



MINUTES OF THE CHARGEUK STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING  
30 May 2023, 10:00-11:00

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Members to sign contract	All members
2	Member profile on potential members to be circulated	Connect
3	Membership queries to be moved to board meeting in two weeks.	Connect
4	Charge Up Europe's values to be circulated	Jaynesh
5	Values to be expanded	All members
6	Budget papers to be circulated	Connect
7	Comments on Ofgem consultation	Connect to ask for members' response
8	Data request on barriers	Connect

ITEM ONE  
MEMBERSHIP

**a) Membership Applications**

1. NICK DE MESTRE opened the discussion and noted the items on the agenda. Nick clarifies that membership applications were to be discussed to help formalise the ways organisations can become members of ChargeUK.
2. DAN SIMPSON provides background for the three new membership considerations: Urban Fox, Total Energies Charging Solutions and Whattif EV. Dan noted that Whattif are a European company who have headquarters based in the UK and that they fall within the existing definitions and are similar to existing members.
3. DAN RILEY requested a member profile to be sent on the three members. It was noted that having a profile on potential members will help with decision making and understanding them – e.g., having clarification on their charge-point numbers.
4. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked whether we have spoken to Totale on what their key views are.

5. DAN SIMPSON noted that there was a strong alignment in terms of policy, and they seemed to be a natural fit.
6. JARROD BIRCH questions whether the definitions should clarify potential members' UK presence. He notes that ChargeUK will need to be careful regarding this due to potential risk from countries based outside of the UK.
7. DAN SIMPSON noted that he has had discussions with organisations who are currently not operating CPOs in the UK, but clarifies that they do need to be operating in the UK when joining.
8. DAN RILEY asks what the specific concern is with members who are not operating in the UK. Dan noted that ChargeUK have yet to break down what a tier membership actually brings – for example, if an organisation is a full member, they are part of the policy discussion.
9. KARL ANDERS notes that if the UK government think that the conversions ChargeUK are having are being shared with other governments, this could be harmful. Karl notes that we need to be careful in this area.
10. IAN JOHNSTON notes that ChargeUK can approve members but subject them to a check to ensure they are operating in the UK.
11. DAN SIMPSON suggests that this can be referred to the board meeting in two weeks.

## **b) Membership Definitions**

12. NICK DE MESTRE notes that feedback on the definitions is welcome and when welcoming members, ChargeUK need to make sure that organisations are aligned with the purpose of group. It was suggested than in Year 1 ChargeUK should keep to obvious members such as CPOs and allied organisations and expand more in Year 2 when membership tiers are solidified.
13. NICK DE MESTRE noted that a fixed set of membership tiers will help establish this and in turn be associated with how much members will pay and how often their logo gets used. In addition, there also need to be a distinction between those who are not just charge providers, but those who are also present in other sectors such as wind farms - e.g., Siemens. Nick noted that they ultimately need to be aligned in terms of CPOs, which may not be the case with some roaming providers.
14. DAN RILEY agreed that there needs to be an alignment on key issues amongst members. It was noted that ChargeUK was created because we needed alignment on issues such as CPOs, and it is important to consider this. Dan flagged that we need to be careful when we get increasing conflict with core membership as we do not want to admit those who do not align with our key issues and consequently undermine our key business models.
15. KARL ANDERS noted that it has to be clear that ChargeUK is a CPO organisation.

16. NICK DE MESTRE noted that this was a perfectly acceptable condition and if ChargeUK were to have a definition, it has to be abided by.
17. DAN SIMPSON noted that there is a great level of interest from the industry and that discussions with numerous organisations have been held. It was noted that we will not be going forward with all enquiries.
18. TOM HURST noted that various European charging associations struggle to reach alignment due to the differing interests CPOs and MSPs. As a result, pure MSPs are not an appropriate founding member for ChargeUK.
19. IAN JOHNSTON noted that ChargeUK have alignment on barriers but there still needs to be clarification with roaming. As a result, ChargeUK need to make their policy positions CPO led. It was noted that although there will be points of differentiation, ChargeUK must define their CPO strategy. Ian noted that once policy positions are defined, the issue of interest may resolve itself. Ian noted that timing is an important factor and that keeping up barriers to only allow L1 and 2 allows ChargeUK to define our strategy first. Regarding L2 or L3, Ian has asked to remove the word 'software' to prevent software partners in.
20. ANDREAS ATKINS supported the idea of categories and rankings, but questions whether it is too early to say no.
21. NICK de MESTRE noted that ChargeUK will consider the tiers and that there is a potential to have two tiers in the future.
22. JAYNESH PATEL noted that the Europe Trade Association have a founding members category, and a full industry members category. Founding members have to unanimously agree to allow organisations to become full industry members. Jaynesh notes that as members who found the organisation, it a suggestion that ChargeUK take a similar approach and that founding members make an informed decision regarding new members.
23. NICK de MESTRE noted that we want to ensure that the founding members criteria has to do more with the type of organisation, rather than the time of when the organisation joined.
24. JAYNESH PATEL clarified his support for the creation of more categories.
25. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN noted that new members must align with ChargeUK's views. If a potential new member opposes ChargeUK's views, ChargeUK must consider whether them joining is worth the possible dilution of established policy areas.
26. IAN JOHNSTON noted that ChargeUK has to be the go-to association as opposed to any other group supporting CPOs.
27. NICK de MESTRE noted keenness to get this sorted as soon as possible. Nick noted the categories as founding members; associate members (those who will pay to be a member but have little influence – e.g. law firms/accounting firms) and those who do not fit in these two categories and can be seen as more questionable or problematic.

## ITEM TWO

### Statement of Values

28. NICK de MESTRE noted that this does not need to be a 'line in the sand' and can be something that is discussed at the meetings.
29. JAYNESH PATEL flagged that founding members must have a deeper set of values – if a new member is to join, they are adhering to these values. The current values are quite broad and anyone can meet them and suggests that this needs to be narrowed. Jaynesh to circulate Charge Up Europe's values for comparison.
30. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN agrees that the values need more detail and questions whether ChargeUK are in favour of a market-based approach or a subsidy, for example. Both cost effectiveness and energy and transport working together were also noted as points of discussion. Natasha notes that she is happy to work with others on the details of the values.
31. DAN SIMPSON notes that there is no suggestion that this discussion on values has to end here and that a formal process on this can occur in the coming months.
32. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asks whether we can bar new members from joining if they disagree on one of the key principles of ChargeUK.
33. JAYNESH PATEL agrees that this makes sense and that if ChargeUK set up a clear position on what the associations stands for, ChargeUK can then prevent members from joining if they do not agree with these values.
34. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN questions whether further detail is needed right now to safeguard ChargeUK's coalition and working practices – is there a risk that ChargeUK may be flooded with new members who may cause potential disruption?
  - i) There was an agreement from members on this issue.
35. DAN SIMPSON notes that this can be looked at in more detail as time moves forward and clarifies that it will be the next item of business.
36. NICK DE MESTRE notes that the first definition is publicly available whilst the values are not. Nick asks whether ChargeUK need to have publicly available values.
37. JARROD BIRCH notes that he feels like it would not make a difference.
38. DAN RILEY clarifies that regulations cover anything so this will not signify much.

## ITEM THREE

### Organisational Development

39. NICK DE MESTRE notes that the organisational development will be progressed over the three months during the summer period. Nick mentions how individuals will be co-opted to help with this.

40. DAN RILEY notes that if a lawyer is needed to help sort this out, BP is able to assist in organising this.
41. JAYNESH PATEL asks whether the three potential members will be joining as founding members.
42. NICK DE MESTRE clarifies that we do not want founding members to be based on timing and since the three members are CPOs, they can be admitted as founding members.
43. DAN SIMPSON notes that ChargeUK should avoid putting up barriers to prevent legitimate organisations from joining as this would be hard to justify.

## ITEM FOUR

### Budget and Resources

44. NICK DE MESTRE notes that Budget Papers will be circulated shortly. Nick notes Connect's key role for setting up the organisation and that administrative fees should be prioritised over position papers and research. This will be trialled for three months to see how it works.
45. DAN RILEY notes that he is comfortable with this process and suggests that members can provide additional fees to support research projects.
46. JAYNESH PATEL notes that although policy papers are important, key alignment on government issues is more important than long term research.

## AOB

47. DAN SIMPSON flags that the contract is with all board members and encourages those who have not already signed, to sign as soon as possible. Dan notes that papers to the board will be circulated shortly and that Connect will also ask for comments regarding the Ofgem consultation on connection prioritisation later this week. A data request on some of the barriers points following the OZEV meeting will also be circulated shortly.
48. DAN RILEY asks whether board papers will be distributed to the Steering Committee as well.
49. DAN SIMPSON notes that Connect will circulate as requested.
50. IAN JOHNSTON flagged that the initial meeting with OZEV regarding barriers was more positive than expected. Ian clarifies that it is now up to ChargeUK and re-flags that an important data request will be coming to members shortly.

## ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Members to sign contract	All members
2	Member profile on potential members to be circulated	Connect
3	Membership queries to be moved to board meeting in two weeks.	Connect
4	Charge Up Europe's values to be circulated	Jaynesh
5	Values to be expanded	All members
6	Budget papers to be circulated	Connect
7	Comments on Ofgem consultation	Connect to ask for members' response
8	Data request on barriers	Connect

Attendees:

Andreas Atkins, Ionity  
Jarrod Birch, Shell Recharge Solutions  
Nick De Mestre, Raw Charging  
Dan Riley, bp pulse  
Tom Hurst, Fastned  
Ian Johnston, Osprey  
Natasha Mahmoudian, Tesla  
Jaynesh Patel, Chargepoint  
Tom Davies,  
Dee Humphries, Genie Point  
Karl Anders, Mer UK  
Tom Davies, PoGo  
Sam Hazledine, Gridserve

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

Dan Simpson  
Harry Methley  
Olivia Ryan  
Krisha Indrakumar