

Briefing: On this pathway we consider the extent to which the organisation can develop a coherent programme of projects and activities appropriate to the scope of its agenda on climate change.

Why is this important? Responding to climate change requires changes in so many different aspects of our society that actions will almost invariably run into constraints (e.g. laws, company cultures, economic pressures) that will frustrate the defined scope of the agenda unless they are addressed as part of the programme.

What we can learn: By focussing on this pathway we can highlight what has enabled barriers to change to be adequately addressed and where project success needs to be replicated. We can also see whether action plans and programmes are congruent with an organisation's mission on climate change.

Activity 1: Speed relating

(This is better done with more than one person so it's an opportunity for the lead reviewee to participate actively.)

1. In just ten minutes list all the climate change relevant activities, however big or small, that have been and are going on in your organisation or that your organisation is involved in.
2. Give yourself a pat on the back.
3. Prioritise each item with a score from 1-3 (with one being highest) according to the greatest impact it will have on emissions reduction or adapting to the effects of climate change.

Activity 2: Barrier/Opportunity mapping

Integral psychologist, Ken Wilber, identifies four different sorts of obstacles to change:

1. Individual Subjective: the stories a person tells him or herself which limit change, e.g. "I wouldn't be a good mum if I didn't drive Jimmy to school everyday."
2. Collective Subjective: the group mindset, organisational culture etc. which limits change, e.g. "Incinerators are dirty and we don't trust anyone who tries to persuade us to adopt new waste to energy technology"
3. Individual Objective: external issues such as skills and competencies e.g. "I can't build you a house that stays cool in the Summer without air conditioning because I've not learnt to do so."
4. Collective Objective: These are legal, technical economic barriers, e.g. "Much as we'd like to build a wind turbine here, we can't get planning permission to do so."

Have a go at describing which kinds of barriers your top scored projects are a) tackling b) likely to run into.

Discuss what this suggests about the scope and coherence of your agenda on climate change with the review team. What else needs to be included in order to tackle anticipated obstacles?

Organisational level	<i>The programme scope pathway</i>
6. The 'champion organisation': Focus on changing the political, social, legal, technological environment in which it operates in order to promote sustainability, rather than just respond to a changing climate or position itself on the issue.	Able to log constraints to broader system responsiveness and to refer them to other places within the broader system, well beyond its own sphere of influence. More understanding needed!
5. Strategic resilience: Top managers recognise that issue is of significant strategic importance. Focus on the ongoing resilience of the organisation and the key systems of which it is part both to climate impacts and to an energy constrained future.	Able to log constraints to action and other learning from experience and to initiate other projects to address them, bringing new stakeholders into the process as appropriate, crossing internal and cross-organisational boundaries where necessary.
4. Breakthrough projects: Top managers begin to recognise that the agenda poses substantial risks and opportunities. They use projects to make breakthroughs in practice, with a close interest in their progress	Able to recognise aspects of wider system that are holding responses back. Able to recommend these to top levels for possible action but processes not in place for these to be actioned without further authorisation.
3. Efficient management: Recognise that climate change needs to be managed systematically, rather than occasionally. There will be measurement systems & targets. Issue is usually delegated to someone lower; senior managers may think they've cracked it.	Able to log operational issues that arise in projects and address them in future activity within its own operations. Likely to see more strategic implications (e.g. broader contextual constraints to action such as laws and government policy, its own organisational culture) as beyond its remit.
2. Stakeholder Responsive: Responds to pressure from others – e.g. a legislator or a customer – but not proactive. Little understanding of how issues apply to its activities; actions risk being tick-box exercise.	Does not take responsibility for a programme of activity either internally or as part of a wider network of activity led by others. Participation in projects likely to be on an ad hoc basis without sustained commitment.
1. Core Business Focussed: Threatened by the issue. Reluctant action, if any.	Unwilling to participate in projects, let alone in a programme of activity.