



MINUTES OF THE 'CHARGEUK POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS GROUP' MEETING
27 July 2023, 10:00-11:30

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Amended document on lines to be shared with members	Secretariat
2	To scope jobs study	Secretariat

ITEM ONE

Welcome and Introductions

1. VICKY READ, the Chair of PCG, introduced the meeting. The workshop was outlined as an opportunity to address how ChargeUK should respond to different areas of discussion in the media and the tools we can use to do so.

ITEM TWO

Update

2. DAN SIMPSON gave an update on the ZEV mandate following previous discussions. It was noted that a document was circulated by the Secretariat which included updated lines.
3. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN flagged that the biggest issue with ZEV is that MPs do not understand it's importance and ChargeUK should prioritise getting this positive message across.
4. DAN SIMPSON noted that ChargeUK need to ensure there is no further watering down and weakening of the policy. DAN flagged that coverage by the Times, which made references to SMMT and ChargeUK, was positive.
5. RANDAL SMITH noted that there needs to be more focus in the media regarding the connection between EVs and climate change.
6. IAN JOHNSTON raised the issue with the word 'ban' in reference to petrol and diesel cars. The rhetoric surrounding this needs to be changed as this is what concerns consumers.
7. DAN SIMPSON noted that, as reflected in ChargeUK's coverage book circulated yesterday, the £6bn investment figure is consistently quoted in media mentions of

ChUK. This is a unique figure and ChargeUK need to continue to use this in proactive comms.

8. The competition policy, which prevents discussion of pricing, was flagged to all members.

ITEM THREE

Proactive Communications

9. DAN SIMPSON began by outlining the 'five pillars' – the areas ChargeUK should address through proactive comms. These were noted as:
 - *Roadmap to 2020 (including the rate of rollout, investment and jobs at risk from delaying 2030)*
 - *Availability (including ratio and geographical spread of chargers)*
 - *Consumer (ease of use for consumers and reliability)*
 - *Cost (VAT, fleets)*
 - *How good are EVs – the best and greenest cars ever made (including ref. to air quality)*
10. DAN SIMPSON asked members if they were happy with the five pillars and if there were any alternative suggestions. VICKY noted that it would be worth adding the UK's position as a leader in regard to roll out.
11. DAN RILEY flagged his concern with the last pillar, noting that ChargeUK should focus on the charging experience as opposed to cars. ChargeUK's goal is to showcase that they are delivery infrastructure that will make the switch to EVs easier.
12. RANDAL SMITH noted that discussions around the range of charging should be included.
13. BEN WALKER noted that workforce and skills improvements should be mentioned. It is important for the Government to think about the workforce in remote rural areas where charging is being implemented. BEN WALKER noted the government fall short at times in delivering the policy that would help skills enforcement and delivery.
14. DAN SIMPSON flagged that the Government's cost benefit analysis of the ZEV mandate anticipated that jobs would equal that of the car manufacturing sector but pay would increase.
15. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked for clarification regarding geographical distribution and skills. BEN WALKER clarified that if infrastructure is being brought into different areas, such as Scotland for example, there needs to be a supply chain present to make it successful. Therefore, ChUK must push the Government on a regionalised approach.
16. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN raised the importance of equity with EVs and charging.

17. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN requested that RTFO, costs and market-based approaches be added as a discussion area.
18. MARTINA HUNT questioned whether it is clear who the audience is in regards to comms – are ChUK influencing the government in terms of policy development or is it consumers?
19. DAN SIMPSON clarified that the comms strategy is focused on influencing government policy. However, it was noted that ChargeUK should consider media and public opinion. Although ChargeUK are not targeting consumer and motoring press, government policy is framed by the media and consumers.
20. JAYNESH PATEL raised that there should be lines covering grid connections, DNOs and planning.

a) Overall Focus

21. DAN SIMPSON covered the first slide, noting that the government figure of 12,000 jobs does not seem to be high enough and therefore has not been referenced here. There is a possibility that this number is higher and ChargeUK can provide the statistics to prove this. DAN flagged to members that the Secretariat would welcome any comments on the document that was shared previously noting this.
22. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN noted that the line *“ChargeUK are committed to making the UK the best place in the world to drive and charge an EV”* can be nuanced slightly.
23. BEN WALKER suggested a possible mention on energy security.

b) Rate of rollout

24. MATTHEW ENEVOLDSON asked for it to be made clear that these are publicly available charging points.
25. RANDAL SMITH queried whether charge points should be referred to as connectors. This could mean the figure could then double.
26. VICKY READ noted that the word ‘chargepoint’ can mean different things for different organisations and suggested looking at how many cars can be charged instead. DAN RILEY also noted that chargepoint numbers are not simple here.
27. MARTINA HUNT flagged that recent government statistics noted it was around 44,000 so it is worth checking statistics.
28. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN raised that it needs to be highlighted that a lot of users do not have problems with charging.

29. JAYNESH PATEL noted that installed capacity is a difficult concept to understand and there needs to be a re-framing/translation as to what this will end up being. JAYNESH noted his agreement with previous comments that the rate of rollout needs to consider the regional rate of rollout.
30. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN flagged that it is important to consider where the vehicles are – e.g., is there a need for chargers if utilisation is low in some areas? JAYNESH noted that this is not necessarily the case, and it is a two-way street. Consumers may not be obliged to switch to EVs if there is no infrastructure and vice versa.
31. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN noted her agreement, stating that the narrative can then be re-framed as: ‘the industry is committed to rolling out charging to help increase roll out of EVs etc.’

c) Investment

32. DAN SIMPSON spoke on the £6bn investment figure, noting that it is commonly quoted when ChargeUK is mentioned in the media and Parliament.
33. KARIN BRACKLE flagged that business opportunities should also be mentioned within investment. When consumers switch to electric, business opportunities in areas, in addition to jobs, can also increase.
34. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN questioned whether it was possible to work out the percentage increase regarding the growth of jobs in the industry.
35. VICKY READ noted that it would be a good idea to scope possibilities into producing a figure regarding jobs and how investment is related to this.
36. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN questioned whether it would be useful looking at the collective number of people that ChUK members employ.
37. DAN SIMPSON noted the importance in sticking to a figure re. jobs – if ChargeUK mention the 12,000 figure, this cannot be reverted back on in the future.

d) Geographical Spread

38. DAN SIMPSON noted previous comments regarding geographical spread, flagging that NATASHA’S point regarding EV equity is tied to regional rate of installation. The focus should be on the right charging solution in the right place.

e) Availability

39. DAN SIMPSON spoke on the figures, as noted on the slides, which were extracted from a utilisation study.
40. VICKY READ flagged that utilisation should be framed carefully – communications that argue that chargers are not used for most of the day will be problematic from an investment point of view – and suggested re-framing the first point outlining how long the average charger is used per day.
41. DORA CLARKE spoke on the number of charge points per site and per location. When availability is discussed, this is usually the concern.
42. CHRIS DAY noted that it is unclear what the comms focus in this area is. The focus should be on the right speed, right place and right need for EVs.
43. DAN RILEY suggested that the line should be re-framed to start on a positive tone, rather than mentioning what is negative.
44. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked whether it was possible to organise a survey with consumers to extract figures such as ‘X amount of users do not have an issue with charging.’
45. JAYNESH PATEL flagged that in a user’s mind, reliability and availability of chargers are closely linked and so the messaging should focus on this.
46. CHRIS DAY questioned whether availability should then be framed around consumer experience.

f) Convenience

47. DAN SIMPSON asked members whether there were any statistics regarding the number of chargers drivers use in a week/year as this would be useful in framing the convenience debate.
48. DAN RILEY raised his concern with the line referencing ‘petrol station’ as many users will still charge here. DAN also flagged that ChUK need to consider what we mean by convenience.
49. VICKY READ flagged that it was probably best to steer away any comments relating to utilisation.
50. Members shared different charging statistics and studies on the difference between fuel vehicles and electric vehicles. The AA study was noted as a key report that can be used.

51. JAYNESH PATEL noted that the key difference in driving an electric vehicle in comparison to an ICE vehicle is that it is easier to know whether a chargepoint is free as opposed to trying to find petrol.

g) Rapid

52. The rapid messaging focused on the average time spent at a service station and the difference in this in comparison to fuelling your car.

h) Cost

53. DAN SIMPSON noted that the focus on cost needs to be positively shifted.

54. DAN RILEY noted that mentions to tax should bear in mind other debates surrounding fuel duty.

55. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN flagged that there should not be too much of a focus on VAT as it is unlikely this will be changed. It should instead be used as a hook for RTFO.

i) Fleets

56. DAN SIMPSON noted that although ChargeUK do not discuss fleets often, it is being brought up for comment and it would be good to have lines prepared.

57. DAN RILEY raised the point that fleets are not the next phase, they are already driving the transition. DAN SIMPSON noted that there needs to be a positive story regarding why fleet transition is important.

j) Air Quality

58. Members questioned whether air quality was an issue worth commenting on, especially given the current political context and controversy with ULEZ. There was some agreement with members that ChargeUK should not be saying anything in this area right now.

ITEM FOUR

Summary

59. DAN SIMPSON summarised members' comments, noting that the lines will be reviewed and amended to be sharper.

60. VICKY READ concluded by noting that a report on jobs will be further discussed and will either be commissioned internally or externally.

ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Updated document on lines to be shared to members	Secretariat
2	To scope best way to commission jobs study	Secretariat

Attendees:

1. Vicky Read, Connected Kerb
2. Ian Johnston, Osprey
3. Ben Walker, SSE
4. Karin Bräckle, Ionity
5. Natasha Mahmoudian, Tesla
6. Dan Riley, bp Pulse
7. Simon Kendrew, Equans
8. Wendy Gallagher, ESB
9. Sam Hazeldine, Gridserve
10. Martina Hunt, Gridserve
11. Randal Smith, Urban Fox
12. Tariq Arafa, Connected Kerb
13. Ella Gibbs, Equans
14. Dora Clarke, Osprey
15. Isabelle Osborne, Mer
16. Jaynesh Patel, Chargepoint
17. Chris Day, Bp
18. Agnese Chiesa, Believ
19. Stuart Heckford, Harpswood
20. Matthew Enevoldsen, Chargepoint

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

- Dan Simpson
- Harry Methley
- James Millar
- Olivia Ryan
- Krisha Indrakumar