

## Table 5 - Don't expect me to think about the planet when we have to choose between heating and eating

Both conversations revolved around the concept that – in an ideal world – you shouldn't need to think about climate whilst thinking about heating and eating. The provocations by the facilitators indicated that action should be ingrained and normalised within all the work organisations and partners, who were in the room, are engaging in. Interestingly, there were immediate themes emerged from our provocations in both discussions that resulted in very different perspectives on these key themes.

Within our first discussion, a fair chunk of discussion time was driven by considering lived experience and the role this can play in guiding our action, as “decision makers” or “influencers” on this topic. Due to time constraints, this conversation felt very embryonic and as-if it was just beginning by the time we finished up. However, there were some standout examples and food for thought across the board. One of these examples was the quality of current housing stock and the pitfalls experienced in these, for example, when it comes to rising energy costs, high energy demand, and the impact of poor insulation which leads to black mould and damp, which leads to further issues in terms of health and insecurity due to high costs (which may, in turn, have a knock on effect across issues such as food insecurity or otherwise). This discussion really captured the breadth of the issue in case- the link of health, climate, cost-of-living etc. and it was clear what the co-benefits were for each issue whilst tackling the cost-of-living element of discussion.

The second discussion felt like it moved in the opposite direction- from the top down, rather than from lived experience and grassroots views and ideas up. Some of the conversation circled around the use of community assets- libraries, men's sheds (and other forms of community networks like these), and other centres- as hubs for climate and cost-of-living support, whilst other parts of the conversation focused on initiatives which have been put in place which communities should take advantage of- ALISS, OLIO, Too Good to Go etc. Another key example of the approach the second group took to the conversation was how to escape the “it's a Local Authority's job” mindset, which it was felt was present when it comes to the delivery of this support. For me, as a facilitator, this group took a totally different approach to the question.

Between the two groups, though, there were some key themes:

- **Communication:** In one hand, communities being able to make use of directories and other resources for accessing support and advice over these topics. In another, making sure that organisations are ensuring these are complete and that messaging around these issues is clear and communicates in the most accessible possible way.
- **Funding:** In one hand, that this is a challenge as public sector budgets are particularly and increasingly stretched. In another, that there is an opportunity to increase the flexibility of funding requirements to achieve co-benefits (i.e. climate and nature outcomes for funding responding to the cost-of-living and vice versa.)
- **These issues are intricately connected and, even from different perspectives, there are common realisations:** the “main points” from both groups, to me, signal the opportunity to listen to lived experience on these issues, but also to provide money-saving results for communities.

Overall, these conversations moved in contrasting directions, but there were still connecting threads and there is lots of food for thought, as well as actions committed for the future from participating groups.

Main points	Gaps	Suggested actions
<p>Communication: (i) communities being able to make use of directories and other resources for accessing support and advice over these topics; (ii) ensuring that organisations are keeping entries complete and that messaging around these issues is clear and communicates in the most accessible possible way.</p> <p>Funding: In one hand, that this is a challenge as public sector budgets are particularly and increasingly stretched. In another, that there is an opportunity to increase the flexibility of funding requirements to achieve co-benefits (i.e. climate and nature outcomes for funding responding to the cost-of-living and vice versa.)</p> <p>These issues are intricately connected and, even from different perspectives, there are common realisations: the “main points” from both groups, signal the opportunity to listen to lived experience on these issues, but also to provide money-saving results for communities.</p> <p>Benefits of taking action on either climate change or improving access to heating/eating for BOTH.</p>	<p>More lived experience input</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take other opportunities to listen to lived experience on these issues</li> <li>• Take opportunities to provide money-saving results for communities.</li> <li>• Promote the information that taking action on one of the issues will bring benefit for both.</li> </ul>