


Evaluation of a citizens' panel for an accessible and affordable household vision of Net Zero

Impact Report, August 2025



Quality Management

URSUS Consulting Ltd has quality systems which have been assessed and approved to BS EN IS9001:2015 Certificate number GB2002687)

Creation / Revision History

Issue / revision:	V4
Date:	28.8.2025
Prepared by:	Anna MacGillivray, Hilary Livesey
Authorised by:	Anna MacGillivray
Project number:	U197
File reference:	URSUS impact report v4 28.8.2025

URSUS CONSULTING LTD
www.ursusconsulting.co.uk

57 Balfour Road
 London N5 2HD
 United Kingdom
 Tel. 07989 554504



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 INTRODUCTION 5
 - 1.1 Context for the citizens’ panel 5
 - 1.2 Specific objectives of the citizens’ panel 6
 - 1.3 Framing 6
 - 1.4 Design and delivery of the citizens’ panel 8
 - 1.5 Evaluation approach 9

- 2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS 10
 - 2.1 Overview 10
 - 2.2 Integrating the findings into the CB7 drafting process 10
 - 2.3 Potential for policy impact 13
 - 2.4 Media and academic coverage since publication 16
 - 2.5 A growing interest in further public engagement on NZ 18
 - 2.6 Sharing the key findings with wider audiences 19
 - 2.7 Positive impact on panellists 20
 - 2.8 Financial costs 22

- 3 HOW FAR THE PANEL HAS MET ITS OBJECTIVES 23
 - 3.1 Overview 23
 - 3.2 Lessons on design and delivery that helped meet the objectives 23

- 4 RECOMMENDATIONS 31
 - 4.1 For commissioners and Sciencewise 31
 - 4.2 For delivery contractors 32

- Annex A:** Oversight Group members 33
- Annex B:** Evaluation feedback from panellists 34

Acronyms and abbreviations

APPG	All-Party Parliamentary Group
CAST	Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations
CB7	Seventh Carbon Budget
CCC	Climate Change Committee
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DA	Devolved Administration
DAERA	Northern Ireland Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs
DESNZ	Department of Energy Security and Net Zero
DM	Distributional Impact Model
EV	Electric Vehicle
F2F	Face to Face
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HEV	Hybrid Electric Vehicle
ICCN	International Climate Council Network
KNOCA	Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies
NZ	Net Zero
OG	Oversight Group
PAT	Public Attitudes Tracker
UKRI	UK Research and Innovation

Executive Summary

This impact report has been prepared by URSUS Consulting Ltd for the evaluation of Climate Change Committee (CCC) and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Sciencewise's¹ deliberative citizens' panel exploring household perspectives on delivering Net Zero (NZ). The citizen's panel aimed to understand public views on what an accessible and affordable vision of Net Zero looks like from a household perspective. The process was designed and delivered by Ipsos. This final evaluation report is based on expert observation and feedback from panellists, specialists, OG members and the CCC team.

Background and citizens' panel objectives

- The CCC, established under the Climate Change Act 2008, found during its [Sixth Carbon Budget](#) (CB6) analysis that 32% of emissions reductions up to 2035 must come from households adopting low carbon technology or reducing demand for high carbon goods and services. The citizens' panel aimed to explore public views on which policies would make the key low-carbon household choices accessible and affordable for households to help inform CCC's advice for the [Seventh Carbon Budget](#) (CB7) between 2038-2042 which was being drafted during late 2024 and published in February 2025.
- The panel's objectives included understanding public perspectives on policy acceptability, distribution of costs and savings, views on CCC pathways and illustrative policies, trade-offs within policy packages and identifying policies with broad support. The approach was novel in providing panellists with a lot of detail on costs and savings generated by CCC's distributional impact model (DM).
- The panel was affected by the announcement of a general election after fieldwork had already started: the workshops were put on pause and rescheduled and redesigned so that fieldwork was completed by the end of July and the findings could still inform CCC's CB7 advice.

Citizens' panel design

- The design and delivery were overseen by an 11-person Oversight Group (OG) of specialists, chaired by Professor Becky Willis of Lancaster University. The process was managed by a core team comprising Ipsos, three CCC co-managers, the Sciencewise Dialogue Engagement Specialist (DES) and the independent evaluator.
- A panel of 26 were recruited from in and around Birmingham, chosen for its close reflection of the socio-demographics of the UK as a whole. Those recruited reflected the mix of characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, household income, tenure and political leanings) reflective of the area and the UK as a whole.
- The panel met over a series of seven workshops - five online and two full day face-to-face (F2F) Saturdays - for a total of 24 hours. They also had access to a shared online site for reviewing materials and individual tasks between workshops.
- Due to a change in external circumstances (a general election announcement), the process was paused and rescheduled until early July: six individuals who were not able to rejoin at this stage were replaced with individuals from similar backgrounds. The CCC team ran an online workshop to bring them up to speed on what they had missed.

¹ Sciencewise helps to ensure policy is informed by the views and aspirations of the public. The programme is led and funded by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) with support from DSIT. Involve provides expert advice, assurance and support to the programme.

- Workshops covered climate change and NZ, an introduction to policy levers, and four key sectors: surface transport, home heating, an average reduction in meat and dairy consumption and keeping flying close to today's levels until technology develops.
- Discussions on home heating and surface transport were informed by outputs from CCC's distributional impact model (DM) which generated costs and cost-savings for two policy packages (described in CCC's [Methodology report – UK, Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland carbon budget advice](#)). This was a novel approach for a citizens' panel since it produced more detailed information on costs and benefits and how they might be experienced by five illustrative households (so-called household archetypes) than public deliberation processes generally focus on.

Outcomes of the process and policy impact

This citizens' panel was very tightly framed and timetabled to feed into CCC's iterative CB7 process and this was expected to be the major policy impact. The evaluation has found that:

- The project has met all its five stated objectives and has had a very clear impact on the CB7 advice report text and recommendations where they relate to households.
- The panel findings (from early drafts of the full report and policy-makers summary onwards) were shared widely with others in CCC from the early reporting stages so that they could feed into the drafting and final version of the CB7 report. The [citizen's panel report](#) was published alongside the CB7 report as part of the related content.
- Clear links to the panel are evident throughout, from references to the role of the panel in the acknowledgements, executive summary, references and footnotes, to dozens of references to the panel's views and recommendations through the main text in language that reflects what participants said. The panel's influence is clearest in Chapter 7 on sectoral pathways to NZ - with boxes on each of the four sectors considered by the panel - and in Chapter 8 which focuses on households. The key messages from the panel can also be seen in both cross cutting and relevant sectoral recommendations to policy makers (CB7 Annex 1: Priority Recommendations).
- Since autumn 2024, the CCC team have shared the panel findings and key messages with a range of relevant government departments and agencies (including Defra, DESNZ, Ofgem) and the devolved administrations (DAs) in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Senior CCC officers have also shared the findings with parliamentary committees such as the Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) and the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Climate.
- Since the publication of the dialogue report the messages on what the public finds accessible and affordable have also been picked up in national and specialist press, and in blogs and social media by academics, campaigners and business organisations.
- Based on the experience of this panel, CCC and Sciencewise have gone on to commission a similar panel focused on household attitudes to climate adaptation. This will incorporate many of the lessons learnt from this process.
- There is also evidence that both the CCC and other organisations are keen to see Government engaging the public more actively on NZ and taking a slightly different approaches in dialogues with the public on other policy development areas (e.g. engaging them with modelling processes and looking in detail at costs and cost-savings).

Taking part in the process also proved a satisfying experience for the panellists

- The panellists felt well-informed and enjoyed contributing to the CCC's decision-making process. They found the discussions interesting and informative, on NZ and choices in the

four sectors. Some initially felt pessimistic but became more hopeful about the NZ transition as they learned more. Several participants felt empowered to make a difference for future generations, with one even developing an app concept to track household carbon-saving behaviours.

- Participants believed strongly in the public's role in informing policy makers and felt confident that CCC was listening to their views and would use their input to advise government: on a confidence scale of 0 to 100, the average was 88/100, with just two of the 26 reporting less than 50% confidence, in both cases reflecting their hesitancy about whether policy makers would implement all the panel's suggestions. Participants particularly appreciated the CCC team's receptiveness to hearing their views and the resources invested in the process.
- Almost all panellists wanted to continue being involved, mainly through receiving the final report and summary, or attending the launch event which was held eight months after field work was completed. All were invited to the launch but, mainly due to the elapsed time and scheduling during a weekday, none were able to attend on the day.

Factors which contributed to this success included

- A small, very engaged and agile OG were able to bring helpful experience to complement CCC's own, supported the novel framing and gave timely steers at key decision points.
- A strong core team comprising commissioners, Sciencewise and the contractors were able to react quickly and decisively to a major external change in circumstances (the election) and able to access contingency funds so that the original deadline could still be met.
- A very hands-on CCC team played a key role in designing and delivering elements of the process so that it would deliver novel insights for CB7, without compromising the independence of the process.
- A small, experienced design and facilitation team were able to provide almost complete continuity across all workshops and focus on ensuring the process was neutral and supportive of the 26 panellists.
- The diverse mix of panellists was reflective of the location and also brought a rich range of perspectives based on lived experience. They were able to grapple with a complex set of issues using the outputs from quantitative modelling to help them tackle difficult trade-offs.
- Time invested in getting the stimulus materials right – particularly those presenting some very detailed modelling and cost/benefit results - enabled panellists to handle a great deal of technical information without feeling overwhelmed.
- A carefully chosen group of climate, sector and policy specialists were able to share information and interact with panellists on an equal basis so that they felt informed and confident in their choices about what policies would make NZ accessible and affordable in the four sectors. Despite interruptions to the process, the panellists remained fully engaged and provided very useful insights for the CCC's advice to government.

Recommendations to commissioners and delivery contractors for future citizens' panels

Commissioning

- Allow sufficient time for the dialogue to inform internal processes and consider whether to build in possibilities for future follow-on discussions with the same cohort/contractors at the outset.

- Consider a hybrid delivery model with a mix of online and F2F workshops designed to get the most out of their relative merits for information sharing, small group deliberations and recommendation-forming.
- Build in contingency plans to cope with unforeseen risks. In this case a financial contingency allowed for re-recruitment, catch-up sessions and more short workshops in response to a forced pause caused by the announcement of a snap election.

Governance and project management

- Choose an Oversight Group that will be suited to the topic matter and purpose. In this case a carefully chosen group of about 10 managed to bring sufficiently broad perspectives while remaining agile for quick advice and steers.
- Where possible, involve commissioner body staff as observers to help increase confidence in the robustness of the findings and help ensure they are used even before final reports are published.
- Build in workshops for the commissioners to share technical background and get the project management team up to speed.
- Establish clear roles between commissioners and delivery contractors for producing content and designing engaging stimulus materials.

Information shared with panellists

- Optimise use of specialists/experts by balancing the type of information they are sharing with time constraints and travel demands. In this case, less complex topics worked well online, while detailed modelling outputs were best shared in F2F meetings.
- Design a variety of stimulus materials to keep energy levels up and to suit different learning styles, including both verbal and visual. Ensure sufficient budget is allocated for producing visually appealing materials.
- Consider whether running a dedicated online space could be useful to panellists (for reviewing information and sharing individual reflections).

Helping all panellists to be fully engaged

- Anticipate participant support needs, make provisions and let participants know that support is available even if - as in this case - they don't need to use it.
- Wherever possible, plan for continuity in the facilitation team, particularly for a complex topic where the team need to be up to speed across a broad topic. Consider whether a Chair/Lead Facilitator is needed for both F2F and online sessions, or whether they could double up as a breakout group facilitator for online sessions.
- Encourage a variety of approaches to capturing and reporting what participants and specialists said beyond transcriptions and facilitator notes (e.g. post it notes).

Analysis and reporting

- Consider whether a policy makers summary in a succinct style (e.g. as a PowerPoint slide deck) would be a useful additional output for disseminating messages. If so, build in enough time and resource to produce it alongside the main report.
- Take the time to carry out a first cut of the analysis before analysing the findings and agreeing a reporting structure with the commissioners.

1 Introduction

This impact report has been prepared by URSUS Consulting Ltd for the [Climate Change Committee \(CCC\)](#) and [UK Research and Innovation \(UKRI\) Sciencewise](#).² The report summarises independent evaluation findings of a citizens' panel which aimed to understand public views on what an accessible and affordable vision of Net Zero (NZ) looks like from a household perspective in order to help inform CCC's advice for the Seventh Carbon Budget (CB7) between 2038-2042. The dialogue has been designed and delivered by [Ipsos](#).

This report describes the context and framing for the panel's discussions (*Section 1*), how far the panel has met its objectives and its potential to have a significant policy impact (*Section 2*) and how far the governance, design and delivery have met best practice to help deliver objectives (*Section 3*). Finally, *Section 4* suggests some lessons which could help to improve future similar dialogues.

1.1 Context for the citizens' panel

The CCC is an independent, statutory body established under the [Climate Change Act 2008](#) to advise the Government and devolved administrations on climate change. Analysis based on its [Sixth Carbon Budget](#) (CB6, 2020), found that 32% of emissions reductions up to 2035 would need to come from households. The [Seventh Carbon Budget](#) (CB7) has found that a third of total emissions reductions (136 MtCO₂e) by the middle of the period (2040) will need to come from changes that directly involve households. These changes include both switches to low-carbon technology - such as electric vehicles (EVs) or heat pumps - or reducing demand for high carbon goods and services such as meat, dairy, flying and fossil fuel use for surface transport (by replacing some car journeys with public or active travel) and home heating (by insulating homes).

The overall aim of the citizens' panel (hereafter 'the panel') was to explore the public's views on what an accessible and affordable vision of delivering NZ might look like from a household perspective. Findings from the panel were timetabled to inform CCC's advice to Government in the CB7 report on how the UK can achieve its legally binding Net Zero emissions target by 2050. The timing of the panel was designed to be able to benefit from CB7 modelling, inform further iterations of the modelling and the drafting of CB7 from autumn 2024. Both the CB7 and related reports, including the [citizens' panel full report](#) and a [policy makers summary](#) were published on February 26th 2025, alongside [a video](#) presenting the commissioners' and panellists' views on taking part in the process.

It is worth noting that the dialogue process (workshops 1 and 2) began in spring 2024, at a time when the cost-of-living crisis was high on the national agenda. A snap general election was called after the initial workshops (22nd May) and CCC decided to halt field work until after the election (4th July) due to pre-election period guidelines for public bodies such as the CCC. The fieldwork was therefore paused, redesigned and the panel was re-launched

² Sciencewise helps to ensure policy is informed by the views and aspirations of the public. The programme is led and funded by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) with support from DSIT. Involve provides expert advice, assurance and support to the programme.

the first weekend after the election (w/b 6th July). In order to still be able to provide timely inputs to the CB7 process, the fieldwork was condensed into a more intense series of online and F2F workshops over a two-week period before the summer holidays.

1.2 Specific objectives of the citizens' panel

Different policy approaches to achieve emissions reduction will impact on costs and benefits for households differently and it was therefore important for the CCC to understand different public perspectives on what they would find accessible and affordable. The aims of the citizens' panel were therefore:

- 1 To inform the CCC's understanding of public perspectives around the acceptability of illustrative policies.
- 2 To look at the distribution of costs and savings across society and what the panel saw as accessible and affordable.
- 3 To explore panel members' views on considerations for how people in different circumstances and lifestyles might view the CCC pathways and illustrative policies.
- 4 To explore panel members' views on the trade-offs implied within and across the illustrative policy packages, and the extent to which these are acceptable or unacceptable from a household perspective.
- 5 To help the CCC understand which illustrative policies achieve broad support from the panel and which do not, why and what might be needed (if anything) to enable them to become acceptable.

1.3 Framing

Framed within the wider context of climate change and achieving Net Zero

While most panellists were expected to know something about climate change, it was agreed they would need a good grounding in information about climate change, the rationale for NZ and the UK's progress towards it. Panellists were expected to have limited familiarity with policy instruments which might be used to help achieve NZ. The first two workshops therefore allowed time for all panellists to develop a shared understanding of climate change goals and included a full day on different types of policy tools, how they have been used in the past, which are most effective and how they can be paid for.


A focus on four key household sectors

The workshops then focused in on four key sectors – how we travel, heat our homes, eat and fly – which involve household choices. For each theme, a small group of specialists set the scene for small group deliberations around the effects of different policy choices. Household choices and policy levers are shown in *Figure 1.1*.

The relative costs and cost-savings of policies to achieve necessary changes

A number of previous public dialogues³ have explored which pathways to NZ households might find acceptable. This research was novel in focusing not just on whether households understand the need for and support such measures, but rather on how illustrative policies might help to make the transition accessible and affordable. Unlike previous dialogues, the panel were presented with detailed cost and cost-savings information generated by the CCC’s distributional impact model (DM). The DM covered two sectors – household heating and surface transport – and showed the implications of individual illustrative policies and policy packages (‘orange’ and ‘purple’) with a difference in emphasis between the two illustrative packages in terms of who would receive grants and how they would be funded. Panellists were shown how different approaches would affect up-front (capital) and running (operating) costs for five different example households, and the implications for general taxation levels.

Figure 1.1: Sectoral policies for household choices in four sectors considered by the citizens’ panel



Source: Ipsos, Citizen’s panel for an accessible and affordable household vision of net zero, main report, Feb 2025. *The level of household choices was based on preliminary analysis conducted for the Seventh Carbon Budget, and analysis from the Sixth Carbon Budget where this was not available. Replacing boilers with e.g. heat pumps was presented as taking place when a heating system needed to be replaced anyway.*

Thinking with a citizen mindset

Five graphic representations of household ‘archetypes’⁴ were used to bring to life the perspectives of households with different circumstances. Participants also brought their own lived experience of how many of these factors affect household choices.

³ [Net Zero Public Dialogue, A Report by Newgate Research and Cambridge Zero for BEIS](#), Research Paper Number: 006/2021.

[A Net Zero Society: A Public Dialogue on Scenarios and Pathways, Ipsos for Government Office for Science and Sciencewise](#), Oct 2022

⁴ Drawn from about 15 ‘typical’ UK household profiles reflecting typical characteristics including different aspects of energy and fuel use, income, car ownership, housing tenure, location, building type etc.

Iteration of the DM model and validation with panellists. The timetable for the fieldwork was initially planned so that there would be enough time between workshops for iterative modelling of a panellists' 'preferred package' for surface transport and home heating, so that they could confirm whether they still wanted to recommend it after they saw the cost and cost savings implications. However, the condensed timetable post-election (with only five days between the relevant workshops) made this impractical.

1.4 Design and delivery of the citizens' panel

- **An Oversight Group** (11 members, *Annex A*), chaired by Professor Becky Willis of Lancaster University, oversaw the design and delivery. The group met four times (April, twice in June and September) and advised on the overall framing, the perspectives which would need to be covered and specialists who could contribute. They provided really helpful advice on the relaunch after the general election and on the emerging findings and implications for reporting. Several OG members attended the panel launch event (see below) and have provided feedback to the evaluators.
- **A core project management team** comprising Ipsos, three CCC co-managers, the Sciencewise Dialogue Engagement Specialist (DES) and the independent evaluators attended regular weekly meetings and technical 'teach-ins' and design workshops. A short pilot with a small group of participants after workshop 1 tested language, accessibility and how best to use outputs from the DM for later workshops.
- **A panel of 26** were recruited using purposive methods to fill a sample reflecting socio-demographic characteristics and attitudinal questions designed to give a good mix of characteristics, attitudes and political leanings. Birmingham was chosen as a central location with population diversity typical of the UK as a whole. Recruitment of the 26 panellists was designed to ensure a good mix of socio-demographic characteristics and political leanings including both urban and rural areas.⁵ Some spaces (created by a no-show and six original panellists being unable to continue when workshops were rescheduled post-election) were backfilled with new recruits brought up to speed on what they had missed by the CCC team⁶. The panellists deliberated for 24 hours in a mix of online and F2F workshops⁷ as shown in *Figure 1.2*.
- **Some 16 specialists chosen to provide a wide range of perspectives provided the panellists with background information** on climate change and NZ, policy approaches and set the context for each sector (see *Annex A*).
- **An online community (Community Direct) initially ran alongside the workshops** so that panellists could look at materials, interact with one another and respond to a quantitative survey: this had to be discontinued after workshop 3 as resources were diverted to the post-election redesign.

⁵ Lichfield, Shenstone, Tamworth and Tettenhall were included so that some participants would bring experience of transport and home heating choices more typical of rural areas (such as lack of public transport and reliance on oil boilers).


⁶ Two online catch-up sessions involved a 3-hour introduction for new joiners and a 1-hour catch-up for those rejoining the process after the break from May to July.

⁷ Initially planned as 6 sessions, spread over 3 online weekday evenings and 3 F2F full or half day weekend sessions (including a full Saturday and a Saturday/Sunday).

Outputs from the panel include:

- **The citizens’ panel full report** describes the process, the panel’s starting points and underlying values, and detailed reflections on different policy options. It is rich in quotes which put the panellists front and centre.
- **A shorter policy makers summary** is more concise and uses graphics, photos, bullet points and quotes to highlight the cross-cutting messages and key sectoral findings suitable for policy makers. This PowerPoint report also works as a presentation deck.
- **A video** featuring panellists and the commissioners talking about their reflections on being part of the process and priorities for accessible and affordable NZ choices.

Figure 1.2: Overall design of the Citizens’ Panel workshops



1.5 Evaluation approach

The evaluation has drawn on formative and summative evidence collected during the scoping and field work stages, including observation of all seven workshops and qualitative and quantitative feedback from panellists, specialist contributors and observers at the workshops, and feedback from OG members (3) and the core delivery team at a wash-up meeting. Evaluation feedback from participants is shown at *Annex B*. Quotes from participants and other interviewees are shown in blue italics in the following chapters.

Since CB7 and the panel reports have been published we have collected evidence from desk research on the links between the panel, recommendations made to Government and potential for policy impact.

2 Potential impacts

2.1 Overview

This citizens' panel was very tightly framed and timetabled to feed into CCC's iterative CB7 process and the project has been very successful in feeding in emerging findings from the earliest drafting stages. The panel reports were published alongside the CB7 report at the CCC and Sciencewise websites.

The findings have also been widely shared by the CCC team with external stakeholders in government and beyond and have the potential for significant impacts as government considers CCC's recommendations and makes proposals for the CB7 budget to parliament in 2026. The following sections describe:

- How panel findings were integrated into the CB7 drafting process and are clearly traceable in the final report (*section 2.2*).
- The potential for policy impact through sharing findings with parliamentary committees, government departments and devolved administrations (*section 2.3*).
- How the messages on what the public finds acceptable and affordable have been picked up in the national media and specialist press and are influencing the discourse around household choices for NZ (*section 2.4*).
- How taking part in the process has impacted on the panellists (*section 2.5*); and
- The costs of the project (*section 2.6*).

Based on the experience of this panel, CCC and Sciencewise have gone on to commission a similar citizens' panel focused on household attitudes to climate adaptation. This will incorporate many of the lessons learnt from this process (see *Sections 3 and 4*). There is also evidence that CCC and other organisations on reading the CB7 report are keen to see more government engagement with the public on NZ. This dialogue demonstrates that it is possible to go beyond conversations about acceptability to also include affordability.

2.2 Integrating the findings into the CB7 drafting process

"Overall, I think it is fair to say that we are very happy with the impact the insights from the panel are already having on internal discussions." I CCC team during drafting

"The report and its findings are going to be hugely valuable to policy makers, and we're really excited to share them with government so that they can take them into account in their plans as the country moves towards Net Zero." I CCC team

"Particularly valued the fine-grained consideration of distributional implications and the policy lessons from this." I OG member

From early August once the panel findings had emerged, the CCC core team presented emerging findings to the Climate Change Committee who showed a high level of interest and commitment to drawing on the findings in drafting the CB7. Since the key findings from the panel were clear before the report was officially signed off, the CCC team were able to start working with the key messages from the long and policy maker versions of the report, together with transcripts and ePolling results from workshops, to start drafting relevant


sections for the CB7. The 'citizens' policy package' (purple plus) was integrated into CCC's distributional model analysis as illustrated in Figure 3.2 of the CCC's [Methodology report – UK, Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland carbon budget advice - Climate Change Committee](#).

The panel findings have been threaded throughout the CB7 advice report from the acknowledgements on the first page to the recommendations in the annex, as summarised in *Figure 2.1*. Panel findings are most obviously reflected in:

- The overarching messages.** All key findings were translated into the cross-cutting messages of Chapter 8 and the sectoral analysis and recommendations in sections of Chapter 7 of CB7. Panellists' overall support for low-carbon choices in all four sectors, their appetite for a strong role for Government in providing information and financial support, the importance of affordability (and especially upfront costs) in these choices all come through strongly. Likewise, panellists' strong concerns about fairness – particularly for low-income households and renters– and to protect farmers affected by a shift away from meat and dairy, emerge strongly. The preferred citizen's policy package is included in the text. In presenting the CB7 to wider audiences (via a [YouTube explainer video](#)) and in media interviews, the CCC's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) highlighted the significance of the panel's insights:

"The citizens' panel were often ahead of even our advice on some of the things they were willing to consider ... They are interested and want to do their bit. The public really are proud of the UK's progress on climate action, [and] we can't see any evidence that the public wants us to slow down. What the public worries about is clarity from their politicians. They really want clear messages about what [climate change] means for them and what we're going to do." CCC CEO quoted in the Guardian.
- Sectoral findings and policy implications.** The descriptions of the panel deliberations in relation to each of the four sectors are described in the text and boxes in the relevant sections on pathways to NZ for the sector: boxes in Chapter 7 cover surface transport, residential buildings and reduction in meat and dairy consumption (boxes 7.2.1, 7.2.2, and 7.2.4 respectively) and on aviation (boxes 7.6.1 and 7.6.2). These sections report on panellists' concerns and hopes, preferred policy measures and additional conditions they would want in place to ensure that choices are accessible and affordable. The messages accurately represent what panellists said and include the nuances where there were different opinions in the group. The analysis also draws on ePolling on different policy trade-offs from the final session (workshop 7), to illustrate the strength of consensus, but without putting undue weight on these quantitative results.
- Themed and sector-specific recommendations** as summarised in *Figure 2.3*. Several recommendations to policy makers resonate with the messages from the panel which are threaded through the over-arching themes (on the left drawn from the executive summary) and sector-specific recommendations (on the right drawn from Annex 1).

Figure 2.1: How the citizens' panel reports have informed the Seventh Carbon Budget



2.3 Potential for policy impact

2.3.1 Early sharing of the panel's insights

Even before publishing the panel reports, the summary report for policymakers was being used as the basis for sharing the findings and panel recommendations more widely through a range of conversations and presentations.

A [video explainer of the CB7 process](#) includes a description of the role of the panel and had been viewed 3.5K times on YouTube in the first month. A month after publication, CCC, Ipsos and Sciencewise jointly ran an online seminar to share the panel methodology, findings and how it informed CB7 with wider, non-governmental audiences. In May CCC also published its [Methodology report – UK, Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland carbon budget advice](#), which shows how the Panel's insights have informed the process.

Early evidence shared with parliamentary committees



On 27th November 2024, the CCC Acting Chair and Director of Analysis gave evidence to the [Environmental Audit Committee \(EAC\) on Delivering the Government's Climate Targets](#)⁸ which was reported on the House of Commons and Parliament YouTube channels. One line of questioning was around the need for behaviour change: they talked about the need for change in diets, flying and modal shift in transport and the evidence – drawing on the panel findings - that people appear to be accepting of these choices as long as it is made easy and accessible: *"....we*

have also done a citizens' panel as part of Carbon Budget 7 analysis. Some people would go further, and other people would go for less." In questions about aviation, CCC presenters specifically referred to the panel findings: *"that is something where, when we talk to citizens, people seem very willing to accept that there must be some degree of constraint."*

When EAC asked about why progress in switching to heat pumps has been slower than hoped for, CCC responses also highlighted concerns which panellists had raised about planning, the lack of trained installers and maintenance engineers, high upfront costs relative to gas/oil boilers and limited benefits in running costs because of the relative costs of electricity and gas.

The CCC's evidence was also reported by the Press Association whose coverage was picked up under the banner: [Green behaviour change is not about telling people what to do –](#) in The Independent and in other news outlets including the [Evening Standard](#) and on [MSN](#). CCC were invited back to give additional evidence to [and to the EAC on April 7 2025](#). and present the detailed findings after the CB7 was published.

The CCC's CEO and the Head of Net Zero also gave evidence to the [House of Commons Energy Security and Net Zero Committee](#) on 8th January 2025. Although the panel report had not yet been published, they were able to share some preview findings on household

⁸ Environmental Audit Committee oral evidence: Delivering the Government's Climate Targets, HC494, 27.11.2024, Professor Piers Forster and Dr James Richardson and [YouTube](#) recording of the session.

preferences. The CCC team have also shared the CB7 findings and the panel's insights about household choices, with the [All-Party Parliamentary Group on Climate Change \(APPG\)](#)⁹ in March 2025.

Insights shared with other government departments and bodies

The CCC started to inform civil servants and social researchers about the objectives and process the citizens' panel would take as early as April 2024, with key meetings summarised in *Table 2.2*. As early as April 2024, before the start of field work, CCC ran a seminar with officers across government to explain the process and how CCC's DM would be used to help identify any particular outputs and questions that would be of interest. Since then, the CCC has taken every opportunity to share the findings and the lessons they have learnt with others across government. This has included presentations and meetings with the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), Devolved Administrations (DAs) and Ofgem. Since the CP report was published, the CCC has continued to present or refer to the panel findings in a lot of its public-facing working, as summarised in *Table 2.1*.

Table 2.1: Sharing insights with other government departments

Department or non-departmental body	Date	Nature of meeting	Potential for policy impact
Cross government	April 2024	Webinar with civil servants sharing aims and process	Potential for panelists messages to feed into or reinforce other policy areas
	Autumn 2024	Webinar with civil servant sharing findings	
DESNZ residential buildings team	Autumn 2024	Policy team working on home heating and switching to heat pumps	Helping to inform policies on home heating and switch to heat pumps
	Autumn 2024	Presentation of findings and Q+A to about 80 civil servants	
Ofgem	Autumn 2024,	Presentation to policy leads on home heating and EV insights	Informing thinking about the operational implications of findings on home heating and EVs and the concerns and knowledge gaps which will need to be addressed.
	Spring 2025	Seminar for all employees	
Scottish Government, regular meetings	Autumn 2024	Insights shared at regular meetings	Insights inform work on households and NZ
Welsh Government	Spring 2025	Meeting to share findings and lessons	Inform their work on households and NZ, and on public engagement
Northern Ireland (NI) Chief Executive Forum	March 2025	Meeting to share CB7 Chapter 8 (households) findings	Potential to inform policies on household NZ
Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA)		Meeting with senior officials	Potential to inform approach to further public engagement

Source: CCC team

⁹ APPG minutes, Meeting minutes, 11 March 2025: [The Climate Change Committee's recommendations on the UK's Seventh Carbon Budget, with Emma Pinchbeck \(CEO\)](#)

2.3.2 The potential to influence future NZ policy

Policy impact will depend on Parliament’s decision about the CCC proposals

The extent to which the CCC’s recommendations will become policy depends on the proposals that government now makes to Parliament, whether they choose to accept them, and what policies government puts in place. The Government is expected to propose a level for the Seventh Carbon Budget to Parliament by 30th June 2026. The Government must also bring forward its proposals and policies to enable the carbon budgets set under the Climate Change Act to be met. It is likely - based on suggestions made by the previous Government - that proposals and policies will be published ahead of the vote on the level of the carbon budget.

In the meantime, some recent policy resonate with the panel findings but are not directly attributable

Box 2.1 summarises relevant policy announcements mostly announced in the autumn 2024 budget and the spring 2025 (see *Box 2.1*). These policy developments were announced before the CB7 and so cannot be attributed to the Citizen’s Panel, as the developments were under development at the time of the panel. However, the most recently announced ["Feel All Warm and Fuzzy Inside"](#) (DESNZ) campaign comms campaign and [announcement of more choice in funding mechanisms](#) for low-carbon home heating may have been indirectly influenced by what policy makers heard about the citizen’s panel concerns about upfront costs and the need for clearer independent information on home heating.

Box 2.1: Resonance with the citizen’s panel concerns in recent policy announcements

Supporting roll out of electric vehicles (April 2025):

- Zero Emission Vehicle Mandate reinstates the 2030 phase out date for new petrol and diesel car sales (previously 2035), but with flexibility on annual targets for manufacturers and some hybrids exempted.
- £2.3 billion to boost manufacturing zero emission vehicles
- Accelerate the roll-out of charging points
- Tax breaks to help people switch to EVs
- Working closely with industry to address concerns and misconceptions about electric vehicle batteries and promote consumer confidence in ZEVs.

Support for installation of domestic heat pumps

- [Removing planning barriers](#) to simplify the approval of heat pumps (announced November 2024) to take effect from early 2025.
- [Additional budget for Boiler Upgrade Scheme grants](#) (announced November 2024) to support households meet incremental costs of heat pumps for financial years 2024/5 and 2025/6.
- [Additional funds allocated for Local Authorities and social housing providers](#) (announced March 2025) to spend up to £7,500 per household to meet incremental costs of heat pumps.
- ["Feel All Warm and Fuzzy Inside"](#) (DESNZ) campaign uses stop-motion animation of knitted characters to promote heat pumps as a sustainable and cost-effective alternative to gas boilers.
- [Families to get more choice over home upgrades](#) (announced April 2025) to extend grants to heat batteries (not currently eligible) and offer new purchase and ownership models to spread upfront costs over several years or give households the opportunity to lease one for a monthly fee.

Net Zero Public Participation Strategy (December 2024 commitment to publish in 2025)

- Will cover supporting people to adopt new technologies, and opportunities to ensure that public views are considered in the development of policy towards meeting NZ and meeting 2030 and 2035 Nationally Determined Commitments. Plans to give particular consideration to involving local communities and engaging more vulnerable groups, as well as empowering other organisations to do the same.

2.4 Media and academic coverage since publication

- Since their launch on 26th February, both the CB7 report and to a lesser extent the citizens' panel report have attracted national press coverage (the Financial Times, Guardian, Times and Telegraph) and comment pieces from think tanks, academics, non-governmental organisations and business networks (energy, food, engineering and buildings and aviation) as summarised in *Table 2.3*.
- Most of the coverage came directly after the launch of the report (26th February), but with some more in-depth pieces during March and April. The CCC was on BBC "You and Yours" programme twice talking about the CB7 implications for flying and heat pumps respectively. On each occasion they shared the findings from the panel. When interviewed as part of the 'The Rest is Politics Leading' podcast CCC's CEO highlighted the citizens' panel and its findings.
- However, not all of the coverage, even when it talks of household views and preferences which were raised by panellists, directly mentions the role of the citizen's panel in informing CCC's recommendations (see *Table 2.3* and *Table 2.4*).¹⁰
- Opinions on findings and recommendations traceable to the panel have been generally positive, highlighting the panel's support for NZ measures in general, highlighting support for installing heat pumps when gas boilers are ready to be replaced, reducing average meat consumption, and more expensive flights. Coverage by stakeholder organisations (think tanks, business networks, academics and campaign organisations) picked up on sectoral messages, according to their constituents' interests.

Common messages in the coverage included the following:

- **The public's support for a strong government role in supporting households in the transition.** The call for clear independent information, setting clear phase-out dates for petrol/diesel cars and gas boilers, improving public transport and EV charging infrastructure, setting standards for home energy efficiency, and providing grants and loans to support households in purchasing low-carbon technologies were all highlighted.
- **Affordability concerns associated with upfront costs.**
- **Diverse preferences for the fairest way to fund household choices depending on the type of expenditure.** Several organisations focused on the need for fairness and how this would necessitate government support for necessary investment (e.g., home heating) while panelists were happy to see households making luxury choices (such as frequent flying) bearing higher costs.

¹⁰ See for instance [Energy & Climate Intelligence Unit \(ECIU\)](#), [University of Oxford](#), [Resolution Foundation](#) and [Carbon Brief](#)

Table 2.3: A selection of media and specialist press coverage citing the citizen’s panel or its key messages (non-exhaustive)

Selection of national media coverage		
BBC News 26.2.2025	Half of homes need heat pump by 2040, government told	Highlights key messages in the four household sectors but does not mention the CP directly.
26.2.2025	Heat pumps and EVs – how to fight climate change from home	
The Guardian 26.02.2025	UK urged to act now on net zero – and skip two kebabs' worth of meat a week	Cites "...broad public support for these moves [replacing gas boilers, reducing meat consumption, more expensive flights] according to a representative Citizens' Panel" and quotes CCC's CEO about how the panel were ahead of the CCC's own thinking in some areas (see section 2.2).
2.3.2025	Never mind the planet's fate when the jet set feel the urge to seek out some winter sun	Mentions the citizens panel, quotes CEO and highlights findings on aviation (acceptance of a frequent flyers levy)
The Financial Times 26.2.2025	Third of emissions cuts must come from consumers, says UK climate watchdog	Focus on household choices in the pathway and CP related findings but without direct mention of CP.
The Times 23.2.2025	The carbon noose is tightening	Focus on the potential impacts on the economy, voters and the ability to afford everyday necessities and air travel and that technological fixes might overshadow the need for broader behavioural changes.
The Telegraph 26.2.2025	Net zero plans are divorced from reality	Highlighted potential to penalise families on lower incomes and that consumers would bear the cost of higher costs of flying. Suggested reductions in meat consumption and reliance on low-carbon boilers might be unfeasible or unnecessary.
2.4.2025	Rich should fly less to protect poorer families' summer holidays	
Reuters 12.3.2025	Comment: The role of citizens in the fight against climate change has never been greater	Includes link to CP report and cites findings: " <i>people need help with upfront costsand need to understand the benefits of making the switch and have clarity about when the old technology is going to be phased out.</i> "

Table 2.4: Selected coverage of the citizen’s panel and its messages in specialist press and social media (non-exhaustive)

Organisation	Communication	Coverage of citizen panel messages
Science Media Centre 26.02.2025	Expert reaction to the CCC's CB7	Cites the CP that " <i>fed into these recommendations highlights that measures need to be fair and reduce the cost of low-carbon options.</i> " CAST at the University of Bath
New Economics Foundation 26.2.2025	NEF responds to Climate Change Committee's seventh carbon budget	" <i>The CCC calls on the government to close this tax gap and its own citizens' panel recommended doing so through a frequent flyer levy.</i> "
Institute for Government 27.2.2025	The government needs to ensure there is a proper debate on the 7th Carbon Budget	" <i>...it was a good move by the CCC to consult a citizens' panel to explore their views on the changes needed. The panel wanted government support for upfront costs for decarbonising things like home heating and driving for commuting, but saw price increases as more acceptable for flying – which was seen as more optional.</i> " and that " <i>They also wanted more trusted public information and engagement from government on climate change and different household choices to dispel misinformation.</i> " And reinforced the CB7 and panel recommendations

		that government should start to engage more actively with the public on Net Zero.
Centre for Climate Change & Social Transformations (Building a Net Zero future: CAST's response to the CCC's CB7 Report	Response to CB7 citing the panel: <i>"Importantly, a Citizens Panel also provided feedback on whether proposed solutions would be fair, accessible and affordable to the British public."</i>
Priestley Centre for Climate Futures	Review of the CCC's 7th Carbon Budget by the Climate Evidence Unit	Mentions the panel in relation to changes in diet and making it accessible and affordable to cut back on meat consumption.
Climate Action 4.3.2025	UK's Climate Change Committee Releases Report on Seventh Carbon Budget	Mentions the panel being part of the evidence base for the report and its 7 thematic recommendations.
Good Food Institute Europe 26.3.2025	UK's Seventh Carbon Budget calls for the development of tastier and more affordable plant-based meat	Mentions the panel saying, <i>"that the price of plant-based food needs to be reduced to make these options more attractive."</i>
UK Green Building Council 26.3.2025	UKGBC responds to the CB7	Mentions the panel saying it: <i>"makes clear that NZ must not be a cost to people, affordability and accessibility to these [building related] changes must be addressed so that we can feel the benefits that come from improving our built environment – increased health, reduced fuel poverty, and greater energy security."</i>
Which? (OG member)	LinkedIn	<i>"It was a real privilege for me to be part of the advisory group for the CCC's citizens' panel. The panel highlights the importance of making these changes work for people by making them affordable and providing the right information and incentives."</i>
OG Chair	Bluesky	<i>"Particularly pleased that for the first time, the CCC commissioned a Citizens' Panel (i.e. heard from a representative sample of people) to feed in people's experience, views and values"</i>

2.5 A growing interest in further public engagement on NZ

There is a strong interest to continue deliberative work as part of the CCC's work. The CEO described the overall commitment in the [YouTube explainer](#) on the CB7 as follows:

"The Committee strongly believes that thoughtful, honest, informed engagement with the public, which acknowledges competing opinions and trade-offs, is absolutely essential for progress on decarbonisation. (14'30)

The experience of running this panel has so far encouraged further public engagement in the following areas:

- As part of the original procurement process, UKRI and CCC had set aside funds for a potential follow-on dialogue on households and adaptation. In autumn 2024, a decision was made to re-commission the same delivery contractors and the independent evaluator for a dialogue with up to 32 participants from across the country focusing on climate adaptation. This will build on both a previous UKRI Sciencewise supported public dialogue carried out by DEFRA to inform its third National Adaptation Plan (NAP3) and lessons learnt from this panel. The work will start in July and be completed by December 2025 in order to feed into CCC's Fourth Climate Change Risk Assessment – Independent Assessment (CCRA4-IA). Feedback on the NZ citizens' panel highlighted the importance

of representation from Devolved Administrations, and so this time around three panellists each will be recruited from Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales.

- In their evidence to the [House of Commons Energy Security and Net Zero Committee](#) in January 2025, CCC's CEO and Head of NZ praised the role that the panel had played in informing the CB7: when asked whether there was a need for this to be a permanent part of the CCC's governance and for government to have a clear strategy on public engagement on NZ, they were enthusiastic about a wider strategy: "*There are plans for [a government engagement strategy] this year. That sounded really positive. It came in the response to our progress report. We think it is very important. The citizens' panel said that.*" The CEO also reported she would be happy for CCC to have ongoing public engagement if mandated to do so and with the necessary additional resources allocated.
- The CCC has also had meetings with a range of government departments and bodies who are interested in carrying out their own public engagement on aspects of NZ, building on the learnings and success of this citizen's panel. Given the early stages of these plans, specific organisations are not named here.

2.6 Sharing the key findings with wider audiences

2.6.1 Citizens' panel webinar

On 20th March 2025, a month after publication of the panel reports (and 8 months after fieldwork finished), CCC and Ipsos organised a webinar to share the process and findings with wider audiences. More than 120 individuals including a handful of participants, OG members and specialists who took part in the process signed up. Representatives from the core team (CCC, Ipsos, Sciencewise and URSUS) were joined by over 60 others from: the CCC; government departments and agencies (Department of Transport, UKHSA, Ofgem); environmental and climate NGOs and think tanks (such as Friends of the Earth, Green Alliance, European Climate Foundation, Energy and Climate Intelligence Unit, Which?, Campaign for Rural England, Business in the Community, and the MSC Foundation); and businesses and consultancies working in the energy, buildings, aviation and food sectors. Organisations advising businesses such as the British Standards Institute (BSI) and the UK Green Buildings Consultancy (UKGBC) also took part. A large number of academics representing the Universities of Bath, Exeter, Imperial, Leeds, London School of Economics and Politics, Lancaster, Strathclyde and Sussex also took part. Unfortunately, despite some registering interesting none of the participants were able to join on the day.

Others with an interest in the panel have been able to view the short video of the process available on [YouTube](#) (viewed 43 times in the first three months).

2.6.2 Meetings with non-governmental stakeholders

The CCC team has also met other organisations in climate-related fields to share the panel findings and lessons on how to carry out robust and credible public dialogue. Meetings have included the following:

- **Academic groups.** A lunch and learn event for social researchers at [Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformation \(CAST\)](#) to share the panel insights and discuss the pros and cons of deliberative methods. Findings were also presented to the [Lancaster Climate Citizens group](#) (November 2024) and the CCC plans to present to wide academic

audiences at the ACCESS conference, where the learning focus will be on how to integrate deliberative processes and quantitative modelling.

- **Sectoral stakeholders.** CCC's CEO regularly shares the findings with stakeholders such as the Sustainable Aviation Board and the farming community. The CCC team also share the findings at events around low-carbon food choices, e.g. for the Food Foundation, the Food Investor Summit and a Climate Barometer sustainable diets event and with stakeholders in the building transition sector (e.g. with heat pump installers).
- **NGOs and the third sector.** Whole organisation seminars are planned (or have already taken place) with organisations such as Citizens Advice, Which? and the MCS foundation.

In the longer-term, OG members suggested dissemination to other audiences including:

- **Think tanks interested in deliberative research and policies** to increase uptake of climate-friendly technologies and behaviours. This might include organisations such as the Resolution Foundation (RF), Nesta, Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS), E3G and Grantham Institute, some of whom have either shared blogs on the CB7 or attended the panel launch webinar.
- **Internationally** e.g. through the Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA) and the International Climate Council Network (ICCN).

2.7 Positive impact on panellists

Taking part in the process also proved a satisfying experience for the panellists. By the end of the process many reported feeling more optimistic and empowered with the knowledge they had gained.

- **Almost all panellists reported that they felt well enough informed about the four sectors to contribute to the process and CCC's decision making.** Many individuals reported how little they had known about NZ and what households would need to do (typically feeling they were already doing their part by recycling waste). Most reported how interesting they found it to extend their understanding of how households can contribute to the NZ transition:
"It was interesting & informative, and I enjoyed giving my views and listening to the speakers and other people's viewpoints"
"More understanding of my personal impact in getting to Net Zero".
"Just how important net zero is, I was ignorant before this"
- **Some individuals came into the process feeling pessimistic but gradually became more hopeful as they became engaged in the topic.** Most were heartened to learn about progress so far and took comfort that their fellow panellists felt household transition to NZ was accessible and could be made affordable. By the final session, many commented that they felt positive and hopeful about the NZ transition and this generally positive sentiment is summed up in the word cloud shown at *Figure 2.3* below.
- **Several participants said they personally felt empowered to start making a difference for future generations.** One panellist has been inspired to develop an app to help households track their carbon-saving behaviours and assess their performance against comparator households.
"I thought I already knew quite a lot about climate threats and the root cause of much of the issue being things that WE CAN tweak and thus effect a better outcome for our children and grandchildren. Personally, I have learned LOADS so thanks."

2.8 Financial costs

The final financial budget for the programme was £163,000 (excluding VAT) to cover the design, delivery and independent evaluation of the panel. Bids received were slightly below the initial allocated budget which allowed the commissioners to retain a small contingency as well as increasing the number of panellists recruited (to cover potential no shows), higher facilitation: panellist ratios and to set aside some funds for covering subsistence costs of panellists or specialists who needed to stay overnight for F2F meetings. This contingency - plus a small variation - was then able to enable the approach to be adapted to allow a pause for the General Election, but the work still to be completed to the original timeframe.

In-kind contributions by the CCC team and specialists amounted to an additional 30% on top of the financial budget. CCC total contribution included in-kind time inputs from a three-person core management team and its modelling and sector specialists and senior oversight. This enabled the team to take a very hands-on role which was considered necessary for such a technical subject (see *Section 3.2*). In addition, OG members contributed an average 2-3 days of time in reviewing materials and attending meetings, while additional specialists each spent at least one day in preparing presentations and delivering them at workshops.

3 How far the panel has met its objectives

3.1 Overview

The process has been able to meet all five of its objectives as summarised in *Table 3.1*. Key factors which contributed to success included:

- A small, engaged and agile OG.
- A core team with the capacity to act quickly and decisively, with access to a contingency fund which allowed the original deadline to be met when circumstances changed.
- A very hands-on commissioner team who - without compromising the independence of the process – played a key role in design and delivery of workshops so that outputs produced novel insights for the CB7.
- A small, experienced design and facilitation team were able to provide almost complete continuity across all workshops despite the rescheduling required due to the election.
- A good mix of panellists who brought a range of relevant lived experiences and a willingness to grapple with a complex set of issues.
- Time invested in getting the stimulus materials right enabled panellists to handle a great deal of quite technical information without feeling overwhelmed.
- A carefully chosen group of climate, sector and policy specialists were able to bring a range of perspectives and interact with panellists on an equal basis so that they felt informed and confident in the recommendations they developed.

3.2 Lessons on design and delivery that helped meet the objectives

3.2.1 A small, engaged and agile OG supported the framing, design and delivery

- **The small OG membership balanced breadth of perspectives with agility.** The well chaired group was able to meet - including extra meetings before the election – at the points when it could be most helpful to the core project team. Their timely advice allowed the panel to reconvene seamlessly after the general election. Their suggestions on how to integrate new recruits straight into the returning group helped the groups to gel quickly after the break. The OG members were impressed by the outcomes: *“The need to stop halfway through due to the election was unfortunate but the team did a good job of dealing with that.”*
- **The OG embraced the innovative nature of the process** (with its focus on asking questions with financial model backing to add weight to the findings). They were able to share their own experience from other sectors on how best to present cost information in an accessible way, while two OG members were able to provide panellists with an overview of how policy measures work in different settings. One commented *“This was one of the unique aspects of this panel in my opinion.”*
- **The final OG meeting provided helpful comments on the emerging findings, how to get the messages across for policy makers and ideas for disseminating the findings more widely.** A core team member described them as *“one of the most helpful and constructive OG groups we have worked with.”*
- **Members of the OG also found the process balanced.** *“My top line is that the engagement was professional, and fair minded from my perspective: lots of space for people to ask questions and challenge, and a good mix of information and debate. Valuable to contribute to a fair and robust public dialogue that policymakers can rely on when taking decisions”.*

Table 3.1 How far the dialogue has met its objectives

Dialogue Objectives	Factors which contributed to success in meeting objectives
<p>1. Inform the CCC’s understanding of public perspectives around the acceptability of illustrative policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The overall design included a workshop that explained generic policy instruments such as informing, incentivising, and changing the rules, with presentations from the CCC and specialists. ✓ Panellists found it challenging to think about different types of policy levers initially but found it easier to engage with specific illustrative policies in the context of the four sectors.
<p>2. Look at the distribution of costs and costs savings across society and what the public see as accessible and affordable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The DM outputs for home heating and surface transport were complex, but visual and accessible presentations helped panellists quickly compare upfront and operating costs and understand tax implications for different illustrative households. ✓ The five household archetypes proved relatable and helped panellists understand how the relative benefits and costs would fall on different types of households. They provided a good basis for panellists to discuss costs and cost-savings and what they would consider affordable.
<p>3. Explore panel members’ views on considerations for how people in different circumstances and lifestyles might view the CCC pathways and illustrative policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The diverse group of 26 panellists shared their own and family experiences in discussions on CCC pathways. Household archetypes also helped them think more broadly and highlighted affordability as a key factor in acceptability. ✓ The five archetypes revealed shared concerns for fairness (for example, a universal concern that low-income households should not be made worse off, and that non-income factors like renting status or infrequent flying should not disadvantage them). ✓ The descriptions of their lifestyles (e.g. of car use, flying habits) helped panellists differentiate between what were seen as ‘necessary’ consumption (e.g. diet, heating, commuter journeys) and luxuries (e.g., frequent flying, buying new cars) and the most appropriate policy tools to address them.
<p>4. Explore panel members’ views on the trade-offs implied within and across the illustrative policy packages and the extent to which these are acceptable or unacceptable from a household perspective.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Sectoral workshops used illustrations, prompt questions, and ranking exercises effectively to explore policy trade-offs. ✓ CCC’s modelling outputs help illustrate trade-offs (such as more grants mean more taxes, or in the case of diet that if information policies do not work then more proactive policies will be needed). As a result, panellists shifted from initially supporting grants for EVs towards a focus on tapered grants for home heating seen as a necessity for all. ✓ Since there was no overall preference for either the CCC’s ‘orange’ or ‘purple’ policy packages, the team were able to pull together the preferred elements of each into a ‘citizen’s policy package’ (purple plus) for home heating and surface transport. ✓ The final online workshop used ePolling to gauge the overall level of support for this combined package and its different elements. The majority (23/26 panellists) felt this package was something they could support.
<p>5. Help the CCC understand which illustrative policies achieve broad support from the panel and which do not, why and what might be needed (if anything) to enable them to become acceptable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The final report and policy summary outline which policies are fully supported, which are not, and which are accessible and affordable under certain conditions. The majority of participants were very confident that the CCC was listening and would use the preferences and conditions they suggested to inform their advice to government. ✓ As noted in <i>Section 2</i>, the cross cutting and sectoral findings are clearly reported in the CB7 and suggestions on the need for information, clarity on phase out dates, support for some upfront costs etc are reflected in the final recommendations to policy makers.

3.2.2 A core team with the capacity to act quickly and a very hands-on commissioning team

- **The project team quickly established warm and collegiate working relationships and adapted flexibly to the election announcement while meeting the original timetable.** The Ipsos team's flexibility in reacting to the election, developing materials, accommodating new evidence, and redrafting reports was praised by the commissioners and OG. Regular progress meetings and sharing documents via the CCC Microsoft SharePoint site facilitated the process. Ad hoc design meetings outside regular progress meetings might be useful in the future.
- **The CCC core team plus sector and modelling specialists played a very active role during the design stage.** The CCC core team and specialists played a very active role during the design stage, including an initial teach-in on CB7 and DM, generating stimulus and developing policy packages. This was a larger role than in many Sciencewise dialogues but was crucial given the technical nature of the topic and the very specific outputs expected but did not compromise the independence of the process.
- **The CCC's active involvement throughout the deliberations required extra attention to ensure a neutral role and that panellists were not being led to a preferred position.** Compared to many Sciencewise dialogues, the technical nature of content reliant on CCC modelling meant that the CCC team took a far more hands-on role in developing the content and sharing it with participants during small group discussions. This could have presented risks to the independence of the process but CCC, Sciencewise, the evaluators and Ipsos facilitators all agreed that the risks could be managed including by involving non-CCC specialists to share different perspectives, and by freeing table facilitators up from having to present very technical information, allowing them to ensure that CCC specialists were as neutral as possible and to probe into the values that lay behind what participants said. The active engagement of the CCC team at all workshops gave panellists great confidence in the process (see *Section 2.3*).
- **Warm relationships in the core team sometimes led to unclear division of responsibilities for key elements like stimulus material design.** The CCC team spent significant time turning modelling outputs into accessible graphics, which could have been done more efficiently by a design specialist within the delivery contractor team: in future resources should be set aside for this.

3.2.3 A novel approach to framing using the outputs of a quantitative model

An overall learning from the process was that, with the right materials and enough time to discuss them, participants can provide valuable - often unexpected - insights into very complex issues involving quantified outputs.

- **Time spent in getting the overall framing right and integrating results from CCC's quantitative modelling paid off.** For each workshop, the design guides were structured around a clear set of questions. The questions were ambitious (reactions to different policies, their impacts on different household archetypes and trade-offs between them) but enough time meant that most were covered by every small group. The resulting

outputs added real insights on household preferences which go far beyond what was previously known about public support for household choices for NZ transition.

- **The complexity of the topic required the core design team to understand CCC's model and expectations before designing the process.** An early 'teach-in' workshop by the CCC team helped the design team get up to speed, and co-design sessions identified the necessary background information and precise questions for each sector. The core team and facilitators benefited from understanding CCC's distributional impact model and a detailed design guide, which ensured they could ask probing questions.
- **The 24 hours of engagement allowed enough time for a small element of co-design with panellists** who were asked during early workshops and homework tasks about the types of organisation/perspectives they wanted to hear from. While not all angles could be covered (for instance a request for more information on the impacts of mining for EVs was not fully covered) panellists appreciated being asked, and by the end of the process they felt their questions had been answered.
- **A great deal of thought went into presenting the detail from CCC's distributional impact model in an accessible and engaging way.** Framing around concrete cost and benefit data is not typical for a public dialogue but demonstrated that if presented correctly, the public can engage with it. An early pilot session tested the best ways and language to present information on upfront costs, savings in running costs, and payback periods.
- **The use of five typical household 'archetypes' allowed panellists to think beyond their own lived experiences.** This framing surfaced important findings on how households make decisions and the factors that are most important (such as upfront costs and payback periods) and concerns for fairness.
- **Although a further iteration of the modelling to reflect panellist preferences was not possible in the post-election workshop schedule, it did not detract from the deliberations or findings.** The opportunity to revisit and vote on aspects of the citizens (purple plus) package in the final workshop provided enough nuance for panellists to agree on which elements they supported, which they did not, and which they could support with conditions attached. It became clear that upfront costs (for EVs and heat pumps) were much more valued than savings in operating costs.
- **In retrospect, some of the time spent explaining generic policy levers in the F2F workshop (2) might have been better spent on discussing policy levers in the specific context of the four sectors.** Panellists found it easier to engage with illustrative policies related to specific sectors rather than generic policy tools. Participants enjoyed the policy presentations by specialists, but the carousel workstations worked less well. The logistics were poorly organised and neither specialists nor panellists were clear on what was expected of them. CCC short presentations on policy options delivered in the three-hour onboarding session for new joiners (workshop 3) demonstrated that less time could have been spent on generic policy.
- **The schedule after the election was necessarily more intense but still worked well for most participants.** Of the 26 who completed the process, most found the scheduling over 2 weeks and a blend of F2F and online formats convenient and there was very little drop out. A few who had attended workshops 1 and 2 shared their preference for F2F, but this did not stop them from being fully engaged online. *"I prefer the [F2F] workshops: feel you bounce ideas better"* and *"the face to face [were most valuable] particularly as we all became familiar with each other. This led to easy discussions."*

"The ability to bounce ideas off of one another, especially in person."

- **An overall learning from the process was that with the right materials and enough time participants can provide valuable - often unexpected - insights into complex issues involving quantified outputs.** Commissioners found elicitation exercises based on concrete examples and prompt questions most effective. The final online 'wrap up' workshop was useful for focusing on areas of disagreement and policies unlikely to deliver NZ goals on their own and encouraging panellists to further consider the tricky trade-offs. Such insights can provide policymakers with insights which go beyond hopes, concerns and principles to help shape very specific policy options.

3.2.4 A small (26) but diverse and inclusive panel stayed engaged throughout

- **For such a small group, it was crucial to minimise attrition rates (no shows and dropouts when the workshops were rescheduled).** CCC's request for over-recruitment ensured early gaps could be backfilled and purposive recruitment of 6-7 individuals after the election ensured 26 panellists completed the process. Efforts by the CCC core team to onboard those who missed early workshops helped new joiners fit in quickly and fully contribute, indeed by workshop 4 they were indistinguishable from the returning panellists. CCC also organised a short online wrap-up session for those unable to attend after the election.

"Integration of new panel members post-election went smoothly, probably helped by the in-person session (and great facilitation!)" | CCC.

- **Over-sampling of under-represented groups¹¹ ensured diverse voices were heard.** Provisions to provide support for those that needed it had been put in place (accessible venues, support with technical onboarding, phased payments, rapid reimbursement of travel costs, provisions for carers and opportunities to talk to the facilitation team if they found any of the topics distressing (which in this case they did not). Mixing small groups between sessions helped make sure that all panellists got to hear diverse perspectives. Many panellists found this a particularly valuable part of the process.

"I think hearing different members of the public's views has really helped me shape my understanding - as well as the specialist speakers and the team at the CCC there to clarify immediately."

"The ability to bounce ideas off of one another, especially in person."

- **Representation from Devolved Administrations would have been helpful.** This will be addressed in recruiting participants for the follow-on dialogue.

3.2.5 The thought and time put into presenting information in varied formats paid off

- **The blended approach lent itself to using a variety of methods of learning (self-discovery wall charts, cartoons, video presentations and exercises etc.) suited to different learning styles.** Panellists particularly liked the images and graphics shared by specialists and described their charts and graphs as easy to understand. The colour chart showing climate warming made a particular impression. After workshop 1, very few panellists seemed to have any doubts that climate change is happening and that reaching Net Zero is a necessity.

¹¹ Including individuals from Communities Experiencing Racial Inequalities (CERI), young people, those living in remote areas.

- **The thought invested in how to present quantitative aspects** allowed panellists to take on complex information and stimulated really insightful conversations, resulting in interesting and novel findings. Very few were overwhelmed despite the complexity of the information. The majority of panellists found the amount of information they were provided about right (15, 83.3%): just one found it too much (saying there were too many family scenarios and figures), while two would have liked even more detail.
"There was certainly a lot to absorb - but the reality is that the subject matter IS complex. It is one thing stating what the problem is, but quite another to profile how it might be best fixed to suit all "use cases".
- **By the end panellists almost unanimously agreed that the workshops got the right balance between hearing new information and enough time to discuss it.** A few panellists would have favoured more time for small group deliberation and for answering questions.
"Perhaps a little more time for the group discussions" and "Not enough time for Q&A - Rushed at times. I feel like this was noticed in others too that wanted more questions answered." While an OG member commented that "There never is enough time but overall, I think they struck a good balance!"

3.2.6 The online community share site worked well to the extent it was used

- The site provided resources for panellists to review presentations, share thoughts and answer polling questions on Net Zero affordability and policy attitudes. Most panellists found the share site helpful, even in 'light touch' mode post-election. The majority found the community space useful for checking details and hearing answers to their questions.
"Everything I needed to know was there" and "I found it very interesting to read and helpful."
- Panellists appreciated the CCC team's effort in answering questions, although one panellist noted a gap regarding ethical issues with EV battery minerals. A typical comment was: *"It was good to read people's questions on the climate page. The answers were very informative and easy to understand and digest"*

3.2.7 Panellists really appreciated hearing from a variety of specialists, including CCC staff

- **Specialist presentations were high quality, accessible and unbiased and specialists were able to answer questions in an accessible way.** We noted lots of two-way discussion/Q&A with experts/CCC, and this was essential to ensure that panellists had a shared understanding of the concepts before deliberating on them. CCC put in a lot of effort to get panellists' questions answered in the room or between sessions. Specialists played a valuable role moving around the small groups to answer questions and this worked really well for online break-out groups. The specialist's role was praised by many participants, who enjoyed learning more about the topics and felt more confident about their ability to provide CCC with sound recommendations.
"Very useful expert talks - I learnt a lot," and "The info was great and experts brilliant", and "The new info from the experts was the best bit."
"So many experts on hand, all questions were answered in mainly layman language"
- **A few panellists would have liked to see more workshop time allocated to Q+A; indeed, this was one of the few areas where panellists reflected that the process could have been improved.** Despite the CCC team's best efforts to get all questions answered between sessions, this became less easy when the community share site was

no longer being actively updated. Several panellists highlighted this as one of the few criticisms of the process (see *Annex B*).

"Nowhere near enough time to dig into what they had said and get more information. I felt like I had a fair few unanswered questions and the option to ask them in the ongoing community didn't work and wouldn't open."

- **The specialists also reported finding the process useful.** One noted the value in *"Researchers being forced to engage with the public and see how their findings are understood and interpreted."*

3.2.8 Facilitation was independent, professional and supportive

- **Efforts to keep the facilitation team small and consistent ensured most facilitators had a good technical grounding and were clear on the CB7 and distributional impact model.** Table facilitators were supported by an Ipsos chair/lead facilitator responsible for plenary sessions, timekeeping, and summarising small group discussions. Detailed discussion guides provided clear objectives, timings, elicitation exercises and probing questions. CCC team members supported each small group with technical material.

Evaluators observed excellent, independent facilitation with the Ipsos team able to focus on process due to the support that the CCC team provided on content. Panellists unanimously agreed that the facilitation was professional, independent, and effective, describing them as *"Very good facilitators," "very professional and very effective"* and *"a really great bunch."*

- **Panellists, evaluators, and specialists all agreed that everyone got a chance to share their views and were encouraged to engage.** Table facilitators created space for quieter individuals and dealt decisively with one panellist who behaved disrespectfully to others, who was asked not to return for later workshops. Several panellists noted that louder voices (including their own) occasionally dominated.

"Some were noisier than others - for which I apologise". And *"As is usually the way, if a few on the group are knowledgeable, those not so confident are happy to keep quiet."*

- **The chair/lead facilitator role worked well in F2F sessions but seemed more of a luxury for online workshops.** For F2F sessions, the lead facilitator role helped pull together a 'preferred policy package' and supported less experienced facilitators. For online sessions, it may have been more effective to use this resource to facilitate a small group and reduce the facilitator-to-panellist ratio.

3.2.9 A good mix of approaches to capturing panellists' views

- **A range of methods was used for capturing panellist's views** including transcripts of recordings, note-takers at each table, facilitator notes, and polling on the online site (Community Direct) during the initial workshops and in-Zoom polling (final workshop). The polling data from the final workshop proved useful in assessing the strength of consensus and support for the proposed policy measures, while recognising that such a small sample cannot be treated as statistically significant.
- **A rigorous approach to analysis was employed, including facilitator debriefs, initial code framing, and analysis workshops involving the facilitation team, CCC team,**

and evaluators to feed into the coding. However, the analysis workshops came too early in the process, before any real coding had been done. In retrospect it would have been more helpful at a point where clearer findings were emerging in order to help structure the reports and identify areas where more analysis would be needed.

3.2.10 Analysis and reporting process has produced high quality outputs but required more iterations than expected

- **The mix of online and face-to-face processes and four sectors generated detailed information, presenting challenges in distilling it into a report that met CCC's needs.** Covering home heating and surface transport both individually and together in relation to CCC policy packages made structuring the report to avoid duplication difficult. Multiple authors drafting chapters took time to get a unified tone and writing style and avoid duplication.
- **The reporting process needs to be iterative but could have been streamlined.** Developing a skeleton report once findings emerged from the analysis to agree on the structure and messages upfront would have been beneficial. Producing a sample chapter to review for structure, tone, writing style and inclusion of panellists' voices and stimulus material before drafting the longer report might have helped.
- **A separate, much more concise policy-makers summary was an innovative alternative to a typical executive summary.** This document is likely to reach a wide audience and increase the project's wider impacts but resulted in additional and parallel demands on report-writing resources. Planning for this in advance would have been helpful.
- The contractors have taken the lesson for future report writing of assigning one person to bringing out the findings and overall flow while others work around them. Some flexibility in drafting may still be needed where the insights are being fed into a parallel commissioner thinking, modelling and drafting process.

4 Recommendations

4.1 For commissioners and Sciencewise

4.1.1 Procurement and budget

- If a public dialogue process is focused on informing an internal process, ensure enough time is allowed, including contingency, for the dialogue to be informed by and to inform that process.
- Consider the advantages of a follow-on dialogue with the same cohort or delivery contractors who understand the commissioner process and build in the option at the outset to streamline procurement.
- If the project has a hard end, build in contingency to cope with unforeseen risks. In this case, ringfencing an underspend in initial bids helped speed up redesign and re-recruitment of panellists when a general election announcement disrupted the original timetable.

4.1.2 Governance

- Consider what size of OG will best suit the nature and pace of the project. In this case, a smaller group (11 people) was able to bring a breadth of stakeholder perspectives while remaining agile to meet and make quick decisions at critical points in the process.

4.1.3 Delivery

- For technically complex topics with specific outputs, run a 'teach-in' workshop for the core project management team and similar sessions for facilitators to ensure they are all up to speed on the topic.
- Establish clear roles and responsibilities for producing and sharing stimulus materials, including sufficient resources in the delivery contractor team.
- Consider taking an active role in fieldwork, while ensuring presentations are unbiased and that active involvement of the commissioner team does not lead panellists to a preferred outcome.
- Involve staff who will use the dialogue findings as observers to increase their confidence in the findings and help embed them in any parallel drafting process before they are published.

4.1.4 Reporting

- Encourage a variety of approaches to capturing and reporting what participants and specialists said but be clear about their purposes and suitability for the context.
- Consider a succinct policy-maker summary as an additional output and make this clear from the outset so the delivery team can budget resources and time.
- Build in sufficient time after fieldwork and before report drafting for commissioners and delivery contractors to agree on a structure and narrative.

4.2 For delivery contractors

4.2.1 Design and delivery

- Consider a hybrid delivery model with a mix of online and F2F workshops designed to get the most out of their relative merits for information sharing, small group deliberations and recommendation-forming.
- Develop strategies beforehand to address no-shows and drop-outs. In this case, over-recruitment and short catch-up sessions helped new recruits to be brought in to fill unavoidable dropouts.
- Optimise use of specialists/experts, balancing the value of contributions of knowledge to F2F or online workshop discussions with their time constraints and travel demands.
- Design a variety of stimulus materials to keep energy levels up and engage with different participants' preferred learning styles, including both verbal and visual. Ensure responsibilities for developing materials are clearly defined (e.g. content vs design) and resourced accordingly.
- This process demonstrates that participants can take on board complex cost information if it is well presented. In this case they were able to weigh up more complex cost and benefit information than has been attempted in previous dialogues.
- Anticipate participant support needs, make provisions and let participants know that support is available even if, as in this case, they don't need to use it.
- Consider the benefits to be gained from an online space running in parallel with the workshops. In this case, participants found the share site useful for reviewing materials, getting answers to their question and sharing individual views.
- Wherever possible plan for continuity in the facilitation team, particularly for a complex topic. Consider whether a Lead Facilitator could add value by doubling up as a breakout group facilitator for online sessions.
- Ensure enough time is built into the workshops involving specialists for them to answer participants' questions either in plenary or in small groups.

4.2.2 Reporting

- Take the time to carry out a first cut of the analysis before analysing the findings and agreeing a reporting structure with the commissioners.
- Build in time and flexibility for a gradual approach to drafting. The ideal reporting structure may be difficult to pin down in advance, but moving in stages through a skeleton and a sample chapter can help to get the overall narrative, writing style, length and graphics right for the commissioners, before moving to full drafting and could help to make a smoother process.
- Agree with the commissioner on whether a shorter report – such as a policy-maker's summary as in this case – will be helpful. If so, agree a format which can also be used to disseminate findings to wider audiences and allow enough time and resource to produce it.
- Ensure a strong editorial hand and sufficient resources for editing where reports have multiple authors.

Annex A: Oversight Group members and specialists

Oversight Group

Name Organisation	Name Organisation
Prof. Rebecca Willis (Chair)	Lancaster University
Dr. Christopher Holmes	King’s College London
Sarah Allan¹	Involve ¹
Gillian Cooper	Citizens Advice
Yasmin Ibison	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Lindsay Judge	Resolution Foundation
Dr. Alison Todd	Office for Budget Responsibility
Justin Macmullan	Which?
Dr. Christina Demski	University of Bath
Dr. Lucie Gadenne	Queen Mary, University of London and Institute for Fiscal Studies
Toby Park	Behavioural Insights Team
¹ Sarah Allan transitioned from her role at Involve to freelancing as a deliberative engagement specialist at the end of March 2024	

Specialist contributors

Name	Organisation	Specialist contribution
Prof. Myles Allen	University of Oxford	Aviation policies
Rose Armitage	Climate Change Committee	Aviation's emissions and role of household choices in emissions reduction
Dustin Benton¹	National Food Strategy and Green Alliance	Alternative proteins and UK diet trends
Marili Boufounou	Climate Change Committee	Land use changes to meet Net Zero in the UK
Dr. Sandra Bogelein	Climate Change Committee	Introduction to the Climate Change Committee's role, household choices and policy levers for different sectors
Dr. Sally Cairns	Sally Cairns & Associates Ltd.	Past and future UK aviation trends
Rachel Carr-Whitworth	Climate Change Committee	Surface transport choices and policy options for distribution of flying across households
Dr. Eoin Devane	Climate Change Committee	Net Zero, UK's 2050 target and actions needed to get there
Matt Finch²	Transport & Environment	Aviation policies
Esther Harris	Climate Change Committee	Home heating choices and policy options
Prof. Ed Hawkins	National Centre for Atmospheric Science	Climate change causes and impacts
Tim Johnson	Aviation Environment Federation	Aviation policies
Peter Levell	Institute for Fiscal Studies	Policy levers, including fiscal trade-offs
Bea Natzler	Climate Change Committee	Policies to support households in making surface transport and home heating choices
Toby Park	Behavioural Insights Team	Policy levers
Colin Walker	Energy & Climate Intelligence Unit	Electric vehicles (EVs)
Prof. Rebecca Willis	Energy and Climate Governance, Lancaster University	How policy choices shape actions of different actors (including households)

¹ Dustin Benton was Chief Analytical Advisor for the National Food Strategy and worked for Green Alliance at the time of the panel. Since July 2024 he has worked at Forefront Advisers

² Matt Finch left Transport & Environment in September 2024

Annex B: Feedback from Participants

Panellist evaluation feedback after workshop 2 (18 th May)							
26 respondents							
1	The information provided on the Community Direct¹ website has helped to set the scene for our discussions	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		12	12	2	0	0	0
	Comments: <i>"Points raised I would never have thought of."</i>						
2	I understand the purpose of the panel and how CCC intends to use the findings	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		22	4	0	0	0	0
	Comments: <i>"The CCC have made it very clear."</i>						
3	The information presented in the first workshop on climate change, Net Zero and the need for action seemed fair and balanced	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		14	10	2	0	0	0
4	The information on policies government can use to support households to take action was clear and accessible	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		6	16	5	0	0	0
	Comments: <i>"Very well presented and explained."</i>						
5	Specialists were able to answer our questions in a way that I found helpful	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		19	7	0	0	0	0
	Comments: <i>"All were helpful and in depth." "Super informative" "I had several private conversations - very informative"</i>						
6	I was able to openly express my ideas in my small group	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		23	3				
	Comments: <i>"We were very open and honest in our group."</i>						
7	The balance between time hearing new info and discussing in small groups felt ...	About Right	Too short	Too Long		Not sure	
		24	2				
8	I feel my views were listened to	Strongly Agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
		23	3				
	Comments: <i>"[our facilitator] was great: she articulated our thoughts." "Really strongly agree." "I felt comfortable throughout."</i>						
9	I feel confident that CCC will take our views into account in its policy advice to government	On a scale 0-100 where 0=no confidence and 100=totally confident					
		80-100	60-79	40-59	20-39	0-19	Average
		20	4	2	0	0	85.4
10	Are there any particular perspectives that you hope to	<i>"Suitability of heat pumps." "Travel/transport into the city." "Whether these workshops have influenced gov decisions."</i>					

hear from in the next few workshops?	<p><i>"The real price of what it would cost [to achieve NZ]."</i></p> <p><i>"Benefits to small households."</i></p> <p><i>"Timescales for the different changes."</i></p> <p><i>"Heat pumps etc."</i></p> <p><i>"Policy makers in government (if possible)."</i></p> <p><i>"I'm still learning and taking it all in."</i></p> <p><i>"Affordability."</i></p> <p><i>"I would like to hear from someone more agricultural."</i></p>
11 Was there anything that stopped you fully participating in this event?	<p>25 out of 26 said no. Typical comment "<i>Nothing at all, very enjoyable.</i>"</p> <p>1 said personal reasons had prevented her fully participating.</p>
¹ A dedicated online share site for panellists	

Panellist evaluation feedback after workshop 5 (face to face 13th July)
25 respondents

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neutral	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
1. The scheduling of workshop sessions (evenings and Saturdays) was convenient for me.	14 56%	10 40%	0	1 4%	0
2. I found the online share site a useful space for checking details and hearing answers to our questions.¹	13 52%	9 36%	3 12%	0	0
3. Overall, the amount of information we were provided with felt	About Right	A little too much	Over-whelming	Not as much as I would have liked	
	18 72%	2 8%	2 8%	3 12%	
4. The workshops struck the right balance between hearing new information and discussing it in small groups.	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neutral	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
	17 71%	5 21%	2 8%	0	0
5. I am satisfied that the questions we asked during the workshops were fully answered at the time, or before the next session.	16 67%	6 25%	1 4%	0	0
6. I felt sufficiently well informed on different sectors (home heating, transport, food, aviation) to feel I could make a useful contribution to discussions.	18 75%	5 22%	1 4%	0	0
7. The facilitation has been professional, independent, and effective.	22 88%	3 12%	0	0	0
8. Everyone got a chance to share their views and make themselves heard	20 80%	5 20%	0	0	0
9. I felt that support was available if I had any issues or found the topic distressing	20 83%	2 8%	2 8%	0	0
10. I think it is important that the public is involved in making policy makers understand how different people feel about these issues	23 96%	1 4%	0	0	0

11. Based on their feedback, I feel confident that the CCC team has heard our views.	22 88%	3 12%	0	0	0
12. On a scale of 0-100 (where 0 = not at all confident and 100 = fully confident) I feel confident that CCC will use what they've heard to advise Government about how best to help households contribute to reaching Net Zero.	<u><50</u> 2	51-70 1	71-90 10	91-100 12	Average 88
13. Please let us know if you'd like to be involved in any of the following ways:	Receiving a full copy of the report 15	Receiving an executive summary of the report 14	Attending a launch event 10	Being kept informed how CCC has used our inputs 16	Other (please specify) 2

¹ By this stage the online site was no longer being actively moderated due to a necessary reallocation of resources post-election