DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Dear Sirs

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated Wednesday, 12th August 2020, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Order Number:	CR20071 - Net Zero Societal Change Citizen Research
From:	**Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)** with offices at 1 Victoria St, Westminster, London, SW1E 5JD. **("Customer")**
To:	**Newington Communications (TA Newgate Research)**, 96 Great Suffolk St, London, United Kingdom, SE1 0BE **("Supplier").**

Effective Date:	Wednesday, 12th August 2020.
Expiry Date:	Friday, 27th November 2020.

Services required:	Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by: the Customer's Project Specification attached at Annex A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Annex B.

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	£79,607.00 excluding VAT in alignment with Schedule 2 and Annex 1 of the CR20071 Contract Terms.
Insurance Requirements	Additional public liability insurance to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim. Additional employers' liability insurance with a minimum limit of £5 million indemnity.

	Additional professional indemnity insurance adequate to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract with a minimum limit of indemnity of £2 million for each individual claim. Product liability insurance cover all risks in the provision of Deliverables under the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim.
Liability Requirements	**Suppliers limitation of Liability** (Clause 18.2 of the Contract Terms);
Customer billing address for invoicing:	All invoices should be sent to should be sent to finance@services.uksbs.co.uk or Billingham (UKSBS, Queensway House, West Precinct, Billingham, TS23 2NF)

GDPR	Can be found within the Contract Terms - Schedule 7.

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Supplier:	**For and on behalf of the Customer:**
Name and Title: [redacted]	Name and Title: [redacted]
Signature: [redacted]	Signature: [redacted]
Date: 11th August 2020	Date: 11th August 2020

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background

1.1 Net Zero & Societal Change

There is no doubt that climate change is one of the greatest global challenges we face, and that action is urgently needed in the UK and across the world. The UK is determined to continue to lead the world in tackling climate change. In June 2019, following advice from the Committee on Climate Change, the UK Government set a legally binding target to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions from across the UK economy by 2050. In doing so, the UK became the first major economy to legislate for a net zero target. This will bring an end to the UK's contribution to climate change. The UK has already made progress; between 1990 and 2018 we have reduced emissions by more than 40% whilst growing our economy by three quarters, and decarbonised our economy faster than any other G20 country since 2000.

In order to reach the goal of net zero, significant societal change is required; for example, the CCC estimate that the majority (62%) of emission reductions will require some form of behaviour change[1]. The extent of this will depend on which particular 'pathway' to net zero is pursued. The transformation required could impact every aspect of society and the lifestyles we live, including the way we travel, how we heat our homes, the products we buy, and what we eat. It is increasingly argued that the key to achieving a net zero society will be a move away from thinking about discrete low-carbon behaviours, but rather thinking about a system-wide approach and how multifaceted social shifts can be embedded into everyday life[2]. To achieve these shifts, engagement with the citizens on the issues around climate change will be crucial.

1.2 The need for evidence

To date, much of the analytical focus of net zero (and preceding targets) has been centred upon technical and supply-side analysis. This project seeks to focus on the societal dimensions of net zero. A lot of work has already been completed to help us understand these dimensions; however, we have identified some important evidence gaps to be filled through this piece of work. These include:

- Understanding people's preferences around what a Net Zero society should look like;
- Their views on the importance of societal change in reaching net zero and what they're willing to do on an individual level to achieve this; and
- How we best facilitate relevant societal change.

This project sits alongside a separate piece of government research on Net Zero and Societal Change[3]; this particular project will involve undertaking primary research with the public. It is envisaged that this contract will involve a series of deliberative workshops with the public.

The outputs from this work will inform policy thinking relating to net zero public engagement and behaviour/societal change. This research will be published in a report and should look to present insights and policy recommendations that will be relevant across government, especially for the government's work on net zero and the implementation of the 25 Year Environment Plan.

[1] Carmichael, R. (2019) Behaviour change, public engagement and Net Zero. A report for the Committee on Climate Change. Available at https://www.theccc.org.uk/publications/ and http://www.imperial.ac.uk/icept/publications/

[2] Corner, A., Graham, H. & Whitmarsh, L. (2019). Engaging the public on low-carbon lifestyle change. CAST Briefing Paper 01.

[3] The past tender opportunity can be found here: https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/Notice/70f1a7c5-16e6-4dd7-bae2-5c2855568642?origin=SearchResults&p=1

This contract will be commissioned and owned by BEIS but will be jointly managed by Defra and BEIS with other government organisations (including DfT, Ofgem, Go Science) feeding in regularly. This is due to the cross-cutting nature of net zero and the content of this contract.

Within this tender, we consider the concept of societal change to encompass societal dimensions associated with climate change such as individual behaviour/lifestyle changes and large-scale social change, social norms, public engagement and public participation in decision making.

1.3 Size of the project
We envisage this piece to consist of a series of deliberative workshops with members of the public (a minimum of eight workshops, but we remain open to contractor proposals). The maximum budget will be £80,000 (bids are able to come in at prices lower than this).

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

This project aims to develop the evidence base in areas relating to public attitudes towards different net zero pathways, and preferences regarding the societal changes needed to reach net zero in the UK. Specifically the project has the following objectives:

1. To establish people's understanding and perceptions of what people think reaching climate targets in the UK will mean for both them as an individual, and for society as a whole.
2. To gain insight into people's attitudes and preferences towards different plausible pathways for meeting net zero.
3. To set out the most and least socially feasible areas of net zero (i.e. identify the key risks/toughest areas of reaching Net Zero from a societal change, or behaviour change, perspective).
4. To set out how people would prefer to engage with/access net zero policies and also identify cross-cutting initiatives that could help facilitate the societal change required for net zero.

The first objective would build on existing research into public perceptions of net zero (e.g. the UK Climate Assembly[4], Defra's 'Citizen engagement with the environment' project[5], Energy Systems Catapult's 'Understanding Net Zero: Consumer Perspective' report[6] and Copper Consultancy's 'Public attitudes to net zero emissions in the UK' research[7], to name a few), but would also distinguish between perceived impacts for the individual and society.

The research should provide insights that can be used across government in the design and implementation of Net Zero related policies, in order to optimise their effectiveness and public acceptability. It should also provide clarity on what may be the most publicly desired, easiest to achieve, or hardest to achieve behaviour changes needed within society to achieve the government's net zero ambitions.

Research Questions

[4] https://www.climateassembly.uk/
[5] http://natcen.ac.uk/our-research/research/citizen-engagement-on-the-environment/
[6] https://es.catapult.org.uk/reports/innovating-to-net-zero/
[7] https://www.copperconsultancy.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/net-zero-a5-booklet-v5-online-version.pdf

The work undertaken in the contract should focus on addressing the following specific research questions, which build on the project's objectives. We are also interested in any further suggestions the contractor has to draw out additional information that could help achieve the project objectives.

RQ1: What preferences do people have regarding what they would like a net zero society to look like and regarding the different feasible pathways to achieving this?

RQ2: What are participants' understandings and perceptions of the societal and lifestyle changes necessary to meet net zero?

RQ3: How do participants see their own role in reaching net zero; what do they believe that they are responsible for, and what do they think others bear responsibility for? What behaviour changes are they willing to make?

- What are the main discrepancies between people's perceptions of the wider societal-level changes they think should be made to meet net zero, and the changes that they're willing to make at an individual-level?
- Are these discrepancies, if any, caused by issues/barriers associated with the adoption of certain net zero behaviours, such as affordability/access/other acceptability conditions? If so, what are the main barriers to action?
- Who do participants believe should bear responsibility for the different aspects of reaching net zero?

RQ4: Which are likely to be the easiest and toughest areas for behaviour and societal change, and where do the main opportunities, risks and challenges lie in achieving the societal changes necessary to meet net zero?

RQ5: What are people's views/concerns around the distributional impacts of the behaviour changes needed under the potential societal changes necessary to meet net zero?

- For example, the impacts on people of different income levels, age, regions, rural vs. urban etc.

RQ6: What policy recommendations can be drawn from this research? What does a 'people/user-centred design' of the net zero policy landscape look like?

- For instance, this should consider people's awareness/perceptions of existing policies for achieving net zero; how can we improve the implementation/attractiveness of these; how would people like to access/engage with government's policies; can policies be better packaged?
- How do people want to engage with government strategies and policies on net zero and at what scale (e.g. national, local)?

3. Suggested Methodology

We anticipate the methodology to be qualitative (e.g. deliberative workshops), but we welcome bidders' proposals, providing they meet the project timescales, aims, and objectives. The minimum requirement would be a series of 10 workshops. Given the Covid-19 pandemic, we will require this research to be conducted online.

We are particularly interested in proposals that:

- Involve the use of a range of techniques to engage participants (a few examples: ranking exercises, visual Q methodology, the use of different possible scenario examples for reaching net zero, or development of such scenarios with the participants)[8].

- Demonstrate how best to engage participants in linking the societal question of 'what kind of Net Zero society do we want to live in?' (RQ1) with the more individual-level question of 'what does that mean for my life and what am I willing to do' (RQ3)?

- Provide ideas on how best to engage participants in the concepts of current behaviours and behaviours in future net zero scenarios, which may be several years down the line (e.g. 'a day in the life' type exercises etc.).

We will work closely with the contractor throughout the duration of the project to ensure it meets its aims (as specified above).

Contractors should describe their general approach to meeting the project objectives and research questions, as well as outlining innovative online methods and/or tools for doing this. We are interested in proposals on how best to engage participants with the topic online (in particular, bidders are strongly encouraged to consider innovative online techniques given the limitations of running qualitative sessions online), as well as what formats/length/timings etc. would work best.

Contractors are encouraged to recruit participants as they feel most appropriate within the limited timeframes. A sampling framework should be agreed at the outset of this project. We would like to ensure that the work covers views from a diverse and broadly representative population, approximated by making sure that there is a representation of ages, genders, ethnicities, regions, income levels, educational attainment, and environmental attitudes within participants, where possible. We would also like to ensure that the sampling results in a spread of participants' household sizes and types (including whether they have children).

Further to this, we also propose that the following demographic segments are focused on individually, as we think that they will be particularly useful in fully answering the project objectives (particularly in light of wider BEIS and Defra remit):

- Low-income/social grade
- High-income/social grade
- Rural
- Urban
- Youth

Thus, our minimum requirement would be a series of 10 workshops, consisting of:

- 5 workshops, each one covering one of the above five demographic segments
- 3 workshops, each one covering one of the devolved administrations (Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales) to reflect the UK-wide scope of this project
- 2 workshops covering England

[8] For examples, see: 'Carbon reduction scenarios for 2050: An explorative analysis of public preferences' (Allen & Chatterton, 2013); 'The Sustainable Lifestyles Accelerator' (http://suslife.info); 'On the use of imagery for climate change engagement' (O'Neill et al, 2013); 'Public values for system change' (Demski et al, 2015).

We are, however, open to suggestions on the inclusion of these segments and also regarding any further demographic or attitudinal segments that would benefit the project.

4. Deliverables

Deliverables for this contract should include:
August 2020:

- A detailed project plan (including methodology, risks and mitigation, and timeline) and a meeting to review this before work commences
- A risk register, setting out the main risks and obstacles to a successful completion of this project, along with an outline of the steps that will be taken to mitigate the risks

September/October 2020:

- Research materials (e.g. workshop material and guides)
- Delivery of primary research (e.g. workshops) to meet the objectives and research questions of this project, as specified in Section 2 of this document

November 2020:

- Copies of transcripts/detailed notes from workshops (we are open to other formats, depending on what is most suitable given the format)
- Quality assured, publishable final report
- PowerPoint slides and presentation summarising key findings and recommendations

Throughout the contract:

- Regular updates of project progress

It is important that the contractor builds in working closely with BEIS/Defra. We reserve the right to commission an external peer review of the work. Wherever possible we will try to ensure that this review is conducted alongside BEIS/Defra comments. However, the contractor may be contacted for clarifications and minor revisions after the contract has come to an end.

ANNEX B

Supplier Proposal

1. Approach

1.1. Overview

The ITT calls for 10 workshops, including five covering various socio-demographic segments, and a further five split across the regions of the UK. We agree that this range of coverage is necessary to get a range of diverse perspectives that will broadly represent the UK public. The subject of feasibility pathways to net zero and behavioural responses is complex and we would strongly advise that it is necessary not just to have sessions longer than two hours, but to have **a deliberative approach, where participants are reconvened twice (i.e. two waves of dialogue)**. This enables us to explore both top of mind reactions but also responses to new information, presented in different ways, without overwhelming people. Understanding 'knee-jerk' responses to different actions that move us to net zero is as important as more considered responses. In the real world people won't necessarily engage in the rational, considered way that they do in these dialogue processes. Equally it is valuable to see how and why people change views, including the barriers and facilitators to this – they need time and space to reflect on both the materials and discussions to do this.

By virtue of engaging people online we propose an approach which brings people together for **plenary presentations and Q&As** via Zoom, before separating them again into **10 subgroups (or workshops)** for peer-to-peer discussions via Zoom. This engagement is then extended via our dedicated Recollective online community platform.

The majority of activity takes place on one day at each Wave (a Saturday morning), with some ongoing individual and group-based activity over the course of a week. Our approach makes use of the **Triple D (Digital Deliberative Dialogue) methodology** which is grounded in **Sciencewise principles** of public engagement and will involve **84 participants** in total. The team for this work have all worked together previously on public dialogue projects, including several members who worked on directly comparable work for DfT on the Future Roads dialogue and FSA on Future of Food. We have drawn on this experience, as well as our extensive online research experience, to inform the suggested approach.

1.2. Stage 1: Inception Meeting

The initial phase of the project will involve us getting up to speed on the relevant issues and, importantly, gaining a granular understanding of BEIS's requirements and aspirations for public engagement. Based on our experience we recommend holding a two-hour online inception meeting ahead of any more detailed workshop to focus on stimulus development and expert involvement. This way it will be an opportunity for us to:

- explore in more detail the policy and research context for the project, the key issues, opportunities and deadlines for BEIS/Defra, and key outcomes from the project;
- talk through our approach and rationale in detail to ensure clarity in our suggested approach and discuss any potential changes to the design;
- commence initial discussions around stimulus, identifying key strategy, policy, legislation or research documents, and examples of stakeholders and sources who we may want to draw on in developing stimulus; and
- discuss how we will work together to deliver the project successfully, including the level and type of involvement you would like to have in the engagement exercise, a timetable for reporting and discussion, and an early conversation about what the end deliverables should look like.

Following this we would circulate an updated project plan in the form of a Project Inception Document (PID), including a risk register, a detailed timeline highlighting all key dates, holidays, and any actions required by the core team/wider stakeholder group. We would also set up a weekly telephone catch up call with the core research team, and agree a template for weekly progress updates. This stage will ensure the project gets off to a good start with a clear understanding and buy-in to the aims, process and ways of working; this in turn helps to mitigate risks around slippages to timetables and puts us in the best place possible to deliver on the aims of the research.

1.3. Stage 1: Stakeholder Workshop

The development of stimulus material will be informed by a two-hour virtual stakeholder workshop bringing together expertise from across academia, business and the third sector. The workshop and development of material will be led by Cambridge Zero – the University of Cambridge's cross departmental climate initiative.

To develop appropriate stimulus material and ensure the project properly achieves its objectives, the team will draw upon Cambridge Zero's extensive expert network, connecting with experts from across the University and UK research more broadly. The workshop will be chaired by [redacted] – a world leading climate scientist and Director of Cambridge Zero with extensive public engagement experience – who will also act as advisor to the project [redacted] has led a previous public attitudes study[9] for the Department of Energy and Climate Change). The workshop will incorporate individuals with expertise in behavioural science, public policy, climate science, environmental technology, science communication, industry and sustainable leadership. This may include representation from diverse bodies – from the UK CCC and the Energy Systems Catapult to the ENA and National Grid to Friends of the Earth. Membership of the workshop will be proposed by the core team and reviewed by [redacted] to ensure appropriate representation. Outline material will be developed by Cambridge Zero and the core project team for review in advance of the stakeholder workshop. The stakeholder group will then meet to assess the material, conduct gap analysis and ensure it meets the requirements of Wave One: engaging participants in Net Zero, climate change and feasibility pathways specifically focusing on the areas of greatest potential impact (transport, energy and consumption).

Although this initial workshop will be the primary opportunity to bring to bear the group's broad range of expertise and experience in the development of the material, it is envisaged that this will be an iterative process, with the group providing oversight of content throughout the project timeline – as an informal Reference Group - as well potentially contributing directly as an 'expert' presenter.

1.4. Stage 1: Process of material development

Cambridge Zero will lead on the development of a broad range of stimulus materials including presentations from climate change experts, behavioural scientists and policy professionals, printed handouts and infographics, case studies and 'snapshots' of successful behaviour, contextual data and narratives, and other reference materials. The stimulus material will be developed from a number of sources including materials already in the public domain (e.g. Imperial College's report to the Committee Climate Change: 'Behaviour change, public engagement and Net Zero', the UK Climate Assembly, Defra's 'Citizen engagement with the environment', etc.), academic literature, and the advice and output of the stakeholder workshop. We are mindful of not wanting to 'reinvent the wheel', however it will be important

[9] Climate Science, the Public and the News Media, summary findings of a survey and focus groups conducted in the UK in March 2011; [redacted]; http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/500544/1/lwec-climate-science.pdf

for material to be developed which is engaging and easily understood by members of the public.

The initial **Wave One materials** will look to introduce the concept of net zero and related issues of climate change and sustainability. It will explore the policies and actions (current and planned) of government, business, intergovernmental organisations, and other influencing bodies, feasibility pathways and how these might interface with individual actions to meet the UK's net zero 2050 carbon target. We will use a combination of standalone infographics, visual summaries, videos and animations such as those produced by staff at Cambridge Zero, and engaging tools (e.g. the BBC Climate change food calculator). These will be in addition to presentations to be developed and delivered by experts. The **Wave Two materials** will go into more detail about the range of ways that people could help the UK achieve its net zero target in the pre-established set of priority areas (e.g. consumption, travel and home energy use); exploring the net cumulative impact of different behaviours on emissions in each area. Through the second Wave we will unpack the barriers to adoption, which behaviours are perceived to be, or actually are, harder than others. The material will explore the potential behavioural impact of wider socio-economic trends and political developments (for example, Brexit). It will also incorporate case-studies and examples to demonstrate what successful behaviour might look like.

Newgate and Cambridge both have deep expertise in bringing complex technical issues to life through the development of stimulus materials. These range from animations and infographics of the kind produced for future focused work for DfT on the Future of Roads, and FSA on the Future of Food, through to pen portraits and case studies for engaging people in trade-off activities. [redacted], Director of Cambridge Zero and advisor to the project, has an international reputation as a science communicator and in 2017 co-authored the Ladybird book on Climate Change with HRH The Prince of Wales and Environmentalist [redacted] as part of the Ladybird Expert Series. We will be able to draw on this material to communication Net Zero as part of Wave One.

Cambridge Zero has a strong and innovative public engagement programme. For example, it has initiated a programme of Creative Engagement Workshops which bring together small groups of academics from public policy, engineering and climate science with educational professionals to learn about pedagogical research, to develop educational resources and to pilot them with school children from the University of Cambridge Primary School before disseminating the resources nationally. It also runs a community radio show, Cambridge Zero Climate Talks[10].

In developing the material, the team will be mindful of the COM-B model of behaviour used throughout the project. This maintains that sufficient motivation, capability (i.e. personal

[10] https://www.camfm.co.uk/shows/cambridge-zero-climate-talks/

attributes including understanding) and opportunity (external environmental factors) are required for behavioural change to take place. These three factors will be used as an organising principle for the material, while ensuring we take into account the feedback mechanisms that operate between these elements. For example, following the COM-B framework we will develop materials that highlight the opportunities for reducing climate emissions (like meat consumption above), and the capability barriers to engaging in those behaviours, but also develop materials that provide an insight into the motivational levers that might facilitate behaviour change. Building on extensive psychological literature, we will provide participants with existing 'social norms' for a range of behaviours and attitudes, and work collaboratively to assess the different levers for influence people's attitudes and behaviours in support of net zero.

The project will build on existing message framing for an ESRC funded project with the FCDO led by [redacted], an experimental psychologist and senior Cambridge representative of the core team. The FCDO project is testing the persuasive potential of different psychological frames on support for climate action in seven different countries. These frames already build from a literature in psychology and behaviour change. The project will also build on the public findings of the Cambridge Institute for Sustainable Leadership's (CISL) 'The Future We Want' initiative. This is a platform for debate designed to elicit the critical questions that need to be addressed if we are to move towards a stronger and more resilient society.

1.5. Stage 1: Sample and recruitment

We propose to undertake the research with a **total of 84 people**. This is a fairly large aggregate sample pool for a project of this size and running over two waves, but given the importance and potentially high-profile nature of the research topic, we feel it is important that the data be drawn from as wide and varied a participant pool as possible within the budget available.

The ITT calls for 10 workshops, including five covering various socio-demographic segments, and a further five split across the regions of the UK. Our approach will involve a combination of plenary sessions involving all 84 participants, followed by breakout sessions which equate to 10 workshops (reconvened over two waves).

We will discuss and finalise the sample design with you at the Stage 1 inception workshop. At this point, we suggest the core sample design is aligned to that used in the Climate Assembly UK, namely that it is broadly representative of the UK population accounting both for socio-demographics[11] and location but also their attitudes to climate change[12]. This will enable BEIS to more confidently build on the findings of the more foundational and holistic work undertaken by the House of Commons. It will also enable us to explore if and how attitudes are shaped and in turn shape behaviours that support net zero ambitions. Note one core difference is our suggestion to include a specific group of 16-17 year old participants as they are at a notably different life-stage to those over 18 and would be best engaged separately by Sharon Allen, who brings over 10 years' experience engaging children and young people.

Criterion		Quota
Location	England Scotland Wales Northern Ireland	n 60[13] n 12 n 6 n 6

[11] Based on ONS mid-year 2018 estimates
[12] Based on Ipsos MORI July 2019 polling
[13] Note that these will be proportionately split across the English regions

Location-type	Urban Rural	n 66 n 18
Age	16-17 18-29 30-44 45-59 60+	n 8 n 20 n 20 n 18 n 18
Household income band[14]	Less than £20,000 £20,000-£39,999 £40,000-£59,999 More than £60,000	n 18 n 36 n 18 n 12
Attitude to climate change	Very concerned Concerned Not concerned	n 28 n 28 n 28
Additional demographics (gender, ethnicity) and educational qualifications (no formal qualifications; GCSE / A level or equivalent; Degree or equivalent professional qualification)		Good spread

We can split people out according to the groups suggested in the ITT (i.e. regional and by key socio-demographic segments) for the live workshop discussions, though we recommend discussing this further as there is the possibility that attitudes to climate change may influence how we choose to segment groups. Either way, we have the fieldwork resource to segment into 10 groups in total.

We have proposed recruiting 84 participants in total, to allow for the possibility of c. 5% participants not participating in the second wave. We expect very minimal if any attrition, due to a stacked incentive model we are using and the nature of the participant experience; with sensitive moderation and engaging content, participants tend to enjoy the research process, feel valued for their contributions and want to see through the research process to the end.

We know from experience that where research is potentially contentious or high-profile, professional and sensitive recruitment is absolutely critical; we will need to fully reassure participants around the independence of the research process; ensure we are protecting the research sample from 'hijacking' by those with more extreme views on climate change; obtain early-buy in to the research process and participant commitment, and so on. We work with highly experienced specialist recruiters that bring experience in recruiting for public dialogue. In this case we would work with **Leftfield** who employ three full-time recruitment managers who draw on a national network of specially trained qualitative recruiters. Close liaison between our Project Manager and the assigned recruitment manager is maintained throughout the project to ensure that quotas are met, participants have a positive experience of engaging with research, and we can quickly problem solve any emerging risks.

We recommend that we identify participants through qualitative free-find techniques – a more intensive option than sample recruitment, but important for this type of complex and high-profile research to minimise bias and ensure a representative as possible sample. After providing details of the research, individuals would be asked to undertake a short screening questionnaire to assess eligibility and ensure that the designated quotas are accurately filled. We would carefully develop recruitment criteria around participant attitudes, knowledge and comfort levels around scientific and technical issues; and climate change specifically – as well as any other issues of interest during the inception meetings. We will also ensure that

[14] We recommend income, averaged over the past 12 months, rather than SEG/SEC measures due to the potential recent impact of COVID-19 on employment status

individuals have internet access to enable them to participate online. Only once this has been carried out and it is clear that the individual meets the requirements, will they be invited to participate in the research.

Following recruitment, a confirmation letter or pack would be sent to participants, providing details on the research process, and setting out expectations, as well as the voluntary nature of participation and confidentiality principles. It would also include a named contact within the Newgate research team. Attendees would receive a reminder phone call in the week leading up to each wave and priority alerts would be fed back to the research team in the case of any recidivism. In these cases, the recruitment manager would follow these participants up personally and replacement participants recruited where necessary.

When engaging the public in research, it is typical to pay incentives for a number of reasons such as reciprocity, encouragement, fairness and reliability. Given we are reconvening the participants for two waves of activity, we suggest a sliding scale of incentives: £50 for the first wave and £70 for the second. Staggering incentives in this way has been a critical component of maintaining engagement and minimising drop-out in similar deliberative work our team has conducted.

One criticism that could be levelled against this approach is that it excludes individuals that are not able to access the internet or do not have a minimum level of digital literacy to use tools such as Zoom. In previous work we have supplemented the online approach with face-to-face groups or interviews, or ensured that part of the 'homework' tasks involved participants engaging with friends/family members who were less digitally literate. We would suggest that this latter approach is more appropriate here, and indeed can help to broaden out the achieved sample.

Stage 2a: Digital Deliberative Dialogue: Wave 1

Our standard approach to public dialogue comprises a **deliberative element** – supporting people to understand and engage with an issue through engaging with different perspectives and evidence – with **structured analytical tools**, such as trade-off exercises, to help understand how attitudes and priorities change depending on the information presented. The 'shape' of the public dialogue will be to focus initial engagement on exploration and information provision, then to allow time and space for reflection, with deeper engagement, debate and prioritisation focused towards the end of the dialogue. This is an approach aligned with **Appreciative Inquiry**, a process centred on supporting people in co-designing a future vision that is built on a stage of 'discovery' and 'dreaming' before going into a 'design' stage. This approach helps us determine how people respond to different feasibility pathways, the conditions that influence the acceptability and likely behavioural responses toward different actions, and public priorities for achieving net zero in the UK.

We will be using the **Triple D (Digital Deliberative Dialogue) method** – an approach devised by Newgate's Managing Partner, [redacted] – to manage the entire dialogue process online using a combination of *Zoom* and a dedicated online community platform *Recollective*. The primary live engagement will take place via Zoom, with all participants joining for plenary and breakout sessions. Then there is individual and group-based follow-up activity that takes place over the course of the following week. **In total, over this 'wave', participants will be expected to commit five hours of their time to a combination of live expert presentations and Q&A sessions, stimulus review, forum discussion, live group discussions and independent 'homework' tasks.** Our approach to this first wave is detailed below.

The initial engagement will be through a live two-hour workshop, held on a Saturday morning between 10am and 12pm involving all 84 participants via Zoom. We will begin by clarifying the

purpose of the dialogue, its independence, and the roles of different parties. This will be jointly facilitated by team members from both Newgate and Cambridge. It is very important that participants understand what agendas, interests and organisations lie behind the dialogue, as only then will they engage to the extent that we need them to. We therefore anticipate including a overview from BEIS/Defra of government interest in and position on net zero, and how the dialogue will inform decision making. We will introduce a virtual 'burning issues' board so that anyone can articulate points that are not directly addressed in the dialogue. The board is extremely useful in assuring participants their views will be heard, and in defusing strong feelings and moving discussions on, where necessary.

Following these whole-group introductions we will split people out into smaller groups (no more than 8 people, organized by agreed criteria like geography and socio-demographic (or attitudinal) criteria) to enable people to engage in a live discussion via Zoom to build rapport and really engage in the process. This will involve exploring people's top of mind awareness, understanding and engagement with climate change, factors that influence greenhouse gas emissions, and the types of societal and lifestyle changes needed to reduce climate change. If not spontaneously generated, we would also start to explore associations with individual examples of human activity taken to minimize carbon footprints (e.g. in respect of transport and energy/electricity use), generating freely associated ideas, perceptions, feelings and comparisons. We will then explore the contexts under which they have formed these impressions, providing people with the space to frame the discussion from their own perspective, define their personal priorities and interests and questions.

The final stage of this initial engagement workshop will be a series of three live 15-minute presentations from experts in climate change to help contextualise the dialogue. These sessions – again delivered via Zoom with all 84 participants - will help introduce (i) the concept of climate change and net zero, (ii) the broad feasibility pathways to achieve this in the next 30 years including supply-side actions, and (iii) a deeper dive into the societal and lifestyle changes needed to meet net zero. We expect this will include introducing the savings needed in different 'buckets' like energy, transport, food consumption etc. Questions can be asked and thoughts shared via the chat function, as well as at through a dialogue at the end of each presentation.

It is particularly important at this first session that participants are able to go at their own pace and are not overwhelmed by too much or overly technical information. Early impressions of the dialogue can strongly influence views of the entire process, so we take care to manage the level of information introduced, and vary the format of information provision. The core purpose is to provide high-level information and then give people the opportunity to voice their immediate reactions and to feel listened to.

Following this workshop we would ask people to engage asynchronously in a series of tasks and discussions over the course of the next 7 days via the dedicated Recollective platform. These don't have to be completed on the day, but we would recommend that participants check in regularly to participate. Each day new material, activities and tasks will be 'unlocked' for people to engage with both individually and in their small groups. Examples of activities include:

- Creating vision for a net zero society (both national and local), through use of multimedia (photos, images) and written responses
- A visual Q methodology whereby participants are asked to order photos selected to represent different visions for a net zero society, helping build an aggregate picture
- Providing stimulus (largely videos and illustrations) covering each of the feasibility pathways for people to review, respond to and to ask questions about which experts can then reply to.

- Ranking exercises to identify individual net zero behaviours that are seen to be more or less actionable, followed by a 'homework' task whereby people are asked to undertake an action and to record and report on their experience of this.

The week would culminate by people coming together again for one hour on the following Saturday morning (10am-11am). This would be an opportunity to thank people for their participation and to explain next steps, but importantly also to engage them in a further 45-minute discussion within their original smaller group setting. The focus of this session will be on revisiting the societal-level changes needed and desired, and the challenges in achieving this through individual actions. We will further challenge people to try to maintain certain behaviours between the dialogue waves, and to keep track of their experiences (both barriers and facilitators). It is important to complete the first week with an additional 'live' activity as this will motivate participants to be more engaged and responsive during the week – i.e. completing their homework activities - as they know they will be in a position where they are discussing the subject again with peers.

Wave One will ensure participants have had a brief but well-rounded and engaging introduction to climate change, net zero and feasibility pathways, providing a strong understanding of the context for this research. This will enable them to discuss these issues in detail during Wave Two. It will also identify information needs (e.g. around implications of different feasibility pathways for people, including ethical concerns etc.) so that materials can be further developed and refined for use in Wave Two. Following Wave One we will have gathered an initial understanding of immediate, top-of-mind reactions to net zero priorities and responses, the language and examples used to understand and relate to these, and emerging information needs. This will ensure that we are in a strong position to prepare for Wave Two.

1.6. Stage 2b: Digital Deliberative Dialogue: Wave Two

Wave Two will take place three weeks following Wave One. While the initial wave focused on 'discovery' and 'dreaming' this wave focuses on design. Here we will revisit actions needed to move toward net zero, but frame these more concretely in the context of macro-level changes and opportunities that exist for the UK over the next 30 years. For example, this might include changes to agriculture in the UK resulting from a changing relationship with the EU or potential increases to the cost of meat as a result of increasing global population demand etc. We will also look to more explicitly unpick the challenges that exist for individuals in performing different net zero behaviours, drawing on COM-B and the Behaviour Change Wheel (Michie, Atkins and West, 2014) to identify and test potential levers for behaviour change.

The second wave of dialogue will take place over one day with participants expected to commit 4 hours of their time to a combination of live expert presentations and Q&A sessions, stimulus review and live group discussions. The initial engagement will again start with a live two-hour Zoom session, held on a Saturday morning between 10am and 12pm involving all 84 participants. We will begin by restating the purpose of the dialogue but swiftly follow this on with a series of five short 15 minute presentations to help restate the individual (and societal) changes needed to meet net zero, and to bring to life the opportunities (including policy options), risks and challenges. We would suggest this includes a combination of science communicators (including engaging, UK-based behavioural scientists such as [redacted], policymakers (e.g. from BEIS) and participants themselves. It is important that we help to illustrate 'bright spots' of short-term and longer-term actions undertaken by people, to drive conversation of barriers and facilitators. After these presentations we would hold a curated panel Q&A session, drawing on questions posed in the chat relating to barriers, opportunities and risks.

Following a short comfort and food break, we would reconvene people into their original small groups for 1.5 hours to reflect on what they had heard and to start to work together on prioritising actions – a key aspect of the deliberation process.

Specifically, here we would present people with a series of pen portraits relating to individuals in different life circumstances, and in a few different future scenarios aligned with policy decisions and new technologies. We suggest keeping this within the next 3-5 years to enable people to identify with the situation and for it to be within the current policy cycle. For each of these pen portraits we would ask people to select one that they identify with most and consider the thoughts, emotions and considerations relating to actions that could be taken to reduce their carbon footprint. This is a projective technique that helps people to 'project' their thoughts and feelings on to others, which then enables us to gain additional insight into the potential barriers and facilitators that they may face. Participants would then work together to ideate what would need to happen at an individual, community or societal level, to help pave the way for certain net zero actions, and the barriers that could emerge.

We suggest then structuring the final part of these break out discussions around prioritising net zero behaviours – from those perceived as easiest to hardest to achieve – and then use the COM-B model to help unpick the reasons for this prioritisation and the implications for supporting people to make these changes (including key influencers and where responsibility lies for directing action).

Finally, we would bring all participants back together in plenary to thank them very briefly for their time and to explain next steps in terms of how their feedback will be used. This is an important part of the dialogue process and helps to provide closure to an experience that many will have found highly rewarding. We would recommend that this includes a contribution from BEIS/Defra.

1.7. Stage 3: Analysis and reporting

Through the Triple D process we will have explored: citizen's visions for a net zero society (in the context of social, political and economic changes over the next 30 years); their understanding and acceptance of the paths toward net zero; the barriers and facilitators toward behaviour change; and the direct/indirect consequences of these changes for individuals and society. Though this is a qualitative exercise which intentionally mixes up the sample for parts of the discussion, we will also provide some indication of the characteristics of different sub-groups within the population in respect of knowledge, attitudes and behaviours in respect of climate change and pathways to net zero. Importantly we will also acknowledge and explore, at multiple points, the tension between societal ideals and individual behaviour, and how to address this.

This final stage of the project will involve an in-depth analysis of the data and the development of strategic insight to enable BEIS and Defra (and potentially other decision makers) to make the most effective use of the research. A tension in deliberative research is often moving from the dialogue to a conceptual understanding of the issues for use in future policy and regulation. In this instance the findings need to provide BEIS and Defra with a clear prioritisation of short and longer term actions, and both the expected barriers/ facilitators to actions, for different pathways toward net zero. As mentioned previously, we recommend using a commonly understood behavioural model, such as COM-B throughout the project to help identify and unpick the key influences on future behaviour by specifically looking at individual Capability, Opportunity and Motivation across each pathway. Members of the named team have successfully developed behavioural insights that have helped a wide range of organisations (HMRC, Wellcome, PHE, NHS England, UKRI, etc.) to develop services, campaigns and policies to address larger societal challenges (e.g. blood donation, speeding, cultural capital,

health inequalities and climate change).Our previous experience undertaking comparable dialogue exercises places us in a strong position to help move from a place where we have large volumes of data on public understanding and concern through to a position where evidence is framed by the context of how it most likely to be used.

All forum posts and activities will be automatically captured in audio/writing; live discussions will be digitally recorded and moderator notes then produced from these. Having completed all fieldwork we will undertake a rigorous, formal analysis process. This will involve an developing an analytical framework to systematically analyse data based on hypotheses from Stage 1 and refined through insights and themes developed in Stages 2a and 2b. Our main analytical approach involves content analysis using a method known as 'matrix mapping'. This is a well-known and highly respected analytical process in government circles. Material collected through qualitative methods is invariably unstructured and unwieldy. Much of it is text based, in the form of notes or audio recordings, and the content of the material is usually detailed and in micro-form (for example, accounts of experiences and inarticulate explanations). The primary aim of any analytical method is to provide a means of exploring coherence and structure within a cumbersome data set whilst retaining a hold on the original accounts and observations from which it is derived. Matrix mapping involves developing an analytical framework comprising the themes of interest, so that data from each group or individual can be attributed to these themes, and comparisons or conclusions about the prevalence of specific views can be made. This will enable us to identify differences or faultlines between different subgroups (e.g. by location or income) and highlight potential implications for engaging and influencing the behaviour of people in reaching the net zero goal. We regularly use this approach for all larger-scale social research projects.

After both Waves of fieldwork we will convene the entire project team, including all moderators, to participate in a 1.5-2 hour collaborative analysis session. This is an opportunity for the entire team to discuss the research findings and to start to identify patterns in the data, similarities and differences between subgroups and to make links with other relevant research. We will again draw on Cambridge University here and ensure that the findings are considered in the light of other relevant behavioural models[15].

The team we have assembled has a great deal of experience in developing public dialogue and complex research into strategic insight. We have a track record of producing high quality, timely and useful outputs. We would agree presentation and reporting outlines with BEIS prior to submission of the first drafts, and share emerging insight with the working group so there are 'no surprises' in presentations or reports. Our reports are written to a high standard, are able to withstand close public scrutiny and are accessible to a policy audience. It is usual for our dialogue reports to be published and many that the Project Director has overseen are available in the public domain[16]. As outputs from the dialogue, we would produce:

- Weekly progress updates on the project
- Following Stage 2a, a presentation and short slide deck providing accessible summaries of the key findings of the first wave of dialogue in PowerPoint
- A complete matrix map, with raw data and quotes, at an (anonymised) individual level. This can be in addition to, or in place of, workshop notes and transcripts
- A full qualitative report (c.40 pages), detailing the overall findings of the dialogue, key findings and an executive summary. We would provide a technical appendix including the workshop materials, guides, sample and methodology

[15] E.g. Demski et al., (2015); Schifferstein (2020)
[16] E.g. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-roads-public-dialogue

- A pre-recorded presentation delivered by both Newgate and Cambridge Zero, suitable for wider circulation and/or delivering in a webinar format.

To disseminate emerging and final findings to stimulate policy debate, we would suggest working with Cambridge Zero and - leveraging the academic and industry connection of the University – use social media to publicise emerging findings. We could also provide specific briefings tailored to different sectors such as energy (e.g. ranging from ENA and REA, to Ofgem and RIBA) helping to focus attention on aspects most relevant to different stakeholder audiences. In the absence of the UN Climate Change Conference in November, we would also be happy to help convene a stakeholder summit to bring together key academic, stakeholders and decision makers to discuss the research findings in more detail in early 2021; this could form part of a potential high-profile virtual conference about which Cambridge Zero is in discussions with the Cabinet Office COP26 team.

2. Staff to Deliver

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

3. Understanding the Project Environment

3.1. Understanding the requirement

According to the 2019 Committee on Climate Change (CCC) progress report, the UK is not currently on course to meet its legally binding fourth and fifth carbon budgets or commitments to achieve net zero by 2050. Whilst some progress has been made in reducing scope 1 and 2 emissions this has largely resulted from reducing emissions in electricity generation, waste and in the industrial sector and not from shifts in citizens behaviour. Globally, household consumption accounts for almost three quarters of emissions; facilitating shifts in behaviour represents a substantial opportunity to reduce societal emissions to a level in line with IPCC targets.

Strategies for facilitating behaviour change by developing measures that are likely to be effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions have already been identified (Carmichael, 2019), with the UK CCC report identifying three areas where individual action would have the greatest impact in supporting net zero. These include Home (encompassing behaviours and choices relating to heating and energy use), Travel (choosing more active modes of local transport, adoption of EVs and shared services, and minimising flights) and Consumption (including both choices around food, recycling/reusing, and purchasing behaviours). While there are different feasibility pathways, notably the Clockwork and Patchwork pathways identified by the Energy Systems Catapult in Innovating to Net Zero, and similar pathways identified by the European Climate Foundation, they all require varying degrees of change to individual and societal behaviour interfacing with supply-side changes.

Whilst research on achieving net zero has tended to focus on the technical or supply side, behavioural and societal transitions for net zero have already been the subject of some level of study as mentioned in the ITT. The recent work of Climate Assembly UK has the ability to make policy recommendations for reaching net zero through its model of learning and discussion. Survey work has also been conducted to understand citizens' attitudes towards achieving net zero (Copper Consultancy, 2019) and attitudes towards potential decarbonising behaviour changes (Energy Systems Catapult, 2020). It will be important for this research to account for, and build on, the relevant findings laid out in these studies. While these studies have been more general in focus, getting to net zero will require a holistic, systems-wide approach, that incorporates both supply-side changes to services and production of goods,

demand-side changes to individual behaviours in the use of services and goods, and a policy environment which is supportive of both of these efforts. This is clearly recognised in Carmichael's report to the Committee on Climate Change. As such this research will draw on these findings, as well as wider research undertaken by members of this project team and others around the future of transportation and food (e.g. our work for DfT and FSA), and sustainable consumption (e.g. our work for Resource London).

This piece of research will form an important part of the research literature, by meaningfully engaging with people about what they want a net zero future to look like, and to explore the implications of the feasibility pathways to achieve this. Individual behaviour change is notoriously challenging to achieve, however, as has been illustrated through the public response to Covid-19, it is possible to achieve societal changes to behaviour rapidly. The current environment (both in terms of individual and community responses to Covid-19 and Brexit) presents a significant window of opportunity to explore what a systemic societal transition to net zero might look like, and the key barriers and facilitators to behaviour change. This will help in turn inform both policy interventions for net zero but also to understand opportunities for communication, education and design interventions across all stakeholder audiences. Any changes to individual behaviour will need to be achieved through systemic change.

To elaborate more fully on the objectives stated in the ITT. We have explored each of the four stated objectives using examples from policy areas which represent the largest sources of behavioural emissions. The six outlined research questions are considered throughout discussion of these objectives.

Objective 1: To establish people's understanding and perceptions of what people think reaching climate targets in the UK will mean for both them as an individual, and for society as a whole.

The programme of deliberative workshops will need to establish the current state of people's understanding of what behavioural and societal transitions will occur to reach net zero by 2050. The issue of future discounting is a key challenge here and one that a number of our team faced in similar work that [redacted] for DfT on the Future of Road Transportation and for the FSA on the Future of Food while Head of Qualitative Research at Kantar.

Taking transport as an hypothetical example, we would need to explore how people envisage themselves using transport in the future given actual and predicted changes to policy (e.g. phasing out of petrol vehicles; road pricing), technology (e.g. improved performance of electric vehicles; proliferation of shared services; automation) and wider conditions (e.g. work habits). All these changes could be framed around how individuals may experience transport in the future but the broader systemic ramifications could be extensive. For example, if a transition to net zero involved travelling less and shorter distances, this could change the composition of the community of people that individuals routinely interact with, how often people interact with family members or close friends, the types of jobs people do, their ability to access public services, the criteria they use to make choices about housing, and how all of these possible different scenarios make people feel.

This research objective is of particular importance in positioning future policy, education and communications responses to net zero. Having an understanding of people's current perception of what will be required to meet the net zero targets is an effective way of identifying where there are gaps or misconceptions which may influence current or future behavioural responses.

Objective 2: To gain insight into people's attitudes and preferences towards different plausible pathways for meeting net zero.

This programme of engagement will build on participants' current perceptions by exploring the multiple plausible pathways to achieving net zero. For example, from a technological perspective, experts have identified solutions that vary from relying on existing technology through to geoengineering and climate repair. These pathways to net zero could have very different impacts on peoples' lived experience as is illustrated through the scenarios that the Energy Systems Catapult proposed in their 2018 report. This is a complex issue, and a key reason why we have proposed a deliberative approach as it requires time for people to engage in the research process, and then to engage with the pathways, the implications for them and their responses to this.

Initial reactions to the issue will be more objective, rational and disconnected than would be the case in reality when faced with choices. We will need to use future scenarios and pen portraits to help people to think about issues from the perspective of others and project their thoughts/feelings in a way that will enable us to get underneath the immediate, rational responses which will likely advocate for changes that go beyond what most people would themselves adopt. We will also take advantage of people being situated in their normal contexts (i.e. at home) to get them to take some tentative steps toward activities that reduce their carbon footprint – helping us identify the immediate barriers for people, as well as the 'bright spots' where people have (or are able to) make changes to identify the key facilitators.

We would develop stimulus materials to explore what different pathways to net zero might look like for participants. These materials would both explain the underlying science in simple terms and outline possible options for transition to net zero covering both supply and demand side actions as both have behavioural implications. Taking the example of heating homes in the UK, a non-exhaustive portfolio of options to transition to net zero could include: (i) radically improving insulation of building stock; (ii) replacing gas fired boilers with heat pumps or decarbonised district heating solutions; and (iii) changing people's expectations of the temperature to which they heat their homes. Whilst none of these options are mutually exclusive there may be substantial variation in people's preferences for adopting these actions which may depend on any number of socio-cultural factors as well as opportunities and limitations presented by people's living situations.

People are also likely to vary in the behavioural changes that they themselves are willing to make. One of the challenges in behaviour change for public goods, like the transition towards net zero, is that unless the benefits to individuals are aligned with societal benefits then individuals may not take up these behavioural changes. Variation in individual pro-sociality may result in a continuum of people being willing to take action themselves and believing others to be responsible for action. Understanding the degree to which people are willing to change their own behaviour and the degree to which they believe that its someone else's responsibility will be of importance in designing effective policy recommendations. Likewise, Nisa *et al.* 2019 study published by Nature Communications, suggested that behavioural interventions alone are insufficient to promote sustained behaviour change, potentially because their personal benefits are not aligned with societal benefits. Understanding what actions people find easy and desirable to take provides an evidence base for designing interventions with maximal impact towards net zero. The nature of deliberative research should also draw out where pathways towards net zero may have unforeseen impacts on particular groups and for these to be incorporated into policy design.

Objective 3: To set out the most and least socially feasible areas of net zero (i.e. identify the key risks/toughest areas of reaching Net Zero).

To address this objective we would identify areas where there is either high willingness or unwillingness to engage in behavioural shifts towards net zero. We propose using the COM-B model, and drawing on the behavioural expertise of [redacted], a behavioural expert at Cambridge University, to ensure that we explore responses to net zero and feasibility pathways taking into consideration both individual and 'societal' capability, opportunity and motivation, as the interactions between the individual and the context/system that they respond to will be critical here. We recommend the use of COM-B as it is a model which is well used, validated and understood, and which also aligns with the Behaviour Change Wheel for exploring potential levers for change.

Where people are unwilling it may be the case that in some areas whilst partial shifts could be achieved, reaching a point where net zero can be achieved may very challenging. For example, if we needed to completely eradicate consumption of ruminant meat to reach net zero, current research suggests that whilst people are willing to reduce their consumption it is not clear if the majority of people would be happy to stop consuming ruminant meat entirely. This might be a barrier to achieving net zero. These insights would be highly valuable from a policy perspective as they would allow investment in alternative policy interventions designed to achieve net zero. In this example this could range from investing in food technology to produce adequate meat substitutes, to providing incentives for net zero agricultural methods, taxing ruminant meat heavily and providing education on other viable food choices.

[redacted] is already testing the persuasive potential of different psychological frames on support for climate action in seven different countries which build from a literature in psychology and behaviour change. The value of the deliberative approach is that we will be able to build in both an exploratory stage to gather immediate reactions which are representative of behavioural responses under the current context, but then to look at how these may change under different circumstances.

Objective 4. To set out how people would prefer to engage with/access net zero policies and also identify cross-cutting initiatives that could help facilitate the societal change required for net zero.

This research will be of high value in developing cross-cutting initiatives by identifying areas of strong consensus both in terms of the content of initiatives and the level at which these initiatives are pitched. For example, if the group had strong agreement that action on food is important and that schools are a good place to learn about food, which will in turn influence home habits. Interventions may then be focussed on food in schools. However, we should also be clear that people are often unlikely to be in a position to explicitly identify these opportunities themselves and there is a high danger of overly- rationalised responses. Again we will use COM-B here to identify a range of options for exploring with people to ensure that we consider the fullest range of implications for future engagement and holistic intervention. The recommendations of this work will be grounded in the views of participants but shaped by our expert interpretation of these in the context of behavioural science.

3.2. Newgate Research and Cambridge Zero

We have proposed a consortium approach here which brings together some of the UKs leading experts in public dialogue, climate change and science communication.

Newgate Research is led by [redacted], who has overseen dozens of deliberative public dialogue projects working alongside other members of the proposed fieldwork team. While Head of Qualitative Research at Kantar, [redacted] pioneered the creation of a model for digital dialogue that was used for BEIS in their Public Attitudes to Science series throughout 2019.

We have refined this approach further to include more substantive activities – live group discussions, live expert Q&As, use of whiteboards etc. - for encouraging dialogue. This both helps to overcome the key current challenge of engaging with people remotely due to Covid-19 and maximises the value of online research: both live and asynchronous engagement. [redacted] has led public dialogues, working with all of the named Associate Partners, for DECC, BEIS, DIT, DfT, PHE and other charities and academic institutions.

We have partnered with Cambridge Zero, the climate change initiative introduced by the University of Cambridge's which harnesses the full range of research and policy expertise across one of the UKs leading universities. Cambridge Zero exists to maximise the University's contribution towards achieving a zero carbon future by integrating and substantially enhancing the University's activities: through research and innovation, education and training, stakeholder engagement and reducing the University's own carbon footprint. The Cambridge team will lead on stimulus development, ensuring that the materials build on the existing policy and research landscape. Their expertise ensures we don't have to waste valuable time undertaking literature reviews to get up to speed. The team are already experts in climate change and science communication, and have an existing network to draw on quickly and efficiently. [redacted] is Head of Cambridge Zero and an internationally renowned for her public engagement work, including the bestselling Ladybird Book on Climate Change. She will be an advisor to the team, working alongside [redacted] and others.

4. Project Plan and Timescales

4.1. Detailed project plan

The table below provides detailed timings to provide an indication of when we would intend undertaking key activities and milestones. We've highlighted in our approach the anticipated input from BEIS and the working group. This is also provided below for reference. Key milestones will revolve around the completion of fieldwork, and then the reporting points for each stage of research – these are highlighted in bold below.

Activity	Responsibility	Timing
Contract awarded	BEIS	6th August
Stage 1 - Inception meeting	BEIS	w/c 10th August
Stage 1 – Production of project plan, PID and risk register	Newgate/Cambridge	w/c 17th August
Stage 1 – Stakeholder workshop	**Newgate/Cambridge**	**w/c 24th August**
Stage 2a - Stimulus development for Wave 1 dialogue	All	w/c 17th August – w/c 7th September
Stage 2a - Recruitment	Newgate/Cambridge	From w/c 31st August
Stage 2a - Sign-off of Wave 1 stimulus	BEIS	w/c 7th September
Stage 2a – Wave 1 fieldwork	**Newgate/Cambridge**	**12th – 19th September**
Stage 2a – Post-wave analysis and interim reporting	Newgate/Cambridge	w/c 21st September
Stage 2a – Meeting with project team/working group	All	w/c 21st September
Stage 2b - Stimulus development for Wave 2 dialogue	Newgate/Cambridge	w/c 21st September – w/c 28th September
Stage 2b - Sign off of Wave 2 stimulus	BEIS	w/c 5th October
Stage 2a – Interim report	**Newgate/Cambridge**	**w/c 5th October**

Stage 2b – Wave 2 fieldwork	**Newgate/Cambridge**	**10th October**
Stage 2b - Post-wave analysis	Newgate/Cambridge	w/c 12th October
Stage 2b – Meeting with project team/working group	All	w/c 12th October
Stage 3 – Synthesis and analysis	Newgate/Cambridge	From w/c 19th October
Stage 3 - Final reporting	Newgate/Cambridge	From w/c 26th October
Stage 3 - Draft report submitted	Newgate/Cambridge	By 13th November
Stage 3 - Final report submitted	**Newgate/Cambridge**	**By 27th November**
Final presentation/webinar	Newgate/Cambridge	November (TBC)

Based on our extensive experience of undertaking other deliberative public dialogue projects we are confident that the above timetable is achievable and realistic. To facilitate high quality delivery that meets the aims and objectives of stakeholders we have included review points throughout for us to present findings and discuss stimulus. This level of stakeholder input ensures that there is suitable buy-in for the approach and enables us to minimize the level of revisions needed to stimulus. For the first wave of dialogue we have allowed a four-week window for stimulus development and sign-off which includes convening a stakeholder workshop, collating existing materials - drawing on the bank of materials already held by the University of Cambridge - and supplementing this with new material gathered from elsewhere. For the second wave of dialogue we have allowed a two week window – this will be sufficient to ensure that new stimulus is developed to address needs/interests of participants.

Pinch-points in the project timetable revolve around the agreement of stimulus and themes for exploration, which is why we have suggested an interim findings discussion which sits alongside the stimulus development process. These meetings also minimize risk of stimulus development becoming an overly drawn out process. Again, members of the Newgate team have worked in this way to tight timetables on a wide variety of deliberative projects for BEIS and others, and have found that this collaborative process helps minimize timetable delays.

In addition to the contact points detailed in the above timetable, we would also provide weekly progress reports to BEIS during fieldwork periods, supplemented with weekly KIT meetings. The contract for this research is relatively tight given the range of activities being undertaken so we feel this level of contact would be beneficial. As standard we will ensure that all queries from BEIS receive a response within 24 hours.

[redacted]

[redacted]

4.2. Ethics

As previously outlined, we abide by the Market Research Society (MRS) Code of Conduct and ESOMAR Code of Marketing & Social Research Practice. Our procedures accord with ethical guidance/frameworks published by the Social Research Association, ESRC and GSR. Below we detail our approach to considering ethics in response to this project, which have been further enhanced in response to Covid-19. This forms part of our approach to identifying and monitoring risk.

Expert application and conduct of social research methods: Every single member of the proposed team is an experienced social researcher, bringing, on average over 15 years' experience delivering comparable social research projects. The research lead, [redacted], brings nearly 20 years' experience and has successfully led many public dialogue projects both at Kantar and now at Newgate, including pioneering the digital dialogue approach. The partnership of Newgate and Cambridge University provides a high level of credibility and expertise in high profile and complex public dialogue, managing sensitive subjects, science communication and climate change. This minimises risks of project delivery and material development not being fit for purpose.

Informed and inclusive participation: Our ethical guidelines make it clear that the principles of honesty and transparency must be reflected when gaining participants' co-operation to participate. This includes clearly communicating to participants (in writing and verbally) the purpose and subject of the research, what is required from them, that participation is voluntary and they may withdraw at any stage, and that the research will be carried out according to the MRS Code of Conduct. All consent material is drafted in plain English, and suitable for all levels of education. Specific materials will be provided for those aged 16-17 to ensure that parents of those younger people who will be participating are aware of the purpose and process of the research. All recruitment will be undertaken by professional recruiters in accordance with ISO 20252.

We are committed to ensuring our research is inclusive, which is particularly relevant for this project given the online nature of the discussions. We are experienced in applying principles of inclusivity in our research, which frequently involves disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. Specific measures for this project include the engagement of Cambridge Zero – experts in both climate chance and science communication – to ensure materials are suitable for engaging all participants in what can be complex subject matter. We have also proposed a sample design which is inclusive whilst meeting objectives and maximising public value.

Avoidance of harm: Newgate has a duty of care both to participants and researchers working in the field. As a matter of course, all our qualitative researchers have Disclosure Scotland clearance, we train researchers to deal with situations where participants become distressed and offer information to respondents about where they can get support and we have a formal

respondent complaints procedure, which conforms to the requirements of the MRS Code of Conduct. We will maintain the same researchers for breakout groups across waves to maintain rapport and help researchers build trust with participants. We understand the need for sensitivity in managing participants during this period and have identified support organisations and materials that can be used in case participants experience distress during the project. These include both NHS information and advice, and dedicated mental health hotlines in England and each of the devolved nations.

Anonymity and confidentiality: In line with the requirements of the Data Protection Act (and GDPR) we ensure that research outputs do not in any way identify individual participants. Measures that we take, as standard, to ensure that confidentiality include:

- Integrating confidentiality into our interviewer training and briefing
- All respondent-facing materials detail our commitment to confidentiality
- Personal contact details are stored in a separate file from the main data file and transmitted separately. We will also request that participants do not use their full name on Zoom or Recollective to maintain anonymity
- Once on our systems, personal details are always stored in separate files from the anonymised data records. These files are also stored in separate (protected) locations from the main data
- Data supplied to clients do not contain any information that would allow individuals to be identified

Part 2: Contract Terms

Contract Terms v6.0