

# Low Carbon Built Environment Knowledge Hub

## Workshop 1 results

25 October 2016 @ Swinburne University

Attendees	Apologies
Brett Pollard – Hassell	Dr Lan Ding – University of NSW
David Jarratt – AECOM	Prof Deo Prasad - University of NSW
Dr Catherine Bridge – University of NSW	Prof Chris Ryan – University of Melbourne
Dr Stephen White – CSIRO	Mary O’Neill – NSW OEH
Prof Wasim Saman – University of SA	Prof Peter Newton - Swinburne University
Dr Peter Graham – Swinburne University	Prof Peter Newman - Curtin University
Amanda Lawrence – APO	<b>Guest attendees</b>
Michelle Zwagerman – Project Manager	Dr Eva-Maria Jakobs - RWTH Aachen University
Stephen Summerhayes - CRC HQ	Kate Thornton - Swinburne University

The following is the consolidation of the feedback provided at the workshop held on 25 October at Swinburne University. The inputs have been grouped into project planning, project outputs, and areas of further investigation.

---

## 1. Project Planning

The workshop identified the Project’s mission, vision and values, as well as the project’s stakeholders.

### Mission – reason for the project

*What:* This project will deliver a ‘knowledge hub’ that provides authoritative, concise, and accessible evidence relating to lowering carbon emissions in the built environment. The ‘knowledge hub’ will also offer a collaborative platform for stakeholders to come together. The project will set the ‘knowledge hub’ up as an enduring solution.

*Who:* This ‘knowledge hub’ will be made available to a range of decision makers to assist the transition to Low Carbon Living:

- a. Building practitioners
- b. Industry
- c. Government
- d. Communities
- e. Wider audience

*How:* The project will consult with the CRC Nodes to identify their needs and that of their partners. The project will be delivered based on four strategies: 1) Research and industry consultation strategy; 2) Technical and design strategy; 3) Content strategy; and 4) Management and Business planning strategy.

## **Vision – how the future looks**

The project's vision is to provide authoritative evidence from the CRC, and other locations, in a targeted way to the consumer for the long term.

## **Values – how we will behave**

- Innovate and show what is possible
- Disrupt BAU
- Go for some early wins
- The end solution is one that can be reused in other areas
- The design and user interaction are very important
- The process and journey are very important
- We will align and leverage existing resources
- Collaborate

## **Stakeholders**

### 1. Industry

- Practitioners
- Industry associations eg PCA, IPA
- Peak body eg ASBEC
- Other related industries eg Insurance council

### 2. Government

- National government
- State government
- Local government, specifically G.Ms and Lord Mayors
- Mid rank policy offices in government eg research offices, internal staff
- International bodies eg UNEP

### 3. CRC Nodes of Excellence and Partners

### 4. Others

- Investor groups on climate
- Networks and other alliance groups eg C40s, 100RC
- NGOs and research organizations

## 2. Project Outputs

The workshop identified the desired outputs, outcomes and impacts of the project.

### Outputs – what are the products or services

The follow list of desired outputs were identified:

- Synthesised evidence: A single online presence that provides evidence either through a hierarchy or framework or information map (eg. 10 steps to twitter).

#### Types of content

- Infographic, audio, video, fashion, reports, papers, “Josh’s house”, briefings, synthesis.
- Evidence publications, summary info, industry fact sheets, consumer fact sheets, social media (chain of info).
- Triple peer review, systematic reviews, rapid reviews.
- A curation function that ensures the authoritative positioning of the evidence provided (eg a ‘Wels rating’-like tool of building).
- A stakeholder map
- A publishing guide
- Metrics on use of material, CRC or other.
- Feed into case studies for ARC impact exercise
- Demonstrate business case / model for ongoing services (identify drivers of advantage / positioning).

#### Early wins

Some early wins were also identified:

- Research – stakeholder, information systems, open data collections, etc and innovation change
- Collection of CRC outputs
- Consultation and identify process scenarios

#### Business model

It was also identified that the business model for transitioning from the CRC project funding to ongoing BAU funding should be started early. It should also include Phase 2’s systematic review. Sources of possible funding support to be investigated are:

- the CRC Nodes
- Local government eg Lord mayor's support
- Membership model
- Partnerships – ASBEC

## Outcomes – what are the benefits of those outputs

Some benefits were identified:

- Collaboration eg “tinder for built environment”
- Addressing the sticking points in the innovation system and effecting change
- Gives industry partners a business advantage

However, further consultation with stakeholders is required to fully answer the “What is success” question.

## Impact – what impact from those outcomes

The impact of project’s outputs and benefits were identified as:

- Knowing *how* to have impact in the ‘policy planning practice’.
- Influencing policy decision making through the measures of “sticks” (regulations and legal mandatory requirements), “carrots” (incentives, rebates, fiscal instruments, etc.) and “tambourines” (awareness and education).
- Lower carbon emissions!

## 3. Further investigation

It was identified that there are areas of further investigation, namely the target audience of the project, the stakeholder’s needs and issues, and other topics that require further clarification.

### Audience

The focus on the target audience groups for the knowledge hub is essential and needs to be based on the stage they are at in the ‘built environment’ journey. Therefore, the following questions will require further research:

- Who are we serving? Who is most receptive to this evidence and where / how?
- What are their different types of information needs?
- What role does personal relationships play?
- Who is behind the policy decision making?
- Who will have most impact? What is the chain of impact?
- Is targeting industry organisations better than government? Or lobby groups?
- What is missing in the information ‘ecosystem’?
- How will the audience receive the evidence? User centred, task centred, or Media centred?

The target audience will want to know:

- Simple answers - digestible, useful analysis
- What the politics is behind the decision
- Business / political advantage → proof of payoff
- Economic gain eg solar

## Needs & Issues

The needs and issues identified in the workshop can be grouped into two categories:

a. Challenges to *providing* evidence:

- CRC reports getting lost -> people can't find information
- Need to deal with copyright issues
- Having good metadata and information systems (DOIs)
- Still need research in lots of areas
- Agreeing on the knowledge chain
- Identifying and collating relevant, diverse and disparate resources

b. Challenges to *using* evidence in decision making:

- Lack of synthesis & various models of how to synthesise
- "don't believe research" -> Lack of trust in the data
- Contest of economics vs evidence
- Drivers are based on building codes not based on research
- Volatile politics
- Risk averse politicians
- So much info but not acted on
- Not accessible eg in journals or not using easy english language
- Information is locked in case studies and buildings

### Other areas to be clarified

- How does it fit with the CRC website?
- What kind of certification or accreditation or something else to identify quality of evidence?
- Collaboration within and between the nodes.