



MINUTES OF THE 'CHARGEUK POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS GROUP' MEETING
DC DISCUSSION

8 September 2023, 13:00-14:00

ACTIONS

ACTION	DETAILS	OWNER
1	Slide deck shared during meeting to be shared with members	Secretariat
3	Summary paper on AC/DC discussion to be shared with members (to include feedback)	Secretariat

ITEM ONE

Welcome and Introductions

1. DAN SIMPSON welcomed members, noting that the discussion **was focused on the barriers that DC providers face. DAN** opened for general discussion and views.

ITEM TWO

DC Discussion

2. SIMON KENDREW spoke on the importance to standardise a lot of the elements and having this progression from one stage to the next in the process.
3. DAN SIMPSON talked through the slides. When discussing streamlining the pre-construction process, ROSANNA TURNHAM asked whether ChargeUK can look to see what has been successful elsewhere.
4. IAN JOHNSTON noted the planning issue that occurs when the application is not going to be validated.
5. DAN SIMPSON noted some of the things being asked will require changes to legislation whilst some things won't. In the meantime, PDR (permitted development rights) could be extended without changing planning system itself. ChargeUK could suggest that 90% of development should be permitted development, for example.
6. IAN JOHNSTON provides an overview on the Scottish PDR scheme. DAN SIMPSON noted it would be useful to look at the Scottish PDR scheme to compare. There was agreement from members on this.
7. DAN SIMPSON talked on DNO paperwork, noting that the bulk of feedback we have had is around DNO challenges and their inconsistency. DAN questioned whether ChargeUK are asking for a standard set of contract for each DNO. ANDREAS ATKINS

noted his agreement, stating that standardisation was needed. IAN JOHNSTON also showed his agreement.

8. DAN SIMPSON suggested ChargeUK then go to ENA, for example, and agree a standard set of contract that would be accepted and used. IAN JOHNSTON noted that it needs to be spelled out that DNOs need to work off one standard contract.
9. DAN SIMPSON clarified that ChargeUK will be asking to negotiate a specific contract for EV infrastructure that would be used by all DNOs. As negotiating takes so long with different DNOs, if there is no agreement on a standard contract then we will be following up with the Government to change something.
10. DAN SIMPSON noted that there has been some feedback on design approval and asked members whether there was a specific ask there. IAN JOHNSTON noted that operators just want standardisation where it is possible. ANDREAS ATKINS noted that the problem is that it is not the same kit and cable that is being installed at every project. DAN SIMPSON noted the approach needs to be consistent for DNOs and for contracts.
11. ANDREAS ATKINS noted if the legality of everything is sorted, this will be huge in terms of the timeline of getting things deployed.
12. DAN SIMPSON spoke on grid offer, noting that some DNOs will say either yes or no to applications but others will provide a more nuanced answer. They don't all take the same approach and ChargeUK are asking for an approach to negotiation that is consistent. IAN JOHNSTON clarified that rather than negotiation, it would be good to see commonalities in the response. ANDREAS ATKINS noted that operators want standardisation so they are aware of from day one. It was agreed by members that the focus is standardisation as this will solve a lot of the issues.
13. DAN SIMPSON spoke on highways authority, noting that getting a date agreed for a roads order is time consuming. DAN questioned what 'ask' will help speed this up and make it more reliable from a highways point of view.
14. IAN JOHNSTON noted that the issue a lot of DC providers have is that projects are usually scheduled for the school holidays. If they experience delays, these are then pushed back to the next school holidays resulting in further delays. IAN suggested that for EV projects, the timeline could be asked to be shortened as allowing 28 days between every back and forth leads to months of dialogue.
15. DAN SIMPSON asked members how far in advance would they need to make use of a road closure?
16. IAN JOHNSTON suggested six weeks. ANDREAS ATKINS noted that were embargos and calendar complications, especially during Christmas time.
17. DAN SIMPSON noted that if DNOs and highways choose a date and this doesn't align, this makes it complicated for operators. If DNOs provide a date and then operators ask

Highways for this date, it is easier and there is agreement. There was broad agreement from members on this matter.

18. DAN SIMPSON asked who ChargeUK would want to bring in as part of the 'duty to co-operate'.
19. IAN JOHNSTON noted that it was about the engineering resource with DNOs rather than a duty to co-operate. DAN SIMPSON asked how long DC providers will need to complete construction after DNO agreement. IAN noted that this timeline could take months – it is more about the DNOs coming onto site and switching it on once it has been completed. DNOs have also claimed that they do not get enough information from CPOs about a timeline.
20. SIMON KENDREW spoke on the importance of standardisation, noting that this will help with knowing what projects are coming through and the regional expectation. SIMON and ROSANNA TURNHAM noted their agreement with what had been discussed.
21. MARTINA HUNT also noted her agreement, stating that standardisation on documentation is the issue.
22. DAN SIMPSON noted that the biggest issues seem to be legal agreements with DNOs and planning permission. This is in addition to operational issues about energisation and highways that then affect how planning permission is granted.
23. MARTINA HUNT questioned what the incentive was to move the issues forward. DAN SIMPSON noted that local authorities frequently say they have numerous applications but don't have the resources to manage them. However if ChargeUK frame the debate to focus on how we can remove local authorities from the planning process, this will be able to highlight how it will give them more resources in the long run.
24. SIMON KENDREW noted his agreement, stating it was important that the industry remains as market-led as possible. The less regulated the industry can remain, the better.
25. IAN JOHNSTON noted the increase of standard charge to a project and how the real problem is that it is not always clear how much standard projects have tracked – OZEV need to be aware of the unintended consequences of the standing charges and there needs to be clarification on what these will be on sub standing charges.
26. SIMON KENDREW agreed that there needs to be clarity on costs, as well as the cost of energy. DAN SIMPSON noted the confidence in bringing forward an individual site is also what is most relevant here.

ANNEX A ACTIONS

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

1	Slide deck shared during meeting to be shared with members	Secretariat
3	Summary paper on AC/DC discussion to be shared with members (to include feedback)	Secretariat

Attendees:

- Andreas Atkins, Ionity
- James McKemey, Pod Point
- Ian Johnston, Osprey
- Martina Hunt, Gridserve
- Agnese Chiesa, Believ
- Rosanna Turnham, bp
- Simon Kendrew, Equans
- Randal Smith, Urban Foz

Secretariat for ChargeUK, Connect:

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