

Democratic Climate Model

Rooted collaboration: definitions (draft)

Top half half (left to right)	Definitions
Reframed narratives; new possibilities	Diverse actors and diverse voices puts different perspectives on climate-related challenges. From "mobility" to "quality of life". Centring voices of marginalised communities; everyone part of change; new ways of looking at things; new ways of being and working together.
Broad appeal; quality of life benefits evident	Experiencing benefits first hand increases sense of agency and motivation to be an ongoing part of city and regional change.
Strengthened governance	Enables collaborative decision making on complex policy determining the future of the city and region.
Strengthened participation	Strengthened participation shares power more equitably between citizens and cities. Redefine how we value people and ecosystems.
Regenerative, circular thinking	Helping cities think more holistically and systemically, about interconnectedness and connection to nature. Adaptive, complex

	systems. Thinking about parts of the whole, downstream and upstream. Rethinking technocratic emphases; redefine who knows, who decides and who sets the rules of tech and transitions. Funding options, not products and output.
More effective decision making for policy	Citizens will feel agency through enhanced participation and cities will be strengthened through enhanced democratic decision making. Rooted collaboration connects citizens to their democratic institutions and giving cities more voice, representativity and reach across Europe.
Continuous, lifelong learning by doing	Plants seeds of understanding about principles for change. This is particularly powerful where this enables and empowers city champions. Once they have a buy-in to the participatory approach this smooths the way for collaboration.
Going beyond city limits: interconnected thinking	Collectively addressing bigger-than-city issues of fairness and justice grounded in food systems, manufacturing/logistics systems, and energy systems. Two or more interconnected cities have these conversations together to explore possibilities for change.
Conflict and crossing boundaries seen as necessary to participation	Tension and conflict is necessary and healthy for climate work. City actors needn't be allies or even like each other. They can speak in the same direction towards the same shared goals. Non-violent communication and reducing polarisation.
Bottom half (top to bottom)	
Citizen participation interwoven	Nourishing the 'root systems' at the community-level, people with lived experience who are often not heard and experience the biggest impacts; flows up across the city in a form of 'capillary action'.
Funding of options, with clear and concrete goals	lived experience who are often not heard and experience the biggest impacts; flows up across the city in a form of 'capillary
Funding of options, with clear	lived experience who are often not heard and experience the biggest impacts; flows up across the city in a form of 'capillary action'. Funding projects and programmes so that they have clear and concrete goals, but also allow emergent possibilities to be explored. Acknowledging change as emergent from an accountable, accessible, and collaborative process, rather than as a point at the

Weak collaboration: definitions (draft)

Top half half (left to right)	Definitions
• •	Framing work as "mobility" rather than "quality of life". Narrowing of possibilities caused by lack of diversity of voices and perspectives.
Lack of appeal to broader audience	Actors being excluded, exacerbating political, social and cultural divisions and diminishing chances and impacts of climate-focused work. Increase in polarisation.
Weakened governance	Siloed, non-inclusive decision making on complex policy weakens the future of the city and region.
Weakened participation	Weakened participation unevenly distributes power between citizens and cities. It devalues, disempowers, and disenfranchises people and ecosystems.
Linear thinking	Systematising thinking and processes. Not acknowledging the complex, adaptive, interconnected nature of systems and climate transitions.
Withholding power; less effective decision making for policy	Gatekeeping relationships and access to information, and shutting out communities and diverse voices. Exacerbates power imbalance tied to privilege, access, power, role, and rule power.
Lack of capability and capability for change work	Short-term thinking is brought about by single-point, technocratic solutions rooted in old narratives and power structures.
Restricted to city limits; no interconnected thinking	Looking inward, within the city limits, in ways that fail to acknowledge the possibilities for change arising from interconnectedness between cities and regions.
Conflict and boundary crossing avoided	Seeing municipal boundaries and governmental siloes as problems to overcome, rather than opportunities to be addressed.
Bottom half (top to bottom)	
Citizen participation as afterthought	Citizens being told what to do and what to vote on, without having had any say in what is being presented.
Funding of projects and outcomes, with ambiguous goals	Funding in ways that predetermines project outcomes and can stifle creativity and innovation, risking more single-point solutions. Sees change as 'the deliverable' at the end of the process, rather than something that happens over time through collaboration and accountability.
Homogenous actors with technical, consultative focus	Tendency towards technocratic single-point, siloed solutions without consideration for the whole. Product and delivery focus borne of consultancy driven 'innovation' processes.

Homogenous voices and	Homogenous voices and knowledge systems in decision-making on
knowledge systems; may have no	matters of climate importance exacerbate issues of inequality and
local context	inequity. May hold technical, subject matter expertise (e.g. food
	systems, energy systems) but lacks knowledge of application in
	local context.