

# Climate Action London (CAL), London, Ontario, Canada

**Scored by name(s):** Emma Spett, University of Vermont ([emma.spett@uvm.edu](mailto:emma.spett@uvm.edu)) and Oda Hustad, Roskilde University ([ohustad@ruc.dk](mailto:ohustad@ruc.dk))

**Date:** 25/09/2024

**Cite as:** Spett, E., & Hustad, O. (2024). Climate Action London (CAL), London, Ontario, Canada (GOGREEN Case Report Series No. 6), Roskilde: Roskilde University. ISBN: 978-87-7349-253-6

## **Is the project a case of...:**

- State-initiated co-creation
- Entrepreneur-driven co-creation
- Grassroots-based co-creation\*

*\*For an elaboration of the typology, please consult the GOGREEN theoretical framework p. 25.*

## **Integrated case analysis**

Before proceeding to the scoring of the GFs, please provide a 3–5 page case analysis in which you describe the background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case, the problems and goals addressed by the local collaboration, the participating actors and their relationships, the unfolding of the co-creation process, the most important governance factors (this may include factors other than those in focus in this project), and the generated outputs and outcomes. The conclusion may specify a few lessons learned from the case study.

### **1) Background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case**

Climate change is showing its teeth all over Canada in the form of sea level rise, high temperatures, and wildfires. While climate change for instance is very visible in the Northern and Western parts of Canada in the form of increasingly long wildfire seasons, and in waterside cities such as Toronto and Vancouver in the form of expected severe sea level rises, climate change is less visible in the city of London, Ontario. Situated “halfway between Toronto and Detroit” in safe distance from the wildfire catching forests of Northern and Western Canada and from rising sea levels in Canada’s coastline, London citizens experience few visible signs of climate change apart from rising temperatures and the health issues they bring along. As a result, climate change is not a high priority on the London political stage. This is potentially due to Londoners’ traditional preference for conservative local politicians, and has manifested in London being relatively late to the party in starting green initiatives such as waste separation. However, things are progressing. In 2019, London City Council declared a climate emergency, which sparked the development of a Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) released in April 2022. The plan consists of over 200 climate action initiatives and was approved by the majority of London’s City Council, which consists of a Mayor and 14 Ward councilors that have been elected based on their personal political profiles, as they are not members of specific political parties.

The CEAP was created as a broad plan to survive shifting political interests in London’s city council, and according to our interviewees it is still unclear how the 200 climate action initiatives are to be implemented. The CEAP initiatives are included in the city’s strategic plan and therefore, any items (related

to city funding) in the strategic plan were included in the city's draft multi-year budget, currently being discussed (but not likely to be approved due to budget constraints). Many initiatives in the CEAP are directed at individuals and businesses with no clear path for funding. An important challenge to London's climate action is a general skepticism towards climate change between citizens and some city councilors. In addition to this, the city deals with other important problems such as an increase in homelessness and decreased purchasing power due to inflation, that might feel more urgent to address and therefore will occupy more resources in the city government. In this context, it requires continuous, active political work towards both city councilors and Londoners to ensure that the targets of the CEAP are translated into action.



*The city of London, Ontario. Photo: Scott Webb*

## **2) The aims of the project and the sustainability problems that it seeks to address**

Climate Action London (CAL) is a community-driven initiative that seeks to embolden all citizens, communities and institutions in London and Middlesex County to meet and exceed the targets of London's Climate Emergency Action Plan by 2030. The initiative was started by a local community member who was a part of an advisory board for the City of London. The initiation of CAL was prompted by the City of London's 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration, which motivated the CAL founder to gather with other community members and leaders to follow up on the Climate Emergency Declaration and promote action to address climate change in London. CAL is a loosely organized initiative with some core members and several collaborators that attend their meetings. Their partners usually represent other climate initiatives, such as the London Environmental Network, PATCH, etc.

As of 2023, the primary aim of CAL is to convene, manage, and oversee a Sustainability Summit which will bring together a diverse group of concerned individuals and organizations to advocate for mayoral and city council support for some collectively identified “business cases” from a draft budget. The overall aim of the summit is to demonstrate broad community support for business cases that are linked to addressing sustainability issues, so that these will be included in the city’s final budget.

With regard to the summit and community participation in city-level sustainability work more broadly, CAL seeks to use the summit as a forum to remove barriers to participation for those that do not regularly engage with the municipal government or the budget process. They work to specifically integrate people who feel like: 1) the budget documents for the City of London are too long or overly complicated; 2) the language or format of the budget was confusing; and 3) engaging with city government feels overwhelming, or they feel their input would not be meaningful.

Prior to the summit, which took place on January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, CAL convened a working group that has assessed the upcoming London city budget, and reviewed and evaluated 60 “business cases” related to sustainability. These cases related to transit, energy efficiency, environmental management, housing development, community gardens, and public facility management.

After the summit, CAL plans to utilize the interest and outcomes from the summit to bring a large presence to two public participation meetings, where significant budgetary decisions will be made. These will be held on January 29<sup>th</sup> and February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024.



*Flyer developed by Climate Action London to engage Londoners in demonstrating community support for the sustainability items in the City’s budget.*

### **3) The participants and their interaction and communication in and between meetings**

There are four key leaders of CAL, all of whom are sustainability leaders in their own right who participate in CAL as volunteers. They constitute the formal management of CAL. As CAL is a grassroots initiative, there is no formal president or assembly in CAL. The initiative is uniquely driven by the four volunteering CAL leaders. There is also a wide network of actors engaged in CAL's work. This includes local environmental organizations like the London Environmental Network, Pillar Nonprofit Network, Sustainable Development Cities Canada, ReForest London, and Antler River Rally. Individuals also participate in CAL meetings and online engagement.

CAL is a community-driven initiative that is run primarily by volunteers who communicate regularly through newsletters, social media, and email lists, and develop programming to address municipal sustainability challenges through public and community engagement. They also regularly hold events related to a variety of relevant issues, including plant sales, volunteer opportunities, and more recently, planning meetings and summits related to the London city budget.

### **4) How often do they meet, and do they communicate between meetings?**

For the budget lead up, they're meeting on a monthly basis either online or in-person at First St. Andrews church. Otherwise, communication occurs as needed via google drive, emails, and newsletters. There is also an active Facebook page, and a growing Instagram presence with over 1,000 followers due to university student volunteers.

### **5) The role and forms of knowledge sharing, coordination and joint problem-solving**

There is a shared google drive, and the four-person central leadership offers opportunities for volunteer empowerment. There is also a strong network of environmental and sustainability minded organizations that leverage their respective strengths to address community challenges. These organizations include the London Environmental Network, and the Pillar Nonprofit Network. Additionally, there is a broader network of engaged community members, city leadership and staff, and elected officials who provide insight and support for coordination and problem solving when needed.

### **6) The relation between consensus and conflict and the handling of the latter.**

There is mutual respect amongst the four key leaders of CAL, and they have developed trust over a long period of collaboration on sustainability related issues in London, and over their shared mission to achieve climate action through policy and programming in the city and surrounding areas. Since the entirety of CAL is volunteer-based, they acknowledged that there has been minimal conflict in their tenure as an organization.

### **7) The role and form of leadership: lead actor, steering group and/or collective leadership**

CAL has a steering group of four key leaders, who are all volunteers. We have named these leaders project facilitator 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Project facilitator 1 is the de facto leader of CAL, and has a long history of engaging in sustainability and environmental leadership in London. She has run as a candidate several times for the Green Party of Canada, and has significant institutional knowledge regarding governance and bureaucracy at the city,

provincial, and national scales. She sponsored the original motion for London City Council to declare a climate emergency in 2019, which led to the development of the Climate Emergency Action Plan. She leads the environment committee at First-St. Andrew's United Church, which acts as the physical home-base for CAL, has been trained as a climate reality leader by Al Gore, and helped organize the 2019 Global Climate Strike in London.

Project facilitator 2 is a retired healthcare executive, and was formerly the Executive Director of Cheshire Independent Living Services. She has deep connections in the health community in London, and brings those voices to the table during CAL events.

Project facilitator 3 is a sustainability consultant and social impact practitioner who utilizes the sustainable development goals in framing the work of CAL.

Project facilitator 4 is a retired project manager in the finance industry who brings their digital and project management skills to elevate CAL's social media presence and simplify large city documents.

Project facilitator 1 acts as the primary convener for CAL activities, although work is distributed across the four key leaders of the organization. There is abundant opportunity for other volunteers to step into leadership roles as well, if they show interest and commitment.

#### **8) The temporal unfolding of the co-creation process: major shifts and ups and downs**

While co-creation is a central theme in CAL's work, their projects are mostly emergent, meaning they come together and develop programming and protocols based on identified community needs. For example, in 2019 when Project facilitator 1 led the motion to declare a climate emergency in London, they engaged with city officials to act as community engagement liaisons during that process. Covid-19 obviously slowed down co-creation and required a reassessment of activities, but CAL continued to engage in partnership with organizations in their larger network to support their needs and efforts.

In 2023, CAL was energized to collaborate and engage community members across London to address sustainability as it appears in the London city budget. Their current focus revolves around developing spaces for community members to convene around shared sustainability interests, and processes to support those interests during budget deliberations with the city.

CAL finds ways to keep prominent leaders and volunteers involved when there is not a major focusing event, through regular newsletters, social media, and meetings.

#### **9) The most important governance factors (may include factors other than those in focus in this project)**

In the context of CAL, the following governance factors for this project are: 1, 7, 13, and 16.

**GF1** (Perceived importance of biosphere conditions) is critical because it is the motivation, in a variety of ways, for each volunteer leader and member of CAL, as well as members of their network. They are energized and motivated to address pressing environmental and biospheric challenges as well and as quickly as they can.

**GF7** (Construction of narratives about prior multi-actor collaboration) is essential to the effective functioning of CAL and its partners. The deep degree of connection and collaboration between CAL leaders, its members, environmental organizations in London, and city councillors and staff indicates a longstanding commitment to collaboration between multiple actors that began long before CAL, and allows CAL to be effective in their co-creation processes.

**GF13** (Trust-building and conflict mediation) allows the leadership team to be effective and produce actionable results. They work to their strengths, leverage their networks and relationships, and understand they must rely on each other for their goals to be achieved.

**GF16** (Exercise of facilitative leadership) is reiterated by the above points, but the energy and commitment of the leaders is what facilitates effective co-creation and collaboration, and ultimately, results.

### **10) The generated outputs and outcomes**

The expected outcome of the project is to utilize the interest and outcomes from the sustainability summit on January 18th to bring a large presence to two public participation meetings, where significant budgetary decisions will be made. These will be held on January 29<sup>th</sup> and February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024. In this way, CAL aims to ensure that climate action initiatives will be included in the city's budget and that these initiatives have a broad resonance in the local community.

### **11) Lessons learned about the conditions for co-creating green solutions**

A critical lesson learned from this case study was the way a lack of official federal/provincial status (i.e. non-profit status) allowed for the emergent nature of programming, actions, and collaboration. Climate Action London was not limited by fundraising or boundaries set by the roles nonprofits can play in advocacy. Rather, they operated in a liminal administrative state and were able to utilize collaboration and best judgment to determine courses of action that they would take with respect to achieving their climate- and environment-related goals.

## **Scoring and analysis of governance factors**

### **1. Perceived importance of biosphere conditions**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Every interviewee cited biosphere conditions as the primary purpose of creating and/or participating in Climate Action London (CAL). Interviewees consistently stated that the manifestations of climate change in the form of wildfires, rising sea levels and extreme weather both in Canada and the rest of the world

motivates them to take climate action through CAL. A secondary, but linked purpose is social inclusion, as CAL seeks to empower marginalized groups to take climate action. As a non-profit grassroots initiative, there are no economic interests in CAL.

## **2. Legislation, programs, and formal goals**

### QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

### Data sources:

- Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

### Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

As described above, CAL aims to empower local citizens, communities and institutions in London to implement the targets in the CEAP before 2030. The creation of the Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP) seems to have stimulated collaboration in the sense that CAL is frustrated about the City's lack of action on implementing the CEAP, and the limited opportunities for citizen participation in suggesting and developing solutions that the city can take on. In response to this, CAL has taken on the role of community advocates and watchdogs in ensuring that the City of London takes concrete climate action. In 2022, the city of London provided CAL with \$3,000 to support community groups who are doing concerted outreach and engagement on behalf of the CEAP, primarily due to city-wide capacity issues around engaging with community members.

In this sense, there is definitely a presence of legislation, programs and formal goals, to which CAL has been adjusted to fit. The goals are amorphous, though, and leaves room for co-creation and collaboration, as evidenced by CAL network development and programming.

## **3. Relative openness of public governance paradigms**

### QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

### Data sources:

- Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

### Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The City of London is open to input from citizens through public in-person and online consultations about laws, strategies and decisions, as well as through citizen committees connected to subject areas where citizens provide their ideas and feedback. However, the City of London does not actively create initiatives on behalf of CAL to solicit inputs from citizens. Moreover, it appears from the interviews and observations that in order to make your voice heard as a citizen, you need to gather a significant group of people (200+

people) that to a certain degree represents the diversity of London (including different religions, ethnicities, income groups, and indigenous peoples) that stand unanimously behind the message.

Additionally, while there is space for citizens to provide feedback and ideas with respect to the development of a city-wide budget, the parameters for feedback are narrow and require advanced understanding of protocol to influence any kind of shift in the status quo. CAL has taken time to develop strategies that allow for increased public input into the budget system, which has lowered a barrier to public participation. That said, we provided a low score due to the bureaucratic barriers in place that limit public participation more broadly.

#### **4. Formalized institutional channels for citizen participation and community mobilization**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

As mentioned above, the City of London is open to input from citizens through public in-person and online consultations about laws, strategies and decisions, as well as through citizen committees connected to particular subject areas where citizens provide their inputs. Among these feedback channels, the public in-person consultations have shaped the CAL project, as CAL aims to achieve its green outcomes through participation in said public consultations. These public consultations have improved collaboration in CAL by providing a specific time frame for the project. The specific dates set by the city for public consultations about the CEAP has provided a clear timeline and direction for CAL, thus helping CAL to structure their efforts towards specific deadlines.

A critical factor that enhances the effectiveness of co-creation for advancing sustainability-related advocacy is the institutional knowledge retained by Project facilitator 1, the key leader of CAL. Her understanding of how to navigate formal processes allows for structured programming with specific and measurable goals in mind. Additionally, the networked nature of CAL, with the inclusion of partner organizations like the London Environmental Network and Pillar Nonprofit Network, and local faculty and academic partners, brings a high degree of government literacy that allows for easier navigation in the formalized institutional channels. The complicated nature of such institutions is why we provided a score of 0.66.



**5. Mechanism for ensuring top-down government and bottom-up social accountability**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

CAL is not a nonprofit. The CAL leadership classifies themselves as a "community group". In Ontario, there are specific rules around nonprofits - which includes a board of directors etc. We do not want to become a nonprofit. They like the flexibility of being a "community group" or grassroots community group. CAL is run by volunteers, and engagement is contingent upon member interest. CAL core leadership holds themselves accountable to their mission but does not have any formal mechanisms for ensuring accountability from government or community.

There is some expectation of CAL leadership around issues related to climate, CEAP, and convening amongst the greater environmental/sustainability network of London. There is a regular newsletter, and they are responsive to relevant events.

Most funding opportunities that CAL receives do not come with embedded accountability measures for outcomes. CAL does get funds for Canada Summer jobs students and need to submit reports. CAL also sends the city of London a high level "impact" summary every year. We also submit a quarterly "article" to the church's membership magazine outlining our activities.

**6. Strategic agenda-setting by means of translation**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The Sustainable Development Goals are a critical framework embedded within the motivations of the core leadership team associated with CAL. Project facilitator 3, one of the four key leaders of the project, frames all of his thinking through the lens of the SDGs, and a key partner organization for CAL is the Pillar Nonprofit Network, which has hosted a localization of the SDG indicators in the context of London.

While the SDGs have been adapted to the local context by local environmental leadership, many local actors and community members are not attracted to the project because of them. The use of SDGs in CAL is mostly related to funding applications and communication "upwards" towards local government. Additionally, members of CAL have cited the SDGs as a potentially limiting factor to their engagement with

CAL, since they appreciate the emergent, community-based nature of CAL’s work, rather than being guided and informed by an international set of standards. A local leader noted that many community members are not aware of the SDGs, and the language tends to ostracize well-intentioned community members who feel excluded from these processes.

**7. Construction of narratives about successful multi-actor collaboration**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Much of Climate Action London’s programming is a product of ongoing collaborations between government, a wide network of environmental organizations, and leadership from a variety of sectors who have strong and ongoing relationships with London leadership that can be mobilized around a variety of issues, including climate change, health, and sustainability. The leadership from CAL has long been involved in a variety of other sustainability-minded endeavors, and have utilized this legacy of successful multi-actor collaboration to bring many stakeholders to the table, navigate bureaucracy and institutional barriers, expand and widen their reach, and consistently learn and iterate.

**8. Building or harnessing institutional platforms and arenas**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The project facilitators for CAL are connected to a London church named First-St. Andrews United Church, which provides a meeting space for CAL. First-St. Andrews United Church is also the administrative backbone that allows CAL to access grant funding. All of the CAL funds are held at FSA and they issue cheques for CAL and reimburse expenses. Additionally, representatives from several local environmental organizations, including the London Environmental Network, SDG Cities, and Pillar Network/Innovation Works, are part of CAL and able to provide meeting spaces for the project. CAL also uses digital platforms like google drive to collaborate on documents, event planning, action planning, etc.

CAL meets both online on Zoom and in person. In person meetings are more generative from a collaboration perspective, while online spaces are more inclusive but less fruitful. CAL used to hold monthly meetings but found it was not very impactful. Meetings are now either organizing meetings,

generally held online for convenience, or events which are almost always in person. These digital and physical platforms have supported collaboration, as they have enabled actors to meet and develop collaborative projects together.

### **9. Provision of access to blended financing**

**QCA score:**

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

**Scoring confidence:**

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

**Data sources:**

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

**Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:**

CAL received \$3,000 from the City of London in 2022, as part of the city's mandate to support community groups that engage with the CEAP. There are no particular demands or outcome expectations attached to this funding. CAL has also received federal government money for the past 3 years to hire summer students through the Canada Summer Jobs grant program. These students help with discrete projects: they have created (and then revamped) the website, run a plant-based cooking course; and ran a social media campaign.

CAL also runs annual fundraising at a small scale, makes a bit of money from a plant sale. However, the only funding they have received so far has been from the City of London, and therefore, the project does not have blended financing. This is substantiated by interviews with the project facilitators, who oversee the financials of CAL. CAL has made a submission to the city's "multi year community grants" program to hire a part time admin person - however, none of the core leadership team is interested in this role.

### **10. The capacity to leverage support from authorities to enable local collaboration**

**QCA score:**

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

**Scoring confidence:**

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

**Data sources:**

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

**Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:**

There is limited support for community engagement in government processes in London. While authorities are receptive to collaboration, they do not offer any formal support for such work. In our interviews with government authorities, they acknowledged that while they tend to be responsive to advocacy organizations like CAL and their network partners, there are a lot of bureaucratic challenges associated with integrating their demands and ideas into government protocols and policies. A city employee cited the challenge of holding partners accountable once money is administered to community organizations.

Additionally, while there has been some financial support provided to CAL to support their engagement work, it is limited and uncommon.

**11. Inclusion and empowerment of relevant and affected actors**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There are conversations about elevating marginalized voices and empowering young and Indigenous leaders, but ultimately the work of CAL is volunteer-based and requires the motivation of self-selected leadership to amplify programming. Some of the work that CAL does seeks to engage young people and marginalized communities through programming.

The work of Project facilitator 2, who leads health-related climate programming through CAL and its associated programs (Greening Sacred Spaces and the London Greening Health Collaborative) and her collaborators in the academic and health communities acknowledges the disproportionate implications of climate change on Indigenous communities, but has not had the means to integrate them into the work of CAL in a meaningful and equitable way.

**12. Clarification of interdependence vis-à-vis common problem and joint vision**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There is an informal acknowledgement of interdependence, but it is neither essential nor explicit in the way that CAL operates. The collaborative culture is more prominent than an explicit statement of interdependence between the participating actors.

Answers from interviews were very different, and this response was primarily derived from observations of how CAL operates internally and within a network. Some members feel a lack of ownership due to the volunteer-based nature of the organization, while the core leadership team depends wholeheartedly on each other and shares an unspoken agreement that they will work together in pursuit of their mission.

**13. Trust-building and conflict mediation**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Among the small, volunteer-based leadership team of CAL, there is trust that has been built over time based on consistency, a strengths-based approach to operations, and the overall guidance of leaders like Project facilitator 1. This also applies to the other members of CAL, who state that there is a high level of trust between CAL participants. Conflict, it seemed, has not been a significant factor in CAL operations, and there are no mechanisms for handling conflict internally. Trust is assumed and solidified over time.

**14. Use of experimental tools for innovation**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

CAL abides by very traditional forms of community organizing and advocacy work to accomplish their goals. No prototyping or mock-ups are used in the project.

**15. Ongoing critical self-reflection and learning (i.e., process and/or developmental evaluation):**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There has not been time or capacity for structured self-reflection, learning, evaluation. Interviewees cited that they sometimes take on this endeavor in an individualized way to reflect on what went well and what went poorly, but it has not manifested in any kind of official capacity. As one project participant mentioned, "I think it's [evaluation, red.] more informal. Yeah. I'm not aware of any evaluation system".

## **16. Exercise of facilitative leadership:**

### QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

### Data sources:

- Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

### Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

There is a four-person leadership team for CAL, led primarily by Project facilitator 1, who plans and facilitates meetings and keeps projects on track.

All interviewees acknowledged the clear leadership structure of CAL. There is gratitude for the commitment of the four key leaders: Project facilitator 1, 2, 3, and 4, and also an expectation that they remain consistent, engaged, and ready to act on behalf of the communities they serve.

## **Outcome variable: Successfully co-created green transitions**

The outcome variable 'co-created green transitions' will be scored in two parts. First, 'co-creation' will be scored based on an assessment of whether the participants in the initiative, project or process engaged in collaborative problem-solving that fostered creative ideas and innovative solutions (data will consist of survey data combined with interviews and documents). Next, 'green transitions' will be scored based on an assessment of whether the initiative, project or process has fulfilled or is expected to fulfill its green goals, ambitions and aspirations (data will consist of survey data combined with interviews and internal and/or external evaluation reports, including scientific publications).

*The scoring of this variable is done in two parts:*

- 1. Is the developed solution based on collaborative problem-solving spurring creativity and innovative solutions?*
- 2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition?*

*This scoring should be conducted based on both the survey and complementary green outcome evaluations. Please consult Sections 4.4 and 6.10 in the Research Protocol for more details.*

## **1. Is the developed solution co-created?**

### QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

### Data sources:

- Survey  
 Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring.

Of the 8 survey responses, this was the breakdown in responses:  
 Did not produce any green transition solution (2/8)  
 Is expected to produce/has produced a green transition aiming to avoid a worsening in the status quo (3/8)  
 Is expected to produce/has produced a green transition solution aiming to improve the status quo (3/8)

As 5/8 of the survey respondents, which included one key organizer of the project, stated that the project will not produce a green transition solution or that the project will produce a green transition solution aiming to avoid a worsening of the status quo, but not a solution that will aim to improve the status quo, we scored this question at 0.33.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response), including the mean/average % for each survey item.

	Strong dis.	Dis.	Slight. dis.	Neither agr/dis	Slight. agree	Agree	Strong. agree	Mean
1. Problem-solving mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to develop new perspectives	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6	14.3	1.14285714
2. Through the collaborative problem-solving process, different experiences and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge have been mobilized to search for unconventional solutions	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	14.3	1.28571429
3. The collaborative problem-solving process mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to search for solutions that go beyond standard/text-book solutions	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	0.85714286
4. The co-created solution breaks with established practices	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.42857143

5. The co-created solution disrupts conventional wisdom	0.0	14.3	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	0
6. The co-created solution offers new ideas to address the green transition problem	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0	1.14285714
7. I'm supportive of the co-created solution	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	42.9	14.3	1.14285714
8. I'm content with the overall collaborative process of the project	14.3	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	-0.2857143
9. I feel the multi-actor collaboration process was a prerequisite for the success of the project	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	1.85714286
10. I'm satisfied by the results of the co-creation effort in terms of expected impact on the welfare of the community	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	-0.7142857
11. The collaborative interaction in the project has led to an innovative solution	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.7142857
12. The actors involved in the project are engaged in collaborative interaction that stimulated creative problem-solving	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.71428571
13. The co-created solution meets the proposed goals of the project	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	-0.2857143
14. The co-created solution will be durable and robust in the long run	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	-0.4285714
15. The co-created solution is expected to significantly improve sustainability for the whole community	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	-0.7142857



**2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition<sup>1</sup>?**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Survey
- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring:

There was hesitation regarding naming Climate Action London’s endeavors as engendering a green transition because it is currently underway and unclear if their efforts will be effective at getting green and sustainable programming passed through London’s city budget. There may be shifts in the spring that further validate the usefulness of the green transition.

There was also some pessimism expressed in the survey, likely due to the timing of the project. For that reason, we scored this as a 0.33 since there is active co-creation but not clear green transitions facilitated yet.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response).

1. The project:	Yes	No	Don't know
...did not produce any green transition solution	25%	75%	0%
...is expected to produce/has produced a green transition solution aiming to avoid a worsening in the status quo	37,5%	62,5%	0%
...is expected to produce/has produced a green transition solution aiming to maintain the status quo	0%	100%	0%
...is expected to produce/has produced a green transition solution aiming to improve the status quo	37,5%	62,5%	0%

---

<sup>1</sup> By “green transitions”, we mean objectives and aspirations that correspond to at least one of the Green SDGs (SDG 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). The project does not have to refer explicitly to the green SDGs, but the project’s green objectives

**Please list all the informants you have interviewed for the case study (list project role + interview date):**

Project role	Date
Project participant (volunteer)	September 6th
Project participant (local initiative director and volunteer)	September 6th
Project facilitator 2	September 7th
Project participant (volunteer and community health leader)	September 7th
Project facilitator 4	September 7th
Project facilitator 1	September 7th
Project participant (volunteer and local environmental organization staffer)	September 7th
Project participant (volunteer and local environmental organization staffer)	September 7th
Bureaucratic actor (city sustainability employee)	September 7th
Project participant (volunteer)	September 7th
Project participant (volunteer and community health leader)	September 7th
Project facilitator 3	September 8th
Project participant (volunteer and local civic engagement officer)	September 8th
Bureaucratic actor (city sustainability employee)	September 8th
Project participant (volunteer and local environmental organization staffer)	September 15th

**Please list all the observations you have made (type of meeting/workshop/etc. + observation date):**

Sustainability Summit meeting (online) on June 29 <sup>th</sup>
Sustainability Summit workshop (in-person) on September 6 <sup>th</sup>

**Please list all the documents you have analyzed (document name + source + year):**

<p>Sustainability Summit Planning Document, 2024 (attached to this document)</p> <p><u><a href="#">Climate Action London Website</a></u>, 2023</p> <p><u><a href="#">Co-written blog for Tamarack Institute</a></u>, 2023</p> <p><u><a href="#">London Climate Emergency Action Plan</a></u>, 2022</p> <p><u><a href="#">London Ontario SDG Indicators Localization</a></u>, 2020</p> <p>Gabor Sass articles collaboratively written with Climate Action London:</p> <p><u><a href="https://www.resilience.org/stories/2018-12-19/building-resilient-communities-relationships-resources-and-re-imagination/">https://www.resilience.org/stories/2018-12-19/building-resilient-communities-relationships-resources-and-re-imagination/</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="https://www.bethechangelondon.ca/conversations/building-a-resilient-city-with-a-network-of-community-food-hubs">https://www.bethechangelondon.ca/conversations/building-a-resilient-city-with-a-network-of-community-food-hubs</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="https://www.bethechangelondon.ca/conversations/transforming-the-forest-city-into-the-food-forest-city">https://www.bethechangelondon.ca/conversations/transforming-the-forest-city-into-the-food-forest-city</a></u></p>
--

**Please note the response rate for the survey/measurement of outcome variable:**

<p>8/23=34.8%</p> <p>There was some aversion to completing the survey due to the unfinished nature of the project.</p>
--