

Notes from Charge UK Meeting

1) Letter to the Minister

- Greg Cooper (National Grid) now at Jacobs – has strong feelings on RCF
- Call with DfT – 3 key areas: private land, local authorities and MSA. Very reasonable changes and quick wins and keen to work constructively. Positive conversation. Public EV Charging is on the Minister's mind (especially given how much it is in the news)
- We want to influence Government – but not sure which Department does what and not necessarily fussed. Often delegated to Treasury, BEIS, etc.
- Can't channel everything through the DfT, had to go wider.
- Nearer 50% cost than 80% - but they clearly hadn't known that prior to the call. Door is ajar to put some fresh facts and argument forward. Keen to push it with him and others
- DAN: Met with OZEV – don't query with numbers, charge of cost, etc. Haven't yet determined whether they will publish public regulations or to publish a draft regulations first. We are asking for them to come in draft form so that we have an opportunity to play on the detail rather than them being published
- Dan Riley: suggested we add this into the letter rather than create a whole new mechanism
- Wide agreement that we need to get on and send the letter

2) Policy Content / Policy Note

- Harry: We are keen for this to be turned into a briefing note to be sent to various players in Government
- Dan: Members expect introductory letter to be sent to the Minister and that in between that being sent and the meeting happening, we would have a wider call or meeting with the whole membership to finalise a policy paper, but they are expecting a policy paper to be drawn up in the meantime
- Ian: Consumer regs are 2 or 3 serious points and the others are fine. Could we define level of importance and show where our priorities are? Some are business critical and some are just annoying
- Ian: 99% reg needs to be more specific – the approach currently used to measure OCPI is flawed. You cannot publish it as currently states.
- Jarrod: roaming positive but is not the top of his priority list. No desire for this to be more aggressive
- Dan Riley: Believes it is fine. In his opinion, they won't roll back from 99.
- Dan S: But how can we put in stories and case studies that help to illustrate why the difference between 99 and 97 is important? We can definitely flesh it out
- Dan Riley: Doesn't mind if this remains as the first point in this section
- Vicky: Wants to emphasise the good things we are doing and flesh out the rationale behind each point. We need to focus on what we like and why, practising together what those arguments are so it doesn't look like a list of whines for the sake of it
- Dan Riley: Priority is understanding what the final outcome should look like, as people's rationales won't always align. Until we get a Ministerial meeting on the table, not sure how deep we can go without having final outcomes totally secure. Minimum payments – we need to change where it is at the moment. Want to delay the point of starting. Wants the throttle option where you have the key that can be lowered.
- Vicky: 1 is more important than 2. We need to win both consultation arguments. We could well end up throttling but in 18 months, we will consult whether this needs to be extended

again. If they made a song and dance about being contactless, and we fudged it, it will look really bad. We need to show why it doesn't work at this level.

- Jarrod: If we are talking about raising the threshold, that is changing the policy slightly rather than changing it entirely. It allows us to address a drafting issue, affecting the price the consumer pays and the morality of the issue
- Dan Riley: Concerned with setting a higher bar rather than just settling for smaller arguments which are far easier wins.
- Jarrod: For open data, not a big issue but just needs clarification of what is being asked and where the lead up to it is
- Vicky Read: there are differing levels of asks – some are fine but just need some need greater clarity and some need some genuine work before being laid – that needs to be reflected in the policy note
- Would be surprised if companies aren't already compliant on roaming regulations
- Dan Riley has raised concern over how abrasive the language can be
- Vicky: can we do more intelligence gathering before we go full steam ahead (situation would be very different if we knew we had a month vs a week). Worried that the plan is currently too ambitious
- Harry – point 1 is still a good start and will allow for soft intelligence gathering
- Dan Riley: agrees that is sensible and thinks we should gather a centralised list of MPs to gather, but agrees it should come from Charge UK rather than any single member
- Vicky: Concerned over whether we should go for SoS or Jesse Norman
- Harry: Believes Jesse Norman is the way forward – he will be far deeper in the detail. The reason we have settled on press pressure at this point is due to the tight timescale we are working to
- Dan Riley: If we are to do it, let's do it with 1 story rather than lots of stories and target a newspaper.
- Dan S: Government can do one on how the current mechanism is a mess and will work out badly for consumers.
- Dan R + Vicky: Can we get a draft of one to see what it would look like?
- Vicky: We are scared that this could blow back in our faces so that needs to be thought of quite carefully.
- Harry: We all want to make this about the consumer and target 1 or a couple of newspapers so that they will place pressure by calling press teams etc. We understand that we don't want this to blow back in our faces
- Dan R: Nervous that we are arguing against things that are actually popular – we need to decide what the single thing we want the media to say really is

Actions:

- Write to the Minister
- Schedule weekly steering companies over the next 2-3 weeks – set a Thursday afternoon type meeting, Vicky can hopefully dial in but we need to ensure that we involve the other members too
- Need a sub-group of experts (1 from each company) for future meetings and to talk about deployment barriers
-