



MINUTES OF THE CHARGEUK OPERATIONS MONTHLY MEETING
24 August 2023, 10:00-11:00

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Secretariat will circulate proposed membership definitions for year two, linked to our existing categories and seek feedback on membership fees.	Secretariat
2	Members to feedback on draft membership agreement	Members
3	Draft articles and membership fees to be brought to 8 September meeting	Secretariat

ITEM ONE

Update

1. NICK DE MESTRE opened the discussion, noting that today's meeting will be on the draft articles circulated and will also cover membership and budget.

ITEM TWO

Operations Update

2. NICK DE MESTRE began by recapping the previous meeting, noting that membership tiers are being reviewed following those discussions. The main question moving forward is what the different tiers of membership will be and how much ChargeUK wish to charge for these different tiers. There have also been suggestions that the core membership be broadened to include anyone that is involved in charging.
3. IAN JOHNSTON spoke on the importance of expanding membership as this will help with budgeting constraints and will allow ChUK to do more work, especially in regard to research. By expanding membership, this will also allow for more voices in the industry to be included and ultimately add more weight to the association as a whole. The next steps need to outline who is part of the policy decision making process and what this will mean for membership.
4. NICK DE MESTRE noted that the following needs to be outlined:
 - What the role of a founding member is
 - Who are those that have a voice/can vote
 - Those who are part of the association but cannot drive policy

5. KARL ANDERS asked whether the latter members would get comms and output to which NICK clarified that they will essentially be recipients.
6. NICK DE MESTRE noted that moving forward he is not keen on continuing this year's arrangement of members paying what they could, and it instead needs to be a set amount. There was agreement amongst members on this comment. NICK noted that if a member cannot afford to pay, they may be able to receive access to the association but cannot drive policy like other members can.
7. SIMON PICKETT flagged that affordability is not an issue for current members but may be an issue for future members. As the industry and market is progressive, ChUK should try not to limit smaller organisations from being involved. SIMON questioned whether fees could be based on profit or network size to ensure that ChUK are not blocking new entrants.
8. NICK DE MESTRE showed his agreement and noted that the proposal will attempt to address this. If it is a revenue-based model, those who are already big players will ultimately continue to have the biggest voice. As a result, ChUK can propose a nominal fee for year 2 that will allow members to have access, but the question moving forward is whether ChUK would treat them equally by allowing them to vote. There is a possibility that they are instead limited to a reduced fee for only two years.
9. SIMON PICKETT noted that it was important to legitimise those who are allowed into the association, but it is likely we then bring new members in on a caveat. NICK noted his agreement, clarifying that the government have flagged that they wish to hear from the entire industry and not just the biggest operators.
10. KARL ANDERS noted his approval for membership to have tiers (e.g., small – large) but the purpose of ChUK is to represent CPOs and so L1 membership should reflect this. L2 membership can look to outside the CPO network and L3 further beyond this.
11. IAN JOHNSTON flagged that it is in ChUK's interests to bring as many organisations as possible into the association. The risk is that if ChUK don't, organisations will defer to the REA instead. It is important to clarify what a vote means, and that voting will be on ChUK's direction on policy matters rather than on deciding what policy area is important.
12. NICK DE MESTRE clarified that those with votes will ultimately hold the power, but it is important more voices are represented in the policy area. It would be useful to perhaps have a smaller elected board.
13. DAN SIMPSON noted that it was important to start with a simple structure and build upon this, and that once tiers are in place, it will be harder to change and remove this. DAN also clarified that the difference between tiered membership and fee levels needs to be distinguished as these are not interchangeably used terms. It is important to get new entrants into the association and there is opportunity for them to perhaps attend policy discussions but not sit on the board for example.

14. IAN JOHNSTON questioned whether members would then pay a premium to have a board vote. DAN SIMPSON clarified that ChUK could work on the basis that there are two levels of founding membership – e.g., those who are a core member and those who wish to choose a cheaper alternative option. There are trade associations where core members pay different levels depending on turnover or through using a different metric. ChUK need to look at what the best way forward is.
15. SIMON PICKETT noted that ChUK are targeting to be the CPO representative in the UK but there is a risk that other organisations will appear in the EV charging sector and then devalue the hard work ChUK have done thus far. As a result, a core concept needs to be considered on how this can be connected to the wider CPO network.
16. NICK DE MESTRE noted that the Secretariat would re-circulate the definitions article and there is potential opportunity to re-look at the first definition.
17. IAN JOHNSTON asked members for any comments and whether there are any strong views on how ChUK should move forward with tiered membership.
18. TANYA SINCLAIR noted that if ChUK agree to broaden the fee levels to allow different organisations to enter the association, there needs to be balance in choosing the right organisations to be a part of ChUK. Fees are not necessarily the way to help do this but rather maintaining a statement that members can align to – this may help organise structure better. ChUK must try to keep fees simple before it is split into too many ways and should also try not to prevent the influence of those who are not charging companies.
19. ROSANNA TURNHAM questioned what the categorisation of tiers means in practice.
20. NICK DE MESTRE clarifies that it will be an attempt to say who will represent the organisation and then devolve a level of responsibility to those people. Only certain things can be codified in the members' agreement whilst there are certain things that cannot be.
21. DEE HUMPHRIES noted that it's about categorisation as per the definitions that were agreed previously. Along with these definitions, there will be rights and rates that correspond with them. DEE noted that looking at turnover may not be useful, and fees and rights should be based only on the category. For those who wish to join but cannot afford to apply, there may be a special rate and a clear voting right that is established.
22. NICK DE MESTRE noted that there does need to be agreement from members on whether it is based on a flat fee or size of the organisation.
23. ROSANNA TURNHAM questioned whether a research budget will be part of the wider established budget for the year or whether it will be reviewed as and when PCG look at options for research.
24. NICK DE MESTRE clarified that the preference is to have an allocated amount for research in the budget to ensure that this is certainty for research spending. DAN SIMPSON noted that the September Board meeting will sign off the draft articles and the Q4 Board meeting in December will sign off the 2024 budget.

25. NICK DE MESTRE updated on associate membership, noting that this was previously discussed but prices need to be reviewed before the next board meeting so this can progress.
26. IAN JOHNSTON spoke on the high level of activity that ChUK has been involved with since the AGM and how the budget and work of the Secretariat will need to be reviewed to ensure there is less over-servicing. This will be reviewed by the officers and agreed at a future date.
27. TANYA SINCLAIR questioned how research money is being allocated. IAN JOHNSTON noted that a budget for research was already allocated for year one activity and there are contingencies in place.
28. NICK DE MESTRE proposed starting Y2 in January instead.
29. ROSANNA TURNHAM flagged the issue with the 12-month notice period, noting that this should be reviewed. NICK noted his agreement and ensured that it will be re-drafted to reflect an annual membership model. NICK encouraged members to send any comments/feedback to the articles so this can be reviewed and amended accordingly.

ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Secretariat will circulate proposed membership definitions for year two, linked to our existing categories and seek feedback on membership fees.	Secretariat
2	Members to feedback on draft membership agreement	Members
3	Draft articles and membership fees to be brought to 8 September meeting	Secretariat

Attendees:

Nick de Mestre, Raw Charging
 Sam Hazeldine, Gridserve
 Tanya Sinclair, Chargepoint
 Karl Anders, Mer
 Jarrod Birch, Shell Recharge
 Rosanna Turnham, bp
 Simon Pickett, SSE
 Dee Humphries, Equans
 Ian Johnston, Osprey
 Tom Davies, Po Go
 Tom Hurst, Fastned
 Liv Gomez, EVC

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

Dan Simpson

Harry Methley

Olivia Ryan

Krishna Indrakumar