

# Climate Justice: Developing the future UK agenda for action

A report summarising the themes, issues and agendas emerging from the one day workshop discussing the legacy of the JRF Climate Justice programme.

The event was held on Monday 19 June 2017 at the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Offices at Camelford House on the Albert Embankment in Vauxhall, London. In all twenty seven people attended, representing a diverse range of stakeholders and intermediaries from civil society, government and academia and these are provided in *Annex 1* (name and organisation).

Climate Just

Key questions ? Map tool Search the site

Home About Resources Case studies FAQs News Glossary Contact

## Why are some people more vulnerable to climate change than others, where are they and what can be done?

Climate Just

Key questions ?

- Who is vulnerable?
- Which places are disadvantaged?
- What actions support resilience?
- Why does climate justice matter?
- Which households emit the most carbon?
- What can be done to tackle fuel poverty?

Map tool: see how your area is affected

Who needs to do what?



# 1. The purpose of the event

The purpose of the event was to:

- share learning from JRF's climate justice and community resilience work, prior to the closure of these work programmes;
- bring together key stakeholders with an interest in this work to share reflections on the programme and to consider its legacy, including how the research agenda, issues arising and policy and practice change, can be addressed going forward; and
- identify possible opportunities for action that may support change, considering research, national and local policy and practice, public engagement, and associated future funding.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation was supported on the day by Climate Outreach and the UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP), University of Oxford. This report is authored by Dr Chris Shaw of Climate Outreach and based on notes taken during the day and outputs from facilitated sessions. The views represented in this report do not necessarily represent the views of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

## 2. Summary of the day

### Looking back

The JRF climate change programmes have impacted on many areas of activity in social policy. The UK Climate Change Risk Assessments and National Adaptation Programme have both been informed by the climate justice agenda, paying greater attention to distributional issues arising from climate impacts and adaptation responses. The social justice and flood insurance report informed approaches to the development of Flood Re in 2012 and the care homes and overheating work is being used to support Public Health England responses and guidance to the care sector in 2017. JRF reports have also been used in an EU evidence paper that is being developed on social justice and cities (2018). In addition the Climate Just website and resources have proved their value, with over 20,000 users in their first 18 months and 200 local authority, public and voluntary and community sector staff trained on how to use the resources to inform local climate change strategies.

The climate justice theme of work has created an evidence base and vocabulary which has made it possible to talk about inequities in spaces which previously were not paying attention to these themes. In addition the JRF has brought together stakeholders from various fields, building new collaborations and networks. This capacity building has been especially valuable during a period of austerity, when resources and staff have been disappearing from central and local government.

### Looking forward

The closure of JRF's climate change work programmes comes in a context of the retreat of other climate initiatives and structures. This poses challenges moving forward. However, there was a desire and appetite for continuing to work with the ideas and research opened up by JRF's programmes. This will include updating the Climate Just website, continuing to include issues of distributional justice in national climate change plans, and ensuring community level work remains informed by the principles highlighted by the climate justice agenda. There was significant discussion of the need for better communication and the ability to engage effectively with wider communities on the issues. More details about next steps are provided in Section 7 (below).

A LinkedIn page – called [Climate Change and Social Justice](#) – has been set up for attendees and others to share ongoing work being done in this field.

### 3. Introduction: participants' thoughts on what is required in order to deliver climate justice

Participants were asked to introduce themselves and briefly share their thoughts on what they felt would be needed to ensure climate justice. The main themes that emerged were:

- An authentic and ongoing process of talking and listening between all sections of society, especially vulnerable people which in turn would require mutual trust and respect. This means policy needs to be fair and to be seen to be fair.
- A recognition of the importance values play in deliberations about how best to respond to climate change and the importance of justice.
- Working at the scale of the local – recognising that planning and policy decisions are often perpetuating injustice but that there is the infrastructure in place in the form of local authorities which offers a framework through which communities can respond to these injustices.
- Policy makers understand the language of cost/benefits – this forms the evidence base on which decisions are taken.

### 4. A stock take of the JRF climate justice programme from Katharine Knox

JRF's climate change work programmes ran from 2009–2017, and over that time addressed two main themes.

- 2009–2013: Climate change and social justice
- 2014–2017: Climate change and community resilience

Over that time, 25 publications were produced, and numerous events were run by JRF often in partnership with others. Wide-ranging engagement was undertaken to share messages from the work and support policy and practice development.

Phase 1 of the work focusing on climate justice helped to identify key aspects of the agenda and build the evidence base on related issues including:

- Inequities in responsibility for emissions (causes)
- Inequities in the social impacts of climate change (impacts)
- Inequities in how the costs and benefits of policy and practice are shared (responses)
- Intergenerational and procedural justice issues (governance).

Phase 2 sought to help consider ways forward and how to build community resilience to climate change providing:

- Evidence on the concept and nature of community resilience, critical success factors and case studies of local practice
- Action research to support capacity building at the local level and build links between institutions such as local authorities and communities in developing responses
- Support for practice development to overcome vulnerability and build resilience by providing tools and associated training through the Climate Just website and exploring opportunities through the planning system and public health to build responses at the local level.

## Lowlights

- 2009–2017 has been characterised by challenging economic conditions ushered in by the financial crash of 2008, which was followed by an ongoing period of austerity. This resulted in a de-prioritisation of climate change and social justice. The policy/intermediary capacity has shrunk during that period, and it has been apparent that individuals have an important role to play. Often, when the person goes, so does the voice speaking up for those issues.
- It has proved difficult to get justice on to the climate change agenda (though there is some progress on this e.g. CCRA 2017), and climate change on to the social justice agenda (there is little progress on this).
- There has been no noticeable increase in the visibility of procedural (in)justice and intergenerational (in)justice, some progress on distributional justice.
- JRF is seen by some as a left leaning organisation, potentially limiting the breadth of engagement with climate justice work.

## Highlights

The programme has built new collaborations and networks. This has resulted in new interdisciplinary partnerships and built greater research capacity. These networks and partnerships have ensured strong impact in the research sector. This has been a cumulative process and looking back it is clear the project has put climate justice firmly on the research agenda. Some notable policy wins include:

- Highlighting the principle of energy injustice
- The impact made by the flood insurance policy premiums report
- The care homes and over-heating report
- Climate Just: 20,000 users of the website, 200 trained in using the resources including the mapping tool
- CCRA 2017.

## Learnings

- Sometimes pushing the justice agenda may have been counterproductive – policy makers, rather than address these injustices, have instead just avoided pursuing particular programmes.
- There are policy windows, times when it is possible to make a big impact, but that is often the result of fortuitous timing, and is something that it is difficult to plan for.
- The novelty of the issues highlighted means additional work is often required to connect that with already familiar frames and mental models of the audience.

See *Annex 2* for details of attendees' reflections on success and challenges.

## 5. Presentations

A panel of contributors was asked to comment on challenges for the justice agenda going forward.

### Nick Jackson, Defra

JRF are seen as pioneers in building understanding of the social impacts of climate change and climate change policy. The JRF work with Islington and Leeds councils on just adaptation was very important – it filled a knowledge gap in central government, and gave support to other local councils. The first National Adaptation Programme was supplemented by JRF's work and the work of JRF is informing the focus of the second Climate Change Risk Assessment. These issues need to be considered in the next NAP.

### Daniel Johns, Committee on Climate Change

The ASC work highlights 6 priority areas for the NAP, for example the need for the creation of 'blue and green' infrastructure to reduce the urban heat island effect. We will need to see if the next set of NAP objectives will reflect JRF themes. However, now a lot of the infrastructure for delivery of the NAP objectives has gone. It is important that the NAP objectives are measurable, so that government can be held to account.

### Kit England, Sniffer

Katharine has led a tremendous amount of work, for which she deserves our gratitude and recognition. Most of the challenges faced by JRF are coming from societal forces external to JRF. Building regulations are an example of the external challenges – every aspect requires its own level of expertise, combined with moral judgement etc. That level of expertise is being lost.

### Simon Roberts, CSRE

Unless people feel what is being done is fair they won't buy into it. This is the 'why it matters' question. Currently there is a lack of procedural justice and a lack of voice in mitigation strategies – we are exploring the role of energy as a vehicle for building strong local democracy. We still need to build broader consent for climate justice and for social justice.

### Sarah Lindley, University of Manchester

JRF has delivered a diverse body of work, drawing together knowledge from a number of disciplines. Climate Just has reinforced the need for adaptation to be socially and spatially sensitive and represents a very valuable legacy. The Climate Just resource has received international recognition e.g Helsinki. There is a need for the Climate Just databases to be updated, which will be done through the JRF exit strategy.

### Jamie Clarke, Climate Outreach

Climate change was an issue of rising concern until 2008, but since then there has been something of a decline in levels of concern. In part this is the result of climate fatigue and reduced media coverage, and means no one is talking about climate change in their day to day conversations. This growing climate silence has allowed negative and sceptical voices to dominate the discussion, and present concerns and desire for effective policy as a 'leftie-elitist' issue. There is now an effort to make the issue more tangible to the public and since the Paris summit it appears policymakers are becoming more willing to talk about climate change.

## 6. Facilitated sessions - what will a climate just 2030 look like?

Attendees were split into five groups and asked to consider what they thought a socially just and climate resilient society might look like in 2030 – a date sufficiently far in the future such that major changes could be possible but it is still within reach. Attendees had 20 minutes for discussion and were invited to select from the following themes; economic, environment, social cohesion, political and policy environment, natural environment, rights and litigation, regulations and standards, the research environment, how we communicate and engage, the role of campaigns, implementation and practice, welfare, barriers/challenges, enablers/drivers, equitable outcomes, cultural norms, values and beliefs, relationship with our planet, education, world view, vulnerable people (young, elderly, sick, tenants, migrants), how we work.

Having identified what a climate just 2030 might look like attendees were then asked to consider how we might get there.

The discussions shared common themes around the need for greater levels of public participation in decision-making, embedding of climate justice and social justice in national and local planning decisions, improved public understanding of the demands of living in a low carbon climate just world, a shift in focus from the individual to the collective, stronger regulation, and a recognition of the role of values in human behaviour rather than a preoccupation with economics. To get there will need a transformation in the national discourse on the country's collective future, with greater control over decision-making devolved to the people. (See *Annex 3* for notes from this session).

## 7. What will you be doing to build on the Climate Justice legacy?

The day finished with attendees sharing the personal and professional actions they would be taking to take forward the Climate Justice agenda. Actions suggested included:

- Climate justice continues to inform national planning for adaptation.
- The network of people attending remain in touch and share resources or work through linkedin/ other contact.
- The Climate Just website and resources are maintained and developed.
- Participants with an interest seek funding to hold local conversations throughout the country about these themes.
- Continue to develop understanding of the links between climate change and social justice.
- Build links and capacity for people to work together on climate justice.

## Annex 1: Attendees

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Roberta Antonaci</b>              | The Wildlife Trusts                                |
| <b>Nick Banks</b>                    | Centre for Sustainable Energy (CSE)                |
| <b>Kevin Burchell</b>                | University of Westminster                          |
| <b>Esther Carmen</b>                 | University of Dundee                               |
| <b>Jamie Clarke</b>                  | Climate Outreach                                   |
| <b>David Powell</b>                  | New Economics Foundation (NEF)                     |
| <b>Clare Downing</b>                 | UK Climate Impacts Programme                       |
| <b>Kit England</b>                   | SNIFFER  |
| <b>Kristen Guida</b>                 | London Climate Change Partnership                  |
| <b>Kathryn Brown</b>                 | Committee on Climate Change                        |
| <b>Tahseen Jafry</b>                 | Glasgow Caledonian University                      |
| <b>Daniel Johns</b>                  | Committee on Climate Change                        |
| <b>Katharine Knox</b>                | Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF)                   |
| <b>Peter Lefort</b>                  | Eden Project                                       |
| <b>Sarah Lindley</b>                 | The University of Manchester                       |
| <b>Nick Jackson</b>                  | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
| <b>Rosie Mockett</b>                 | Big Lottery Fund                                   |
| <b>Mike Peverill</b>                 | Climate UK   |
| <b>Patrick Pringle</b>               | UK Climate Impacts Programme                       |
| <b>Simon Roberts</b>                 | Centre for Sustainable Energy (CSE)                |
| <b>Paul Sayers</b>                   | Sayers and Partners LLP                            |
| <b>Chris Shaw</b>                    | Climate Outreach                                   |
| <b>Graham Smith</b>                  | University of Westminster                          |
| <b>Claire Spooner</b>                | Economic and Social Research Council               |
| <b>Carla Stanke</b>                  | Public Health England (PHE)                        |
| <b>Clare Twigger Ross</b>            | Collingwood Environmental Planning                 |
| <b>Andrea Westall (morning only)</b> | FSDS/ independent consultant                       |
| <b>Christine Wissink</b>             | Kent County Council                                |
| <b>Ruth Wolstenholme</b>             | SNIFFER  |

## Annex 2: Attendees' reflections on the highs and lows of the Climate Justice programme

| Year              | Lowlights   | Highlights   |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 2009<br>-<br>2011 | <p>Very few people have 'climate justice' in their job descriptions.</p> <p>Local authorities have deprioritised joint work on climate justice.</p> | <p>Inputting to both CCRA's - providing good evidence on heat and drought.</p> <p>Started and continued a conversation and network of champions.</p> <p>Taking a distributional approach to flooding - using a social science and interdisciplinary lens e.g. -pluvial flooding project.</p> <p>Gave people the language to talk about climate justice.</p> <p>Developing the conceptual framework for flood climate disadvantage and evidence approach (Manchester work).</p> <p>Policy +ve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NI 188 CC Adaptation</li> <li>• CC Act 2008</li> <li>• CCRA 2012</li> </ul>   |
| 2011<br>-<br>2013 | As above  | <p>+ve. JRF funding in this space has opened up the debate, made it easier for people (inc. policy makers) to talk about the issues. But doesn't guarantee they will ACT on it.</p> <p>Thought provoking work on how councils are addressing climate change and vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Link between social justice and climate better understood in influential organisations.</p> <p>Shed light and provided evidence for sectoral work on the individual impacts of flooding and heat.</p> <p>Putting a human face on the issue of climate change from a respected organisation.</p> <p>Flood insurance report made Defra officials think about flood insurance as a problem of social justice, not just an economics problem.</p> <p>JRF's legitimacy as an advocate for these issues.</p> |

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <p>2013<br/>-<br/>2015</p> | <p>Not sure how useful the change to the language of resilience has been for continuity of narrative.</p> <p>Lost traction on what do with justice frame - action/research/policy/activism.</p> <p>Failure to capitalise on media opportunities - local case studies? Need a national debate.</p> <p>Contrast between enthusiastic policy contacts and complacent 'higher-ups'.</p> <p>Seen by some as research with a political agenda.</p> <p>Has JRF provided enough tools and resources (rather than just evidence) to stimulate change?</p> <p>Failure of JRF and others to embed these issues - very siloed.</p> <p>Difficult to always be salient publicly within 'climate frame'.</p> <p>Scotland and Wales get this stuff a lot more than England and put resources into it.</p> | <p>Bringing together learning from different actors (practitioners/researchers/government). Offered opportunities to bridge gaps between sectors.</p> <p>Research on resilience of communities to climate change.</p> <p>Co-ordinating/creating a network of sector organisations.</p> <p>Opening the debate with MPs about where investment does go and where it should go. Not the same thing.</p> <p>Climate Just - a real resource!</p> <p>Providing a UK focused Climate Justice hook for academics, consultants and others.</p> <p>Research projects - by far the most impactful. Clear robust evidence, objective. Well taken up by others.</p> <p>Gives legitimacy to those who want to promote the issue.</p> <p>Impact on capacity - enabled CSE to develop wider work (with DECC, CCC etc) on distributional impacts, and make case to new funders.</p> <p>Specifying policy work as part of projects.</p> <p>Being able to bring distributional justice to Chinese policymakers through JRF work.</p> <p>Consolidating evidence on climate justice.</p> <p>Great JRF visibility in the adaptation sphere.</p> <p>Evidence base links local and national policy (though there is still a policy gap).</p> <p>Wide engagement through Climate Just project. Creating new discussions with members, planners, flood risk managers, voluntary community sector.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|---|

|                            |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| <p>2015<br/>-<br/>2017</p> | <p>Procedural justice and managed realignment: legacy decision - who pays and who benefits. No real engagement yet.</p> <p>Coverage of social vulnerability in CCRAI +2 a lot of material provided, more than other topics, how to strike need for balance against getting the key points across.</p> <p>Local policy focus on a. Inequality and b. Low carbon not linked, not implemented.</p> <p>Climate policy increasingly viewed as concern of elites. People need to own climate change mitigation and adaptation as a set of measures and ideas that not only has a moral imperative but also delivers jobs, regenerates communities etc.</p> <p>Yet to make climate justice and social justice more salient.</p> <p>Could more have been done to go beyond reports and set agendas?</p> <p>Climate Just impact evaluation: great usage stats, but not many people engage deeply. Early days for action on the ground being taken to make a difference.</p> <p>Lack of capacity at local authority level.</p> <p>Where justice may come in: climate change action, relationships with third sector, community (engagement).</p> <p>Still too difficult to link inclusive growth, flood investment, spiral of decline.</p> <p>Realising policy networks aren't very interdisciplinary - difficult to get different sectors involved in conversation.</p> <p>Storytelling and reactivity - waiting for/ reacting to disasters and other publicly engulfing stories can pull us in the wrong directions. But there are lots of stories out there - is there a stronger role for identifying and sharing these stories to help frame the issues which should be our priorities in the long term and immediate future?</p> <p>Reach beyond the usual suspects still a challenge - how can we make people interested?</p> <p>JRF stepping away from climate. Who will fill space? What signal does it send to public/policy makers?</p> | <p>Community resilience action research. Engaging communities in conversations of change.</p> <p>Big policy opportunities opened up in Scotland - political context more progressive. Has highlighted link between Community Engagement Act 2015 and link with climate change.</p> <p>Can point to strategies and outputs that have been directly influenced by JRF.</p> <p>CCRA 2017.</p> <p>Launch of Climate Just. 200 people engaged. 130 people trained, 20,000 users within 18 months. User stories. 6 new case studies.</p> <p>Now routine assessment of distributional impacts by DECC/ BEIS, and increasingly OFGEM. Acknowledgement that policy choices can influence impact.</p> <p>No one working in this field can say they haven't got access to information on climate justice.</p> <p>Case studies and reports have proved very useful. Need to understand how to share this information more widely.</p> <p>JRF reports used in EU evidence papers and guidance - Social Justice and Cities (2018). CLIMA + European Environment Agency.</p> <p>The door has been opened - DEFRA/ NRW/SEPA very interested in the notion of systemic disadvantage (flood).</p> <p>Awareness of built environment on public health, e.g care homes and over heating.</p> <p>Engaging national policy through research</p> <p>Demonstrating how to start doing systems approach - systems maps which national stakeholders loved.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|--|

## Additional comments

| Lowlights  | Highlights  |
|--|---|
| <p>Procedural justice yet to take hold.</p> <p>No strategy for the internal selling job required at policy level.</p> <p>Is the climate justice frame salient for the public? Have we found the right language for the relevant audiences.</p> <p>JRF perceived as politicised - more to do on positioning the work of JRF.</p> <p>Why does it matter - has that been articulated clearly?</p> | <p>Building vocabulary.</p> <p>JRF events driving justice debate space and possibility.</p> <p>Access to MPs on the back of the flood investment report was made possible by JRF.</p> <p>Much JRF inspired work and activity not always happening under the JRF brand, which makes it difficult to provide objective measure of impact.</p> |

## Annex 3: Notes from the facilitated session

### Kit England facilitated group

UK Parliament will provide effective regulation on buildings (heat and flood) and a planning system that incentivises resilience. Projects such as Hinkley C are abandoned as too expensive and not required for a dynamic high renewables energy system. There will be fair investment in low carbon, climate resilient infrastructure and well funded public services.

The future is very much people-powered, following an effective programme to build meaningful public consent for the transition required. This will require ongoing political engagement with public and underrepresented groups. A bottom up, not expert-led, programme of empowerment will mean individuals know how to keep costs down, carbon low and energy sustainable. This is supported with a focus on collective rather than individualistic solutions. For example, people will come together to form 'infrequent flyers' clubs.

### Kristen Guida facilitated group

It will require systems that are closed in terms of resources, but open in terms of impacts and relationships.

National decision-making will need to be based on the principles of justice and low carbon elements, e.g; Carbon budget includes distribution issues; Social policy includes low carbon; Well-being is central to decision making; A basic income and 4 day week; Participation in decision-making; Green jobs; A narrative that has shifted so much that people become incredulous that we were so unjust and high carbon; Focus on society and the collective, not the individual; Everyone has a role in society and they felt valued in decision making process; Unity not uniformity.

### Jamie Clarke facilitated group

Will require regional governance, not top-down, and a third-sector keeping the public sector honest. Politics will embody principles of true representation and inclusivity.

There will be a broad social contract around the issues of climate change and social justice, with a media that is honest, balanced and gives voice to communities and their needs.

Values will be an important determinant of decision-making, not just economics. This means a new way of doing cost-benefit analyses.

The role and value of nature for well-being and mental health will be recognised and these considerations given a place in the trade-offs between competing priorities, e.g. health, security, noise.

## Daniel Johns facilitated group

- **Future vision:**

Intergenerational learning and knowledge sharing; More control over our lives; Home Builders Federation stop blocking anything that adds to the cost of development; Death to the CBA; People as citizens not consumers; The rich take the bus; Natural capital valued and a priority for investment; Good quality low carbon housing for all; Green roofs mandatory on all new builds; Less car parks and more green space in urban areas; Regulation no longer considered a universal evil; Greater devolution – cities at the vanguard of low carbon leadership; Joined up welfare planning – flood and water; Catchments – strategic planning, need rather than market driven; A sense of ‘towards’ something – hope; High performance building standards are enforced; Eco-civilisation/ecological consciousness; Responsive and enabling public services; Communities engaged about coastal change – social contract with government; Decentralised community energy; A more consensual form of politics; Communities/business/institutions make decisions together; Tangible examples of resilient communities; No more fossil fuel subsidies; Paris NDCs ratcheted up; An end to climate scepticism; Scarce things shared out; Generosity, not personal gain; Healthy people and environment; Living within planetary boundaries; Globally responsible; Intractable problems solved – population growth, ageing population costs, intensive agriculture.

- **How to get there:**

Promote the take-up of flood disadvantage analysis  
Drive less, drink less. Be carbon positive by 2022  
Initiate a Climate Just watch  
Promote issues of social justice in future proposals routinely

## Chris Shaw facilitated group

- **What issues are relevant to a climate just future?**

Voice; Deliberative democracy; A healthy civic society; Devolved power; Education; Gender equality; Ethnicity; Class; Inter-generational justice; Responsibility for actions; Joined-up thinking, planning and action; Empowerment.

- **What values will be at play in a socially just future?**

Honesty; Ambition; Respect; Trust; Valuing relationships.