

## Membership

- Podpoint
  - Dan: Will provide services in kind to the association instead of a membership fee. Dan will be meeting with them on Wednesday to understand what that will mean in contractual terms. Draft deliverables around branding will be discussed which Charge UK can then use moving forward.
  - Ian: Scared that as we haven't said this to the membership. We should talk to other members about the plan. We should do that once we've had the scope conversation o what they will be delivering.
  - Tanya: I support this with two conditions: 1) scope of work is costed and equates to roughly what membership would cost and that's transparent. 2) We are clear this is an exceptional circumstance
  - Vicky: I think we put them in a conditional agreement, and also this will move for the second year. We have a long list of events and reports that need to be sorted out. There's a balance to be struck with lots of members wanting to give services in kind – so there will likely have to be a bit of trust involved.
  - Dan: Members will not only exist to pay money – they will have a say and help the group to grow. At this stage, we need to get off the ground quickly and get good membership.
  - Dan Riley: When it comes to Podpoint, I totally agree with Tanya. I would also add that costing out is fine, but I don't think this being within the pre-existing price range is reasonable. Would rather we go back to our proposal for this trade association where we costed out what was additional. Don't think it's a bad thing to charge at the high end, even if they don't like that. We need to demonstrate to other members that this arrangement is punitive to an extent. When we set this up, we created a range of money they could contribute. I don't think its sensible that every person to pay the lowest part of the scale. Everyone going for the habit of inputting the lowest amount of money is sustainable.
  - Ian: Some of our board directors are ex Geniepoint – so I think we pushed them at the higher number, they wouldn't have signed on. This comes back to Gridserve – they are the ones we put a figure on. They only agreed to join in word and not nuts and bolts.
  - Vicky: We need transparency around who's paying what.
  - Ian: I can send Martina the email that I never got a response to. The problem with Gridserve is getting a response from them. I will copy Dan S into that email.
- Geniepoint
  - Meeting on Thursday to do onboarding
- Other members
  - Vicky: Who else have we got to come onboard with membership? Who are our targets? It would be good to know how many we are aiming for before our launch? Who will be on the first ruster? Do we need to make any effort to get that niled down?
  - Ian: My thought was that we were done for founding members. Tesla would only come if we have the time and energy
  - Dan: For those wavering, we will demonstrate utility by impact – but that can only happen once we're out there. When we get out there and playing an active role in media, they will see the advantage in coming after launch.
  - Dan Riley: We have also said that we will build it and then come, but we are yet to build anything. Once we launch, we will get more members.

- Vicky: If Geniepoint come in at £10k, that might present budgeting challenges. Can Connect take this away and tell us how to deal with it?
- Dan: Our standard transparency contract allows us to change mid-process. We anticipate that the work programme will be reviewed and agreed with the board in year and that provides a mantra for the contract throughout the year.
- Dan Riley: With Geniepoint, we are in a position for them to join before we sign the contract
- Dan: Sure but as we say with Gridserve – we pitch on the basis of number. By the time we sign the contract, there will be a statement of works. If you want to say at this point that's moved since we pitched. But at this point, the work programme that was proposed at the start is what we were working with at the start. We anticipated more members coming in as we go along. Through the different activities here, there is scope within that and the Membership Services package to grow.
- Dan Riley: Would it be going too far to say what does extra memberships get us? A normal trade association, for every new member, that might be another member of staff or the production of new materials, etc. We are paying for Connect's time, so what's the block equivalents of what happens when new members join?
- Tanya: I think that's right – we have the workplan and then in addition, we need a workplan that is Blue Peter thermometer style to see what more money/membership gains. That would need to be transparent. If there is money that isn't spent, that goes into reserve
- Vicky: All actual fees go to Connect – you either hold additional blocks in reserve or go towards things like a launch.
- Dan: We are the only legal entity that can invoice so we will collect the fees. If we go into excess, that will be passed through to events costs or the website etc. Or if the hours aren't used this year, they can be extended to next year. My assessment is that there is a cost to servicing every member – but we will likely need a scale like you talk about that we should discuss
- Vicky: We might need a budget quarter by quarter. We can't have a situation with all year 1 fees for you and do nothing else because we have no additional members.
- Dan Riley: When certain things come up like a launch event, we might be willing to go deeper into the pocket and pay more for specific capital costs. We would expect things like speaking invitations, but as additional costs come up, there are also other ways we can gain more money.
- Vicky: Those big items will come at us quickly. So even if members are charged extra for events, giving them priority access because they have extra budget might get tricky. I am confident that we will get enough members in Y1 to get what we need for Y1, but it's a bit chicken and egg esque to complete it all.
- Dan: The single biggest upfront cost to deal with is the launch event. The only additional costs will be catering etc. We can run the launch event well with the current fees. But questions around an external report or a Christmas event can be discussed nearer the time
- Ian: Are there new terms we need to bring into the contract?
- Vicky: What happens to new members as they come in – are there different contracts or one contract. The clauses currently aren't sufficient, so we need a beefed up section on competition. Maybe Dan and Sara need to have a conversation to get this to a decent place.
- Dan: I have a meeting with Sara – and we are joining the trade association forum so we will be in a conversation with them. My gut is that we should do that.

- Ian: Can I just suggest that I don't think people like Geniepoint will sign up tomorrow. What a great problem to have that by the time we have a contract, there are lots that want to join – but maybe the only way to solve it is for a contract to be resolved with Sara and to then take it from there?
- Dan: When I meet with Geniepoint, I will say this is their chance to be a founding member. Can each contract just be with us individually or will it be between all of you?
- Vicky: I think there does need some legal entity recognition between us. I will leave it to you and Sara to take it forward.
- Dan Riley: There may be a degree of this that is faith alone. It's worked well so far, so us as a steering group maintaining that as a driving force has been helpful. Maybe until we have actual directors and a driving force, we may need to continue in this slightly less clear cut way of this working in Y1
- Dan: We've put a couple of milestones in the workplan where decisions are taken. The company will be incorporated by the end of Y1. That would be the most obvious way to work. It will also raise a lot of VAT questions – but we can process that at the time
- Dan Riley: The more we just have this on paper and decide it, the quicker this will be

## Governance

- Contract – to note progress
  - Dan Riley: The contract will take a long time for our lawyers to sign. If we're thinking about launch in which you might require sensitive data, without that, we would not send you it. However, that doesn't mean there aren't options for quick NDA etc. We just want legal protections
  - Dan: I agree we will need a data request for a launch
  - Dan Riley: Yes we will need legal signed terminology
  - Dan: We will talk to Sara about the things we can do now for transitional cover.
  - Dan Riley: I can speak with our lawyers about a bilateral between us and Connect. It might be a case that we need that kind of arrangement
  - Dan: The legal risk doesn't just apply to you but to us as the secretariat too.
  - Dan Riley: Charge Up Europe do do the kind of data trawling that you do. I did this in January – and what I learned is you can't expect this quickly. I'm not sure how they did this, but perhaps it's a general agreement.
  - Tanya: Yes there is so much that they asked for with the state of industry report. They wanted number of chargepoints, business models, how many chargers we installed – but there was so much we couldn't answer. We all want the outcome but none of us want to do the tedious work.
- Competition compliance policy – next steps
- AGM and meeting programme – please see attached
  - Dan: I am conscious that a lot of the conversation is how we maintain legitimacy between us and the membership. As we go on, that will be more important. We are proposing an AGM as the first formal meeting which would constitute a steering group, working group and officers. The way we have drafted this is that we might get to the point where they put different people forward for different work groups. WE would hope that would be CEOs, lawyers, etc. Once we get a proper workgroups, that will allow for it to flow more easily
  - Ian: One of the reasons people are happy with the steering group at the moment is that we have good representation. We have big oil, big TC, big AC, but that's

relevant for showing a good balance. I am not clear on how the roles differ between the steering group, the operations group and the board. Why do we need all the groups?

- Dan: Firstly, the starting point was what was in the pitch. There's a logic to us. There needs to be an AGM for groups to voice their opinions and nominate people to the steering group. The board will be about governance and the business case involved in the operation. The work streams will feed into that. The steering group make decisions and keep things moving in the meantime. The operations side and the policy side will operate to their name. For operations – they will discuss how to get companies incorporated, dealing with contractuals and legals (things that require a different skillset). That is very distinct from the policy workstream. As we have seen over the last few weeks, the policy stuff will operate differently in a lobbying capacity.
- Dan Riley: I think the operations and the steering group should be integrated. There will be sub things that come up (e.g. legal status for board members). It might be lawyers or finance people, but that will just be different people at different stages. I wouldn't separate them
- Vicky: I think there needs to be someone in the steering group who takes a lead on the operations. They would need the knowledge and skills to take it forward.
- Dan Riley: I would argue that that person could be Dan as the essential lead of the secretariat. As long as he gets the advice needed from the associations and trade associations
- Vicky: yes but also they would need to deal with the contract with Dan which is hard for him to do. All the stuff exists under operations which sets up the group, someone needs responsibility for that. We're currently employing Dan to do that.
- Ian: Maybe there needs to be an operations vice chair from the membership side of things.
- Dan: We want there to be a regular amount of meetings but it makes sense that there's a VC for this. There would also need to be a VC for the policy and comms working group.
- Ian: Is there anyone on this call from the members who has a passion for one or either of those roles.
- Dan Riley: On the operations one, I think it might be better if it's someone not here, like Nick Domestra
- Ian: Nick Domestra was Chair of Landsec. I would also recommend that the person for VC for the policy role is Vicky Read. I believe that Vicky is instrumental in this group and has a good grasp of DC matters and wears an AC hat so she would be able to represent everyone. We have had 10/20 calls – we know what works.
- Dan Riley: I fully support your recommendation. Vicky is great. The only thing we need to think about is what the JD is for this. She can't be expected to become the expert on things that aren't within her business requirement
- Vicky: I am totally happy for someone else to be nominated for this.
- Jarrod: I am more than happy to third Vicky for the job
- Tanya: I absolutely agree with the rationale – we can't resolve ourselves of responsibility – we need to pitch in and support Vicky in this and to contribute to the extra workload. As well as deputising for the chair, we need to establish what we are expecting of her.

- Dan Riley: What's the external vision of her doing this? We can't expect companies to pay their employees to represent the interests of other companies. I'd like to understand what we're expecting this role to actually do
- Dan: The outside point is something we are still working on. Internally, there needs to be strength and depth in establishing the leadership. We are also conscious that there is a growing list of things we need to prioritise and align on. We are going to do the bulk of the actual group, but there is an important role for the chair to make sure that everyone feels happy with it.
- Vicky: I'm happy to do this- but I'm only 2/3 weeks into my new role, so I cannot do everything or give huge amounts of time. If this I about chairing discussions and helping decisions, that's fine. But I can't be expected to do the data deep dives or enforcing my opinion on others. I want to protect the team effort as well – a bit of deputising would help the team structure. Dan – could we write down all 3 of those roles, the terms, what happens to the corporate memory, etc.
- Dan: Very happy to draft some job descriptions. Some of these will be established in the standing orders and rules of membership. The fact that we're on a 1 year contract and talking about AGMs suggest that we're talking about 1 year terms, which is fine but doesn't have to be the case.
- Ian: I have lunch with Nick Domestra next week so can chat to him then.
- Vicky: Does the steering committee nominate people that everyone else votes on?
- Dan: If we proceed, we notify the AGM, say that we've received the following nominations, but they will have an opportunity to kick off.
- Ian: Could we get the job descriptions and another time to talk about launch plan and the draft work plan.
- Dan: The main thing I want to talk about when we come to this is that we want to get a soft launch out there sooner rather than later and have a bigger launch event in summer. We can get to that then.

## AOB

- Jesse Norman meeting
  - Vicky: Can we ask Adam directly who's been invited?
  - Dan: I will ask and get to the bottom of whether we've all been invited? I also think there should be a meeting before this but I will be away in the days just before. I will be around for the meeting itself.
  - Ian: I'ms cared that we'll go in, be next to MFG or InstaBolt and they will start saying things that contradict us
  - Dan Riley: I agree – but they might do it anyway. It would be helpful to also know who from each company is going. I know Kieran is going, Vicky will go if Chris can't dial-in, but I want to know who other randoms are coming. Dan in your engagement with Adam, could we agree an agenda with them in advance. I am concerned by that final line – I don't want them to moan at us.
  - Dan: We will re-iterate that we want a meeting with the Minister too as Charge UK.
  - Vicky: Is this just a set piece? What can we bring to the table that we haven't already set in? How does this move things on and where are they hoping to get to?
  - Dan: We can't assume that what we said to SpAds hasn't been sent to the Minister
  - Dan Riley: That's why I'd also like to align ourselves with the agenda and to agree what we are saying, when and what our messaging is. Substantive issues – payment and accessibility are still slightly in the air. By the time we get to the 15<sup>th</sup>, it's unlikely

we will have a shared vision for it. We need to go in there as Charge UK saying what we actually think can work.

- Tanya: No SMMT in that meeting – they don't deserve a seat at that table.
- Vicky: Would it be a good idea to start putting together a briefing note for us all to think about the key points we want to land and then we have a week or so to practise that and agree it with our internal colleagues so they're as prepped as possible.
- Dan: Maybe we have two pre-meets – one next week and one the day before with the attendees. The day they've invited us is Budget day and civil service strike day, so it will likely get moved. We will work to the day they've given us.
- Dan Riley: What do we think the agenda should look like? Payments and reliability are the two main points for us.
- Tanya: ZEV mandate is high for us
- Dan Riley: Strategic overview at beginning, the meat of this on consumer regs, power planning, power connections. But the meat has to be consumer regs
- Dan: Lead time and the implementation period are also key. Is there another point of the cycle of terrible policymaking
- Vicky: It's annoying to go straight into complaining. Ian is probably going to have to do a state of the nation overview. This is our opening meeting with the Minister and we have to start on the right foot. ZEV Mandate should be landed in the round because it's key. There's loads of stuff in the regs but the 3 things we pointed out in the brief are the 3 main things to bring up with the Minister.
- Tanya: Can we go to Jesse with "why we need this, what are the consequences of not changing the regs" not just a shopping list of things we don't like
- Dan: I think it's also about the change to position. We've agreed a technical adjustment
- Vicky: We also need to prepare for the media that they wheel in on the day – they'll use it as an excuse of engaging with industry
- Dan Riley: My experience is that they would have asked for the things they'll kick us over. Also the Treasury will have control over the media that week.
- Dan: I will go back to their office and keep you posted, send out a doodle poll for a pre-meet with us next week and then a pre-meet with those in the room the day of/before and then send out the agenda
- Dan Riley: We will also send to you who we intend to attend it.
- Dan: We also need to pick up the second half of this meeting.