



MINUTES OF THE 'CHARGEUK POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS GROUP' MEETING  
22 August 2023, 11:00-12:00

## ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Slide deck on initial barriers findings to be shared at next PCG meeting	Secretariat
2	Research Spec document and options to be shared with members	Secretariat
3	Consumer Regs note to be shared with members	Secretariat

## ITEM ONE

### Welcome and Introductions

1. VICKY READ, the Chair of the PCG, introduced the meeting and noted the competition policy. This week's meeting was on commissioning research.

## ITEM TWO

### Weekly Update

2. DAN SIMPSON gave an update on the individual policy items. DAN began by noting there was no further update on RCE, but the Secretariat were meeting with OZEV this week and will update members accordingly.
3. DAN SIMPSON updated on barriers, thanking those members who have participated in the data request thus far. Any members who are yet to submit their responses were encouraged to do so – the barriers work is significant, and this is reflected with the feedback received from No 10 on the first cut. The next two PCG meetings will be focused on barriers with a discussion on findings next week and recommendations the week after. This will also include a discussion surrounding the media and stakeholder strategy with the barriers work and meeting those, such as ENA, who have shown interest.
4. DAN SIMPSON noted that the feedback from members on barriers has been varied and although all data will be kept confidential, there is a possibility that certain areas may require more detail further down the line.
5. DAN SIMPSON updated on consumer regulations, noting that OZEV's reliability working group is next Wednesday. OZEV are yet to flag what the focus of the working group will be, but the Secretariat will follow this up with them.
6. DAN SIMPSON updated on the VAT workstream, noting that the Secretariat will hope to discuss this at the meeting with HMT in September – this meeting is a pre-meet

ahead of the meeting with the Exchequer Secretary in October. JAYNESH PATEL asked whether RTFO will also be raised at this meeting with DAN SIMPSON noting that it will be a broad discussion at the meeting.

7. VICKY READ asked members if there were any final thoughts regarding regs before a note is circulated by the Secretariat on an update. VICKY READ also re-iterated the earlier discussion on the barriers request, and encouraged members to participate and to do so as soon as possible.
8. VICKY READ updated members on last week's discussion on comms lines, noting that if there were no further suggestions or amendments from members then these will be taken as agreed at the end of this week. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN re-flagged her query about the 200 miles stat noting that it could be misleading, and DAN SIMPSON noted that the footnotes will be re-circulated with the document for clarification.
9. It was agreed that members have until the end of this week to feedback on the circulated comms lines and infographics, as well as the retweeting protocol, before they begin to be used from next week.

### ITEM THREE

#### Commissioning Research

10. VICKY READ noted that this week's discussion will be on research. VICKY provided context for the discussion, re-flagging that the Board had allocated the PCG 50k for year 1 to spend on projects. Although the PCG do not have to spend the entire amount, it was important to note that money is limited and the PCG won't be able to commit to all projects this year.
11. VICKY READ outlined the first research option- the Cenex Proposal. Cenex reached out to ChUK noting their similar discontent towards commonly used metrics and stats in the industry and the need to find new statistics to use. The proposal was circulated to members in last week's PCG update but was summarised as:
  - A headline sponsorship of £15,000 + VAT
  - ChUK would have the opportunity to co-brand and chair the report committee as well as steer the research questions
12. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked who else was sponsoring the research. VICKY READ noted that Cenex came to ChUK first as their preferred option and are currently holding others off until they hear back from us. The assumption is that even if there were other sponsors, ChUK would have control over who this is.
13. KARL ANDERS asked if they have noted how many sponsors they want. VICKY READ confirmed that they haven't yet, but would assume it was a headline sponsor and two others.
14. RICHARD STOBART noted that there was currently a lot of negative press in the industry and anything that has ChUK's name on it should only generate positive

headlines. If ChUK's name is on this report, it needs to be painted in a positive light and needs to be something that is picked up by the press.

15. ADRIAN FIELDEN-GRAY questioned whether there is a danger that the research may not seem positive with ChUK's name on it. There may be assumptions that it is not independent, and it may lose its credibility with ChUK's name on it as it may seem biased. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN agreed, noting that there was a risk that it may lose its credibility with ChUK's name on it.
16. VICKY READ questioned whether we would want a report out that looks like ChUK's input wasn't in it. The research would be the missing bit of proof that the industry is actually doing well and that we are on the way to reaching the set targets.
17. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN questioned whether Cenex would be open to having a conversation on whether ChUK can perhaps assist them with other research and if we can provide assistance/input without being the headline sponsor. KARL ANDERS also noted that ChUK contributing is positive but being the primary sponsor does run a risk. If there was an opportunity to be a secondary sponsor, this may be a better option.
18. VICKY READ asked members if they agreed this report would be useful for ChUK to which members showed their agreement. VICKY READ noted that now the next steps were looking at how to do this, so it doesn't backfire or undermine ChUK. Another chat with Cenex was proposed for a discussion around other options and sponsorships.
19. VICKY READ moved onto the second option for research, with this being on economic impact and jobs. VICKY highlighted that this research was a key basis that most trade associations have and ChUK have already discussed the need for this.
20. JAYNESH PATEL questioned whether the research would be measuring ChUK as a network or if it would be private.
21. ADRIAN FIELDEN-GRAY noted that this piece was needed and positive and that it was good for ChUK to counter some of the negative narratives that are frequently being circulated. ADRIAN questioned whether there it was worth focusing on environmental aspects as well as this is important. Members showed their support for the work and noted that a focus on environment would also be positive.
22. VICKY READ asked members if they have recommendations for good agencies, noting that she also has some recommendations. DAN SIMPSON noted that there is potential for agencies to perhaps pitch at a PCG meeting, noting the importance of the research and getting good value for it.
23. VICKY READ spoke next on research option three which was on RTFO. The piece of work on RTFO would involve asking an external agency to capture how renewable electricity would benefit CPOSS and consumers. It is estimated that this would cost around 50k.
24. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN showed her support for the research piece noting that it was important and more urgent. NATASHA noted she knows someone who can do the work quickly and within budget and if this is of interest and agreed by members, ChUK should move along with this as soon as possible. VICKY READ noted it was important to look at

how this policy affects other markets, such as European ones, and how it fits into the wider policy agenda.

25. VICKY READ asked members to provide comment on the value that this could bring to them. TOM HURST noted that the value could be significant if the UK is in line Europe and that it will allow for reinvestment into infrastructure and passing benefits onto the consumer. JAYNESH PATEL also noted how this work has been seen in California with their low carbon fuel standards and has been positive.
26. DAN SIMPSON noted that members would need to show agreement for this research to go ahead as this would involve spending entire budget on one proposal.
27. KARL ANDERS noted that ChUK need to be careful about putting the entire budget into RTFO as it could open ChUK to be being painted negatively. VICKY READ flagged that regardless of where money is being spent, ChUK still need to continue to push the government on RTFO and to think about the long-term success and failures of this.
28. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN suggested that the research doesn't need to be made public and can just be shared with key stakeholders and the government. The message needs to show that they are missing out on money and investment for the industry.
29. VICKY READ suggested that the discussion needs to be continued so members can have a deeper look at what is being proposed. RICHARD STOBART asked whether some members are willing to put it more money to share the cost.
30. DAN SIMPSON flagged to members that ChUK are still in their start-up year, and it wasn't possible to do all three research projects simultaneously. Budget for year 2 will be discussed at the Operations Group meeting. JAYNESH PATEL noted that the economic impact and jobs piece could potentially be a year 2 project.
31. NICK DE MESTRE, Chair of the Operations Group, noted that budget for the first year is tight and is reluctant to ask for money at this point in ChUK's existence. It is likely that the Cenex proposal would happen anyway, but the second report was important to underline ChUK's work. NICK questioned whether the RTFO work would be worth the 50k. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN noted her disagreement that RTFO is not important as it would be good for both the consumer and for the industry.
32. VICKY READ noted that ChUK need to look at the risks and benefits and then decide the next steps. There is opportunity for further discussion on this.

## ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Slide deck on initial barriers findings to be shared at next PCG meeting	Secretariat
2	Research Spec document and options to be shared with members	Secretariat
3	Consumer Regs note to be shared with members	Secretariat

Attendees:

- Vicky Read, Connected Kerb
- Sam Hazeldine, Gridserve
- Jaynesh Patel, Chargepoint
- Tom Hurst, Fastned
- Richard Stobart, Char.gy
- Jarrod Birch, Shell Recharge
- Liv Gomez, EVC
- Ben Walker, SSE
- Nick De Mestre, Raw Charging
- Natasha Mahmoudian, Tesla
- Karl Anders, Mer
- Adrian Fielden-Gray, Be Ev
- Agnese Chiesa, Believ

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

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