End of Day One

David G Victor

Three tasks for this panel

- Which topics seem highest priority?

- What should be done to get the social sciences more engaged?

- What are the largest gaps between what's happening in the social sciences and what's needed?

Issues related to siting

- How does community engagement affect future patterns of opposition and support?

- How do people form attitudes (mental models) about unfamiliar technologies and infrastructure

- What factors explain why some plans are seen as credible and others are not? (credibility important for long term, capital intensive projects)

- What can we learn from other countries?

- How are siting issues for complex hubs different from individual projects, and how can these complex projects get started?

Issues related to labor

- Setpiece: the labor market issues are extremely complex and hard to pin down

- A high priority for labor research should be about the impacts of change on the most vulnerable workers

- Literature on which programs work best is scattered, thin and inconclusive. Some of the most important impacts may be insurance-based rather than retraining.

Issues related to Justice and Engagement

- Central question: how do different types of engagement affect outcomes?

- What can/should we learn from literature on engagement in other areas of technological innovation—about how engagement shapes attitudes and interests?

- How do you build trust and credibility from the start?

- Program evaluation is really important—done from the perspective of impacts on justice

- Rethinking theory and empirics around CBPs: how should we run experiments to learn more about shifts to alternative metrics (or away from metrics) and more on the process of engagement.

Directing Technological Development

- Which frameworks are best for for understanding how decarbonization investments create local benefits, including co-benefits such as cleaner air?

- Are there some technologies that have more favorable politics than others? (e.g., electricity?)

- Can you create siting processes that create supportive political dynamics?

- Understanding and quantifying the allocation of benefits from government-backed projects

What should be done to get the social sciences engaged?

- Engage the social science professional institutions-–most of which aren't really that focused on "climate change" but know a lot about social sciences

- Do a "mapping exercise" that places questions of interest

- Run some "tournaments of theories" exercises

- Assess a variety of deep decarbonization scenarios against what's feasible/needed to identify what's "hard"
  - E.g., huge siting of new infrastructures such as transmission and pipes

Where are the gaps between what's needed and what's happening?

- Hypothesis: <u>topics aligned with how social scientists already work</u> will already attract a lot of research
  - E.g., how organized labor will react to technologies that affect existing industries;
  - E.g., why some political interest groups are better organized/influential than others
- Hypothesis: <u>gaps for complex topics that cut across disciplines</u>
  - E.g., design and evaluation of community benefit programs
- Hypothesis: things that <u>treat climate as "unique"</u> probably get in the way
- Hypothesis: <u>things that require a lot of novel data</u> probably get ignored
  - e.g., program evaluation of DAC, H2 and other hubs
- Hypothesis: <u>social science questions that are framed by technologists</u> probably don't align with how social scientists think
  - E.g., "why don't people adopt the right technologies"