

1. Considering the campaign objective, who are our target audiences?

- Given that individuals generate 50% of America's carbon footprint, and I suspect similarly in Canada, and up to 90% locally we need to focus on empowering households to reduce their carbon footprint. This in turn predisposes individuals to support local, state and national legislation which will further support these lifestyle choices. It is a virtuous circle. So our target audience needs to be households and local government, community groups and businesses, such as utility companies, who can support these behavioral changes.

- Note: I prefer an amended version the original statement of the objective to the "sustainability" version. Specifically, my answers will be in response to this over-arching question: "What is the best design for a national climate change engagement, education and communication campaign the objective of which is to get the public to support local, regional and national policies to reduce their emissions through either passive acceptance or vocal demand? That said, here are my thoughts as to priority audiences: 1) segments of the public who already care but are currently NOT voicing their support (e.g., the Alarmed and the Concerned in the US). 2) Formal and informal opinion leaders in key professional groups that elected officials and the public see as credible sources of information about climate change. At a minimum, this includes health officials, weathercasters, natural resources professionals (including forestry, agriculture, wildlife, national parks, etc), business leaders, religious leaders, and national security leaders. 3) elected officials at all level of govt who already are willing to support sensible legislation (but have not said so in a visible, public manner)

- I think it needs to be broad with different approaches for each. Under 30s tend to be more receptive and active on social and environmental issues (particularly 15 to 25) but younger children should not be excluded (bc they influence parent behaviour) and neither should boomers, bc they are the ones who appear to be most resistant to behaviour change. The corporate and governmental sectors will, obviously, be critical in terms of engaging support.

- It's essential we build on last year's Stonehouse. There we agreed what was necessary was the linking together of all the people and groups who are, or are potentially, onside on this issue, building people's sense of being part of a growing movement. Naturally, we need to develop new skills to reach laterally, forming partnerships. Our target audiences are almost everyone -- except those white males rewarded by the status quo with wealth & power through the status quo. Sorry to put a complex subject so bluntly. So let's start with women's groups and when we develop the appropriate skills, reach out.

- We need to decide if it is the public, or policy-makers, or opinion leaders, or a subset of the public. We need to avoid preaching to the choir, and stop worrying about trying to convert the heathen. It's the people who say they believe climate change is a problem but do nothing to address it whom we need to focus on.

- the general public

– In general terms, I think our primary target audience ought to be the sustainability "issue public" - that segment of society that is already aware of, knowledgeable, and motivated to act. In most cases, however, they are unorganized and don't recognize themselves as a political force. Without them pressuring elected officials, little to no progress can be expected, barring the occasional "white knight" political leader who is willing to push for change on their own accord. But such leaders are few and far between. A more focused answer, however, is to do a fine-grained analysis of actual elected representatives and their respective districts, in order to identify those that are "bright spots" - already voting (at least in part) on sustainability issues, and figuring out why. Secondly, identifying those voting districts that are predisposed to support sustainability issues and leaders, but haven't yet been engaged or motivated. And keep working down from tier to tier of such voting districts across the country or province, linking these groups and leaders together into a stronger and stronger advocacy coalition - made up of not just leaders and voters, but also (critically) key institutions - companies, faith groups, civil society organizations, etc. that also share the same aims.

- The key target audiences would be: a) opinion leader segments of the population (educated, engaged, connected individuals) who are aware of climate change but not actively engaged in this issue because of other priorities, limited understanding of the issues, and perhaps some skepticism about the seriousness of this issue (relative to others); and b) a larger segment of the population that could be influenced by a more effective communications campaign that connects messages to key social values.

- Two levels: 1) local, state, regional leaders who can demand/push through systemic change; 2) engaged citizens who need to know enough to at least be passively accepting of systemic change. The goal for public engagement should be creating the public opinion climate that allows policymakers/leaders to do the right thing. Since the national political climate is so poisoned, we are better able to make advances locally/regionally.

- Youth. Young adults. Also people who have been interested but not involved... we want to get them catalyzed to ACTION.

- Engaged greens - get them to do more. Light greens - start engaging them. Younger citizens who care but are fatalistic Atypical environmental voices - voices decision-makers listen to.

– youth

- The general public works, and it is at work where we can start to address this problem. Therefore, I submit for consideration that a target audience is the environmental/sustainability industry itself. Including, environmental professionals; engineers, compliance and sustainability corporate managers; environmental support organizations - NGO's, associations, government support agencies, etc.; ultimately employees of these organizations, as well as the leadership. The general public works, and it is at work where we can start to address this problem.

- Canadian voters, especially in swing ridings - but also we need to look at ways to motivate young Canadians to vote - those 18-35 are not voting, and if we can move them, we can have huge impact.

- Very hard question – perhaps even the hardest question on this survey. In the past our target audience were “thought leaders” and/or “decision-makers,” but what had become clear to me in the last couple of years is that decision-makers (who often posit themselves as thought-leaders or even just leaders) are very often neither. I have come to believe that decision-makers, particularly political decision makers, are very rarely leaders, and in fact most require a level of public dialogue, discourse and pressure in order to create the space in which progressive decision-making can occur. Preferred target for me are sectors, groups and demographics that are or could be a driving political force – that probably means the private sector, but also parents, or specific language, ethnic or cultural groups in key (swing) ridings in the country (provincially and federally).

- presuming that the reason for aiming at public support is to open up policy space that allows (if not forces) decision-makers to act appropriately... the key target audience is the broad middle who have to be convinced that real action on climate change is not just about economic costs, but also opportunity. Other more targetted audiences in the Canadian context are BC, Quebec and Ontario residents (electorate), boomers worried over their legacy, and the more environmetally conscious millenials. Lastly decision-makers themselves.

2. Considering the campaign objective, what is working for us?

- People care, want to do the right thing, and will do the right thing, if they have the tools to act effectively and see how it will make a difference. They need to see their drops filling the bucket, rather than being a drop in the bucket. Therefore we need to focus on behavior change tools and a feedback system that can aggregate the carbon reduction, household by household, community by community, nationally.

- 1) A large but silent majority of the public who want the problem dealt with 2) Large segments of the business community that want to get out ahead of the problem

- A general shift towards greater social responsibility and awareness when it comes to consumerism, the environment etc. And D Suzuki.

- 1. Reality, unfortunately: the climate is rapidly changing. 2. Many other groups are working on the same thing.

- Not much, I'm afraid. I'm concerned that focusing on climate change obscures the real issues--our society's myopic emphasis on economic growth, which results in overconsumption and all kinds of environmental crises including climate change. Imagine if somebody invented a way to capture solar energy cheaply. would this be a boon or a boondoggle? I'd say the latter because it would worsen the problem of overconsumption. We have to tackle the central questions around the economy and the purpose of society.

- the reality of change - glaciers melting, more intense storms, etc. Parents' concern for their children's future. Desire for security.

- Macro forces like globalization (some types), the spread of communications networks, new technologies which will make sustainability possible, growing awareness that the current system is failing many people and likely to cause much bigger problems for the future.

- 1. The fact the issue is global and not just domestic (so pressures will come from outside as well as inside Canada). 2. Weather and climate events that are significant enough to capture media attention (melting ice caps), and public attention directly (extreme weather events that suggest something significant is changing for the worse).

- The economic and government budget crisis could work for us - governments and businesses at all levels are looking for ways to be more efficient, to plan ahead, to reduce long term costs. They are also fighting for stimulus money designed for new energy jobs; working to bring that industry to their state/region. Also, we know the gaps in public (and leader) understanding that need to be filled. For the most part, we have the communications elements in place - we just need to get people consistently using the strategy.

- Diversification of the 'environmental' issue - it's becoming connected to social and economic issues, even in the mainstream media. This makes it more relevant.

- Many people do care. We just need to be clear on what we are asking them to do and provide reinforcement and incentives.

- relevancy

- There are established environmental decision-support systems (in place since the 1970's when environmental legislation was born in N. America) now in place in most places of work, that address the basic environmental compliance requirements - air, waste, water, etc. Has this been working? To a certain extent it has. But, the issues, or emerging issues, around climate change require a re-adjustment if not a total review of these decision support systems. There are current HR (human resources) systems in place, as well, that until now have been divorced from a company's environmental goals. More and more HR and Env. are clashing/merging in the face of climate change - organizational structures are changing, training and incentive programs are slowly changing. The above, is an opportunity only because the pressures of climate change and/or sustainability is creating this tension and forcing management and employees to pay attention - only just barely, however, to climate change effects filtered through the lens of yesterday - air, waste, water, etc.

- We are reaching government officials and academics. My most recent survey of 5,000 elites is pretty clear on this.

- High degree of interest and concern in environmental issues.

- General acceptance in Canada of the problem of climate change. Knowledge that if we don't do something now, future generations (and their planet) will be at risk. Some recognition that individual actions can help. Cities at leading edge of taking action.

3. Considering the campaign objective, what is working against us?

- A limited understanding among policy makers on the roll of behavioral change and how to aggregate this to impact climate change. Part of this plays out as a false polarity between "legislation and light bulbs." Either/or rather than both/and. I am not worried about the climate denier phenomenon as they are not our target audience.

- 1) A hyper-active opposition (with superior messaging and message discipline) 2) A deep recession 3) An issue that has been highly partisan (in a hyper-partisan national, state and local environment) 4) A scientific community that is not effectively communicating its consensus on climate change 5) politicians who are failing to see beyond the current media and election cycle 6) Vested economic interests -- e.g., Exxon, Koch -- that is funding disinformation campaigns

- rampant individualism, the rural/urban divide, poor urban planning, lack of vision (short term political agendas) and a lack of funding for public transit (in terms of emmissions). And, most importantly, those who deny the existence of climate change have been absurdly successful at changing the message. Economic/recessionary pressures are also working against us at both the individual and governmental level. Oh, and Fox News, half-baked columnists and the far right. I could go on.

- The deniers have been strangely effective.

- Policy makers who are ecologically illiterate, public for whom climate change is a marginal issue, powerful interests who say one thing in public and something different in private. We also face the potent cultural myth of endless resources, which is central to understanding Canada.

- An opposition that is not bound by rules of honesty, willing to fund groups and individuals who pay no attention to scientific evidence (except that which fits their agenda). Lots of money.

- Inertia, habit, cynicism about the political process, an active and (by contrast to progressives) relatively organized set of opponents, political structures of gerrymandered voting districts, political campaigns finance systems, corporate influence (sometime for, sometimes against us), lack of imagination and real world exemplars and stories of ordinary people, just like all of us, actually helping to solve the sustainability problem right now. The sense that one is part of an historic movement.

- 1. Inertia. Societies, at all levels (institutional, social, personal) are resistant to change. In this case the changes necessary are substantial rather than marginal, and the evidence for climate change does not provide the compelling/unavoidable type of impetus that is usually required for major changes. 2. Industry and government stakeholders who have so much invested in the status quo, will actively slow the pace of change. The natural inertia works well in their favour. 3. The current electoral system, based on first-past-the-post, which presents a major obstacle to parties and candidates that focus on specific issues like the environment and climate change (in sharp contrast to some countries like Germany).

- The economy and government budget crisis also work against us - people become risk averse in this kind of climate. It becomes easy for leaders to criticize anything "new" as costing money and not affordable (even when it saves money over the long term). Also, our past communications efforts work against us. For too long, we've told the public to change their lightbulbs, but we haven't impressed upon zoning boards the importance of forests/greenspace or transit patterns, etc. What are the actions that will make the MOST difference in CO2 emissions immediately? Finally, characterizing global warming as an "environmental issue" works against us because of people's limited perception of "environment". It too easily becomes about "nice" things like trees and wildlife rather than systems essential to all life, including human life. This dynamic makes it easy for "environmental" issues to be pushed aside during tough economic times.

- 'Environment' still hasn't busted through and become THE majorly important issue. Its relevance still has to become very very clear (ie. Health, planning for the future...) -Focus on the present, not the future, is the status quo. We are dealing with a very selfish era, when it's all about here and now. -For every message of sustainability, there is an overwhelming amount of media/advertising/websites/info that give messages counter to what 'we' espouse... promoting a totally unsustainable way of life. -the appeal of the vast array of attractive consumer products out there. The vast appeal of the consumer/North American lifestyle. We haven't built the sustainable lifestyle as visible, attractive or widely accessible yet. -diffuse focus; there are too many issues, it's unclear what people can do; people who are aware get overwhelmed and don't know how to engage.

- Big carbon energy interests and their anti-climate/anti-science campaign. A finite pool of worry for an issue that is not a top priority for most.

- perceived economic impact, youth engagement in mainstream politics

- The above concepts are also working against us. The established decision-support systems created in the 1970's are the antiquated infrastructure of the management field, the pipelines, refineries and upgraders of corporate America. This infrastructure is holding employees and leadership back from true transformational change. This infrastructure must be dismantled, quickly. And the creative tensions, mentioned above, are also not happening fast enough or are so insulated as to have little effect in and beyond work. I also feel that the current title 'climate change' is also working against us, as well as the generic term sustainability. These terms fail to give this challenge or fight of our time a clear and distinct shape, they are amorphous. Additionally, the scientific nature of the term 'climate change' is a problem that turns people off. We need new terminology. Maybe then the debate will disappear. The lack of an emotional connection/intelligence to this debate hinders the deep reflection on what is happening to our Earth - a pre-requisite to changing individual behaviour. We are not connecting emotionally to the Earth's plight, and fear is not working. Finally, the disconnect between work and home is working against us

- The focus on the IPCC, individual scientists and facts, instead of academies of science, mental models & stories based on value frames -- meant that the IPCC Report INCREASED doubt and led to a drop in concern in Canada -- my data.

- There's a very high degree of both scientific and political illiteracy in Canada. Scientific illiteracy is something we've talked about for a long time – but political illiteracy is just as problematic, if not more. Example: after the last election Harper was able to exploit political illiteracy by calling attempts by the opposition to form a coalition government 'unconstitutional' and was able to get away with it. Canadians also don't understand strategic voting either. We have a huge gap here that needs to be filled if we want to ensure that Canadians put sustainability/environmental forward as a ballot question. The CRED research identifying the finite pool of worry has been very illuminating for me. I see it all the time. Folks are concerned about environmental issues – and to a certain extent are also willing to make market place decisions on toxics, health and even climate concerns. But they're also really worried about jobs, about putting a roof over their heads and being able to feed their children. We aren't even close to seeing people vote preferentially on sustainability issues. Would love to see research that proves me wrong though.

If we believe that there is a need to develop political literacy, then DSF has to get to grips with our anxiety about the CRA – what can we do? Where can we push the boundaries, but still stay within the realms of our charitable status charter? How outspoken can we be?

There's an endless list of other things that are a very significant problem for us – the economy is just one.

A general disengagement with the political process.

- climate change hard to express as problem of today, rather than of tomorrow. general lack of knowledge as to what should be done economy-wide. minimal political leadership at the national level in Canada. Disparate political leadership provincially.

4. How do we strengthen what is working for us?

- Put practical demonstrations on the ground in 10 cities to showcase how this behavioral change approach works and can be scaled up community-wide. Push the envelope and find cities ready to put all the pieces together (behavior, legislation and technology) and achieve the next frontier of carbon neutrality.

- Enact some key strategies: 1) localize the global: we need to help people see and think about the impacts -- current and future -- in their community, region, state, favorite national park, etc. 2) Help people experience climate change in concrete ways (to invoke their experiential information processing systems rather than their analytical information processing systems) 3) Engage people in thinking about -- and expressing their opinions on -- the actions their community, their province, their nation should take to prepare for the unavoidable consequences of climate change (i.e., adaptation). 4) Design public assessment mechanisms that allow the public at large, as well as other smaller stakeholder groups (such as public health experts), to publicly weigh in on their preferred community adaptation options (so as to give voice to the silent majority).

- Arguing the science may, in the short term, be a moot point - those who have bought into the "other side" are unlikely to change their minds, so to belabour the point becomes a "he said she said" that is lost on those who are not already heavily invested in climate change issues. So I would say we strengthen what's working for us by convincing policy makers at all levels (municipal, provincial, federal) to adopt genuine green platforms...which will mean getting Canadians ramped up about environmental challenges through direct, new, different and highly creative campaigns. Some important elections are looming, so now would be the time to hit back hard.

- We have to learn the skills to reach out, network, and partner (not lead). And the sooner the better.

- Happiness is our trump card. The existing system erodes the environment, health, and happiness, except for a sliver of society. The happiest nation in the world is Costa Rica, whose ecological footprint is a fraction of ours, whose life expectancy is the same, and who eliminated their military 50 years ago and invested the money in health and education. Many Canadians are disenchanting with the status quo and thirsty for a galvanizing vision of a world that is sustainable, compassionate, and fun. We need to imagine a better future and then start to deliver it (not just tell others how to do it). There are pieces of the solution all over the place but they are not being brought together in one place.

- We have to broaden our reach. Abandon words like environmentalist, use words like security, quality of life, family. But most of all, reach out to peace groups, human rights groups, anti-poverty, etc. All these issues are interconnected.

- Coordinated and focused strategy. Organization! Not strict, rigid, hierarchical organization - but the new model of decentralized, self-organized, networked organization. Developing, testing, and diffusing best practices of message frames, messenger choice, value appeals, visual representations that help people focus on the choices that need to be made, and public deliberation and dialogue.

- There is a need to develop a more cogent and compelling story about the issue, perhaps built around strong historical or cultural narratives. This story needs to provide a basis for collective action without dividing or demonizing some. The conclusion needs to focus on how society can move forward in a constructive way to both prepare for the climate change already underway and reduce the extent of such change for future generations. There needs to be a greater focus around finding a way to build and leverage social norms - to connect individuals to their meaningful social groups and communities, to create social pressures and supports around this type of issue (vs. the consumer model of each person as an individual in relation to the state and market).

- Best practices -- model how local governments and businesses are advancing solutions and develop the communications materials and outreach that allow those lessons to spread. Communicate those lessons broadly to: 1) get attention and 2) put pressure on leaders to act.

- Need to build a stronger, more unified movement, and clear, communicated vision of 'what to do'.

- Think long term. Be strategic. Develop cross-sector collaborations

- consolidate the base (youth) but look beyond it (women)

- If change is to occur quickly, as it must (from my point of view - change in management style, environmental management principles, metrics and outcome, professional skill sets in the environmental field, employee attitudes, incentives, etc.) we have no choice but to use some of the current environmental decision-support systems to transform from within (re-use what works and re-do what does not - training, auditing, etc.). Ideally, we could take a kind of guerilla approach to changing the mind-sets and operating standards. Supporting and strengthening green education from k-12, to new green MBA's, all the way to empowering everyday employees are ways to do this - but so few 'get it'. How do you create a critical mass? What motivates people to change? Unfortunately, humans are motivated by fear, and an aspect of climate change is to scare the hell out of people and off their couch. This also works against us.

- Get our elites telling the right story, using the right language -- they are the ones in the media, but are really really making it worse. They also suffer from the chump factor.

- Education, talking to folks, challenging the status quo. And we need to spend as much of our time talking about politics to Canadians as talking about the environment.

- more education, simple explanations with common language that is easily understood for both explaining the risks of climate change as well as outlining viable solutions.

5. How do we overcome the barriers are working against us?

- 1. Bring together in synergy the most effective and proven tools for environmental behavior change, community organizing, retrofit demand aggregation and implementation, technology, and legislation. 2. Bring together an "A" team with proven track records in the mission critical competencies to implement the above. 3. Put enough money -- 20 million dollars. 4. Set aggressive goals (BHAGS). 25% citywide carbon footprint reduction in 3 years and 50% in 5 years. 5. Create 10 city cooperation. 6. Do media blitz to have country and world watching. 7. Then when it is built set up 10 cities as "teaching cities" for other cities around country and world to visit and learn from. 8. When it is built they will come.

- First, we need research to identify the most important behaviors -- which behaviors will have the biggest impact on elected officials. Then, we need audience research that identifies the most important barriers (to those previously identified most important behaviors).

- By continuing to hammer away at it and by trying different approaches. Environmental education in schools is also key so that children and youth have a clearer picture of both the needs and the science.

- We have to break down our sense of superiority (that we have to lead this), because that approach is not working. Instead, we have to learn respect for the 90% of people who are actually with us, or would be if we let them. We have to learn how to collaborate on the things on which we agree, and ignore the rest.

- We need a campaign that isn't measured in weeks or months but in years and probably decades. I worry that creating a false sense of urgency in the absence of direct feedback to peoples' lives is self-defeating. We need to find a small number of powerful frames for reshaping society in a sustainable direction. And we need to become the policy-makers, rather than trying to influence others.

- I don't know. I have spent more than 40 years trying to educate people and have failed spectacularly.

- The lack of imagination is one of the most important and can be addressed through a process of identifying the "bright spots" and "sustainability pioneers" and sharing their stories with all of us. But given the political focus of this workshop - we need to shift the sense of the possible. Obama's election is just one example of how quickly this consciousness and set of expectations of politics can change. Though we're now seeing in the US a collective hangover of punctured inflated expectations as we see how difficult change actually is in practice. Catalyzing community conversations on sustainability are important. Organizing, growing, and engaging the "issue public" is especially important. They need some early successes to build a sense of momentum and to draw others into the group - especially in this cynical age.

- Switch the focus from winning minds, to winning hearts. The science and facts are important, but not sufficient to win this battle, which is political/social/cultural at root. And it also requires more effective leveraging of economic forces/pressures (e.g. see how the insurance industry is starting to pay attention).

- Frame the best practices for local governments/businesses with the economic climate in mind. Know that opponents will characterize systems change as risky and costly and inoculate against that. Also, focus on the solutions that will make the most difference - don't just tell people to change lightbulbs because it is easy. Do we even agree on the top 10 changes that matter most and the steps to advance them?

- We need to approach this in a new way. We need our movement to be positive and inspiring, and elevate people above the weeds/usual way of thinking.

- Too complicated to answer here.

- demonstrate solutions that work socially, economically, environmentally

- Emotional intelligence, clear terminology around this debate, transparent corporate communications, transforming k-12 education (21learn.org), bridge the gap between home values and work values - they are the same, remove the fear tactics and replace with support tactics. Incentify people to do good, everywhere they are, no matter what their work is.

- Get the story right -- frame the mental model of the threat, the framing of the benefits, channel action, and values right for the audience -- for example mobile engagement for youth. Also use election polling station data to target audiences, not riding data.

- By upgrading the general level of conversation in this country about politics and science.

- need step change throughout ranks of decision-makers at every level of government, among both bureaucrats and politicians.

6. Do you have any other thoughts you wish to share?

- Let's create a bold plan of action, get it resourced and change the game in the next five years by demonstrating rapid and substantial carbon reduction on the path to carbon neutral cities. Anything less is not worth our time and we don't have the luxury of time anymore.

- A published national "public education and engagement strategy" -- developed jointly by the national govt, state and local govts, NGOs, and even industry -- and a process by which the contributing organizations meet routinely to pursue the strategy is an important strategy that is currently not even on the radar screen (at least in the US). Instigating this process should be a top priority.

- I think the message could benefit from a short term reinvention. If people were motivated to change their behaviours in the past because they felt something they valued was being lost, they now wonder whether that's true any more, reducing the incentive. The more this comes down to scientific arguments, the more people tune out. I am not sure what that reinvention looks like yet (but look forward to the chats), tho I do have some thoughts on this subject that are too long to share here.

- I reiterate that if we don't build on the last Stonehouse, the exercise begins to lose my interest. I am hoping the people invited this year can teach the rest of us how to movement-build. We have so many of the parts in place. We just have to learn how to build concern up to the critical max. Concern -- and the conviction we can do something about it!

- Looking forward to the weekend.

- Just that I have high hopes for this conference.

– (none)

- Looking forward to an engaging and constructive dialogue at Stonehouse.

- Sustainability is not a familiar concept or shared value for most people. And "growth" is so accepted as the norm people don't even think about it as a choice. We can make great gains for all environmental issues if we figure out how to 1) explain sustainability in a powerful way and 2) get people to embrace it as a core value. Until we address sustainability as a core value, we will continue to run uphill on all environmental issues. Making inroads on sustainability and growth perceptions could help with the consumption problems at the heart of environmental stressors

- I hope there is some investigation of Bill McKibben's approach, and the projects of 350.org, as a means of galvanizing broad support towards specific goals.

– (none)

– (none)

- I work at the interface(s) of the environmental profession - engineers, managers, software developers, NGO's, regulators, lawyers, property managers, scientists, etc. My work is primarily focused on helping corporations leverage all of these entities and existing networks to improve their environmental footprint. However, transformational change is not a consideration at all, and climate change is not seen collectively as a transformational moment in our human evolution. There is a disconnect we must overcome, and I hope Stonehouse brings some fresh ideas to this urgent challenge.

- We need to start using mobile platforms to reach people. But the story is key, not the technology.

- (none)

- (none)