to provide the panel members with the knowledge and information they needed in order to develop a youth pathway to meeting the 2050 emissions reduction target. The sites visited ranged from coal fired power stations, to offshore wind farms and housing retrofit schemes. The site visits were selected such that they *'matched up...with the different levers on the [2050 pathways] calculator'* and were intended to *'bring the calculator to life'* for the panel members.

Report writing

At the end of the year, Panel members produced a report which bought together the findings and recommendations of the panel's activities for the 2050 pathways project, the site visits and panel meetings. The final report (see footnote 13), launched in December 2010, presented the panel's views on the different energy sources learned about through the site visits. The report also outlined a number of recommendations for future energy use based on the panel's activities.

[14] Described in the next section.

[15] More details about the site visits undertaken for the 2050 pathways project can be found in the youth panel's final report 'Energy: How fair is it anyway? Report by the Department of Energy and Climate Change Youth Advisory Panel', available at: http://decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/about/youth_panel/youth_panel.aspx

2.4 Deliberative Dialogue Workshops

Rationale and objectives

DECC commissioned Ipsos-MORI to conduct three deliberative dialogue workshops in England and commissioned Involve, based on the workshops, to develop toolkits which would enable further dialogue about climate change. The objectives of the 2050 Pathways Local Deliberative Dialogues[16] were:

1. To promote an informed deliberative dialogue amongst local community leaders in the pilot areas. To consider participants' data on what choices and trade-offs they make on the route to the 2050 target using the 2050 Pathways Calculator.
2. To develop 2050 pathways analysis dialogue materials for use in the three pilot communities and for future use in future engagement opportunities.
3. To test whether and how engagement with the 2050 Calculator influences the attitudes of those local representatives involved in the pilots, and to seek feedback on the events.
4. On the basis of the feedback, to develop proposals for how to improve the format of the deliberative dialogue day.

The deliberative dialogue events were described as pilots, and used as an opportunity to test a number of different approaches to the events, in order to develop proposals for how to improve the format of the day and for how these workshops could be delivered in the future. The pilot events were the first time the 2050 pathways calculator had been used outside DECC, with external facilitators and with community leaders and were therefore the first research opportunity to explore how people other than those directly involved with its development engaged with the calculator.

Workshop format

Three deliberative dialogue workshops were held in late February and early March 2011 in Cumbria, London and Nottingham. Locations were chosen to give a good geographical spread of rural, metropolitan and urban locations. This ensured that participants brought experiences of different environmental issues to the dialogue, which might be thought to have influenced their awareness of and views towards energy and climate change; for example, direct experience of flooding and exposure to power stations in Cumbria, or concerns about noise emissions from industrial premises[17].

The three workshops differed in design or length, to enable the delivery agency to determine which approach was most effective. Design differences included the number of participants per computer and number of experts on hand. Two workshops lasted for a whole day and one was held in the evening. Table 1 below outlines the format of the workshop in each location.

[16] As outlined in the Invitation to tender for the 'Evaluation and learning from the 2050 public engagement programme'

[17] Sampling and recruitment for the three deliberative dialogue events is described in more detail in *Findings from the DECC 2050 Deliberative Dialogues* Ipsos MORI.

Table 2: Format of workshop in each location

Location	Workshop format
Ulverston, Cumbria	• 27 participants • 1 participant per computer • Full day workshop • 3 moderators • 4 experts
London	• 40 participants • 2-3 people per computer • Full day workshop • 5 moderators • 6 experts
Nottingham	• 19 participants • 2-3 participants per computer • Evening workshop • 3 moderators • 2 experts

Each workshop included the following core sessions:

- Introductions by Ipsos-MORI and DECC about the purpose of the day, including a brief introduction to the 2050 target, the purpose of the 2050 pathways calculator and an overview of how the calculator works
- An opportunity for participants to explore the 2050 pathways calculator
- Introduction to and group discussion around the four 'Big Themes', which were environmental themes to consider when creating a successful pathway to the 2050 target[18]
- A final session to create a pathway with which participants were happy and that they would like to see implemented.

Agenda for the full and half day workshops[19] differed by the length of each of the sessions listed above, and, in the full day event, the inclusion of a session which focused on the local impact of pathways. This session included discussions about the impact of carbon reduction at local level and what the participants, as community leaders, could do to help ensure the target is met and to develop buy in from their wider community, followed by an opportunity for participants to refine their pathways based on discussions of local impact.

[18] The 4 Big Themes were: Growth and Mix of Low-Carbon Electricity Generation; Energy efficiency; Electrification of demand and Availability of Bio-Energy.

[19] For more details of the agenda for the full and half day events, see pages 20-33 of the appendix to Ipsos-MORI's report of the findings from the DECC 2050 deliberative dialogue.

The sessions in each workshop were facilitated by staff from Ipsos–MORI and Involve. DECC representatives provided technical and expert support about the calculator and energy and climate change issues. During the four Big Themes discussion, participants were handed out a 'one-pager' summary of the big theme, which table moderators read aloud. At the end of each workshop, each participant was asked to save their final pathway. At the beginning and end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete two pre and post workshop questionnaires, one for Ipsos-MORI and one for evaluation.

Participants and recruitment

DECC wanted to engage specifically with local community leaders at the workshops. The purpose of engaging with community leaders was to stimulate awareness and debate of 2050 target; to introduce the 2050 pathways calculator to local representatives to help promote an informed debate within communities; and, to motivate community leaders to use the calculator with their local communities. DECC specified the participants should be:

- different councillor types, i.e. parish, district, county or city councillors;
- elected members of local governance boards and committees;
- local representatives from business forums; and
- local representatives from non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Ipsos-MORI conducted the recruitment for the workshops and this is described in more detail in their final report[20]. According to the sampling framework used for each workshop, Ipsos-MORI recruited according to minimum quotas for each of the following variables:

- Type of participant (councillor/ elected representative/ business representative/ NGO)
- Political party members for councillors (e.g. conservative, labour, liberal democrat, other or independent)
- Location
- Age
- Gender
- IT literacy (how confident participants feel about using IT/ online tool – it was specified that all would feel confident about using the tool)
- Concern about climate change (ratings of 'very concerned' to 'not at all concerned').

Profile of evaluation respondents

In the pre-workshop evaluation forms participants were asked to complete demographic questions about their position, age and ethnicity. Participants were also asked how concerned they were about climate change and how confident they felt using a computer. The main findings are summarised below. This summary is based on evaluation form responses from:

[20] For more information on recruitment for the workshops, see pages 9-10 of the Ipsos-MORI report and pages 1-17 of the appendices to this same report for the recruitment questionnaire and sampling framework used during recruitment

- 39 respondents from the London workshop (out of 40 attendees)
- 27 respondents from the Cumbria workshop (out of 27 attendees)
- 19 participants from the Nottingham workshop (19 attendees)

In this section we refer to the profile of *evaluation* respondents as opposed to *participant* responses. Not all participants responded to all the questions in the evaluation form so where the number of evaluation respondents differs from the above, this is stated.

Evaluation respondents included people from across all of the above recruitment categories. Across all three workshops the higher representations of participants was from the NGO sector: in the London workshop, these two sectors accounted for over half of attendees. Cumbria had the greatest proportion of councillors (49% of participants) and London had the greatest number of business representatives (24%). In the Nottingham workshop, twenty one percent (21%) of participants described themselves as a 'chair of a community group' in the 'other' space provided.

Table 3: Profile of evaluation respondents at each deliberative dialogue workshop

	London (%)	Cumbria (%)	Nottingham (%)	Total (%)
NGO	54	39	42	46
Business representative	24	10	16	17
Parish councillor	0	26	5	10
County councillor	0	10	16	7
Chair of community Group	0	0	21	5
District councillor	0	10	0	3
Borough councillor	5	3	0	3
Other	16	3	0	8

N = London (37[21]), Cumbria (27), Nottingham (19). *Other includes: City councillor, Council, Community representative, local environmentalist, School governor, Local Authority member, Artist in the Community.

Table 4, below, shows the age profile for evaluation respondents in each workshop. Of the three workshops, the London workshop included the greatest spread of participants across all age groups and, the largest number of participants in the 25-34 age group (21% compared to 4% in Cumbria and no participants aged 25-34 in Nottingham). Cumbria and Nottingham workshops had an older profile of participants, for example, in Cumbria, just under half (42%) of participants fell into the 55-64 age group and in Nottingham, 20% of participants were 65 or older.

[21] Two evaluation respondents did not specify the group to which they belonged.

Table 4: Age profile of evaluation respondents at each deliberative dialogue workshop

	London (%)	Cumbria (%)	Nottingham (%)	Total (%)
17-24	0	8	0	3
25-34	21	4	0	11
35-44	15	8	27	15
45-54	36	19	27	29
55-64	23	42	27	30
65+	5	19	20	13
Total	100	100	100	100

N = London (39), Cumbria (26), Nottingham (15)

Respondents completing pre-workshop evaluation forms were asked how concerned they were about climate change[22]. At all three workshops, the majority of respondents described themselves as either 'very concerned' or 'fairly concerned'. No respondents in the London workshop described themselves as either 'not very' or 'not at all' concerned, compared to a small number of in both the Cumbria (12%) and Nottingham (11%) workshops. Respondents were also asked how confident they felt about using a computer, for example the internet. Again, the majority in all three workshops described themselves as either 'very' or 'fairly' confident. None in the Nottingham workshop described themselves as 'not very' or 'not at all' confident at using the computer. In London 5% of respondents said they were 'not very confident' about using a computer, and in Cumbria 12% described themselves as either 'not very' (4%) or 'not at all' (7%) confident about using the computer, perhaps reflecting the older age profile of those attending this workshop.

2.5 My2050

DECC worked with Delib, a deliberative democracy organisation, to develop a 'serious games interface', which later became known as the 'My2050' simulator[23]. The aim of developing My2050 was to develop a serious game or 'front end' to the 2050 pathways calculator, based on real world data, which engages, informs and consults members of the public about the challenges of climate change and energy security and allows them to arrive at their own solution for the 2050 target – to cut carbon emissions by 80% (from 1990 levels) by 2050.

According to stakeholder interviews, the aims of the tool changed over the period of development. Initially, My2050 was intended as a serious game which would be accessible to young people, in order to promote DECC's 2050 pathways work and to educate young people about what would need to be done to meet the 2050 target. These aims changed and the interface ceased to be called a game, being referred to instead as a 'tool'. The target audience was broadened too, so that rather than being designed primarily for young people, it was aimed also at an older audience.

[22] Analysis of this question is based on responses from 39 participants in the London workshop, 25 participants in the Cumbria workshop and 19 participants from the Nottingham workshop.
[23] The My 2050 simulator is available here: http://my2050.decc.gov.uk/

The My2050 simulator was not used in any of the dialogue workshops, and to date has been used only as a stand alone tool which could be used by a variety of members of the public. According to interviews with stakeholders, DECC was hoping to use My2050 to engage more widely with members of the public not taking part in the workshops and with people who had limited awareness or knowledge of climate change and youth groups. To fulfil this aim, My2050 was designed to be visually attractive and accessible to a wide range of groups. In addition, the simulator was intended to be simple and quick to navigate and therefore give the user the main messages and promote engagement with the issues in a shorter period of time than would be possible with the 2050 pathways calculator. These features were designed in to enable it to be used as a stand-alone tool, without any need for prior explanation or instruction. The My2050 simulator takes in the options the user has chosen to achieve the 2050 target and uses these to visualise a world based on these choices, as the quote below illustrates.

> *"It gives them [the user] a twenty minute, visually attractive engagement so they can get the main messages and to highlight the main issues."*

My2050 asks players to submit basic demographic data, such as age and location, to rate how happy they would be to live in the world they have created through these choices and to explain why they made those choices. According to stakeholder interview data, the purpose of collecting this data was to understand who engages with the site, how long they spend on the site and the process by which they chose their world. This data would help to ascertain whether the My2050 simulator is an effective tool for deliberative engagement on the 2050 carbon emissions reduction target, which is particularly important as this is the first time Sciencewise has supported the development of this type of engagement tool.

DECC commissioned Ipsos-MORI to analyse the results of the first 500 pathways submitted from the My2050 simulator. However, their final report includes analysis of pathways submitted by 10,215 people who submitted pathways between 3rd March, when the site was launched, and 29th March 2011. Ipsos-MORI's final report of the analysis of these pathways is available on the DECC's website. According to interviews with stakeholders, the purpose of Ipsos-MORI's analysis was to analyse the process that players went through when using the game, for example, how long they spent at the site and how engaged they were with the process. In addition, DECC intended to analyse the data from the 10,000 submitted pathways and to provide an understanding of the options chosen by different groups who weren't engaged in the deliberative dialogues, for example, younger groups.

3. Youth Panel

In this chapter we describe what worked well and less well in terms of involvement with panel. We draw on interviews with panel members and with the independent panel manager and a review of documentation relating to the set up and implementation of the panel including a survey of the panel members about their involvement in the panel, conducted by the independent panel manager. At the close of the chapter we draw brief conclusions and outline recommendations.

DECC's youth panel was established as a pilot in February 2010, to establish how the panel would work. After two pilot meetings, it was agreed that Sciencewise would fund the panel and an independent panel manager was appointed. The 2050 pathways project was the first piece of work in which the panel was involved.

3.1 What worked well?

Panel meetings

In interviews, panel members described the meetings as providing an open and stimulating environment where members could take part in discussions with other *'like minded people'* and learn from each others' experiences and knowledge.

> *"What I liked most was talking about the issues with other young people, hearing what they had to say…just being in that atmosphere."*
>
> *"I enjoyed having high level discussions with very interesting people from around the country, liked having the opportunity to talk to people in the know."*

Interview reports and our own observation found that meetings were well structured and efficiently facilitated, giving members the flexibility to have both informal and in-depth discussions.

Learning, maintaining momentum and getting things done

The meetings helped to ensure that the Panel held together as a whole. For example, not all Members went on site visits, so the meetings provided a forum in which the learning and questions from these could be explored across the Panel as a whole. Hearing about a site visit from another Panel member "*felt [like] you were sharing the journey together".* For panel members who had been on site visits, the meetings acted as a space where they could explore their own opinions about the issues and questions raised by the visit. For the Panel as a whole, the meetings gave members an opportunity to discuss not just the issues raised in site visits but also the way in which they were presented, with some members feeling that site representatives' emphasis tended to focus on the positive response to emissions reductions (there is further discussion of this in a later section).

In addition to learning from each other, the panel members interviewed welcomed the opportunity to learn from a range of external speakers from DECC and other organisations.

> *"I really really enjoyed working with David [from DECC] who talked to us about various styles of blogging and types of online interaction…and the different types of speakers that came to talk to us".*

Finally, Panel members agreed that the meetings were instrumental in enabling the panel to fulfil its purpose. From the online survey of panel members conducted by the independent panel manager, more than three-quarters (76.5%) of panel members reported that the meetings were 'essential' to the programme, with the rest (23.5%) reporting that they were 'very useful'. Some panel members felt that the value of panel meetings was to maintain momentum over the six month period when the panel was completing this work. Other members felt that working together, the panel achieved more than individual members could do working alone:

> *"Every face to face meeting was, I thought, a lot more productive than what we could get done apart."*

Site visits

Panel members who went on site visits thoroughly enjoyed them and found them interesting, informative and inspiring. From the online survey of panel members, the majority felt that the number (80%) and types of visits (73.3%) had worked well for the programme. Just over half (52.9%) felt that the visits were very useful for the programme with rest (47.1%) feeling that they were 'essential' to the programme.

> *"I thought the visits were AWESOME. They allowed incredible insight to the reality of energy, and ... proved to be incredible experience, and encouraged me to head into the world of renewable utilities."*

Some panel members interviewed as part of the evaluation described how the visits had led them to change their views about different types of energy.

> *"It was very educational, they showed us what they're doing, what they're trying to change, carbon capturing etc , I do see DRAX in a new light now. I learnt about their challenges with the media. I can see it from both sides now, I learnt a lot."*

There was also some evidence to indicate that this positive experience was facilitated by the welcoming and attentive reception they received while on these visits. One panel member felt that this was a result of the panel members' association with DECC:

> *"Having that 'DECC ticket' that lets you in to so many places...we would normally not be able to be that inquisitive. It opened a lot of doors. So they treated us well, shown us things we would never have seen otherwise."*

Contributing to the final report

From the interviews with panel members and the online survey completed by the independent panel members, it seems that they were able to contribute to the report, either by writing a section, by giving their opinions or by helping oversee the process. This was the case even though there was a central writing group in place:

> *"I couldn't participate in the report writing group because I was so busy at the university. But there were a lot of emails and everyone was involved in getting their opinions across. We were really encouraged to share our ideas."*

Through the online survey, panel members reported being generally very happy with the final product - with 71.4% describing it as 'very good'. They were also very happy with the content of the report with 35.7% describing it as 'excellent' and 50% describing it as 'very good'. On the other hand, comments from the online survey suggest there was a general feeling that the layout and design of the report could have been better: "*It looked quite professional, although typos and perhaps a lack of photos and generally creative design features let it down slightly".* Any dissatisfaction with the final layout and design of the report seems to be due to the fact that the process of report writing was very rushed for the panel members – there is further discussion of this later on in this chapter.

3.2 What could be improved?

Clarity of aims

Panel members identified a number of areas in which greater clarity would have been useful. Primary amongst these was the basic purpose of the Panel. As noted above, this was to allow two-way communication between DECC and young people. However, the Panel members interviewed as part of the evaluation saw their communication with DECC as one-way only and the aim of the Panel to bring individual young people together to test and challenge DECC's policy-making.

> "[The] *aim was to bring together a selection of young thinkers to experiment with the policies that DECC was implementing and also to challenge them from our perspective…to provide a youth lens to the decision making process."*

This suggests that panel members saw their responsibility to the panel in terms of their own individual contribution as 'young thinkers' rather than as representatives of a wider community of young people or of the views of their 'home' organisations.

Amongst panel members interviewed, there was some difference in opinion as to the primary aims of the site visits. Most commonly, they were described as an opportunity to gather information and evidence that would help them to write the final report. Site visits would "g*ive us some validity in our arguments, to prove we had done the research".*

However, some Panel members felt that the purpose of site visits was to raise their awareness or to demonstrate to the sites visited that young people have a stake in issues relating to emissions reduction:

> *"[The purpose was] to open our minds, to show them that there is a vested interest from young people. It's unusual for them that there are six people under the age of 25 who want to come and learn about coal."*

The proposal for the youth panel, sent to DECC by the independent panel manager and the pilot youth panel (which later developed into the functioning panel), outlined a different purpose for these visits which focused more on engagement with local communities:

> *"These trips (potentially) will be to areas in the UK where communities are/will be affected by energy policy and climate change. The field trips will offer the youth panel the chance to meet with local communities to ask questions about the relevant impacts that government policy (or lack thereof) will have on their communities."*

As discussed later in the report, panel members had limited access to people in the communities surrounding the visited sites. Some panel members felt their visits would have been more useful if opportunities to talk to local people had been available.

A number of interviewed panel members felt that they could have been better prepared for the site visits. This feeling seemed to stem from their lack of clarity about the purpose of the visits as there was a range of opinions about the purpose of the site visits (as discussed earlier). This is highlighted in the following comments by panel members:

> *"We didn't quite see what we were doing with them first, perhaps would have been better to have an idea of the report first to know what we were looking for."*

> *"The site visits were well organised and a great opportunity, although perhaps it would have been useful having a clearer brief about the questions we were supposed to be asking and the issues we were supposed to be considering."*

Link between elements

Linked to the lack of clarity around the aims of the panel and the lack of clarity about the purpose of the site visits, evaluation data suggests that there was a lack of understanding amongst panel members about how the site visits fitted into the overall purpose of the panel. In the online survey for panel members completed by the independent panel manager, the majority of panel members (66.7%) felt that the fit between the site visits and the programme as a whole worked well, a third of panel members (33.3%) felt that although the fit between the two worked well, it could have been better. This highlights the importance of ensuring that all panel members have an accurate understanding of the purpose of the different elements of work that they will be doing so that they are able to use their time efficiently and maximise the value gained from different activities.

Inclusivity

Feedback from panel members and observation by OPM both confirmed that some panel members found it easier to contribute to discussions than others. Some panel members were considerably more vocal about their opinions than others. At the same time, panel members involved in the evaluation interviews described the atmosphere as "*open and non critical"* and some said they found it easier to contribute after the first few meetings, once everyone got to know each other better.

> *"I like to know who I am speaking to and be comfortable before I feel free with what I am saying. For the first couple of meetings I stood back to see what the dynamics were. We all had a different background. It took a while for me to understand how I fit in but when I did I felt comfortable."*

Some of the panel members who found it more difficult to contribute in meetings found other ways to express their opinions. One member interviewed for the evaluation reported getting in touch with the panel manager when needed and another reported using the online workspace and email to communicate with other members.

> *"Sometimes I had a lot more ideas than I verbalised. I don't like confrontation, I like to reflect on my opinions before I challenge others, so found it easier to do so on a blog or over email."*

These findings highlight the importance of ensuring that there are a variety of modes of communication available to panel members so that they are able to play to their strengths. It also highlights the importance of ensuring the effective facilitation of sessions, perhaps with agreed 'ground rules' for discussions.

Some panel members in the interviews also reported that panel meetings could feel overwhelming at times: the quantity of work they felt they had, both as panel members and in their student lives meant at times that they found it difficult to stay on top of discussions and conversations.

> *"We had so much to do that sometimes it felt a bit overwhelming. I'm at Uni and studying all the time, found it hard to pull my own weight and stay on top of conversations that were going around."*

The meetings could also be overwhelming for members when they felt that they didn't have enough knowledge about issues and thus felt did not feel comfortable contributing to discussions. It was suggested that access to reading lists could have helped in this instance – though this would clearly have added further to the weight of work.

> *"'I guess sometimes I felt that there hadn't been enough background info on some issues. Sometimes full on discussions about things you couldn't contribute to. Would have been good to have background reading to do so that everyone was on the same page."*

This highlights the importance of managing the different backgrounds and expertise in the room such that all members feel they have an important contribution to make, and of ensuring that the expectations placed upon them are clear from the start.

Limitations of site visits

Panel members tended to feel that their experience of the site visits would have been better if they had been afforded the opportunity to talk to local people in the areas where the sites were located. Some participants involved in the evaluation interviews felt that this would have given them the opportunity to find out more about how local communities are affected by energy related issues: "*Perhaps we need a change to meet the local community and explore the wider issues.'"*

One panel member interviewed for the evaluation, who had attended a number of the site visits, felt that the British Gas Green Streets Project in a village in Wales was the best because it involved talking to local people about practical experiences of tackling climate change:

> *"I enjoyed the village in Wales the most [because it involved] hearing from people who are doing stuff on the ground at the moment, the stuff we campaign on is actually happening on the ground."*

This highlights the difficulty of managing the tension between over-loading young people involved in this kind of activity and their desire to gain as broad a picture as possible of the issues they are exploring. Clearly, engaging more widely with local communities would also have required additional resource and planning.

Perceptions of spin

Some panellists interviewed for the evaluation felt that the sites often focused excessively on the positive aspects of their work as they regarded the visit by the panel as a good opportunity for "*publicity*" and "*PR work"*: "*[They] wanted photos showing they were working with DECC and young people - we can see through these things."*

This highlights the importance of recognising that young people can have an impressive level of expertise about energy related issues and are very astute at distilling the information they are receiving. They tend as well to have well-tuned antennae for messages which appear to be promoting a particular perspective on the issues. This highlights the importance of the sites themselves understanding the importance of seeing the visits as opportunities to engage honestly and openly about both the pros and cons of their activities.

Timetabling activities

From the interviews with panel members and the online survey with panel members, there was a general feeling across all members that the report writing process felt very rushed and should have been started earlier. Participants involved in the evaluation interviews felt that given panel members were also juggling other commitments, they needed more time to work on the report:

> *"It was quite rushed in the end, because I had a lot of other things going on up here as well. Would have liked more time."*

The result of this rushed process was that some panel members in the online survey reported there wasn't enough teamwork in writing the report or that the burden of writing fell primarily on a few people.

> *"[We] should have started further in advance and worked more as a team."*

> *"[My] feeling is we relied on a few individuals, not necessarily fair on everyone."*

To help with the demands during the report writing stage, an external facilitator was brought in to help facilitate the discussions about the content and structuring of the report, as the independent panel manager was heavily involved in drafting the content of the report with the panel members. Though the role played by the external facilitator was generally regarded as valuable by the panel members, they were concerned that they didn't have enough time to develop a comfortable rapport and relationship with the facilitator.

These challenges involved in writing the report highlight the importance of developing and keeping to a realistic timetable for activities and milestones. This is important to ensure that the panel members feel motivated and have the time to be involved through every stage of the programme.

Use of online space

One panel member reported posting and writing articles on the online shared workspace 'Huddle' and thought that this space could have been used better as a means to engage with young people and raise awareness about the panel's work. Another panel member reported that there had been plans in place to use Facebook and Twitter as means of engaging with wider audiences but that DECC weren't comfortable with the unregulated nature of these online spaces. This highlights what an important role online spaces play in the way in which young people communicate and interact with each other. Making use of social media such as these could help to increase the impact of youth programmes such as this one.

Impact on young people of belonging to the youth advisory panel

The panel members identified a range of ways in which involvement in the panel has had a positive impact on them. They felt that their knowledge about the British energy infrastructure had vastly increased which in turn has made them feel more confident about discussing and leading debates on energy related issues with their peers. They felt that this had been facilitated through the format of the panel which had allowed them to go out on site visits and then come back to the safe space provided by the panel meetings where they were able to discuss their opinions with the rest of the group. This indicates that young people place great value in collaborative working.

Panel members also reported having improved writing, presentation, networking and communication skills as a result of participating in the range of activities. As a result they felt better placed to pursue the careers they wanted. They also felt inspired to stay involved with and do more in the way of campaigning for low carbon alternatives.

> *"My skills for local campaigning have increased, oration skills, networking skills. I think I can make a bigger contribution to the sector."*

> *"It's opened me up to a lot of opportunities, made me think about what I want to do in the future."*

This positive impact was facilitated by two important factors. Firstly, the fact that panel members felt valued and part of something important: *"Just feeling like you're an agent of change, that you're doing something about it."* This highlights the importance of ensuring that young people feel empowered and a sense of ownership when involved in programmes such as these. Secondly, the panel members really benefitted from all the time spent learning from "*like minded people"* which included each other and representatives from DECC.

In fact, the composition of the panel was also identified as one of the key strengths of the programme. There was the general opinion that the panel members worked very well together and there was an appreciation for the diverse opinions and range of age groups in the panel. This was felt to add to the quality of the discussions and enabled the members to learn a lot from each other, as discussed above.

> *"The diversity of panel, and the different ages [worked particularly well], although all categorised as young, I'm about to turn 25, but was one of the oldest. I found it really inspiring to hear about 17 year olds doing things."*

> *"We all recognised how much expertise there was in the room and we were really interested in talking to each other."*

Finally, the support offered by the panel manager was regarded by the members as "*fantastic*". She played a big role in helping to facilitate meetings and this was regarded as particularly helpful during the first few meetings when the panel were still getting to know each other. She also helped ensure that everyone's views got heard and was easily accessible over email.

3.3 Summary and recommendations

On the whole, the experience of panel members' involvement in the panel was very positive and panel members described a range of positive impacts involved in taking part. The young panellists themselves made very constructive suggestions for how things could be improved.

One main area of improvement for the youth panel was to clarify its purpose overall and the specific purpose of each of the different activities in which members were involved. As noted earlier, some panel members saw their role only as providing DECC with a youth perspective on climate change and not as communicating DECC's messages to the wider youth community; others felt that DECC had afforded them the freedom to define their role rather than impose any requirements on them. It is not clear whether the extent to which differing perceptions were the result of miscommunication between DECC and the panel members, or a real disagreement in terms of what the purpose of the panel and its activities were meant to be.

There was also a lack of clarity from panel members about the extent to which the work of the panel would have an impact on DECC's policy and decision making and this highlights the importance of ensuring panel members have a clear understanding of how their contribution is going to be used by DECC. Young people need to be able to see what difference their contribution has made if they are to continue to participate in such engagement activities and encourage other young people to participate as well.

The expectations of and level of commitment required by panel members need to be considered carefully too. These need to be realistic and achievable and to take into account the other pressures on the young people involved. Some panel members felt under considerable pressure given that they were often juggling other responsibilities as well and were at times overwhelmed, particularly when it came to drafting and finalising their report.

Key recommendations

- Take sufficient time at the start of activities like this to discuss and agree its fundamental elements: in this case, the purpose and objectives of the panel as a whole; the different activities involved in achieving these; the minimum time commitment required and any opportunities for flexible commitment. This will help panel members to schedule their time effectively and ensure that their expectations about their role and the level of impact they might have align with those of the commissioners
- Develop and keep to a realistic timetable and ensure milestones and deadlines are achievable without over-burdening panel members. This will help to ensure that the panel members feel motivated and are able to remain involved through every stage of the programme
- Take into account young people's dislike of and well-tuned antennae for 'spin': if they suspect their involvement is more publicity than anything else, they are unlikely to receive information giving as openly as it might otherwise be

- Ensure that different levels of knowledge about the issues do not impede young people's ability to contribute and provide ways in which those young people who wish to are able to develop their knowledge in other ways than through the core activities (e.g., by providing a reading list)
- Recognise and value excellent facilitation, which can be crucial to the success of this type of project.
- Continue to feedback to Panel members how their contribution is being used.

4. Deliberative Dialogue Workshops

In this chapter we describe what worked well and less well in the workshops, paying attention to themes arising from evaluation data such as clarity in the purpose, aims and objectives of the workshops, timing of activities, how prepared participants felt for the events, the technical and expert help available and the venues used. This chapter draws on interviews with stakeholders, observations of the workshops, feedback from evaluation questionnaires and follow up interviews with workshop participants. At the end of the chapter we summarise findings and make some recommendations for future dialogue events, based on the evaluation findings.

4.1 What worked well?

Engaging with the issues through group discussions

Workshop participants were very positive about the group discussions, whether in larger groups or between small numbers of people working together on the calculator to create pathways. Evaluation data shows that they rated discussions between participants as one of the best aspects of the workshop they attended. Their positive responses were based on both the pleasure they gained from the discussions and the contribution they made to widening and deepening participants' understanding of the issues. They felt they had sufficient time to contribute their views and discuss the issues that concerned them.

Hearing others' views – particularly when these differed from their own - enabled them to learn and gain information which could inform their choices on the pathways calculator:

> *"There was another lady from the elders forum well into her 70s, she talked a lot about the problems of being older, i.e. turning down the heating means an older person could get hypothermia and would mean a cost on society in another way. She also talked about how energy light-bulbs weren't bright enough for older people. I hadn't thought of these things before."*

Some participants commented on the 'four big themes' discussion in particular, noting that it stimulated their thinking about these issues, helped to increase their knowledge and made them more aware of where the gaps in their knowledge lay.

> *"Issue with bio-energy was space, the surface area needed to provide it actually wasn't something I had appreciated. Also hadn't appreciated how small the output from a lot of alternative energy is, particularly wind farms and waves - I was quite surprised by that."*

For some participants, this discussion was the best part of the workshop. However, as the two quotes below illustrate, views on the impact of discussions differed: for some participants, they brought awareness of options not previously considered and helped to change views on some energy types, whilst others suggested that discussion entrenched views already held, rather than modifying or changing them.

> *"Views did develop as hadn't thought about it before. Came away with more nuanced views…made me aware of different options. Felt a bit more enthusiastic about geo-thermal energy"*

"For me most interesting aspect was the discussion, which I don't know if it fulfilled what DECC wanted. After discussion, people became even more opinionated, determined to stick with energy they were attached to."

Engaging with the 2050 calculator

Evaluation data shows that workshop participants were very positive about using the calculator and engaged with it well. In interviews with workshop participants, the 2050 pathways calculator was described as a useful tool to stimulate participants' interest in the issues and the debate.

Post-event evaluation feedback from all three workshops shows that the majority of evaluation respondents agreed with the statements "I found the calculator easy to use" (62%) and with the statement "I enjoyed using the calculator "(81%). However, interview data suggests too that some participants had some difficulty using it, particularly in the first session. Those who found the calculator easy to use tended to feel this was due to their pre-existing knowledge of energy and climate change issues and a relatively high level of IT literacy. Some participants said they would like to have been more prepared for the workshops, to help them use the calculator more effectively and discuss the issues in more detail.

The 2050 calculator helped to stimulate thinking about energy and climate change issues and the options and trade-offs required to meet the 2050 target. Post-workshop evaluation questionnaires show that the majority of participants across all workshops agreed that the calculator helped them:

- to learn something they did not know before (94%)
- to think more clearly about these issues (88%)
- to arrive at their own preferred solution for "how I would meet the 2050 target" (67%).

Participants involved in follow-up interviews lent weight to the data from the evaluation forms used at the events. For example, they said that using the 2050 pathways calculator helped them to learn about the pros, cons and impacts associated with different types of energy use, to give careful thought to developing their pathways and to begin grappling more deeply with the issues and the trade-offs involved:

"I was determined not to use nuclear power, but that meant I had to depend on imported electricity which I wasn't very comfortable with – as depends on relations with other countries. At end I started rushing it, only got to 64% but was happy because I hadn't comprised my ethics. Learnt a lot about bio-fuels, but didn't realise until the workshop that it would mean using huge amount of land."

Another aspect of the process that helped participants to develop their own pathways was the use of illustrative pathways contributed by public bodies. Where individuals identified with the values of these bodies, the particular choices they had made were seen as credible and trustworthy.

Expert help

Participants valued the expert help provided by DECC: interviewees described it as "*knowledgeable*", "*professional*", "*essential"* and "*diplomatic"*. Experts were valued because they helped participants develop their understanding of the different choices they were being asked to make; because they were clearly very willing to provide support and guidance and because they were happy to enter into conversations about the limitations of the calculator, without being dictatorial or possessive over a tool they had obviously spent a lot of time developing:

> *"Really good, we had one chap with us, he was brilliant. Didn't tell us what to do, just pointed things out on the calculator. Very friendly, didn't feel like he was looking over your shoulder."*

Comments about the other moderators in the workshops were also very positive - in the evaluation questionnaires, the moderators were rated as either helpful or very helpful by all the participants: across all events, they were rated as the second most useful resource in helping people to think about the issues.

Some participants in the follow up interviews did distinguish between technical and expert help and the support provided help provided by moderators. These comments highlight the importance of adequate expert support in the dialogue workshops to respond to participants' technical queries. A comment made by a participant in the Nottingham workshop (where there were only two experts) highlights the value of expert involvement in this project and the importance of ensuring adequate technical support:

> *"[*the expert help*] was good, I didn't think the others were very helpful – they didn't have enough knowledge, she told me it was something she was doing this week and she'd be doing something different next week. There weren't enough experts."*

Observer notes on the role of experts were also extremely positive. Two particular points noted were their ability to support participants' use and understanding of the calculator through timely provision of information and their ability to provide straightforward and accessible explanations of what were sometimes quite complex issues.

4.2 What could be improved?

Clarity of purpose

Fifty-two percent (52%) of participants completing pre-workshop questionnaires said that they were not clear about the purpose of the workshop to which they had been invited. Data from these questionnaires and from the follow up interviews suggest that people had mixed understandings of why the workshops were being held. Few mentioned either the 2050 target of 80% reduction in emissions or the 2050 pathways calculator; most said they thought that their purpose was to hear the latest government policy on climate change, to discuss local issues, or to inform and influence policy.

Why was the purpose of workshops unclear?

Interviewees suggested that the lack of clarity originated in the letter sent to invitees in advance of the workshop:

> *"Were a bit surprised information [about the workshop) hadn't mentioned an online tool in information we received."*

> *"I think it's always useful to know details about an workshop you're coming to – I think that's quite a standard thing and a bit of an oversight – whether it's DECC or Mori or whoever it is who arranged it, there's been a bit of an oversight in filling the participants in about what's happening."*

However, several participants felt too that the opportunity to introduce clarity at the start of the workshops was missed and that they and other participants remained unclear about the purpose of the workshops throughout the first session of the event.

> *"They should have been clearer about what we were there for. They should have explained the process and format of the day better. For the first hour people were confused."*

For some participants, being asked to complete two questionnaires prior to the session seemed to exacerbate confusion about the purpose of the day. Attending to these meant they weren't able to concentrate on the introductions to the day and the calculator given by DECC and added to the "rushed feel" of the workshops. This highlights the importance of ensuring enough time is built into agenda for all activities, so that participants can pay full attention to each.

> *"If you have 'pre-workshop' questionnaires you need to build in time for people to fill them in. I arrived on time, found the room and had no time to do them before the first session started."*

> *"Don't remember any information about why DECC had been asked to create the calculator, but to be honest I was still filling in my forms."*

The possibility of combining the event and evaluation questionnaires was discussed before the first workshop was held; the evaluation team agreed with Ipsos-MORI that this should not be done because it would jeopardise the confidentiality of participants' evaluation feedback. The evaluation was commissioned very shortly before the first workshop, so time was not available to plan in advance for sharing personal data in a secure way nor to built time into the agenda for completion of both evaluation and process feedback questionnaires.

Findings from stakeholder interviews suggest that participants' uncertainty about the purpose of the workshops followed from uncertainty within DECC itself about the objectives for this element of the 2050 engagement programme. Some stakeholders suggested that the objectives were both very broad and that there was a tension between the 'calculator test' component and the 'climate change dialogue' component. Whilst the relative priority of these two components was felt to have changed throughout the design process, with the 'test' component growing in importance, the tension remained unresolved and seems to have affected the clarity of the process design.

Observations of the workshops record a further detail that supports participants' concerns about this lack of clarity and perhaps goes some way to explaining how it continued through the events. Observer notes suggest that the single workshops were not framed within the wider context of the engagement programme (e.g., the opening address by the lead facilitator included no mention of the Youth Panel, nor of the workshops taking place elsewhere in the country, nor of the process being a pilot, nor of what use would be made of the findings from the events). In the absence of this kind of explicit framing participants are likely to impose their own understandings and desires on a process and are thus left frustrated when these are not met. Framing devices were similarly absent from the start of each individual session, so participants were not always clear about what was being asked of them, how it contributed to the day as a whole or how long any particular session would last.

Impact of unclear purpose

The lack of clarity about the purpose of the workshops had a number of impacts. Some participants felt they had been brought to the event under false pretences: others were aggrieved at not having the chance to discuss the 80% target and the issue of climate change more generally. Still others were confused about the approach to the calculator they were being asked to adopt when constructing their pathways:

> *"We were there under slightly false pretences, we were there to test a tool rather than about DECC hearing from people trying to do this work on the ground."*

> *"I found it irritating that we didn't discuss why we had to reduce our carbon emissions by 80% - no discussion about impact of climate change."*

> *"After the introduction, was still a bit confused about whether we would be using the calculator or whether we would be discussing what the calculator should be. Also whether in terms of what is scientifically possible or what would actually happen."*

Lack of clarity about the purpose of the events and the tension between the 'dialogue' and 'calculator test' components seem to have resulted in sessions being squeezed for time; an awful lot was packed into a short space of time. Interview and questionnaire data from all three workshops suggest that participants felt the agenda was over-full and that sessions were rushed. Many participants mentioned timing issues when asked what were the 'worst aspects' of the event they had attended. Comments on evaluation questionnaires reflect this: *"not enough time for such a serious issue*", *"too much information",* had *"material indigestion"* and a *"…lack of time to properly discuss complex issues*".

In particular, participants felt there was insufficient time to take in all the information covered in the calculator and explore the choices in depth. This frustration about lack of time did not seem to be linked to ease (or difficulty) of calculator use, but instead to participants' desire to do a "thorough job".

> *"The man from DECC said it was normally done in one day. There was a feeling of pressure and that we hadn't achieved very much and I wasn't able to be as thorough as I would have liked to."* (participant in 1/2 day workshop)

> *"Such an intense day, very much full on – couldn't have done more in a single session. By 4pm everyone was tired."*

> *"Fairly easy to use but huge amount of detail – straightforward but need time to work your way through it."*

When asked what would improve the day participants suggested more breaks. This might seem to exacerbate rather than improve the situation: however, in tandem with greater clarity over the purpose of the day and improved framing, more time for people to discuss the issues informally could be of value.

It is not uncommon for participants to complain about lack of time in public engagement events. This can be because they are enjoying activities and discussions and the chance to learn about something new and do not want this to stop. And indeed, evaluation data and interviews show that participants did enjoy the workshops and relished the opportunity to discuss and debate climate change. However, they were also frustrated by what they felt was time wasted as a consequence over their own uncertainty about the process and its purpose.

Half day event

Several participants in the half-day event in Nottingham mentioned the time of day at which the event was held as its worst aspect: they felt it was too late at night, particularly for participants who worked full time. The timing might explain the higher number of older participants in the Nottingham event, if people who worked full-time were not keen to attend an evening event.

> *"I would question how helpful it is [the time of day of the event] for people who have been at work, I would have been happy to go from 10-4 and have more time to weigh the issues. Instead you had to go with the first thought that came into your head."*

Lack of time was a particular issue for Nottingham participants. In addition to more frustration at not having time to explore issues or the calculator in depth, participants in the Nottingham event also seemed less confident about using the calculator with their own communities. Data from the post-event evaluation questionnaires shows that 63% of participants in Cumbria and 52% from London workshops agreed that they would feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with their own community. Only 39% of participants in the half day Nottingham event agreed with this statement. This suggests that, if the purpose of events is to encourage community leaders to initiate conversations with their own groups, but time is short, it might be more effective to use the My2050 simulator. This tool is more simple and would allow more time for dialogue that will give participants the chance to explore and grasp the issues and equip them more fully to hold conversations with their own communities.

The findings described above suggest that, whilst the format of the one day workshop did work better than the half day workshop, the lack of time and the amount to complete in the events was an issue for all participants. As noted, this seems to be related to their lack of clarity about the purpose of the events, something also felt by some stakeholders involved in the project. This highlights the importance of an effective scoping stage to good process design; of using the introduction session of the workshops to frame the events and communicate the overall purpose of the workshop; and of providing goals for each individual workshop session and an account of how each session relates to the others and to the whole.

How prepared participants felt for the events

Event participants would have liked more information before the workshop and many participants felt they would have benefitted from the opportunity to prepare. One of the main themes arising from the question "what would improve events like this?" in the post-evaluation forms was "greater prior information". This theme included suggestions that participants should be able to see the calculator in advance to give them an opportunity to create an initial pathway and suggestions to provide participants with more in-depth information prior to the events so that they would feel more prepared.

Giving participants the opportunity to prepare may have helped them to feel less rushed when completing activities during the workshop. For example if participants had the opportunity to explore the calculator before the event and create an initial pathway, they could have spent less time becoming familiar with the calculator during the workshop. In addition, by giving participants a greater understanding of the workshop's purpose beforehand, both in terms of information about the session and an opportunity to use and become familiar with the calculator, they would have had a better sense of what was expected from them, and they may have felt less like they were being rushed from session to session.

Tailoring the event to the audience

Many workshop participants made comments about the level of knowledge they felt they needed to have in order to participate to the workshops. From these comments, it seems that a challenge in the design of the workshops was pitching them at a level which suited most participants' level of knowledge. Several participants in the follow up interviews and the post-workshop evaluation forms felt the workshops were pitched to people who were very intelligent and that the content assumed a pre-existing knowledge of energy and climate change issues.

> *"It suggested we didn't need to have experience of green issues and energy methods before attending, but I think it would have been useful for workshop discussions."*

> *"There was an assumption that you were fairly bright and have pre-existing knowledge….I grasped it quite quickly because I have a lot of background on these issues – I don't think my companion felt the same."*

For some of those working in pairs to develop their pathway on the calculator, this meant that one person would be leading the decision-making about which options should contribute towards the pathway. This might mean that some participants engaged less well with the calculator or, conversely, that they had more opportunity to learn through their pairing with another person who was more knowledgeable in these issues. It might also mean that the person assuming the lead became frustrated with their companion:

> *"He kept saying "you know more about it", I had thought things through more than he had. And he wanted me to decide, I would let him know why I was choosing what I was choosing, but he hadn't worked out these issues very well."*

Participants' views about the appropriateness of workshop stimulus material differed. Some participants described these materials as too complex and technical, and felt that simpler language should have been used; others felt these materials were too simple, and some actively disliked being read out loud to. One participant said:

"When you're trying to do workshop like that, will have people with different interests and different levels of understanding. The sheets were quite simple, had quite big pictures which I found quite funny. Discussions were about showing the practical application of the theme."

Reflecting on local impact

Views differed about the value of the session in relation to local impact. Comments made at the learning workshop held shortly after the final workshop suggest that stakeholders felt that this discussion didn't work well in any of the three workshops. Workshop participants in follow up interviews had mixed views about this session: some described it as immensely helpful and others didn't understand its value to DECC. In addition, this session was in an unfortunate position in the workshops - at the end of a very packed workshop when participants' energy levels were flagging. This session not working well could also be related to participants' understanding of what the workshops were about – from responses to the pre-workshop evaluation questionnaires about expectations of the workshop, some participants thought the day was an opportunity to discuss local issues, and were therefore frustrated when this session came at the end of the day. Some comments about this session are below:

"Well it was valuable to us, but don't know what the purpose of that was. These kind of conversations happen all the time at local level."

"Because people had been trying to talk about it all day, by that point people were annoyed with each other as they had different opinions."

"Immensely helpful – that was because of the mix of people there. It was really, really good. The local perspective was really important; it clarified a lot of things because such a good mix of people there. Then you'd go back to your calculator and fine tune what you had done."

One or more participant per computer?

Evaluation data suggests that only having one participant per computer worked less well than more than one participant and this is because of the value participants placed on group discussions to understand and explore the issues, as was discussed earlier in the report. As the quote below illustrates, one participant in Cumbria, where there was one participant per computer, felt very strongly that working in a group to refine pathways was essential to using the calculator:

"So many people there, easy to ask questions, good mix of people in our group, someone from the county council, a freelance artist – so complete spectrum of approaches. Really good to share ideas and then go back and fiddle with it. Can't do it on your own, tried using it but you're kind of isolated. It should be used as a prompt for discussion."

This comment was supported by others made in the follow up interviews – participants enjoyed working together to establish their pathways, though there was a sense that it was more challenging for participants to work together when there was more than two people per computer:

"(Working in pairs) was fun, good to have someone else to work with and talk things over….I think three [people] was a little bit harder and four wouldn't have been possible."

Venue

Many workshop participants felt the venues for the workshops could have been improved - particularly in the Cumbria and London workshop. Some participants, particularly from the London workshop, described challenges in relation to the IT, specifically, the internet connection and the slowness of the laptops used. In response to the evaluation form question 'what was the worst thing about the workshop', the majority of participants who attended both the Cumbria and London workshops mentioned an aspect of the venue. Complaints included: the venue not being comfortable; too hot; about the noise from other groups interfering with group discussions; poor lighting; poor quality refreshments and not enough drinks available. There were also complaints from participants in Cumbria about the absence of sign-posting to the room where the workshop was being held. Only one person from the post workshop evaluation forms in Nottingham mentioned the venue as the worst aspect of the day. One workshop participant who took part in a follow up interview said:

"My only complaint about the whole day was that there were too many people in one room."

Participant's understanding of the assumptions underpinning the 2050 pathways calculator

Some workshop participants, and particularly those in London, disagreed with the assumptions on which the calculator is based. In the evaluation questionnaires, many participants made comments about these. Issues raised included:

- the need for the assumptions to be made clearer
- targets for transport (particularly aviation)and livestock reduction not sufficiently ambitious
- disagreement with the options available in the calculator
- lack of data on costs
- "peak oil" not taken into account
- Insufficient consideration of behaviour changes required.

"Non-stretching targets for transport and livestock reduction - this is a real limitation for the tool"

"Need more adjustments to some items. Disagreed with some of the options i.e. could not reduce aviation, only increase"

From observations of the workshops it seems that complaints about the assumptions underlying the calculator could have been remedied by greater clarity in the introduction to the session. For example, some participants complained the calculator didn't take behaviour change into consideration - when behaviour change actually is implicit in some of the levers. It might be beneficial for the introduction to the calculator to include a discussion about what is and what is not included in it and why, and what subjective factors are built into the assumptions and into the different levels of difficulty in achieving any particular change (e.g., attitudinal and behaviour changes that might be required in order to achieve a decrease in average room temperature to 16°). An underlying excel spreadsheet, which is a more detailed version of the Calculator allowing participants to see the assumptions, is available online, however, this was not available to participants at the workshops – and might have complicated things further rather than adding to clarity.

Attending the workshop as a community representative

As noted earlier, one aim of the deliberative dialogue events was to *promote an informed deliberative dialogue amongst local community leaders in the pilot areas*[24]*.* We have no clear evidence as to whether the views contributed by participants were based on their own individual perspectives or on their understanding of the views of the communities they represented or worked with. However, informal conversations with participants and observation during the workshops suggested two things. First, that many were contributing as individuals, with the choices they made to build their pathways being based on their own views. Second, participants in the London workshop were more likely than those in either Cumbria or Nottingham to act as community leaders.

The London workshop included a higher proportion of respondents from NGOs (54%) and business representatives (24%) than either the Nottingham or Cumbria workshops, where the majority of participant's were councillors. The higher proportion of NGOs and business representatives at the London workshop might provide a basis for explaining why more of these participants seemed to be representing their community as opposed to acting as an individual. People who have joined a community group – particularly a campaigning group – are likely to do so because their personal values are aligned with those of the organisation: the difference between the expression of their individual views and those of their organisation is thus likely to be slight. Participants from businesses – who were recruited as such and, from observation, seemed to be treating the event as part of their working day and dressed accordingly, in suits – were perhaps also more likely to see themselves as representatives of their organisation. However, Councillors are called upon to represent a range of views on a range of issues and might not agree with personally with these views. Unless they have 'taken the temperature' of their communities on these issues, they might have no basis on which to represent community views and hence fall back on their individual opinions. As remarked above, however, this is speculative and not evidence-based. There is also a question about whether individuals can ever act as community leaders, reflecting or representing the views of their communities in isolation of their own personal views.

[24] As outlined in the Invitation to tender.

Observer notes record that participants were not reminded of their participation as community leaders or instructed to approach the tasks from this perspective. If this distinction, between individual and community views, is important to future work, it would be helpful to remind participants of this and perhaps to explore any tensions between individual and community perspectives. This would throw some light on the extent to which community leaders have insight into the views of those they represent or lead and whether there are differences across different types of leader, as suggested above.

4.3 Impact of taking part in the deliberative dialogue workshops

Workshop participants identified a number of immediate impacts on them as a consequence of taking part in the workshops. In line with what DECC stakeholders hoped, for some participants, taking part in the workshops made them realise the "scale of the challenge": they came away with a greater understanding of what achieving 80% carbon reduction target would entail and an understanding of what the impact would be on public life and society. According to interview data, several specific elements of the workshops contributed to this, including learning about the pros and cons of different types of energy supply, the impacts of using different types of energy and, exploring the range of options included in the calculator:

> *"Have shifted my views since that day, was quite happy about alternate types of energy, particularly off-shore wind farms, I can see that would work on a local level but once I saw the bigger picture, I realised what a drop in the ocean it was."*

> *"Also the number of options available for meeting the target – that there is no definite pathway."*

Another immediate impact for workshop participants was learning about the issues more generally. In both the evaluation forms and follow up interviews, participants described how attending the workshops raised their awareness and knowledge of energy issues and the options available for meeting the 2050 target. This was facilitated through group discussions, listening to the opinions and views of other participants, and through using the 2050 calculator. One participant from the half day event stated that using the calculator made her realise the gaps in her own knowledge, which motivated her to use the calculator in her own time.

> *"Made me think I need to know more – I took the details of the website so I can go through it in my own time."*

For some participants the workshops motivated them to use the 2050 pathways calculator with their communities. In the evaluation forms, more than half of participants in the each of the Cumbria, London and Nottingham workshops either agreed or strongly agreed that they would feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with their own community. Slightly more participants agreed with they would feel motivated to use calculator with their own community in the full day London (74%) and Cumbria (64%) workshops than in the Nottingham workshop (53%). This may be explained by the half day format not stimulating participants' interest enough to motivate them to use this tool or because the process was too intensive to provide them with the confidence they needed to lead a similar discussion themselves.

4.4 Summary and recommendations

These were pilot workshops and each one explored a different approach to engaging community leaders in discussion about the issues involved in climate change and achieving the 2050 target and to testing the 2050 calculator. Some clear design principles for future workshops emerged from these pilots.

On the whole, participants engaged extremely well with the 2050 pathways calculator and group discussions during the three workshops. Group discussions and expert help, which was on hand from DECC, were particularly valued. The main impact on people who took part in the workshops was learning, either about the issues themselves or about the scale of the challenge and the implications achieving it have for us all. Many participants understood the purpose of their presence at the workshop as a community leader and stated they were motivated to use the use the 2050 pathways calculator with their own community – this suggests that engaging community leaders worked effectively in the deliberative dialogue workshops.

Some aspects of the workshops could be improved. These include stakeholders agreeing a clear purpose for events; providing better information to participants before events, at their start and at the start of each session; more realistic process design – the workshops had a great deal to cover and participants noted this in evaluation feedback, suggesting they had insufficient time to complete all the required activities. Many of these shortcomings seem to stem directly from the initial lack of clarity about the purpose of the workshops and the breadth of the objectives. It seems that the tension between the need to test the calculator and to engage in rich deliberative dialogue about the issues was not properly resolved.

Key recommendations:

- Agree a set of focused objectives prior to the design stage and ensure that these are compatible, if all objectives are to be met within a single workshop
- Frame the day effectively by providing details about the wider context within which an event sits, how each event will contribute to the wider policy aims and ensuring the purpose of each individual session is clear to participants as well as how long they will have for each session
- Provide adequate expertise to support complex discussions: participants were very positive about the value of expert help and noticed when there was less expert help at the Nottingham event
- For half-day events, consider using My2050 rather than the calculator as a quick introduction to the issues, in a workshop which focuses on dialogue to support participants' understanding of the issues, rather than 'testing' the calculator. Such a session like this would need careful design and could perhaps be piloted first, to ensure sufficient time for participants to carry out activities and not feel rushed.

- Consider how process design might be used to support community leaders to think about the perspective from which they are making choices. This might encourage them to "bring their communities into the room" and also help them to bear in mind how they might have similar discussions with their communities. A possible approach to engaging participants as representatives of their communities could be to remind them of this role during set up or to ask them to identify the values of the communities they represent to ensure these are bought to the fore during discussions. As noted earlier, however, it might not be possible ever to clearly distinguish between these two perspectives in the context of this type of work.

5. My2050 simulator

In this chapter we describe what went well with the development and launch of the serious games interface and what could be improved. We draw on data from interviews with stakeholders, as well as Ipsos-MORI's analysis[25] of the pathways submitted by 10,215 people via the My2050 Simulation website between 3rd March, when the site was launched, and the 29th March 2011. At the close of the chapter we summarise and make some recommendations for how My2050 might be used in future dialogue activities.

How the My2050 simulator works

The My2050 simulation is a 'serious game' which enables members of the public to create their own solution to meeting the 2050 emissions reduction target. It is in effect a more simple version of the 2050 pathways calculator, which can serve as an introduction to its more complex partner or be a stand-alone tool. To create a solution, users manipulate 14 different levers, each of which represents a different choice on the demand side (for example, how we travel or business greenness) or supply side (bio-fuel production, nuclear power or wind turbines on land), in order to reduce CO_2 emissions to meet the 2050 target. Levers can be manipulated on a scale of 0-3 according to how much effort the user thinks should or could be made. As the levers are manipulated, the simulation visualises how the world will look in 2050 according to the level of effort chosen for each lever - for example, showing different numbers of nuclear power stations, depending on the level of effort chosen for this lever.

5.1 Clarity of purpose and objectives

As with other aspects of this project, one of the primary issues raised by stakeholders was the lack of clarity around the purpose of and objectives for the My2050 simulator. Whilst these were initially clear, they changed through the development stage. This meant that available resources were not used as efficiently as they might be and some functionality was sacrificed in the final product. One loss of particular relevance for the question of whether tools such as this have a place to play in deliberative dialogue is the interactive element. This would have enabled users to view and discuss each others' graphs, so facilitating dialogue between participants about their different pathways.

> *"Main impact was that we had to cut out some functionality that would have been good….like the ending graph…….could be more interactive to compare with others' graphs – that could have led to dialogue and discussion. Done something a bit more clever about putting forward solutions and having discussions around it"*

[25] Available on the website for the Department of Energy and Climate Change.

5.2 My2050 as a tool to generate large samples of data, analysable by collection of basic demographic and attitudinal data

The Ipsos–MORI report analyses demographic, attitudinal and performance data collected from those who submitted pathways through the My2050 simulator. Demographic data includes age and location; attitudinal data includes level of concern about climate change, reasons for choices made and how happy they would be to live in the worlds they produced using the simulator. Performance data includes how long participants spent creating their pathway, patterns of levers and levels of effort chosen and whether players revised their pathways. Finally, data collected and analysed also included how players arrived at the My2050 simulator website (e.g., via the link in the BBC article[26], Facebook or through googling "My 2050"). Ipsos-MORI's analysis looks as well at the patterns of choice in relation to demographic and attitudinal data. We have not replayed this analysis here and suggest that readers refer to the Ipsos-MORI report (available on DECC's website) for detailed information.

However, we can say that the engaging nature of My2050, combined with its promotion on well-used sites and in social media drove a large number of people to the tool, and these people provided a great deal of information. This suggests that the simulator has been an effective tool for generating large samples of qualitative and quantitative data, analysable by basic demographic and attitudinal data. What it cannot do, in its present form, is provide information on the underlying factors that informed the choice of pathways, nor whether people approached the simulation with the aim of achieving a result (i.e. 'hitting the target') or in a more thoughtful manner, aiming to generate a result that reflected their own values or that they felt was realistic and achievable for the population as a whole.

5.3 Engaging the target audience

As noted earlier in this report, the My2050 simulator was targeted at specific audiences, namely: people not previously involved in the 2050 engagement programme; young people; and people with limited awareness or knowledge of energy and climate change issues. The Ipsos-MORI analysis of the people who submitted pathways suggests that the simulator had mixed success in reaching these audiences. Players submitting worlds tended to be younger: more people under 25 used the simulation. However, they were also more likely to be more engaged than the general public with the problem of climate change. Forty-eight percent (48%) of players rated themselves as "very concerned" with climate change: this contrasts with findings from a general population survey conducted by Ipsos-MORI on behalf of Cardiff University, which found only 28% of the general population rating themselves as "very concerned" about climate change.

[26] http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-12633622

This player profile raises questions about whether, as it is currently configured, or as it is currently marketed or as it is currently being used (i.e. as a stand-alone tool) it is achieving its aim of reaching new audiences not previously engaged with climate change. It means as well that caution is needed in interpreting the results of the 'worlds' submitted through My2050: they cannot be seen as representative of the population as a whole.

Although not hitting its target audience on the nose, as a tool for engaging people in some of the trade-offs and choices that need to be considered if we are to meet the 80% reductions target, My2050 has been extremely successful. Over 10,000 pathways were submitted in 26 days in March and there were 50,000 users in total. A BBC online article about the My2050 simulator was instrumental in driving traffic to the simulator; the Ipsos-MORI analysis shows that more than half of those accessing the game did so via the link on the BBC website.

DECC was very pleased with the simulator and the enthusiastic initial engagement is seen as a testament to the quality of the product:

> *"The end product is exactly the product that we were hoping to have A 5-10 minute introduction to the topic, with some magnetic visuals which keep people on-side and get some early data back and the My2050 is performing all that and all the numbers of people who have played it and have submitted it are testament to that"*

5.4 As a mechanism for deliberative dialogue

As noted above, the My2050 simulation has been a very positive tool for engaging members of the public with the 2050 target and a useful way to collect data on how younger than average and more informed than average publics might approach the 2050 challenge. There is less available evidence to help us determine the potential for serious games to provide deliberative engagement mechanism on complex issues or, in the future, be used to support such engagement. [27]

To explore this question, we will draw on the definition of **public dialogue** provided by the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre[28]. This definition includes the main aspects of deliberative approaches without being specific about some of the more contentious issues (e.g., such as whether deliberative processes can be described as exercises in reason)*:*

> *"Public dialogue run by Sciencewise-ERC brings together members of the public, policy makers and scientists to discuss and come to conclusions on the social and ethical issues raised by new science and technology, and other policies of national importance. It allows a diverse mix of public participants with a range of views and values to:• learn from written information and experts*
> *• listen to each other, and share and develop their views*
> *• reach carefully considered conclusions*
> *• communicate those conclusions directly to inform Government's decision making"*

[27] See p2 of this report for the specific questions the evaluation was asked to address.
[28] http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/what-is-dialogue-4/

We have used the main elements of the definition above to structure our response to the question of whether serious games such as My2050 does or could potentially support public dialogue or deliberative engagement. The following sections provide an analysis of My2050 which is perhaps unfair: the simulation was not designed to function as a stand-alone tool for deliberative engagement. However, we have taken this approach in order to explore what aspects of deliberative approaches the simulation does support and hence to help identify how My2050 might be embedded into deliberative processes in the future.

Learn from written information and experts

My2050 provides the opportunity for users to access a range of written and visual information from which they can learn. Information is provided on different levels: the game can be played using just the immediate high-level information or users can explore the choices in more detail, accessing data on current use of each lever in the UK and some of the pros and cons involved in using levers to different effort levels. In addition to the information built into the game, My2050 signposts people to the calculator and to a Facebook discussion. This suggests that it could provide value in the context of dialogue, particularly if supported by additional expert input.

My2050 does not provide currently provide an opportunity for users to learn directly from experts. Feedback from participants who took part in the workshops suggests that they placed a high value on experts' input and their support during discussions of technical issues and the implications of different choices and trade-offs on public and social life. It is not clear whether the Facebook discussion group has input from experts, though the nature of the contributions does suggest that discussants are informed about the issues.

It may be that some of the value of face-to-face expert input could be produced by providing a set of "frequently asked questions" (FAQ) and possibly through additional information given about the levers. However, the option of FAQs seems limited as these may not capture all the questions which discussion with an expert could potentially generate. Moreover, the value of expert input is not exhausted in responses to answers. Effective use of experts in dialogue can also have broader value. For example, experts might influence participants' views of scientists or other types of expert and hence help to change their responses or attitudes towards the information they are receiving by complicating stereotypical views. This suggests that face-to-face – or at the very least, unstructured – interaction cannot be *replaced* by using FAQs. An alternative to face-to-face dialogue is to set up webinars, publicising them in advance, at which experts are on hand to answer questions, providing a more collaborative and deliberative online environment.

Listen to each other, and share and develop their views

My2050 provides limited opportunity for participants to listen to others, share and develop their views. Whilst users do have access to a range of information, they cannot debate this information with other users nor share and develop their views with others. As discussed previously, My2050 did not have the interactive functionality originally intended, which would have provided this facility. My2050 does allow users to view other users' worlds, but there is no opportunity within the game to discuss and debate these worlds: it does not support the opportunity for individual choices to be informed by learning from users who may have different views. However, the link to the My2050 Facebook discussion group does provide some opportunity for interaction between players, though only those willing to be Facebook members.

Reach carefully considered conclusions

Some aspects of My2050 do seem to give users opportunity to reach a considered conclusion about the issues in the simulator by providing information and prompts for users to consider their options, for example: the information tabs about each lever, summarising the pros and cons for each; the visual consequences of using each lever on the 'world'; and through prompts on the screen once someone has submitted their world asking "have you considered the following?" and prompting users to consider the consequences of their worlds, e.g. "are you relying on one source of energy?" or "Are you expecting big changes to people's lifestyles?". One strength of the tool is that it gives users the opportunity to reach a considered conclusion on the issues in the tool by presenting information in a way which is visually engaging and easy to understand. It does seem however, that any twenty minute online tool (as the My2050 was intended to be) could be limited as to the extent to which it would allow user to reach considered conclusions on the complex issues and trade-offs involved in achieving the 2050 emissions reduction target – particularly depending on the participant's prior level of understanding and knowledge about these issues. Whilst the My2050 could be used as an introduction to these issues, it seems that twenty minutes is a limited amount of time for a user to reach "considered conclusions" on the range of complex information which is contained within the tool.

Reaching a carefully considered conclusion would also be facilitated through users gaining information, having the opportunity to discuss this and ask questions to experts, debate with other people who have different opinions and then use all this to reach a carefully considered conclusion. Whilst, as discussed above, users do have the opportunity to access a range of information and choices, they cannot speak to experts and ask questions about this information and they cannot debate this information with other members of the public, through the tool. If all these elements are important to reaching a carefully considered conclusion, it seems that the My2050 simulator doesn't work as a stand-alone mechanism for deliberative engagement, and this is because of not creating the opportunity for users to interact with other users or with experts. It is also not possible to determine whether the final pathways participants were arrived at were carefully considered, based on all the information in the tool, or whether they were playing to reach the target, without considering their choices and making an informed conclusion.

Using the My2050 to support conventional face to face deliberative engagement could address some of these limitations of the tool as a mechanism for deliberative engagement, namely the opportunity to listen to other users, share and develop views, learn from experts and use this to reach carefully considered conclusions For example, My 2050 could be used in a workshop format – particularly in shorter events – giving participants the opportunity to debate with other users and ask questions of experts, so providing a more deliberative environment for engaging with My2050.

Communicate those decisions directly to inform Government's decision making

It seems that the pathways chosen by participants will be communicated to and will inform government decision making. As discussed earlier, DECC are interested in the results of which pathways, worlds and levers are chosen in the My2050 simulator, as well as the demographic, attitudinal and performance data collected from those who submitted pathways through the My2050 simulator. This is so as to understand who is using the simulator as well as patterns of choice of levers in relation to demographic and attitudinal data.

5.5 The length of time participants spent on the My2050 simulation

Having sufficient time to explore issues is an important aspect of deliberative engagement. The length of time participants spent on the My2050 simulation might be thought to provide some indication of how engaged they were when choosing the levers and effort levels for their worlds to meet the 2050 target, to what extent they gained insight into complex issues and were able to make informed choices for the worlds they created. According to the Ipsos-MORI analysis report, the median amount of time spent by users on the website was 13.3 minutes, 13% of users spent over half an hour on the game and a smaller number (3%) spent an hour. A smaller number (16%) of users spent more than thirty minutes on creating their world. Five percent spent less than five minutes playing the game. Stakeholders described the intention behind My 2050 as being to provide a *"twenty minute, visually attractive engagement so they [users] can get the main messages and to highlight the main issues".*

However, length of time spent on My2050 could mean a number of things: for example, it might be that players spending a longer amount of time were seeking to get to grips with the issues, exploring the choices available in order to generate a 'world' that best matched their own wishes and values. Or there may be other explanations. It could be that, players spending a longer time on the game were seeking to understand its underlying technical construction and explore the relationships between different choices, rather than the focus being on the production of a 'result' with which they are happy – which would be another way of users becoming 'informed' about the tool and issues within it. Alternatively, it might be that time is an indicator of people finding it difficult to use the game. So whilst time is clearly important to good deliberative processes, in isolation and without evidence about the reasons why different players spent different lengths of time playing the game, it is not possible to draw any conclusions about the relationship between time and level and type of engagement.

5.6 How participants chose their levers

Data from the Ipsos-MORI analysis of worlds submitted suggest that My2050 can encourage a reflective approach by some players. The Ipsos-MORI report notes that a significant number (426) of a randomly chosen sample of 500 players did go back and make changes after the first draft of their worlds, suggesting that they reflected on their choices after submission. Thoughtful response to the consequences of choices is an important aspect of a deliberative approach, though not sufficient to exhaust the definition of deliberative engagement.

Some data from the Ipsos-MORI report highlights issues in the ways players used My2050 which don't support them fully gaining insight into complex issues or making informed choices, when choosing levers and effort levels for their worlds. For example, whilst more than nine in ten users said they would be happy to live in the world that they created, many of the worlds created required effort on the demand side which would mean significant changes to personal behaviour. Based on this, the Ipsos-MORI analysis states *"it is not known how clearly users understood the implications of their worlds"*. So whilst a significant proportion reviewed their initial 'solution' and changed some of their choices, it might be that the game itself prompts people to see the 'solution' as the most important thing, rather than the extent to which any solution is 'realistic' or achievable.

5.7 Conclusions from the serious games interface

Whilst My2050 does give users a great deal of information and an introduction to the issues within the tool, in itself it does not currently create a mechanism for deliberative engagement – and indeed, that is not what it was designed to do. However, in the right context, the simulation could be a very useful tool to be used in the context of a wider deliberative process, either through prompting people to use it in a collaborative way, producing a pathway with friends or family and then bringing the outputs together in a deliberative forum or by embedding it within a workshop context. This would allow participants to learn from experts and listen to each other, sharing and developing views in a way that the simulator does not currently support. Using the tool in a wider deliberative process could also allow for the "carefully considered conclusions" aspect of the definition to be fulfilled, by providing users with more time to consider the information and to reach a conclusion. As noted above, My2050 might also work more effectively than the calculator in shorter events. Being both more simple and less time-consuming to use than the calculator, it might also be used effectively in workshops with less informed or less engaged members of the public, when sufficient time for dialogue and expert input are crucial.

Key recommendations

- Explore ways in which My2050 might be used with social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) or online tools such as webinars, to provide a moredialogic context; this could be combined with face-to-face activities
- Create a forum for players to debate their worlds with other users and experts
- Use My2050 in a workshop format – particularly in shorter events - where users could debate with other users and ask questions of experts, which would allow for a more deliberative engagement with the tool
- Include prompts in My2050 for users to discuss their worlds with family members and friends, and then to re-consider their choices, after these discussions
- Engage with people already involved in promoting climate change at a local level to encourage them to use My2050 in their own activities: the toolkit will clearly be valuable here as well.

6. Conclusions

In Chapter six we provide our overall conclusions about the extent to which this project met its intended objectives and respond explicitly to the evaluation questions:

- the implications of the different methods used in the dialogue events for the credibility of the results of the projects (e.g. numbers of participants and who they are, locations for events, depth of discussions, information provided to the participants, quality of reports on dialogue event results)
- opportunities for follow up with participants, or opportunities for future engagement by them and/or others, or local action
- the potential for serious games to provide a deliberative engagement mechanism on complex issues, and to generate large samples of both qualitative and quantitative data, analysable by collection of basic demographic and attitudinal data
- the lessons from the design and delivery of the Youth Panel, and how the process could be improved in future
- lessons from engaging democratically elected local councillors or nominated representatives on boards or committees as representatives of public views.

6.1 Did the 2050 public engagement programme meet its objectives?

The objectives of the programme were:

1. To run a national Youth Panel dialogue and visioning process with 16-25 year old champions from key UK civil society organisations, from March 2010 to December 2010, representing a broad cross section of interests and backgrounds. Youth Panel activities were intended to inform policy owners in DECC and elsewhere in Government about which 2050 pathways these young people would choose to deliver on the 80% emission target.
2. To engage local community leaders through local dialogue events in London, Cumbria and Nottingham in an informed dialogue over the 2050 pathways in order to promote a debate within communities and investigate local attitudes to the climate change and energy challenge.
3. To develop a front-end to the 2050 Calculator which engages, informs and consults the user about the twin challenges of climate change and energy security, and provides strategic energy and policy options for them to consider, in the form of a digital ‘serious games’ interface for the 2050 Calculator. The aim of the serious game was to contribute to a wider aim to embed digital deliberative tools in the communications and engagement strategy of DECC, and the whole of Government’s energy and climate change policy.

Through the evaluation activities we have gathered more information on more specific objectives for each of these components, through interviews with stakeholders as well as through documentation. To understand the extent to which the engagement programme met its objectives, we discuss below each of the components and the evidence for meeting or not meeting the objectives. Overall, it seems that the deliberative dialogue workshops met their objectives most fully, and the My2050 and the youth panel partially met their objectives.

Youth panel

As identified in the main body of the report, according to DECC documentation and interviews with the independent panel manager, the panel was designed to allow two-way communications between DECC and the wider youth community. Its purpose was both to advise DECC on the thoughts and proposals of the youth community and to relay information about DECC's policy interests and decisions out to the wider youth community. The remit of the panel in the first year was to explore and develop possible energy pathways to meet the 2050 emissions reduction target of 80% and this was the foundation of the panel's work, according to the panel manager.

We have described a number of areas for improvement and made some recommendations earlier in this report. Based on these and our earlier analysis of the youth panel, we consider that the youth panel met its objectives only partially. This view is informed primarily by:

- panel members seeing their communication with DECC as one-way only
- panel members seeing their role on the panel as that of individuals whose role was to test and challenge DECC's policy direction, rather than representatives of a wider community of young people or of the views of their 'home' organisations
- the main focus of the panel activities being on site visits to explore and develop possible pathways to meet the 2050 target and communicate these to DECC, rather than being to communicate information about DECC's policy interests to the wider youth community.

Deliberative dialogue workshops

The objectives for the deliberative dialogue workshops, as specified in the original invitation to tender, were:

1. To promote an informed deliberative dialogue amongst local community leaders in the pilot areas. To consider participants' data on what choices and trade-offs they make on the route to the 2050 target using the 2050 Pathways Calculator.
2. To develop 2050 pathways analysis dialogue materials for use in the three pilot communities and for future use in future engagement opportunities.
3. To test whether and how engagement with the 2050 Calculator influences the attitudes of those local representatives involved in the pilots, and to seek feedback on the events.
4. On the basis of the feedback, to develop proposals for how to improve the format of the deliberative dialogue day.

Overall, the deliberative dialogue workshops have met these objectives. Based on the definition of deliberative dialogue used above, it seems that the workshops did promote an informed deliberative dialogue amongst community leaders in the pilot areas. Workshop participants were presented with a range of information about complex issues and were able to make informed comment and choices, based on debate with other people, being able to consider issues from other people's perspectives and having the opportunity to discuss and ask questions to 'experts'. Participants were also given the opportunity to agree a pathway through discussions which were followed either by working on their own or with a partner on a computer.

We cannot make a judgement about any differences following from paired or group use of a computer followed by discussion compared with individual use of a computer followed by discussion. In part, a judgement on the respective value of these different approaches would be informed by the role being played by the calculator. For example, it could be seen as a way of helping people to understand the issues, without regard to the pathway they produce. In this case, looking at the use made of underlying information would be important. Alternatively, achieving a pathway could be seen as the core aim, in which case interrogation of the underlying information might be less important.

People who were less confident about using a computer might have gained value from the paired approach, in that they could gain insight into the issues by working with someone else: this would give them access to the information on the calculator without requiring them to get to grips with its use. They could then bring this insight into the subsequent discussion. However, the pathway produced might well have been produced by the individual with their hands on the equipment. Individuals who were more confident about using the computer – and perhaps also more knowledgeable about the topic to start with - might have preferred the 'solo' approach, on the grounds that it gave them an opportunity to produce their own pathway without needing to negotiate choices with someone who might have other views.

Through the workshops, dialogue materials were developed which could be used in future engagement activities. With amendments, many of these materials are likely to be of some value to future activities.

Through the evaluation forms circulated at the workshops by the evaluation team and by Ipsos-MORI, and through evaluation interviews, DECC was able to collect data about how engagement with the calculator influenced the attitudes of local representatives and also to seek feedback on the events. This feedback should be used to improve any future dialogue.

My2050

According to the ITT, the objective for the development of the serious games interface, My2050, was:

> *"to develop a front-end to the 2050 Calculator which engages, informs and consults the user about the twin challenges of climate change and energy security, and provides strategic energy and policy options for them to consider. The core element will be a digital 'serious games' interface for the 2050 Calculator. The game could be a central resource for the pilot dialogues and could work either in a stand alone capacity or on websites, social network sites, virally etc. The aim is for this to contribute to a wider aim to embed digital deliberative tools in the communications and engagement strategy of DECC, and the whole of Government's energy and climate change policy".*

To date, this objective seems to have been fulfilled, in that a serious games interface has been developed and has worked in a stand-alone capacity.

Through interviews with stakeholders, it also became clear that the aims of My2050 were to engage with young people, those not engaged through the deliberative dialogue events and those with limited previous knowledge about these issues and to provide a twenty minute deliberative engagement mechanism for these people. As discussed previously, My2050 does seem effective in engaging with younger people, but there is evidence to suggest it is not currently reaching those with limited awareness of climate change.

Whilst My2050 was not tested as part of a wider deliberative process, it does give insight into complex issues in an engaging and straightforward way. This suggests that it has the potential for being a very effective supporting tool to embed in future deliberative engagement on climate change.

Conclusions on the general evaluation questions

Many aspects of the three components of the 2050 engagement programme were a success. The deliberative dialogue events on the whole met the stated objectives, participants enjoyed being involved in the process and valued the opportunity to learn about the issues from both experts and other participants. Initial engagement to the My2050 calculator has been very promising and it seems that the target audience - young people – have been engaged. Finally, youth panellists were positive about the structure of the panel for achieving the set tasks and also about the impact of being involved in the panel work on themselves. However, participants, stakeholders and observers alike agreed that the objectives were not clearly translated into the process or delivery. Many of the shortcomings of the different project components seem to have followed from this.

The numbers involved in each workshop were sufficient to provide relatively detailed findings and some clear learning about how to proceed with this discussion, whether with community leaders or with the wider public. The information provided to participants about the issues themselves was of a very high quality – particularly that contributed by experts, who could respond to the particular queries raised as people used the calculator. The profiles of participants in each location were quite different, as were their main areas of focus. However, it is difficult to say whether these differences were a result of location-specific concerns or because of the different age profile in each location. Nonetheless, we do think that, considered within the context of a pilot project, the findings can be considered credible.

There are some clear opportunities for follow-up and possible future engagement with participants and others and for local action to be taken by participants. Evaluation questionnaires suggest that many participants intended to have discussions with their communities and to base these around the calculator. We think, however, that for these discussions to be most successful, follow-up workshops aimed at capacity building would be valuable. These might be designed as training sessions, perhaps based around how to use the tool-kit effectively and with confidence. This would both help to build people's confidence and to generate an army of 'local 2050 champions'.

My2050 has generated a large sample of both qualitative and quantitative data, analysable by collection of basic demographic and attitudinal data. And as we have noted earlier, we do think that there is potential for serious games to provide a deliberative engagement mechanism on complex issues, but only in the context of a wider dialogue, whether online or face-to-face. The lessons learned from the use of the calculator in the workshops should, however, also be used to consider how the potential is best realised. Most important to this is building interactivity into the process, either by embedding it in the game itself or by using it within a wider interactive context, as suggested in the recommendations in the previous chapter.

The Youth Panel has had considerable success and its members clearly enjoyed being part of it. Improving the process in the future will mean being very clear about what is expected of participants and improving the two-way flow of information between the Panel and DECC, as well as taking into account the recommendations made in the earlier chapter.

This project provides some lessons about engaging people recruited specifically as representatives of communities or organisations, whether democratically or by nomination, rather than as members of the public. When asked in pre-event-evaluation questionnaires what they hoped to take back from the process to the people they represent the most chosen options were 'information' and 'what we can do to help'. Participants clearly gained a lot of information during these workshops and the calculator and My2050 provide a great deal of information. Future work with this audience could usefully consider the 'what we can do to help' element: for example, they might explore different approaches to engaging communities on climate change and how the calculator or My2050 could be embedded in these or, as suggested earlier, workshops could focus on capacity and knowledge building. It was noticeable in these workshops that the 'leadership' role of participants was not emphasised and nor was clear guidance given about the perspective they should adopt when completing their pathways. If people are to be engaged in their capacity as representatives, more thought might be given to how to maximise the value of this, as discussed earlier.

Finally, future dialogue activities should be designed within the context of a more explicit understanding of deliberative engagement and how and why this differs from qualitative research. The Ipsos-MORI report does address the analysis of qualitative data. However, deliberative approaches are not equivalent to qualitative research and the assumptions that underlie the particular model of deliberation being used in any particular project can have implications for the approach to analysis that is taken (which might be different to the approach taken to qualitative research). For example, some theorists and practitioners position deliberation as an exercise in public reason: understanding the outputs of dialogue as the result of rational debate consequent upon the understanding of information provided could provide different conclusions and recommendations to understanding the same outputs as the result of (for example) participants' emotional responses to the same information or to the power dynamics underlying discussions. Surfacing the assumptions implicit in process design and delivery can provide additional insights into the data gathered. There is value in exploring where on the spectrum of approaches to deliberation any particular project lies, if only to ensure that the messages given to participants are transparent.

Deliberative dialogue is also about democracy, and a commitment to the right of citizens to contribute to the decisions that will affect their lives. This is markedly different to the commitments underpinning qualitative research. Careful attention to these issues will help to ensure that future activities in this area build on and improve the work done in this project.

Appendix 1

The evaluation must adhere to the following principles from the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre:

a. Starting early: evaluation needs to be undertaken throughout the design and delivery of the project.
b. Clarity: of the purpose, scope, approach and limits of the evaluation.
c. Rigour: of method used for the evaluation.
d. Appropriate level of participation: of those involved in the process, to the extent appropriate to the evaluation approach.
e. Proportionate: with sufficient resources and in sufficient depth to meet evaluation objectives.
f. Transparency: the evaluation approach and process are explained to all stakeholders, and evaluation findings are published.
g. Practicality: data can be collected, assessed and reported on to budget and within timescale.
h. Utility: the evaluation process and reports of evaluation findings should be in a form that is useful for learning and to provide evidence of what works, impacts, and lessons.
i. Independence: from commissioners, funders, delivery team and participants.
j. Credibility: status / reputation of evaluator and/or evaluation process.

All Sciencewise-ERC funded evaluations need to encompass both audit and learning approaches, and the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. They need to consider:

- Has the programme met the stated objectives?
- Have the public dialogue elements met standards of good practice (Sciencewise-ERC principles)[29]?
- Have those involved been satisfied with the dialogue and other programme activities (value to them)?
- What difference/impact has the dialogue and other programme activities made?
- Has the dialogue produced robust, credible and valid evidence which can be used, with confidence, in policy making
- What was the balance overall of the costs and benefits of the dialogue and other programme activities?
- What are the lessons for the future (what worked well and less well, and more widely)?

[29] Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (2008). *The Government's approach to public dialogue on science and technology*. http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/publications/

Appendix 2. Event Questionnaire Analysis

Key findings

Pre-event questionnaire

Demographics of event attendees

- A majority of attendees were from NGOs or the voluntary sector. The second most represented group at the events were business representatives.
- Overall, the most represented age-range at the events were in the 55-64 category, however Nottingham had equal representation from the age categories of 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64. In London, the most represented age category were aged between 45 and 54.
- The least represented age range were from the 17-24 and 25-34 categories.
- In terms of ethnic background, a majority of event attendees were White (90.4%), the next most represented ethnic background being Black (6%).

Key themes from qualitative feedback

- The main motivation for people attending the events was out of an interest in the areas being covered. Also, people wanted to learn more about the area of climate change, what the governments stance is on this area, and take the learning back to their communities and organisations.

  'What I learn today could be of interest to the membership of the SE London Chamber of Commerce'

  '[I am] interested in learning more and seeing the direction government policy is looking at for green house gas emissions'

- As a result, most attendees hoped that by attending the events, the main advantage would be to gain a better understanding of the issues around climate change and energy efficiency, whilst being able to find solutions to some of the problems surrounding these issues. Many attendees in London also hoped that the events would results in behaviour change amongst the individuals that attended, and also saw the events as an opportunity to influence the government's thinking in the area of energy and climate change.

  '[I want to gain] knowledge of other and ideas of how to improve [the] future for family and friend'

'[The event should] help the focus on increasing public awareness and drive effective policy change' – London attendee

- In terms of taking something back from the events to the people they represented, a majority of attendees across all locations wanted to share information about climate change and energy efficiency and ways of tackling the problems around these issues.

  '[I'd like to take back] information, approaches to education and institutional change'

  '[I'd like to take back] information about current thinking / policy and how people can become involved'

Key themes from quantitative feedback

- A majority event attendees were fairly satisfied with the materials they had received so far.
- Attendees of the Nottingham and Cumbria events were not very clear about the purpose of the process at this point, whereas London attendees were fairly clear.
- A majority event attendees were very confident with using a computer and the internet.
- A majority of attendees from Nottingham and Cumbria were fairly concerned about climate change wheras a majority of attendees going to the London event were very concerned. Overall, a majority of the event attendees were very concerned about climate change.

Post-event questionnaire

Key themes from qualitative feedback

- With regard to the 2050 pathways calculator, a majority of attendees thought it could be improved, in particular clarifying some of the implicit assumptions that the calculations were based on. A number of attendees from Cumbria and London felt that the calculator was a useful tool for raising awareness an increase knowledge of energy issues, but were overwhelmed by the scale of the challenge that the calculator presented to them.

  '[There was a] lack of transparency and choice regarding the underlying assumptions. At times it felt that we were being railroaded. [The] open web calculator sheet on [the] DECC website may well answer these points'

  'I have ticked 'neither agree or disagree' on some of the boxes because today has just reconfirmed to me that issues of energy usage and supply are very complicated and will impact different groups in society differently. Therefore we need to think carefully about choices we can make in the future and right now I am very confused so had to tick the ambiguous box' – Cumbria attendee

'I picked up knowledge on some areas of electrification and possible changes' – London attendee

- For all attendees, the best part of the events was firstly, the range and depth of discussions they were able to have with other event attendees and secondly, using the 2050 Pathways calculator.

  'For me the group discussions and better understanding other peoples opinion about these issues have inspired me to be more focussed and vocal about my own opinions, and to work harder to share these options with other people in the community' – Cumbria attendee

  'The software is great. It is fantastic to know the government has developed this and is continuing to refine' – London attendee

- The main thing that attendees liked the least about the event was the format of the day, where many felt that there was too much information crammed into too little time. The venue where the events were was the second biggest issue for attendees of the London and Cumbria events, in particular, the catering was the most mentioned problem with there being a lack of there being a vegetarian or vegan option. For Nottingham, the second biggest issue was the timing of the event, with it being held late in the evening.

  'The lack of time to properly discuss complex issues and the limited space allowed for more subjective or political topics. I also think it would be good if more information were provided to take to the community and hand outs' – Cumbria attendee

- All attendees felt that the two key ways in which the events could be improved could be to firstly, change the format of the event, making it longer to allow a fuller coverage of all the issues as well as more detailed discussions. Secondly, all attendees thought that being provided with some advance information about the issues being covered by the event would have been helpful.

  '[The event could be improved by having] more time and more information provided to share today's events with the community. More representatives in the younger age groups' – Cumbria attendee

  'It suggested we didn't need to have experience of green issues and energy methods before attending, but I think it would have been useful for workshop discussion' – Cumbria attendee

Key themes from quantitative feedback

- As opposed to attendees of the London and Cumbria event, many attendees to the Nottingham event disagreed that there was enough time for them to say everything that they wanted to, implying that time restrictions were a particular factor for this event location.
- A majority of all event attendees agreed with the following general statements :
  - The information provided was clear and easy to understand

  - I would have liked more information in advance
  - I have been able to discuss the issues that concern me
  - There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to
  - I enjoyed taking part
  - Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about these issues
  - Attending this event has reinforced the views I already had
  - Attending this event made no difference to my views
- A majority of attendees either strongly agreed or agreed that as a result of attending the event, they learnt something they did not know before.
- A majority of all attendees disagreed that attending the event made a difference to their views.
- For both London and Nottingham event attendees, a majority neither agreed nor disagreed with the following statement: 'It is clear to me how the results of this process will be collected and used'.
- With regards to the 2050 pathways calculator, a majority of event attendees agreed with the following statements :
  - Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to learn something I did not know before
  - Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to think more clearly about these issues
  - I changed my views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator
  - I enjoyed using the calculator
  - I found the calculator easy to use
  - Using the 2050 pathways calculator has enabled me to arrive at my own preferred solution for how I would meet the 2050 target
  - I feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community
  - I feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community
- A majority of attendees of the Nottingham event did disagree that they had changed their views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator.

- A majority of event attendees found the following aspects of the events either helpful or fairly helpful :
    - The 2050 pathways calculator
    - The moderators
    - Other participants
    - Group discussions
    - One page summary of the four big themes, e.g. energy efficiency; electrification of demand
    - Technical help offered by the moderators and DECC
- A majority of attendees of the Nottingham and Cumbria event were fairly satisfied with the structure and organisation of their events, whereas a majority of attendees of the London event were very satisfied.
- A majority of all event attendees felt that the purpose of this process at this point was fairly clear.

Data

Demographics of event attendees

Role

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
NGO/voluntary sector	20	12	8	40
Business representative	9	3	3	15
Parish councillor	0	8	1	9
County councillor	0	3	3	6
Chair of Community Group	0	0	4	4
District councillor	0	3	0	3
Borough councillor	2	1	0	3
Elected representative	2	0	0	2
Other*	6	1	0	7

*Other includes: City councillor, Council, Community representative, local

environmentalist, School governor, LA member, Artist in the Community

Age

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
17-24	0	2	0	2
25-34	8	1	0	9
35-44	6	2	4	12
45-54	14	5	4	23
55-64	9	11	4	24
65+	2	5	3	10

Ethnicity

0	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total	% Total
WHITE	32	26	17	75	90.4
BLACK	5	0	0	5	6.0
MIXED	1	0	0	1	1.2
ASIAN	0	0	1	1	1.2
OTHER	1	0	0	1	1.2

Pre-event questionnaire results

Key:
Highest number
Lowest number

1. Why have you decided to get involved in this process?

	as a community representative	concern about climate change	influence government	interest	invited	learn	related to work	voice heard / share
Cumbria	0	5	2	9	4	3	1	9
London	6	2	7	10	3	16	2	9
Notts	4	4	2	4	3	3	0	2
Grand Total	12	11	11	23	10	22	3	20

2. What do you hope this process will achieve?

	behaviour change	better understanding of issues around climate / energy	contribute to dialogue	find solutions	influence government	lack of clarity	local discussions	networking	not sure	raise awareness	share knowledge
Cumbria	3	19	4	5	5	0	1	0	1	3	3
London	7	20	6	7	7	1	1	1	0	5	1
Notts	3	6	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	0
Grand Total	13	45	13	15	13	1	2	1	2	11	4

3. What do you hope to get out of this process personally?

	better understanding of issues around climate / energy	funding	networking	not sure	raise awareness	take something back to community	views are heard	what I can do to help
Cumbria	20	0	1	0	0	0	2	9
London	29	0	3	0	0	3	2	4
Notts	13	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Grand Total	62	1	5	1	1	3	4	13

4. What do you hope to get out of this process to take back to the people you represent?

	contacts	information	information about DECC policy	not much	not sure	save money	what we can do to help
Cumbria	0	18	1	0	2	0	10
London	1	24	0	1	0	1	13
Notts	0	10	0	0	1	0	5
Grand Total	1	52	1	1	3	1	28

5. How satisfied are you with the materials you have received so far?

Key:
Highest number of responses
Lowest number of responses

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very satisfied	6	0	0	6
Fairly satisfied	21	16	10	47
Not very satisfied	5	3	1	9
Not at all satisfied	1	1	1	3
Don't know	4	3	2	9

6. How clear are you about the purpose of this process at this point?

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very clear	3	1	2	6
Fairly clear	18	8	5	31
Not very clear	15	14	7	36
Not at all clear	2	2	1	5
Don't know	0	1	0	1

7. How confident do you feel about using a computer – for example, using the internet?

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very confident	26	15	10	51
Fairly confident	9	9	4	22
Not very confident	2	1	0	3
Not at all confident	0	2	0	2
Don't know	0	0	0	0

8. How concerned are you, if at all, about Climate Change?

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very concerned	34	7	7	48
Fairly concerned	5	15	8	28
Not very concerned	0	2	2	4
Not at all concerned	0	1	0	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0
No opinion	0	0	0	0
Other (please say how you feel)	0	0	More concerned on over use of resources	2
			Partner	

Post-event questionnaire results

1. Overall event ratings

Key:
Highest number of responses
Lowest number of responses

LONDON	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The information provided was clear and easy to understand	6	28	3	1	0	0
I would have liked more information in advance	11	11	12	4	0	0
I have been able to discuss the issues that concern me	10	21	5	2	0	0
There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to	5	24	4	5	0	0
It is clear to me how the results of this process will be collected and used	1	16	18	3	0	0
I enjoyed taking part	15	20	3	0	0	0
I learnt something I did not know before	20	15	3	0	0	0
It is clear to me how the results from this process will be collected and used	3	16	13	6	0	0
Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about these issues	12	22	4	0	0	0
Attending this event has reinforced the views I already had	7	16	13	2	0	0
Attending this event made no difference to my views	1	5	9	18	5	0
I changed my views as a result of attending this event	1	18	9	9	0	0

CUMBRIA	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The information provided was clear and easy to understand	3	15	7	2	0	0
I would have liked more information in advance	3	17	4	3	0	0
I have been able to discuss the issues that concern me	7	18	0	1	1	0
There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to	6	14	2	4	1	0
It is clear to me how the results of this process will be collected and used	5	8	4	6	3	1
I enjoyed taking part	8	19	0	0	0	0
I learnt something I did not know before	14	12	1	0	0	0
It is clear to me how the results from this process will be collected and used	2	6	8	5	1	1
Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about these issues	9	14	4	0	0	0
Attending this event has reinforced the views I already had	5	12	5	5	0	0
Attending this event made no difference to my views	1	4	6	12	4	0
I changed my views as a result of attending this event	1	11	10	5	0	0

NOTTS	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The information provided was clear and easy to understand	0	11	5	1	0	0
I would have liked more information in advance	6	8	1	1	0	1
I have been able to discuss the issues that concern me	2	15	1	0	0	0
There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to	2	6	3	6	0	0
It is clear to me how the results of this process will be collected and used	0	5	6	3	1	0
I enjoyed taking part	4	13	1	0	0	0
I learnt something I did not know before	6	8	2	1	0	0
Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about these issues	6	8	2	2	0	0
Attending this event has reinforced the views I already had	3	7	7	1	0	0
Attending this event made no difference to my views	0	4	3	10	1	0
I changed my views as a result of attending this event	1	6	5	5	1	0

TOTAL	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The information provided was clear and easy to understand	9	54	15	4	0	0
I would have liked more information in advance	20	36	17	8	0	1
I have been able to discuss the issues that concern me	19	54	6	3	1	0
There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to	13	44	9	15	1	0
It is clear to me how the results of this process will be collected and used	6	29	28	12	4	1
I enjoyed taking part	27	52	4	0	0	0
I learnt something I did not know before	40	35	6	1	0	0
Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about these issues	11	30	23	13	1	1
Attending this event has reinforced the views I already had	24	43	15	1	0	0
Attending this event made no difference to my views	12	32	21	17	1	0
I changed my views as a result of attending this event	3	15	20	35	10	0

2. What do you think about the 2050 pathways calculator?

LONDON	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to learn something I did not know before	13	24	1	0	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to think more clearly about these issues	15	20	3	0	0	0
I changed my views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator	3	21	11	3	0	0
I enjoyed using the calculator	8	24	4	2	0	0
I found the calculator easy to use	3	27	5	3	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has enabled me to arrive at my own preferred solution for how I would meet the 2050 target	1	22	8	5	2	0
I feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	5	23	5	4	1	0
I feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	4	20	19	3	0	0

CUMBRIA	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to learn something I did not know before	7	16	2	0	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to think more clearly about these issues	8	16	2	0	0	0
I changed my views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator	4	8	12	1	0	0
I enjoyed using the calculator	5	14	5	1	0	0
I found the calculator easy to use	4	13	7	0	1	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has enabled me to arrive at my own preferred solution for how I would meet the 2050 target	6	11	5	1	0	1
I feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	6	10	7	2	0	0
I feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	6	9	7	1	1	0

NOTTS	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to learn something I did not know before	5	11	2	0	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to think more clearly about these issues	5	8	5	0	0	0
I changed my views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator	1	5	5	7	0	0
I enjoyed using the calculator	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	11	2	2	0	0
I found the calculator easy to use	1	8	4	4	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has enabled me to arrive at my own preferred solution for how I would meet the 2050 target	1	9	4	4	0	0
I feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	2	7	6	2	0	0
I feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	1	6	6	5	0	0

TOTAL	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to learn something I did not know before	25	51	5	0	0	0
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has helped me to think more clearly about these issues	28	44	10	0	0	0
I changed my views as a result of using the 2050 pathways calculator	8	34	28	11	0	0
I enjoyed using the calculator	13	38	9	3	0	0
	9	51	14	5	1	0
I found the calculator easy to use	8	41	17	10	2	1
Using the 2050 pathways calculator has enabled me to arrive at my own preferred solution for how I would meet the 2050 target	12	42	16	10	1	0
I feel motivated to use the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	12	36	32	6	1	0
I feel confident in using the 2050 pathways calculator with my own community	1	6	6	5	0	0

3. Is there anything you would like to add about what you learnt from using the 2050 pathways calculator today?

	2050 target challlenge	assumptions	cumulative impact	difficulties	improve calculator	not enough time	positive/ liked the calculator	prior information	raised awareness/ increased knowledge	range of options available	scale of the challenge	working with other participants
Cumbria	2	0	1	2	4	0	1	0	3	1	3	0
London	0	11	0	1	11	0	0	0	3	0	1	2
Notts	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0
Grand Total	2	13	1	3	15	2	2	1	6	1	5	2

4. How useful did you find each of the following in helping you to understand the issues?

LONDON	Very helpful	Fairly helpful	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful	Don't know
The 2050 pathways calculator	16	18	1	0	0
The moderators	22	13	0	0	0
Other participants	23	12	0	0	0
Group discussions	21	13	1	0	0
One page summary of the four big themes, e.g. energy efficiency; electrification of demand	15	19	1	0	0
Technical help offered by the moderators and DECC	28	6	0	0	0
Other one page resources, please specify:	4	1	0	0	2
Other - please specify:	1	0	0	0	2

CUMBRIA	Very helpful	Fairly helpful	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful	Don't know
The 2050 pathways calculator	12	9	1	0	0
The moderators	16	6	0	0	0
Other participants	9	9	2	2	0
Group discussions	13	6	1	2	0
One page summary of the four big themes, e.g. energy efficiency; electrification of demand	11	11	0	0	0
Technical help offered by the moderators and DECC	15	6	1	0	0
Other one page resources, please specify:	4	2	2	0	1
Other - please specify:	0	0	0	0	0
Larger font would enhance use	2	0	1	0	1

NOTTS	Very helpful	Fairly helpful	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful	Don't know
The 2050 pathways calculator	3	8	3	0	0
The moderators	9	5	0	0	0
Other participants	5	7	2	0	0
Group discussions	5	8	0	0	0
One page summary of the four big themes, e.g. energy efficiency; electrification of demand	2	12	0	0	0
Technical help offered by the moderators and DECC	9	5	0	0	0
Other one page resources, please specify:	0	4	0	0	1
Other - please specify:	0	1	0	0	1

TOTAL	Very helpful	Fairly helpful	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful	Don't know
The 2050 pathways calculator	31	35	5	0	0
The moderators	47	24	0	0	0
Other participants	37	28	4	2	0
Group discussions	39	27	2	2	0
One page summary of the four big themes, e.g. energy efficiency; electrification of demand	28	42	1	0	0
Technical help offered by the moderators and DECC	52	17	1	0	0
Other one page resources, please specify:	8	7	2	0	4
Other - please specify:	1	1	0	0	3

5. How satisfied were you with the structure and organisation of the event?

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very satisfied	19	9	4	32
Fairly satisfied	16	13	9	38
Not very satisfied	1	0	0	1
Not at all satisfied	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

6. What was the best part of the event you attended?

	discussions with other participants	government engagement / contribution	learning	positive	Using the 2050 Pathway Calculator	Big themes	Networking
London	8	1	3	0	4	1	
Notts	4	1	3	2	3		
Cumbria	15	4	7	-	4	2	1
Grand Total	27	6	11	2	11	3	1

7. What was the worst thing about the event?

	2050 Pathway calculator	format of the day	group discussions	IT	positioning of the event	pressure to achieve the 2050 target	prior information	target groups	time of day	venue
Cumbria	0	5	2	1	4	3	3	2	0	6
London	4	2	2	5	1	0	3	0	0	5
Notts	1	5	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	1
Grand Total	5	12	5	7	6	3	7	2	4	12

8. What would improve events like this?

	format of event	government participation	info to share with community	IT	not sure	positioning of the event	prior information	target groups	venue
Cumbria	5	1	1	0	1	1	4	3	3
London	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	3
Notts	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2
Grand Total	17	1	1	3	1	1	12	4	8

9. How clear are you about the purpose of this process at this point?

	London	Cumbria	Notts	Total
Very clear	9	6	6	21
Fairly clear	21	13	9	43
Not very clear	6	4	0	10
Not at all clear	0	1	0	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0