

WHAT IS THE IMPACT AND LEGACY OF CLIMATE ASSEMBLIES?

Draft research briefing, 1 June 2021

Stuart Capstick and Daniel Thorman, Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, Cardiff University

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 **Please do not cite this draft briefing without permission of the authors.** Please send any comments on the draft to info@knoca.eu.*

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

1. Key insights

- The impact and legacy of climate assemblies range from immediate and specific impacts (e.g. a concrete policy proposal implemented by government) through to longer-term and more wide-ranging legacies (e.g. heightened awareness of climate change among a population; institutionalisation of deliberative methods).
- A primary objective of climate assemblies has been impact on policy making, with relatively little sustained effort to consider other immediate and longer-term impacts.
- Involving a diverse range of actors brings about a more significant influence over time. Finding ways to engage the public, industry, business, and media, for example, is likely to result in greater impact and continued legacy within these respective sectors of civil society.
- It is useful to distinguish between different approaches to impact and legacy of climate assemblies: normative (participation is the right thing to do), instrumental (it is better way to achieve particular ends) and substantive (it leads to better ends). There is evidence that climate assemblies have had influence in all these areas, although this is not consistent.
- The ultimate test of the impact and legacy of climate assemblies is the extent to which they raise ambition and achieve real change in climate policy and decarbonisation. It is often argued that citizens' assemblies are able to achieve more radical measures than could be accomplished in their absence. There is conversely the risk that they might serve to consolidate mainstream policy and sideline more radical demands. Much depends on

the transparency and methods of expert-led agendas, and the encouragement of openness and inclusivity in citizen-led processes.

2. Recommendations

- Careful consideration of the different pathways to impact and legacy needs to be built into the commissioning, design and implementation of climate assemblies, otherwise opportunities for transformation will be lost.
- A consideration of normative, instrumental and substantive perspectives on impact and legacy can lead to a broader spectrum of outcomes.
- Engagement with the wider public, including beyond the lifespan of a particular assembly, should be integral to the process of climate assemblies. Examples include commitments from authorising bodies to respond publicly to assembly outcomes and establishing a robust media and communications strategy. This has the potential to contribute to a ripple effect beyond assembly members and engaged actors.
- Given the potential for wider influence beyond policy-making, future climate deliberation should be alert to how impact and legacy can be achieved across civil society.
- Further research is needed to understand the nature of the different pathways to impact and legacy, not least the barriers to achieving them in different forms.
- KNOCA and other relevant bodies should support work to develop an impact evaluation framework that could inform the commissioning, design, implementation and evaluations of climate assemblies.

3. Introduction

Climate assemblies are intended to be mechanisms for change. As such, it is critical to establish an understanding of the types of impact and legacy that can arise from them. An appreciation of the outcomes that can be achieved from climate deliberation can help to ensure good practice – as well as the strategic use of recommendations that arise from them.

In this briefing paper we review the evidence base on citizen deliberation in relation to the influence that they generate. We focus largely on recent studies that have looked at these processes in the context of considering climate action.

We make use of a rapid evidence review in order to draw out the central ideas and insights from the academic and wider literature. This enables us to provide a summary of some of the most recent and relevant literature on climate assemblies, with a focus on identifying the range and types of impact and legacy that can be associated with them.

Because climate assemblies themselves are a new and still-developing approach to tackling the climate crisis, clear evidence of legacy and impact is limited. Indeed, in more general terms there has rarely been a concerted effort to consider the immediate or longer-term impact of citizens' assemblies (Schöenwalder, 2020); furthermore, the longer-term impacts of citizen assemblies may not be apparent for some years after their implementation (Bryant & Stone, 2020). Tracing the genesis of policy to a particular exercise in citizen deliberation is

similarly problematic. Nevertheless, there remains the tantalising prospect that climate deliberation can trigger innovative and ambitious action in this area.

In this briefing, we outline some of the broad principles for identifying legacy and impact. We consider both the more immediate outcomes that can arise from climate deliberation and the longer-term influence of these processes. In a future iteration of this paper, we will include insights from interviews with practitioners and experts in this field

For the most part, the involvement of citizens in deliberation about social issues has tended to focus on generation and refinement of policy (Farrel et al., 2019; Gerwin, 2018; Gerwin & Gąsiorowska, 2020). While remaining an important aim for climate deliberation, the nature of the climate crisis is such that consideration of a wider remit for its influence is warranted. These include changing the nature of public engagement, raising the profile of climate change in the media, and drawing wider attention to citizen involvement in enabling emissions reduction. In this briefing we aim to draw attention to a wider range of influence beyond policy, and to encourage practitioners to utilise climate assemblies in a way that reaches their maximum potential. This is especially relevant when considering the climate mitigation objectives of citizen engagement, where more ambitious policy remains a pressing need.

Existing perspectives on impact and legacy

One of the most comprehensive frameworks for understanding citizen participation and deliberative democracy has been undertaken by the OECD (2020), which reviewed 289 case-studies across a range of topic areas and geographical locations. The OECD employed four categories from Nabatchi et al.'s (2012) evaluation framework for deliberative processes, two of which are relevant to considerations of impact. The first of these states the importance of *influential recommendations*, in terms of "the evidence of impact on public decision making" (OECD, 2020, p. 81), in relation to the implementation of recommendations (OECD, 2020, p. 103). Impact upon policy-making and policy implementation are key areas for citizen assemblies in general. This said, the impacts of citizen deliberation can be understood in broader terms: Nabatchi et al. (2012) describe this as *impact on the wider public*, in relation to "the secondary and long-term effects on efficacy and public attitudes." (OECD, 2020, p. 81).

While the OECD report is a useful resource for examining how citizen assemblies can effect change, we aim to move beyond its notion of impact. We outline ideas of impact and legacy of relevance to climate action and present a broader framework for considering how citizen involvement can bring about a range of action on climate change.

4. Rapid Evidence Review

Methods

To capture the key literature in relation to citizen deliberation on climate change, we undertook a rapid evidence review. Use of the search terms “citizen assembly” and “climate” / “climate assembly” in *Google Scholar* yielded 254 search results, of which 72 were considered relevant to review in detail. Further sorting of articles led to 25 papers and reports which had a key focus on the impact of climate assemblies and/or climate assemblies. This review approach does not aim to be exhaustive, rather its aim is to identify core themes and ideas in relation to the impact and legacy of climate assemblies. In addition to material identified through the rapid evidence review, further prominent studies were also incorporated.

5. Identifying impact and legacy

Action on climate change can be considered both in terms of immediate and concrete measures, as well as longer-term shifts in how society understands and responds to it.

In relation to action on climate change, the *impact* of citizen deliberation is best understood as the near-term, concrete outcomes arising from a particular process. The *legacy* of climate deliberation is best understood as the wider influence that can be achieved, over a period of months or years.

Impact

The impact of climate deliberation has been most commonly understood in terms of influence on policymaking or decisions taken by statutory authorities, including government at local and national levels. In this vein, the OECD presents impact as a result of “deliberative process [that] were commissioned by a public authority”; Wells et al. (2021) likewise frame the influence of climate deliberation in terms of recommendations being adopted in the policy domain:

“an immediate response by the commissioning body, formal acceptance of the recommendations by the authority, the appearance of a recommendation in policy documents or work programmes, or the actual implementation of the recommendation”

In order to achieve meaningful impact, Schöenwalder (2020) argues that there needs to be “at a minimum, a formal commitment from policymakers to consider the inputs received and report back on any steps taken as a result.” This recognises that the outcomes of an assembly require some level of buy-in from policy-makers to adopt – or at least seriously consider – the recommendations arising from citizens’ deliberation. In the case of the Irish Citizens’ Assembly 2016-2018, the establishment of a dedicated parliamentary committee to respond

to its recommendations can be considered to have fulfilled this aim at least to some extent (Devaney et al., 2020). Likewise, the commitment from President Macron of France (which for many commentators was later watered down) that measures generated by the Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat would be subject to a national referendum or incorporated into legislation or regulation represents a level of promised impact embedded into the process itself.

These perspectives on impact make clear that influence on policy is a critically important objective of climate deliberation. However, the nature of climate action is such that the involvement of wider civil society is required for successful emissions reduction. In the UK, the Committee on Climate Change increasingly recognises the role of behavioural responses to tackle emissions. The United Nations Environment Program has likewise emphasised the role of lifestyle change for emissions reduction, driven by a variety of processes including shifting cultural norms, business innovation, and a range of action by citizens.

Whilst the stated aims of climate deliberation – including in recent national climate assemblies in France and the UK – have been to inform policymaking, it is clear nonetheless that several subsidiary aims have also been incorporated. For example, CAUK employed a team of media liaison officers to publicise its work, and the Convention Citoyenne implemented an additional public-facing online platform to which a broader range of citizens could contribute. The presence of elected representatives at local and national climate deliberation processes reflects a wider interest in political circles in the work of these initiatives. Many environmental NGOs have also taken a keen interest in climate deliberation, including through participation in them at the design stage, as advisory members, or in giving evidence. It is appropriate therefore to consider the impact of climate deliberation in terms of influence upon these parties, as well as formal policymaking.

Legacy

Beyond the more immediate influence of climate deliberation, there is also an express need to consider its longer-term legacy. In the same way that climate mitigation and adaptation policy requires fundamental shifts and changes to society and everyday life, deliberative democracy practitioners have argued that more enduring change is needed in the ways that civil society engages with governance and decision-making. An important legacy of climate deliberation in this context is a shift in the ways that civil society is more actively involved with charting a course towards a low-carbon society.

This legacy of climate deliberation can be achieved in part through extending the climate conversation to greater numbers of the public, and beyond the timeline of the assembly procedures (Geib, 2020). There has been a recognition of the value in doing this by using the occurrence of a climate assembly as a form of conversation starter, enabling engagement beyond the necessarily small number of participants able to participate directly in formal climate deliberation (Wells, Howarth, & Brand-correa, 2021). Scotland's Climate Assembly

engaged in active outreach to promote deliberations in the Children’s Parliament and across schools. The recent Global Assembly initiative is taking this a step further this through inviting participation of civil society in climate deliberation through schools, community groups and other organisations, in order to enable more broad-based engagement.¹

A further potential legacy from climate assemblies can be the integration of more deliberative approaches within formal bodies and institutions, such as local and devolved governments. As with other topic areas in which citizen deliberation has been carried out, practitioners have reported that a visible and successful process can act to persuade sometimes sceptical politicians and civil servants of the value of these methods. Indeed, one of the broader objectives for convening CAUK was that this might highlight the generalised value of citizen engagement to the policymaking process (Cherry et al., 2021). It has been argued that the Irish Citizens’ Assembly has given momentum to the continued practice of deliberation, with the accompanying opportunities for progress towards ambitious and new ways of debating and governing (Murdova, Walker, & Colli, 2020). In reviewing the ways in which the Irish citizens’ assembly informed subsequent work in its Scottish iteration, Cahillane (2020) has also argued its success lay in challenging dominant forms of political wisdom, such that “the real value of the Citizens’ Assembly model may lie in how it impacts on the political class”. Similarly, Niessen (2019) has argued that a core legacy of climate assemblies may be in their contribution to the transformation of our existing models of representative democracy.

While changing the shape of democratic processes will necessarily require support from the political class, such a shift towards a more deliberative ethos will also require a broader cultural shift in perspective, including public recognition and acceptability of such approaches (OECD, 2020; Geib, 2020). Emerging evidence suggests that there may indeed be relatively high levels of support for deliberative processes in the context of climate action (Steentjes et al., 2021).

The influence of participation in (climate) deliberation upon citizen assembly members themselves has often been evidenced in several studies, and this experience has often been presented as a positive, even life-affirming experience (Werner & Muradova, 2020). While not an explicit aim of climate deliberation, the enthusiastic involvement of citizens in informing climate policy – not an activity typically associated with non-experts – can have ripple effects in terms of raising the legitimacy of deliberative processes among the wider population (Ibid.). Some scenario-experiments have found heightened acceptance of climate policy recommendations where these were perceived to be linked to a deliberative process, in comparison to a control condition (Gastil et al., 2016).

¹ <https://globalassembly.org/>

6. Types of impact and legacy

While climate deliberation has the potential to bring about both short and long-term influences across a number of areas, it is useful to consider the various *motives* and *functions* in accomplishing impact and legacy. There is the potential for climate deliberation to be used for three broad purposes: to ensure active participation of citizens in climate policy; to help existing plans to become more acceptable or achievable; and to develop more innovative and creative solutions to the climate crisis. These three approaches have been characterised in the long-standing literature on public engagement in terms of *normative, instrumental and substantive* rationales, as articulated by Stirling (2005):

“From a normative view, participation is the right thing to do. From an instrumental perspective, it is a better way to achieve particular ends. In substantive terms it leads to better ends.” (Stirling, 2005, p. 220)

Normative approaches are compatible with a ‘democracy-driven governance’ whereby participation, inclusivity, and widespread democratic representation are emphasised (Bua & Bussu, 2020). Instrumental approaches can be most useful for legitimising policy as a means of ensuring decisive action, and can be termed as ‘governance-driven democracy’ (Ibid.). Finally, substantive approaches are defined by their contribution towards a more effective and/or ambitious outcomes, in relation to climate mitigation and adaptation.

The following subsections will explore literature from the rapid evidence review and explore what we mean by these varying typologies of impact and legacy, and how they result from different types of practical application of the process, as well as the different roles they have in terms of contribution to outcomes of a climate assembly.

Normative rationales for climate deliberation

Far-reaching social transformations will accompany emissions reductions of the scale and speed needed to align policy with commitments such as those made by governments under the Paris Accord. There are implications of climate mitigation in many areas of everyday life – including mobility, food, material consumption and international aviation. In any democratic society, this presents a strong *normative* case for meaningful citizen engagement in climate-relevant decision-making.

A normative perspective on climate deliberation emphasises the need for a diverse range of voices to be heard in order to re-connect the public with legislative and governing bodies, and to provide an opportunity for citizens and decision-makers to learn, participate, increase equality, provide social justice, and move towards a more emancipatory democracy (Devaney et al., 2020; Dryzek et al., 2019; Farrell et al., 2019; Fournier et al., 2011; Stirling 2005).

While being justifiable in its own terms, normative rationales for climate deliberation can also be directly linked to the attainment of impact and legacy. As Bryant and Stone (2020) argue, government can only achieve so much *without* wider citizen engagement:

“Local authorities can only go so far in reducing the climate impacts within their locality through their own actions – they require partnerships and collaboration with local businesses, institutions and of course the citizens.”

In this vein, and in the context of a local sustainable food assembly in York, UK, Doherty et al (2020) explain that actively engaging with citizens and stakeholders at all phases of the policy cycle creates the best opportunity for achieving impact. Outcomes arising from this assembly included increased membership of local food groups and attendance at sustainable food events. An inclusive membership within climate deliberation can increase their impact; in the context of York’s sustainable food assembly, proposals for the re-localisation of food provision were embedded in the unique community. This was seen as valuable and with proposals widely accepted due to the make-up of the assembly including local stakeholders and businesses (Doherty et al., 2020).

In terms of ensuring policy is representative of as diverse a range of voices as possible, the OECD (2020) emphasizes the need for deliberative processes to "gather buy-in from all stakeholders across the political spectrum so that it does not become wedded to one political grouping". The leaders of the UK’s Green Party have explicitly argued that the engagement of a diverse range of people in climate deliberation can be a valuable tool for government in being able to reflect a non-partisan representation of society’s views (Manley, Bartley & Swarbrick, 2020).

As well as being ‘the right thing to do’, normative approaches to climate deliberation can result in a more complete, practical and well-informed policy response; as Sandover et al. (2021) argue, citizen deliberation offers an opportunity for “extending democratic processes beyond ‘politics as usual,’ engaging a wider set of voices than ‘conventional’ public participation processes”. The case can also be made that certain groups in society have particular prominence in climate deliberation. For example, the inclusion of youth voices has the potential to be impactful in terms of developing ambitious policy, or by raising awareness through school strikes and climate marches, especially given the direct effects that climate action or inaction will have on their futures (Devaney et al., 2020).

Instrumental rationales for climate deliberation

A normative rationale for climate deliberation proceeds under the assumption that good democratic processes can enable desirable outcomes for climate action. An alternative slant on the purpose of climate deliberation, by contrast, is that this can enhance the acceptability of ambitious emissions reduction – that is, an instrumental rationale. As Sandover et al. (2021) argue, a citizens’ assembly can “provide legitimacy for the bold policy changes that might be required” on climate.

An instrumental mobilisation of climate assemblies can be understood as a way to increase the political legitimacy of policy, as a means to overcome political deadlock, or to make up for

a democratic deficit in policymaking. Muradova et al. (2020) similarly describe the value of climate deliberation in the following terms:

“a means of bringing credibility and legitimacy to political decision-making and tackling the disconnect between citizens and the unique challenges posed by climate change”

An instrumental focus in climate deliberation can be a clear route to policy impact. Of the nearly 140 policy recommendations produced by the UK’s Climate Assembly, close to 100 of these had been prepared in advance by experts and received almost universal support from citizens (Cherry et al., 2021). Headline findings arising from this climate deliberation included a ban on the sale of petrol and diesel cars in the near future, and dietary change to lower emissions. These policies and most others discussed were supported by citizens, but were nevertheless already firmly on the policy agenda; the assembly itself had the ability to strengthen their legitimacy through citizen appraisal. In terms of the wider publicity and media reporting of the climate assembly, the clear message conveyed – in quite deliberate terms – was that proposals had largely originated from citizens. For example, the BBC reported that the following recommendations had been ‘suggested’ (even though in practice they were selected from options devised by experts):

“A frequent flyer tax, phasing out polluting SUVs and restricting cars in city centres are among climate change solutions suggested by members of the public.”²

In the climate component of the Irish citizens assembly, too, many proposals were actively being considered or largely uncontroversial in policy circles, including increased investment in electric vehicles and active travel, and a socially just transition (Devaney et al., 2019).

An instrumental approach to climate deliberation clearly has advantages for advancing climate policy – and as such for enabling impact and legacy. However, it is problematic to view climate deliberation primarily as an exercise to provide public legitimacy for policy that is already on the political agenda, rather than to create new knowledge through an inclusive conversation with citizens (Wakeford et al., 2015; Wells, Howarth, & Brand-correa, 2021).

Climate assemblies have not always set out with an explicitly instrumental aim; rather, it may become the de facto outcome of a largely ‘expert-led’ process, in which the agenda and proposals under consideration are pre-prepared. Nevertheless, there is a risk that an instrumental approach largely serves the power hierarchies that already exist, which risks “denying citizens the opportunity to present their own solutions to issues” (Bryant & Stone, 2020). Analysis of the Devon climate assembly from Sandover et al. (2021) also questioned the legitimacy of its approach for similar reasons, asking the question “whose voice and whose knowledge are listened to?” Where the participatory process is utilised in a largely instrumental way, there is a tendency to work within explored territory, and seek the reiteration of existing knowledge. Although policy influence can arise, Sandover et al. (2021)

² <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-54087176>

point out that this type of process will remain constrained by existing expectations, and so likely to fall short of more decisive action, with the potential that ‘business as usual’ prevails.

Beyond policy formulation, climate deliberation can serve an instrumental function through bringing home to the wider public the extent of the need to take difficult action to reduce emissions. As Sandover et al. (2021) observe, a climate assembly can be viewed as an opportunity for public education and promoting behaviour change. As these authors note:

“[an] assembly can be seen, to some degree, as an instrumental tool to foster behavioural change, as much as the re-configuring of power relations between citizens and elected politicians.”

Substantive rationales for climate deliberation

Given the need for ambitious and radical social change, and for widespread transformation of industry, business, and individual lifestyles, there is a major opportunity – and arguably, obligation – for climate assemblies to pursue impact and legacy that are commensurate with the challenges we face. An important development in acknowledging the scale and urgency of this has been the declaration of climate emergencies, and the commitments of national and local governments to their net-zero carbon targets, which climate assemblies have played a large role in facilitating (Manley, Bartley & Swarbrick, 2020). One of the main arguments for climate deliberation is that it is able to raise ambition and lead to more radical policy measures – both of which are clearly needed for rapid and near-term emissions reduction:

“Citizen assemblies and other deliberative fora can boost public support and provide legitimacy for ambitious climate policy [...] policy recommendations were ‘significantly more radical than many expected’ (Torney & O’Gorman, 2019)

A substantive rationale for climate deliberation is that this can lead to both better and more ambitious policy. Indeed, both the UK and French climate assemblies have led to provocative recommendations that could not have been envisaged at the start of those processes.

In the UK, a session provided to enable citizens to devise their own proposals led to the recommendation that there be more transparency in the relationship between energy companies and government, the need to achieve net zero without offsetting emissions elsewhere in the world, and the need for an ongoing relationship between government and citizens through regular deliberative processes – this last proposal itself implying a legacy of deliberation through its continuation. The Irish citizens’ assembly featured a recommendation to decarbonise the public sector, which was adopted by the health department (Kirk, Grenfell & Muraga, 2021). In France, citizens proposed a law of ecocide, a ban on short-haul domestic flights, and an amendment to the Republic’s constitution. While Macron’s commitment to receive recommendations ‘without filter’ has proved less radical than originally understood, a number of substantive proposals from the Convention have

been incorporated in a Climate Bill – although there remains controversy about the extent to which some aspects have been ignored or diluted in the process.

At the local level, the Oxford, UK, climate assembly led to a climate emergency budget which provided £18m funds for a zero-carbon plan (Bryant & Stone, 2020); Oxford city council formally recognised the role of their climate assembly in raising ambition to reach net zero. In a similar way to the UK climate assembly, the Oxford process also proposed action on the role of lobbyists from the fossil fuel industry (Wells, Howarth, & Brand-correa, 2021). This has also been echoed in other climate assemblies, whereby some of the more ambitious scenarios for climate mitigation are supported by citizens (Ipsos MORI, 2019; Wells, Howarth, & Brand-correa, 2021).

In addition to obtaining unexpected and creative approaches to tackling climate action, a further substantive outcome from these processes can be a heightened level and quality of media reporting. McGovern and Thorne's (2020) pre- post- analysis of media reportage in Ireland, across four distinct types of outlet, showed that the media sought more expert advice, reported climate change issues in a more neutral way, and wrote stories that were more grounded in evidence. In the UK, the BBC have recently aired a documentary about the process of the Climate Assembly UK, which will serve to reach a far larger audience than that of typical knowledge and communication streams of local and national government.

The importance of communicating beyond the participants is recognised in the OECD (2020) document, where it stresses that communication has the potential to engage the broader public, and this could be achieved through the appointment of a dedicated press officer, or similarly media-facing role. Geib (2020) states that building an engagement with the media and public into the formal process of a climate assembly has the potential to increase long-term impact. Niemeyer and Jennstal (2018) stress that the media is a key component to the deliberative method, and should be well-integrated into design and dissemination.

In the case of smaller, local assemblies, there is often less traction in creating wider public engagement, and they typically ignored in the national media (Ercan & Hendriks, 2013; Sintomer & Maillard, 2007; as cited in Geib, 2020). Interviews with practitioners and expert panel members involved in the Devon Climate Assembly revealed that many stakeholders expressed how important a concurrent communication campaign was. This was in order to ensure that the wider community of Devon were part of the conversation, and were also exposed to the knowledge sharing that the participants themselves experienced (Sandover, Mosely, & Devine-Wright, 2021).

Capturing impact and legacy across sectors

Climate deliberation to date has led to impact and legacy across a range of areas, although with a strong emphasis on policymaking.

One area for future attention concerns the ways in which climate assemblies can exert influence more widely across civil society. This is particularly important for action on climate change, which requires participation at all scales and from a wide range of social actors. In Table 1, we summarise some of the ways in which impact and legacy can be achieved, and how this corresponds to the ‘instrumental-normative-substantive’ (INS) framework we have outlined.

Table 1. Impact and legacy of climate deliberation

Area of influence	Impact	Legacy	Link to INS typology
<i>Policy</i>	Tabling of legislation; refinement of statutory guidance; new laws and regulation	Attention to cross-cutting concerns of citizens when designing policy	Better climate policy (S) Prefigured policy becomes more viable (I) Policy co-designed with citizens (N)
<i>Politics</i>	Use of findings from climate deliberation to support arguments made in parliament	Enhanced recognition of citizen perspectives on climate action	Bridging gap between elected representatives and citizens (N)
<i>Public engagement</i>	Heightened awareness among public of climate policy	Enduring public interest and involvement in climate action	Enabling wider citizen participation in climate policy-making (N) More nuanced debate among the public about climate policy (S)
<i>Third sector and advisory bodies</i>	Expert incorporation of citizen recommendations in formal advice to policy-makers	Use of citizen recommendations by environmental NGOs to lobby government	Expert advice given additional weight where aligned with citizen views (I) Expert advice refined through citizen input (S)
<i>Media and communication</i>	Spike in reporting of climate topics at times of public deliberation	Recognition by media of interest and concern among general public for climate reporting	Media reporting takes into account citizen views (S) Citizen views used to support editorial line (I)

7. Future network activities

In the short term, this Research Briefing will be revised in light of interviews with practitioners and experts in the field and following feedback and consultation with KNOCA members.

In the medium term KNOCA is well placed to organise future events and commission research that teases out the different pathways to impact that citizens' assemblies could exploit. This should engage those with expertise in both climate policy and deliberative democracy, as well as specialists in different aspects of impact and legacy (e.g. media experts).

A longer-term aim would for KNOCA to develop an impact evaluation framework that could be applied to climate assemblies in two ways. First, to inform the commissioning, design and implementation of initiatives in ways that are cognisant with different approaches to impact and legacy. Second, to inform evaluations of climate assemblies, which tend to be focused on the direct impact of assemblies on participants and other immediate impacts on policy and media, rather than longer term considerations.

8. Bibliography

Beauvais, E., & Warren, M. E. (2019). What can deliberative mini-publics contribute to democratic systems? *European Journal of Political Research*, 58(3), 893–914. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12303>

Blue, G. (2015). Representing global public concern: A critical analysis of the danish participatory experiment on climate change. *Environmental Values*, 24(4), 445–464. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327114X13947900181077>

Bryant, P., & Stone, L. (2020). *Climate Assemblies and Juries*. 48. <https://pcancities.org.uk/sites/default/files/Shared-Future-PCAN-Climate-Assemblies-and-Juries-web.pdf>

Bua, A., & Bussu, S. (2020). Between governance-driven democratisation and democracy-driven governance: Explaining changes in participatory governance in the case of Barcelona. *European Journal of Political Research*, *Fung 2015*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12421>

Cahillane, L. (2020). Ireland as a learning experience for the Scottish citizens' assembly. *Edinburgh Law Review*, 24(1), 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.3366/elr.2020.0604>

Cherry, C., Capstick, S., Demski, C., Mellier-Wilson, C., Stone, L., & Verfuert, C. (2021). Citizens' climate assemblies: Understanding public deliberation for climate policy. *Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations*.

Devaney, L., Torney, D., Brereton, P., & Coleman, M. (2020). Ireland's Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change: Lessons for Deliberative Public Engagement and Communication. *Environmental Communication*, 14(2), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2019.1708429>

Devaney, L., Torney, D., Brereton, P., & Coleman, M. (2020). Ireland's Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change: Lessons for Deliberative Public Engagement and Communication. *Environmental Communication*, 14(2), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2019.1708429>

- Doherty, B., Sidhu, Y., Heron, T., West, C., Seaton, A., Gulec, J., Prado, P., & Flores Martinez, P. (2020). Citizen participation in food systems policy making: A case study of a citizens' assembly. *Emerald Open Research*, 2, 22. <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13609.1>
- Dryzek, J.S., Bächtiger, A., Chambers, S., Cohen, J., Druckman, J.N., Felicetti, A., Fishkin, J.S., Farrell, D.M., Fung, A., Gutmann, A. and Landemore, H., 2019. The crisis of democracy and the science of deliberation. *Science*, 363(6432), pp.1144-1146.
- Farrell, David, Curato, Nicole, Dryzek, John S., Geißel, Brigitte, Grönlund, Kimmo, Marien, Sofie, Niemeyer, Simon, Pilet, Jean-Benoit, Renwick, Alan, Rose, Jonathan, and Setälä, Maija. Deliberative Mini-Publics: Core Design Features. Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance working paper 2019/5. Canberra, Australia: Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance
- Fournier, P., Van Der Kolk, H., Carty, R.K., Carty, R.K., Blais, A. and Rose, J., 2011. *When citizens decide: Lessons from citizen assemblies on electoral reform*. Oxford University Press.
- Gastil, John, Elizabeth Rosenzweig, Katherine Knobloch, and David Brinker. 2016. "Does the Public Want Mini-Publics? Voter Responses to the Citizens' Initiative Review." *Communication and the Public* 1 (2): 174–192.
- Geib, J. (2021). *Dynamics of instituting mini-publics for a more participatory democracy Dynamics of instituting mini-publics for a more participatory democracy*. April.
- Gerwin, M. (2018). *Citizens' Assemblies: Guide to democracy that works*.
- Gerwin, M., & Gasiorowska, A. (2020). Rivendell Model: Rules and Procedures for Citizens' Assemblies. *Center for Climate Assemblies*.
- Ginanjar, W. R., & Mubarrok, A. Z. (2020). Civil Society and Global Governance: The Indirect Participation of Extinction Rebellion in Global Governance on Climate Change. *Journal of Contemporary Governance and Public Policy*, 1(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.46507/jcgpp.v1i1.8>
- Kirk, A., Grenfell, P., & Murage, P. (2021). A Planetary Health Perspective to Decarbonising Public Hospitals in Ireland: A Health Policy Report. *European Journal of Environment and Public Health*, 5(1), em0067. <https://doi.org/10.21601/ejeph/9368>
- Manly, P., Bartley, J., & Swarbrick, C. (2020). Green parties and environmental activism. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 11(3), 181–188. <https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2020.03.09>
- McGovern, R., & Thorne, P. (2020). Citizens assemble: a study on the impact of climate reporting in the Irish media 'before', 'during' and 'after' the Citizens' Assembly on 'how the state can make Ireland a leader in tackling climate change.' *Irish Political Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07907184.2020.1811970>
- Muradova, L., Walker, H., & Colli, F. (2020). Climate change communication and public engagement in interpersonal deliberative settings: evidence from the Irish citizens' assembly. *Climate Policy*, 20(10), 1322–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1777928>
- Nabatchi, T., Gastil, J., Leighninger, M. and Weiksner, G.M. eds., 2012. *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. Oxford University Press.
- Niemeyer, S. and Jennstål, J., 2018. Scaling up deliberative effects: Applying lessons of mini-publics. *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy*, pp.329-347.

- Niessen, C. (2019). When citizen deliberation enters real politics: how politicians and stakeholders envision the place of a deliberative mini-public in political decision-making. *Policy Sciences*, 52(3), 481–503. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-018-09346-8>
- OECD (2020). In *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/339306da-en>
- Sandover, R., Moseley, A., & Devine-wright, P. (2021). *Contrasting Views of Citizens ' Assemblies : Stakeholder Perceptions of Public Deliberation on Climate Change*. 9(2), 76–86. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v9i2.4019>
- Schönwälder, G. (2021). Engaging citizens to boost climate neutrality and greater circularity: opportunities and challenges for research and innovation. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 23(2), 483–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-020-01902-2>
- Steentjes, K., Demski, C., Seabrook, A., Corner, A. and Pidgeon, N., 2020. British public perceptions of climate risk, adaptation options and resilience (RESiL RISK): topline findings of a GB survey conducted in October 2019.
- Stirling, A., 2005. 15| Opening up or closing down? Analysis. *Science and citizens: Globalization and the challenge of engagement*, 2, p.218.
- Torney, D. and O’Gorman, R., 2019. A laggard in good times and bad? The limited impact of EU membership on Ireland’s climate change and environmental policy. *Irish Political Studies*, 34(4), pp.575-594.
- Wakeford, T., Pimbert, M. and Walcon, E., 2015. Re-fashioning citizens’ juries: Participatory democracy in action. *The SAGE handbook of action research*, pp.230-246.
- Wells, R., & Brand-correa, L. I. (n.d.). *Are citizen juries and assemblies on climate change driving democratic climate policymaking ? An exploration of two case studies in the United Kingdom*. 1–12.
- Werner, H., & Muradova, L. (2020). *Zooming in and Scaling up with Scenario Experiments*.
- White, S. (2020). Citizens’ Assemblies and Republican Democracy. *Radical Republicanism, December 2018*, 81–100. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198796725.003.0005>