



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

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Slide deck on initial barriers findings to be shared with members, feedback requested ahead of next week's meeting	Secretariat

ITEM ONE

Welcome and Introductions

1. VICKY READ, the Chair of the PCG, introduced the meeting. This week's meeting was the first of the two meetings on barriers and was surrounding the initial findings. Next week's meeting will be on solutions.

ITEM TWO

Weekly Update

2. DAN SIMPSON gave an update on the individual policy items. DAN updated on RCF, noting that OZEV informed ChUK that we can expect an update next month, and that there will be a further consultation on the main fund in September.
3. BEN WALKER asked whether ChUK are preparing election material for the industry ahead of the general election, which could be sooner than the predicated date of October 2024. VICKY READ noted that we would look to bring together the policy asks for each of the 6 priority areas into a manifesto or other form of election material, potentially alongside research we may commission. DAN SIMPSON noted that the current barriers research is one of the issues that ChUK hope influences election manifesto drafting.
4. JAMES MCKEMEY questioned whether RCF having a further consultation suggests that there are more questions. DAN SIMPSON clarified that the next consultation will be focused on the main fund, as opposed to the pilot, as OZEV have indicated that they are finding that the pilot does not tell you much about the main fund.
5. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked whether ChUK are giving OZEV a position on RCF. DAN SIMPSON noted that the view at this stage is to establish a position on what is still up for discussion. NATASHA noted she is still in favour of getting something in there now as there is no clear indication as to what is blocking ChUK from getting something to the government. JAMES MCKEMEY noted that ChUK may still be able to get some priorities considered.

6. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked whether a document on the areas where there is no agreement on RCF could be put together to be provided to the minister. VICKY READ asked for RCF discussions to be continued outside of this meeting.
7. VICKY READ flagged the HOL/CCC inquiry into EVs. DAN SIMPSON informed members that a first draft of the response will be circulated to members this week.

ITEM THREE

Barriers – Initial Findings

8. DAN SIMPSON spoke through the initial barriers data request, noting that the request was intended to better understand the barriers to the installation process. Responses were given in both qualitative and quantitative terms and have provided an understanding of such barriers, but there are still some gaps. The initial findings will go to form and identify the policy asks ahead of the next PCG meeting.
9. DAN SIMPSON went through the slide deck ([this can be access via the ChUK Shared Member Drive](#)) and began by noting the main stages where barriers were identified. These were as follows:
 - AC projects mainly deal with delays at the beginning of the process
 - DC projects mainly deal with delays at the pre-construction phase
 - Both AC and DC projects deal with delays post construction, but not during the construction process when CPOs have control
10. The following slides identified other key issues/data such as:
 - The rate of charging infrastructure is rising exponentially but delays are also growing month to month
 - The speed and constraints of local authority procurement is the largest issue for public funding AC charging
 - There is a need to bring down the overall period of time spent on procurement (this is one of the solutions to bring more projects forward)
 - A possible solution is to start construction sooner by the reducing average time spent on securing planning consent to eight weeks. Planning consent can then be secured by enabling issue of PDR
11. DAN SIMPSON re-capped the issues outlined by underlining the five key asks to be discussed at next week's PCG:
 - Speed up the deployment of public funds
 - Simplify local site selection
 - Provide clarity on costs
 - Streamline the pre-construction process
 - Create an over-arching duty to cooperate
12. ANDREAS ATKINS noted that the slide deck was reflective of the main barriers to installation.

13. BEN WALKER asked whether ChUK wish to run DNO process past SSE, to which DAN agreed. DAN noted that discussions with Ofgem, National Grid and ENA also noted that they wish to see findings on this.
14. DAN SIMPSON spoke further on the AC side noting that the biggest issue was that it was very time consuming unless there were changes to the procurement process. The consultation and client site approval were also noted as time consuming when they were done end to end. This is something that needs to be communicated through feedback and solutions.
15. VICKY READ asked whether it is worth joining site selection, resident consultation and client site approval together. It would be helpful to find a way to describe all the three areas in a way that would bring them together.
16. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN asked whether there was a reason RTFO was not included as a barrier. VICKY READ questioned whether RTFO would be considered a solution as opposed to a barrier. NATASHA clarified that it could be linked to the barrier of cost.
17. JAMES MCKEMEY noted that RTFO may not be considered as a barrier as it doesn't really exist at this stage. However, in regards to cost, high electricity costs can be considered a barrier. This has been a big issue in the demand for selling public chargers.
18. DAN SIMPSON showed his agreement noting that the initial barriers request began with a focus on mechanical points regarding infrastructure etc, but research has shown that a lot of projects do end with issues at the grid stage due to cost. However, more evidence on this will be needed for it to be a viable point.
19. ROSANNA TURNHAM questioned whether going to the government, especially in the run up to an election, with a list of difficult asks would be successful. DAN SIMPSON noted that these are difficult asks, especially surrounding the planning system, but this is why ChUK will focus on permitted development rights as opposed to making changes with the system.
20. DAN SIMPSON asked members whether they felt the issues outlined covered the main areas and whether individual companies' problems sit within them. Members did not indicate otherwise. ROSANNA TURNHAM asked whether planning falls within the 'streamline the pre-construction process' to which it was noted it did.
21. VICKY READ suggested possibly re-wording the first policy ask and including planning in one of them and possibly adding snappier language.
22. ROSANNA TURNHAM asked whether slides could be shared ahead of next week to which it was agreed they would be.

ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
--------	---------	-------

1	Slide deck on initial barriers findings to be shared with members, feedback requested ahead of next week's meeting	Secretariat
---	--	-------------

Attendees:

- Vicky Read, Connected Kerb
- Andreas Atkins, Ionity
- Jaynesh Patel, Chargepoint
- Tom Hurst, Fastned
- James McKemey, Pod Point
- Liv Gomez, EVC
- Ben Walker, SSE
- Nick De Mestre, Raw Charging
- Natasha Mahmoudian, Tesla
- Adrian Fielden-Gray, Be Ev
- Marie-France Vanheel, Be Ev
- Agnese Chiesa, Believ
- Rosanna Turnham, bp
- Wendy Gallagher, ESB

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

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