



MINUTES OF THE CHARGEUK POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS GROUP  
26 Sept 2023, 11:00-12:00

## ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Members to provide feedback on barriers paper by 3pm Friday	Members
2	Paper to be amended following feedback and a next steps document to be shared ahead of next PCG	Secretariat

## Welcome and Introductions

1. VICKY READ opened the discussion, noting that today's discussion was focused on barriers.

## ITEM TWO

### Weekly Update

2. DAN SIMPSON updated on barriers, noting that the next two scheduled PCG meetings will be focused on this.
3. DAN updated on the week passed, noting the virtual roundtable with the SoS for Transport. The Secretariat are meeting with OZEV this week and will discuss recent events and key priorities moving forward. An update will be provided in the Friday PCG email.
4. Members were thanked for their feedback on RCF – the PCG discussion and following comments has allowed for a more aligned view to be formed. This feedback will be shared with OZEV.
5. DAN updated on consumer experience. Although the technical working group is still in diaries, OZEV has now confirmed that this will be rescheduled until they make some tangible progress.
6. JAMES MCEKEMEY asked who the team at OZEV were now following recent changes. It was noted that Nick Shaw was leading on LEVI, Stephen Rippon on RCF, Lizzie Culwick is Deputy Head of Department.
7. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN updated on a recent conversation with Mark Harper, noting that comment around connections seemed to have landed.

8. JAMES MCKEMEY queried on what the next steps would be following the meeting with the SoS.
9. DAN SIMPSON noted that there was a little bit of effort from the Telegraph and Mail to get a backlash to the backtrack, but this didn't gain any momentum. As it needs to be tabled in Parliament and will need a vote, it will take around 8 weeks.
10. VICKY READ asked whether ChargeUK need to write to Mark Harper following the roundtable. DAN SIMPSON noted that we have had correspondence with their team regarding a follow up meeting to discuss ChargeUK's barriers research. We would suggest continuing with this as opposed to a formal letter as this may suggest the end of a correspondence we seek to continue.
11. ROSANNA TURNHAM asked whether there is anything we can do further on comms regarding ZEV following the roundtable last week.

## ITEM TWO BARRIERS

12. DAN SIMPSON updated on the discussion paper shared with members prior to the meeting. The Secretariat are welcoming any comment or feedback on this as this will help form the next steps for the barriers work which is to be discussed at next week's PCG.
13. HARRY METHLEY asked members to provide comment by 3pm on Friday. If members are able to comment on whether they agree or disagree with the recommendations, or anything that they feel has been missed or needs more detail, this would be appreciated.
14. HARRY METHLEY talked through the paper, noting the government asks and the voluntary code of conduct. The paper can be found saved in the [ChUK Member Share Drive](#). When discussing the problem and the process map, it would be great if members can share any examples or case studies as this will be helpful in strengthening the argument. It was noted that the DC/AC process map are separate as these are mainly intended to be an education piece.
15. IAN JOHNSTON asked whether we need to make all the points we want to get across later down the line now – e.g. discussions around the grid. IAN also noted that the variability that DNOs can take from document to document needs to be mentioned as this is a common issue. Highways was also noted as very important – the timeline is problematic and can add six months onto the process. IAN asked whether the intention is to get other associations, as well as the ENA, on board moving forward. IAN also noted that specific members should have a close look at the RCF points and provide feedback where they can.
16. HARRY METHLEY noted that any case studies about highways will be very useful to make the above point and encouraged members to send these across if possible. It was noted that the time delay with school holidays had been noted. The implementation process and next steps will be the topic of discussion at next week's PCG. In regards to RCF, HARRY agreed that scrutiny from members on this would be appreciated.

17. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN clarified she would send notes after the meeting but noted the issue with DNOs not accepting the wayleave approach and that it must be clear that DNOs must accept licensing and wayleave. On VAT, NATASHA noted that she doesn't think VAT should be placed in terms of commercial viability. Regarding RCF, NATASHA spoke on how RCF creates distortion but is not necessarily a barrier – if ChUK agree on RCF design then this can be pulled into the paper.
18. ROSANNA TURNHAM noted that by placing and grouping things together, the prioritisation piece has slightly been lost. On DNOs, ROSANNA questioned whether the asks were realistic and whether they go far enough – do we need to suggest that if DNOs don't stick to the asks, there are consequences? It may also be worth noting that they may be subjected to a transparency requirement for example.
19. VICKY READ asked whether figures and statistics could be used instead of bar charts. It is also important to not focus too much on the “challenge”, as noted in the beginning of the paper, and instead focus on how all the problems are in fact solvable.
20. VICKY READ spoke on engagement with residents during the consultation process – the guidance to local authorities on when to consult and on what basis varies and needs to be clearer. There needs to be more of a focus on the wider issue around consulting in general.
21. HARRY METHLEY clarified that the back of the paper is designed to have more detail and will have wider stats. Members are welcome to suggest what else can be added here.
22. DAN SIMPSON noted the paper is trying to formulate a summary. The aim is to lay out the specific new concepts that we are introducing to be part of discussion. For example, introducing PDR will not require any legal changes whilst a TRO consultation will.
23. JAMES MCKEMEY asked whether we use last week's announcement to change the language in the paper. JAMES also noted that with TCR, it lumps a lot of it into standing charges.
24. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN noted that it would do better to separate VAT and RTFO and that her view is that viability and affordability needs to be a stand-alone piece.
25. VICKY READ noted that we need to make sure that we are thinking carefully about CNI discussions. In addition, we need to be reiterate the mandate on CPOs and that local authorities have a duty to provide local infrastructure.
26. NATASHA MAHMOUDIAN clarified it is the framing of the discussion that needs to be amended to consider first what the problem is and then what the solution is.
27. DAN SIMPSON spoke on the next steps, noting that the Secretariat will share the implementation plan ahead of next week's PCG meeting.

## ANNEX A ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Members to provide feedback on barriers paper by 3pm Friday	Members
2	Paper to be amended following feedback and a next steps document to be shared ahead of next PCG	Secretariat

Attendees:

Vicky Read, Connected Kerb  
Liv Gomez, EVC  
Martina Hunt, Gridserve  
Sam Hazeldine, Gridserve  
Ian Johnston, Osprey  
Jarrod Birch, Shell  
Ben Walker, SSE  
Tom Hurst, Fastned  
Rosanna Turnham, bp  
Agnese Chiesa, Believ  
Antoine Picron, Chargepoint  
Natasha Mahmoudian, Tesla  
Randal Smith, Urban Fox  
Marie-France Van Heel, Be Ev  
Fay Clarke, Shell  
Jodie Brown, Shell  
Simon Kendrew, Equans  
Adrian Fielden-Gray, Be EV

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

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

