

ChargeUK On-Street Group Meeting

Date: Friday 17th May, 11am

Attendees: Richard Stobart, Aaron Berry, Andreas Atkins, Gary Peters, Sam Illsley, Vicky Read, Charlie A, Lamech Solomon, Simon R, Stuart Wilson, Ben Boucher-West, Liz Aab, Harry Methley, Connor Whyton

Introduction

1. HM reminded the committee of the competition policy.

Discussion

Introduction to the Group

2. RS asked members to email through what they would like to get out of the group.
3. VR flagged that the forum could be used to flag things going on elsewhere in other groups.
4. BB noted that smart regs on lower powered networks is a key area to raise.
5. SW noted the importance of permits and licensing, and the need to understand how these come into effect. VR noted that the deployment group is a forum to discuss this.

Internal Discussion of Issues to Raise with OZEV

6. RS shared that OZEV were still waiting for legal advice on this issue before they could explain the DPS issue fully.
7. VR highlighted that current timelines are unlikely to be met.
8. LA noted that differing procurement routes and back and forth between OZEV and councils would delay the process.
9. SR noted that a common contract that everyone can use would be helpful. He also noted that local authorities had not received a timeline on when they must spend grant money by.
10. LA noted that the development of a common contract for local authorities would delay the process. RS responded that a lot of procurement is already common over contracts.
11. CA warned that receiving legal approval for procurement terms would be a long-winded process.
12. SR noted that most authorities don't have a long concession contract, so whatever they come up with is unlikely to be accepted with private entities involved. They will all end up being different contract and hard to manage in delivery phase.
13. VR added that anything in contracts being ambiguous would also delay the process.
14. Attendees agreed care needs to be taken on how to communicate guidelines to local authorities and CPOs.
15. BB raised the importance of tertiary focus on technology and parking sensors, and noted that clarity of the funding route and is needed.

Discussion with OZEV

16. AB updated that Oxford City Council had raised concerns over the legality of procuring contrast through DPS. He noted that local authorities will need to take their own legal advice.
17. RS asked about the impact of delayed procurement on overall timelines.
18. AB replied that the whole timeline will be slightly delayed. OZEV did not give local authorities authority to go to tender in April. He noted that fixed annual budgets leave little wiggle room in timelines, but added that OZEV was looking at mitigations for this to ensure less delays.

19. RS asked if the November deadline will be moved. AB replied that tranche 1 funding has gone out, and that the overall direction of these applications was good.
20. AB shared that he was confident grant money will be spent on charging money, but that the challenge is ensuring tranche 2 local authorities are compliant with LEVI regulations. He added that OZEV needs reassurances that the money will be spent sensibly.
21. He added that not all contracts will be signed by November, but that OZEV will find a way to deal with this.
22. AB noted that all tranche 2 money must go out this year.
23. CA asked whether it was viable to assume that most money from tranches is likely to land with councils before OZEV's signature. AB responded that OZEV was thinking of mitigations for contracts that are not approved by November.
24. SR noted that if local authorities do not receive guidance before the tender, they could take longer than November to complete the process, which would impact CPPs. AB replied it was likely that OZEV would provide guidance before the November deadline, pending approval from ministers.
25. SR asked if councils would miss out on the final 10% of the grant, AB noted that putting this into ITT documentation was a potential mitigation.
26. AB noted that OZEV did not have a realistic deadline for a response from local authorities to guidance. There have been discussions of a period between 6 and 12 weeks, wanted a ChargeUK response.
27. AB noted that no ITTs had been approved at this point.
28. LA asked whether OZEV would not have a formal opinion on what contracts local authorities should be using. AB replied that this would be the case. LA noted it would be helpful for OZEV to communicate this to local authorities.
29. AB added that the timing of local authority submissions could make them difficult to review, so there was no definite answer on how long reviewing would take. He added that LEVI guidance has been issued to local authorities.
30. AB noted that tranche 1 funding has received a post-funding review. Mid-June is the deadline for the tranche 1 cohort to come back with ITT documents and any amendments.
31. Mid July is the deadline for the tranche 2 cohort and any tranche 1 that had outstanding actions.
32. RS noted that clarity on timelines was needed from both local authorities and OZEV. Clarity is also needed from OZEV so that the local authorities do not dither and wait. He added it would be useful to know when its are coming out.
33. AB replied that timelines on these are not set yet, but this will be expressed to CPOs as soon as possible.

Actions

- Attendees to inform the group of topics they would like to discuss in future meetings.