



MINUTES OF THE CHARGEUK POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS GROUP
16 January 2024, 11:00-12:00

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	To share a RCF discussion paper	Secretariat

ITEM ONE
WEEKLY UPDATE

1. DAN SIMPSON opened discussion and flagged competition policy. Today's discussion was noted to be on the RCF.
2. DAN SIMPSON spoke on priorities. Updating on barriers, following the meeting with NGED, we are working with them to set up sub working groups. They have also asked for case studies - we are analysing the barriers paper and then will contact members for permission to share those. We may also request further case studies. Updating on CX and accessibility, the OZEV/OPSS meeting is to be scheduled for 26 January. We will also discuss Reliability and OCPI in next week's PCG, a note will be circulated ahead of this meeting. Updating on meeting, ChargeUK recently met with Adept regarding barriers report and will also be meeting TfW and Transport for Scotland soon.

ITEM TWO
RCF

3. DAN SIMPSON opened the discussion noting we have a month to finalise our submission but there are a lot of different views, we are taking time to do this.
4. HARRY METHLEY spoke through the draft paper, and through each of the individual bullets. Harry began by noting that ChargeUK believes that RCF funding is needed for certain A roads. Harry noted that the consultation from DfT breaks into four or five sections and welcomed views on first section.
5. ROSANNA TURNHAM noted that we need to broaden it out on the SRM more generally, and need to be more broad than A roads and rural areas. HARRY METHLEY noted that the question actually asked about A roads and whether we want to broaden regardless? ROSANNA agreed and noted that it should be broader regardless and not restricted.
6. IAN JOHNSTON agreed that we should not limit to the areas that are listed. It should be any A road. A lot of things re. grids can be lifted from barriers report.

7. MARTINA HUNT noted that RCF only applies to England and not Wales or Scotland where it is devolved. Martina noted point four and asked what the premise of the assertion was. HARRY METHLEY confirmed that we think it is a good point to raise regarding difficulty around competition that the MSA is in charge of funding. The rules between two CPOs on site and the need for a 70/30 split. Happy to discuss this if members don't agree. It was clarified that the cost point was regarding the lack of competition. MARTINA noted that we just need to be clear on what we are saying.
8. JAMES MCKEMEY asked a question about whether introducing it into the A road network will also cause delays like it had done on the motorway network.
9. KARL ANDERS noted that if we create zones just for MSAs, it will be difficult for everyone else?
10. IAN JOHNSTON noted that the issue is not calculating future demand but is that they only want to dig once. We are losing opportunities to make better connections in 2025.
11. HARRY METHLEY spoke on who should be the RCF applicant.
12. RICHARD STOBART spoke on whether off motorway services should also be included.
13. IAN JOHNSTON noted that he was unsure if what we have drafted is quite right. You can't have two applications, there needs to be one application for that location. The applicant could be another third party, whether that is National Grid or National Highways.
14. HARRY METHLEY noted that in the consultation, DfT do encourage and welcome collaboration but the design is one applicant from each site, but CPOs can collaborate.
15. HARRY METHLEY spoke on the 70% of control – we are not sure how they have come up with this figure, and we should discuss with them before submitting.
16. VICKY READ we need to make it clear that we are not the reason for the delay – why it is important that competition works.
17. IAN JOHNSTON noted that what makes a site viable or not viable is the location of the land estate.
18. HARRY METHLEY noted that there are notes within the consultation that outlines that should be no preferential treatment to certain CPOs. Our point should be regarding how this works in practice.
19. ROSANNA TURNHAM was unsure on the HGV point and noted that she doesn't feel comfortable regarding our position. HARRY confirmed that we don't have a position on this yet. We don't want to do anything that would delay the timing of the rollout. ROSANNA noted that a lot of it is about future proofing, and we should include it.

20. IAN JOHNSTON noted that a plan for megawatt is too generic. It needs to be linked to utilisation. DAN SIMPSON asked whether we are suggesting we prefer a banded approach, as opposed to the flat rate approach. We would not make a suggestion about the reference to £ as ChargeUK. MARTINA agreed with IAN.
21. HARRY METHLEY asked whether we should be commenting behind a certain metric or whether we agree regarding the average charge point usage point.
22. ROSANNA TURNHAM agreed that they are just trying to get rid of queueing and came back with a really complicated way. She noted that she will come back to us with further comments on this. HARRY said that there are some questions we can give broad answers to.
23. Members to feedback with written feedback by end of the week. The Secretariat will beef it up and bring it back to another meeting of the PCG.
24. Next week's meeting is reliability ahead of the OZEV and OPSS meeting at the end of the month.

ANNEX ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	To share a RCF discussion paper	Secretariat

Attendees:

Ian Johnston, Osprey
 Wendy Gallagher, ESB
 Richard Stobart, Char.gy
 Liv Gomez, EVC
 Ben Walker, SSE
 Matthew Enevoldsen
 Martina Hunt, Gridserve
 Rosanna Turnham, bp pulse
 Laura Hardy, Gridserve
 Fay Clarke, Shell
 Antoine Picron, Chargepoint
 Karl Anders, Mer
 Keith Johnson
 Oli Freeling Wilkinson, Urban Fox
 Vicky Read, Connected Kerb
 Sam Hazeldine, Gridserve
 James McKemey, PodPoint
 Agnese Chiesa, Believ

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

Dan Simpson
 Harry Methley

James Millar
Krisha Indrakumar