

## Greater South East Net Zero Hub (GSENZH) Board Meeting - 24 January 2023

This meeting was conducted via online conference.

### Attendees

<p><b>Ben Burfoot</b> - (Reading Borough Council) - Berkshire LEP (BerksLEP)</p> <p><b>Sheryl French (SF)</b> - (Cambridgeshire County Council) - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA)</p> <p><b>Esther Fadahunsi (EF)</b> - (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) – Finance Manager for Greater South East Net Zero Hub</p> <p><b>Swapna Uddin</b> - Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)</p> <p><b>Marida Cable-Lewis</b> - EnterpriseM3 LEP (EM3LEP)</p> <p><b>Chris Bailey</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Energy Efficiency Programme Manager</p> <p><b>Genevieve Dady</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Supply Chain Engagement Coordinator</p>	<p><b>Richard Hall (RH)</b> – Greater South East Net Zero Hub - Consultant for Local Authority Delivery Phase 2 and Sustainable Warmth</p> <p><b>Peter Gudde</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub</p> <p><b>Maxine Narburgh (MN)</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Regional Hub Manager</p> <p><b>Erica Sutton</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Hub Support Coordinator</p> <p><b>Helen Pollock</b> - Hertfordshire LEP (HertsLEP)</p> <p>- Chair</p> <p><b>Ellen Goodwin</b> - New Anglia LEP (NALEP)</p> <p><b>Sarah Gilbert</b> - (Oxfordshire County Council) Oxfordshire LEP (OxLEP)</p> <p><b>Arthur Le Geyt</b> - South East Midlands LEP (SEMLEP)</p> <p><b>Jo Simmons (JS)</b> - South East LEP (SELEP)</p>
---	--

### Minutes

#### 1. Apologies, Introductions

- The meeting was chaired by Helen Pollock, HertsLEP.
- Apologies were given by Ed Barlow (Buckinghamshire Council) Buckinghamshire LEP; Robert Emery, CPCA; Marsha Robert, Coast to Capital LEP; Chris Burchell, EM3LEP; Simon Wyke, Greater London Authority; and Chris Starkie, NALEP.
- The meeting welcomed Marida Cable-Lewis, who has recently joined Enterprise M3 LEP as Sector Development Manager.

## 2. Minutes, Actions and Matters Arising

### 2.1 Minutes

- The minutes of the previous GSENZH Board meeting 06.12.22 were reviewed and agreed as a true account.

**BOARD DECISION:** The minutes of the previous GSENZH Board meeting 06.12.22 are agreed as a true account.

**ACTION 1.** HP to sign off the minutes of the GSENZH Board meeting 06.12.22 as agreed.

### 2.2 Actions and Matters Arising

- The actions from previous Board meetings were confirmed as complete or covered within the agenda.
- **Retrofit Skills and Supply Chain Research** - With reference to Action 8 from the Board meeting 06.12.22, it was noted that while the retrofit skills and supply chain market intelligence reports had been circulated to Board members, the final report is still to be completed and this will be circulated in due course.

**BOARD DECISION:** The Board is content that GSENZH will continue to work with EP Group to develop the business case for the establishment of a pilot Net Zero Development Vehicle and given that the commissioning cost is within the public-sector procurement threshold.

## 3. Finance

- A report on the GSENZH financial position to 31 December 2022 was circulated to the Board in advance of the meeting. The content of the report was presented at the meeting by Esther Fadahunsi (EF), CPCA, Finance Manager for GSENZH, who highlighted the following points:
- **Revenue Expenditure** - GSENZH has a change in forecast outturn of £3.35 million for this financial year.
- The GSENZH budget represents a combination of core and ringfenced projects.
- There is £1.015 million committed, of which £843k is ringfenced projects and £172k is technical consultancy.
- There is an underspend of £1.426 million of the core funding, which will be reprofiled into the next two financial years.
- It is expected that the COP26 budget will be fully spent and closed off.
- The Green Homes Sourcing budget (Local Authority Delivery Phase 2 (LAD2)) is £699k of which £366k has been spent. As the ultimate underspend will be returned to BEIS, it will not be declared as underspend.
- Net Zero Investment Design has an underspend of £627k. This is the 3Ci work, which has been completed and for which the invoicing is awaited.
- For the Public Sector Decarbonisation budget line, there is a £950k underspend. This is pending staff recruitment and is to be reprofiled into the next financial year.
- Rural Community Energy Fund has an underspend of £346k. This is a ringfenced project and is to be reprofiled into next year.
- **Capital Expenditure** – EF advised that the budget lines shown are BEIS-funded projects so that GSENZH is not declaring any underspend in relation to them, as any funds not spent will go back to BEIS.
- The LAD2 programme had a September 2022 closure. The final figure for spending is still being worked on.
- The Local Authority Delivery Phase 3 (LAD3) programme has taken on board lessons from LAD2. It is on track and its risk rating been reclassified by BEIS from red to amber due to its improved performance. The programme is expected to conclude in March 2023.
- The delivery of the Home Upgrade Grant Phase 1 (HUG1) programme is challenging and there is likely to be an underspend. We are waiting to hear from BEIS as to whether there

will be an extension to the delivery timescale. This decision is expected in February 2023. The delivery timescale will impact on how much underspend there will be.

- The Board had the following questions and comments about the GSENZH finance report:
- BerksLEP asked whether the Revenue Expenditure table in the finance report could be split so that the core and grant programme business could be looked at separately.

**ACTION 2. EF to set out the Revenue Expenditure core and grant programme figures into two separate tables in the Board finance report.**

- Berks LEP commented that the underspend on the retrofit programmes was a concern but that the challenges to delivery were understood. BerksLEP noted that 10% of the funding had been spent on staffing and administration and asked what the challenges were to the scale-up the GSENZH team and what the ideal level of staffing would be. MN advised that there were currently three vacant posts on the GSENZH Energy Efficiency team. One post was already approved by CPCA, and two new posts were awaiting approval. This would be near to the ideal team size once in place. MN explained that the LAD3 and HUG1 programmes are reported separately. There is a limitation placed on the number of Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) D-rated properties that can be addressed through the LAD3 programme, which deals with on-the-gas-grid properties. Eighty percent of the on-the-gas-grid properties in the region are D-rated. It is more challenging to engage properties in the LAD3 programme that have a lower-than-D EPC rating as there is a much smaller pool of them. In addition, such properties need more work done to address their energy-efficiency requirement, but there is a £10k average cost cap on measures. The go-ahead on £5 million of work on D-rated properties via LAD3 is pending a decision by BEIS. This is having the biggest impact on delivery.
- MN advised that the recruitment gap for GSENZH relates to the Net Zero and Public Sector Decarbonisation team. It is a challenging recruitment market as consultancies are growing their teams and offering higher salaries. GSENZH is working on the marketing of roles at the Hub, to position the vacancies as being more attractive than posts in consultancies. HertsLEP observed that the recently-launched Innovate UK [Fast Followers](#) local authority grant competition, which aims to enable recruitment of Net Zero Innovation and Delivery Officers, would also add to competition in the recruitment market.
- HertsLEP asked how much capital funding would be returned to BEIS, and what percentage of this was of the total budget. EF and MN advised that for LAD2, the estimate is £2 million. The final figure is pending completion of the programme audit. Data is still being gathered from local authorities and Managing Agents for reconciliation purposes. Installations require a TrustMark lodgement prior to payment of works and some of these lodgements are not complete. Installers, all of which are TrustMark registered, need to upload 40-50 documents as evidence for each lodgement, and if any piece of evidence is missing, the lodgement cannot be completed. Of the £78.35 million LAD2 budget, the delivered outturn is expected to be c.£24 million, which is around one third of the budget. The LAD3 and HUG1 programmes are still being delivered, so it is too early to provide a figure. However, the delivery for LAD3 is much improved on LAD2, due to improved supply-chain capacity. HUG1 is challenging to deliver, since the cost cap for the scheme is much lower than the cost required to supply the measures needed for eligible properties.
- OxLEP asked whether the extension of the Sustainable Warmth programme would bring with it the risks to delivery associated with overlap, to the start of the Home Upgrade Grant Phase 2 (HUG2) programme. MN advised that the Net Zero Hubs are still working to an assumed closure date of the end of March 2023. This has a 30-day reporting period, which will be very challenging to achieve. Therefore, to achieve the reporting requirement, the Sustainable Warmth programme will need to curtail delivery by the end of February 2023. An extended, managed close, which has been requested to BEIS, would allow greater delivery and spending of LAD3 funding. GSENZH intends to take adequate time with the preparation of HUG2, to ensure that the scheme is in robust and maximise efficiency of

delivery. Queries about this are sitting with BEIS. Another issue is that the ECO4 scheme will be in delivery alongside HUG2, and it is more a more profitable scheme for installers to be involved with than HUG2.

#### 4. GSENZH Strategic Projects – Funding Proposals

- Five strategic project ideas to support net zero delivery in the region have been developed by GSENZH. These strategic project ideas were reviewed and short-listed by the GSENZH Board at their workshop 24.11.22 and meeting 06.12.22 and an action was taken by GSENZH to prepare an outline business case for each.
- Further information about the resources required for each project, and an overall budget request to fund them, were supplied to the GSENZH Board in advance of the meeting with the GSENZH Board papers 24.01.23 (page 17-32).
- The **recommendation to the GSENZH Board** set out in the Board papers 24.01.23 was:
  - 1) To note the strategic project proposals set out in Annexes 1-5.
  - 2) To approve the funding allocation up to and including the financial year 2023-24 for the projects to a total value of £721,000: A) Project 1 – Digital services to assist Net Zero delivery: £225,000. B) Project 2 – Carbon Offsetting and Removals: £90,000. C) Project 3 – Able-To-Pay Retrofit: £106,000. D) Project 4 – Industrial Clusters: £100,000. E) Project 5 – Greater South East Retrofit Training Network: £200,000.
  - 3) To delegate to the Hub Manager the authority to assign the projects funding allocation and undertake procurements and award contracts in accordance with CPCA rules and procedures.
- The meeting was attended by GSENZH Energy Project Manager, Peter Gudde (PG) who highlighted the following key points about the strategic project funding proposals:
- The proposal is that the five projects are to be supported through the GSENZH technical consultancy budget. The indicative total spending of £946k for the projects, and which is set out in the Board papers, relates to the successful delivery of the projects in their totality. The requested funding of £721k is an initial ask to start the projects.
- The **Carbon Offsetting and Removals project** has a change of scope in view of the work already done by [Anthesis](#) on [area-based insetting](#). The Anthesis work has focused on how the concept is understood and translated into the public sector. Offsetting is defined as compensation for emissions outside the value/supply chain and geographical area. Insetting is defined as compensation for emissions within the value/supply chain and geographical area. Insetting can include actions such as investment in domestic retrofit.
- The GSENZH project is to be focused on removals, for example, peat sequestration and biomass utilisation with carbon capture and storage. It will investigate whether schemes can be developed that could attract commercial investment. It will seek to map and understand the techniques, technology, business models, investment opportunities and potential scale of deployment in the region.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the projects/recommendation:
- EM3LEP confirmed their support of the proposed projects and highlighted the work that EM3LEP is involved in to be clear about the potential for any duplication. The EM3LEP projects are retrofit skills boot camps and decarbonisation of the agrifood sector. The EM3LEP representative also flagged that they did not have delegated authority on this occasion to take a decision on the proposal.
- BerksLEP commented that the Carbon Offsetting and Removals project would produce a useful suite of research to inform conversations within local authorities. BerksLEP asked whether the project would have a portfolio approach, given that there will be different opportunities for insetting depending on the area. PG advised that solutions were needed in areas where opportunities for removals do not exist. This needs to be scoped. There are opportunities for collaboration across areas to explore co-benefits. The project lead, GSENZH Energy Project Manager, John Taylor, is investigating which stakeholders want to be involved to help scope the project, which will bring the answers to that question.

- OxLEP commented that the offsetting project had synergies with net gain and climate adaptation that should be taken account of in the business case as there are both risks and benefits to sequestration. The involvement of a steering group is welcome and would be of interest to the lead at the Local Nature Partnership in Oxfordshire. OXLEP commented that there is a great deal of research and development currently taking place around this agenda. Knowledge transfer is key. It would be useful to have engagement across all the projects during their development, rather than just with the report at the end. It is important to take people with you, so that they understand how their local authority can benefit, ensure that the outcomes work for them, and avoid duplication. However, there are capacity limits to how much partners can be involved. PG agreed and emphasised that there is a need to move the studies onto delivery and that the projects were a pathway to deployment, working with local stakeholders. It is difficult for LEPs and local authorities to have meaningful involvement in all projects, and there is a challenge in how to translate the work out to local authorities that are not involved. There needs to be good communication and engagement so that the products from the projects will be used extensively rather than left sitting on a website. There are other projects being developed in parallel. The Net Zero Delivery Vehicle could have a synergy with the industrial clusters and carbon inset/offset projects. The Hub is looking at how to get wider benefit from these.
- HertsLEP welcomed an opportunity to be involved in the **Retrofit Training Network project** steering group, noting the benefit of knowledge gained from this sort of level of involvement, which can then be fed back into the sector within the LEP, and adding value through local knowledge and expertise.
- OxLEP raised a query about the **Able-to-Pay Retrofit project**, which references the Cosy Homes Oxfordshire project. OxLEP highlighted that there are some issues about scaling the project. It is a good model but not a panacea. OxLEP asked what the outputs of the project would be. PG advised that GSENZH would look at the diversity of approaches and see how they fit. Local areas may have different needs, but there is an intention to scale-up investment opportunity through the project as well. MN advised that able-to-pay retrofit is an area that many local authorities want to develop. Access to green finance is a challenge and there are links to the 3Ci project, so there is a driver to focus on those opportunities. The BEIS Local Energy Advice Demonstrators programme should also provide potential models as well.
- HertsLEP highlighted that [BRE](#) has a bid pending with the [Small Business Research Initiative](#) (SBRI). The organisation proposes to model by house type and then assess what likely retrofit measures are needed to enable needs/measures to be mapped out. HertsLEP flagged the importance of the Board being aware of such related initiatives.

#### **BOARD DECISION:**

- 1) To note the strategic project proposals set out in Annexes 1-5 of the GSENZH Board papers 24.01.23.
- 2) To approve the funding allocation up to and including the financial year 2023-24 for the projects to a total value of £721,000:
  - A) Project 1 – Digital services to assist Net Zero delivery: £225,000.
  - B) Project 2 – Carbon Offsetting and Removals: £90,000.
  - C) Project 3 – Able-To-Pay Retrofit: £106,000.
  - D) Project 4 – Industrial Clusters: £100,000.
  - E) Project 5 – Greater South East Retrofit Training Network: £200,000.
- 3) To delegate to the Hub Manager the authority to assign the projects funding allocation and undertake procurements and award contracts in accordance with CPCA rules and procedures.

#### **5. GSENZH Terms of Reference – Draft**

- GSENZH, Maxine Narburgh (MN) presented to the Board the latest draft of the GSENZH Terms of Reference (ToR) which is being updated in consideration of the new MOU provided to the Hub by BEIS. The BEIS MOU will also be translated into the CPCA Accountable Body Agreement as deemed appropriate.
- MN highlighted that the key elements of the ToR still to be resolved, and which may require further consideration by the GSENZH Board, are:

- Sub-boards and how their representation feeds into the main board, and whether the sub-boards are decision-making (the decision-making process is detailed in the project assessment frameworks)
- Recruitment of sub-board members,
- Strategic / policy framework/priorities
- Stakeholder mapping and engagement in relation to the above.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the draft Terms of Reference:
- HertsLEP thanked MN for her work to date on the ToR.
- BerksLEP observed that there is a tightening up of the existing structure, but that there are outstanding questions about how the sub-boards will work in practice: how they will avoid duplication of conversations, and how they will add value, since the geographical areas they are to cover are still huge. MN acknowledged that there are some uncertainties to be addressed and that the remit of the sub-boards is still to be settled but highlighted the challenge that BEIS is required to address, given the changes that are coming with devolution, and the need to engage with relevant stakeholders. The sub-boards will be better able to focus on local projects and priorities, while the main Board will have the role of dealing with its current business and approvals. Local Partnerships has been tasked with developing a structure for GSENZH that incorporates a programme lead each for the North and South areas of the Hub and to work with their respective sub-boards.
- SELEP agreed that there is no easy solution and asked what number of sub-boards there will be. MN confirmed that there will be two sub-boards, one for the north, one for the south of the region, plus a sub-board for London. The London sub-board will not require any separate GSENZH programme lead recruitment as existing infrastructure will be used.
- SELEP raised the issue of whether the geographical grouping of the sub-boards could result in competition and parochialism, and that it would be the better approach for the sub-boards to make recommendations to the main Board, rather than taking decisions themselves, and to focus on thematic discussion.
- SELEP also raised the importance of reaching as many interested parties as possible via the sub-boards so that decisions by the main Board are fully informed. SELEP emphasised the importance of understanding what existing groups there are in local areas, and with the ability to cascade information, to inform membership of the sub-boards.
- SELEP observed that the current arrangement for the Board is comprised of local enterprise partnership representatives, which have a remit to represent business, and asked what opportunity there might be to bring in a business voice and skills-sector representation via the sub-boards.
- HertsLEP agreed and suggested that a mapping exercise is needed to identify relevant existing groups and that a thematic approach would help to reduce a competitive attitude within and between the sub-boards.
- BerksLEP agreed that there is potential for competition between sub-boards and sub-board members and that there might not be agreement from the sub-boards with the decisions taken by the main Board. MN advised that the CPCA Board is clear that decisions are to be made for the region rather than for localised areas. The CPCA Environment and Sustainability Communities Committee will be involved in future and be able to provide scrutiny to decision-making. The delegation arrangements are that it is the main GSENZH Board that makes decisions on grant funding and staffing and provides a steer to CPCA.
- MN proposed that prior to a further conversation by the Board about the remit of the sub-boards, Local Partnerships, acting as consultants for GSENZH, could undertake stakeholder mapping and develop an understanding of regional strategic policy. This work could then be used to inform the sub-board structure and how GSENZH projects could fit within it.
- SELEP asked what timeline for establishing the subgroups is required by BEIS. MN advised that the MOU only requires the Hub to outline its process and operating strategy and that no timeline is specified. MN proposed that it is better to get an appropriate process in place that will be flexible and able to work in the long term, rather than to rush its development and end up with something that is not fit for purpose.

**BOARD DECISION:** Local Partnerships, acting as consultants for GSENGH, is to be asked to undertake a stakeholder mapping exercise and develop an understanding of regional strategic policy to inform the sub-board structure and how GSENGH projects fit within it.

- MN advised that as the GSENGH is now operating under a new MOU, it would also be preferable to agree interim updated ToR pending the execution of this work, particularly the project references and objectives, and proposed to share the latest ToR draft with the Board.

**BOARD DECISION:** An interim ToR is to be agreed by the Board pending the scoping and execution of stakeholder and strategic policy mapping work by Local Partnerships. The current draft ToR will be reviewed by Board members.

**ACTION 3.** MN to circulate the draft GSENGH Terms of Reference to Sheryl French, CPCA and Jo Simmons, SELEP for review.

**ACTION 4.** SF and JS to read the draft GSENGH Terms of Reference and offer any comments to MN.

## 7. Regional Hub Manager Report

- A written report from Maxine Narburgh (MN) Regional Head, GSENGH on the GSENGH core programme of work was provided in advance of the meeting with the Board papers 24.01.23 (pages 39-42). MN highlighted the following points:
- **GSENGH Evaluation Report** - The GSENGH programme evaluation report has been received from consultants Arup. This will be reviewed and incorporated into the GSENGH operating strategy. The evaluation report was circulated to Board members in advance of the meeting alongside the Board papers 24.01.23. MN recommended that Board members read the Arup evaluation report executive summary and offered to talk the Board through the key outcomes of the evaluation at a future meeting. This offer was accepted by Board members.

**ACTION 5.** MN to talk GSENGH Board members through the key outcomes of the Arup evaluation of the GSENGH programme at a future Board meeting.

- **Local Partnerships Needs Assessment and Resource Proposal** – The main conclusions, from the Local Partnerships Needs Assessment, have been fed into a Resource Proposal for GSENGH staffing. MN asked that in view of limited meeting time that Board members to pick up any questions about the Needs Assessment for public sector decarbonisation with MN separately.

**ACTION 6.** GSENGH Board members to raise any questions they have with MN about the Needs Assessment on public sector decarbonisation produced by Local Partnerships.

- MN then talked Board members through the proposed new GSENGH structure in the Resource Proposal and asked for their feedback.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the new GSENGH staff structure:
- CPCA asked whether GSENGH employees are civil servants. MN advised that GSENGH staff are local government employees.
- OxLEP asked whether alternative routes to recruitment have been considered, given the current competitive market. For example, whether a rolling secondment programme could be offered to local authorities to help fill the gap and enable local authorities to develop experience. This would benefit both local authorities and the Hub. MN confirmed that GSENGH is happy to explore this option further and to have a trial to test whether it could be supported.

**ACTION 7.** MN to consider the option of local authority secondment as part of the forward GSENGH recruitment approach.

- BerksLEP asked whether, in consideration of any redundancy risk, the new posts would be offered on fixed contracts or as permanent contracts. MN advised that the new posts would be offered as fixed term two-year contracts. BerksLEP commented that fixed-term posts could undermine recruitment, especially if too short-term.
- CPCA asked whether the posts could be two-year secondments from the private sector, which might want local authority experience and might be willing to top-up staff salaries. CPCA also commented that the increase in staff numbers could be quite challenging for everyone, and it would be interesting to see the quality of applicants coming forward. MN

advised that project officers and interim associates had been included in the staff structure to widen the recruitment scope.

**ACTION 8.** MN to consider the option of private sector secondment as part of the forward GSENZH recruitment approach.

## 8. Forward Plan and Horizon Scanning

- The latest GSENZH Board Forward Plan was provided with the Board papers 24.01.23 in advance of the meeting.
- MN proposed that the next meeting of the GSENZH Board 07.03.23 should cover the Local Energy Advice Demonstrator programme scope and MOU, and an overview of the key findings of the Arup GSENZH evaluation. This was agreed to by the Board.
- MN also proposed to move the items currently scheduled for a briefing and discussion in April 2023, to a later date(s) to allow room for more priority topics. The items currently scheduled for the GSENZH Board meeting 25.04.23 are: Ofgem and DNOs, hydrogen development and carbon capture and store, and EV update. This was agreed to by the Board.
- CPCA asked whether the next Board agenda would cover the implications of the Net Zero Review report. Patrick Allcorn has asked local authorities for feedback on the community section of the report before end of January 2023. BEIS advised that work is ongoing about how the Department will make its response to the Net Zero Review report, and this is due in March 2023. The Board agreed to include the Net Zero Review on the next GSENZH Board meeting agenda 07.03.23. CPCA offered to share the ENDS Report top 33 issues.

**ACTION 9.** SF to share with MN for circulation to GSENZH Board members, the ENDS Report top 33 Net Zero Review issues. MN to circulate to the Board.

- MN asked BEIS to clarify whether they would be able to present on the Net Zero Review report at the next GSENZH Board meeting 07.03.23. BEIS advised that this might not be appropriate given that it is an independent report.

**ACTION 10.** SU to clarify whether it is possible to brief the GSENZH Board about the Net Zero Review report at the next meeting 07.03.23 and let MN know if it is not possible so that MN can prepare an alternative briefing.

- CPCA asked whether it would be possible to have feedback from the Net Zero Forum on the Net Zero Review, which is due to be discussed at the Forum meeting 25.01.23. MN asked BEIS whether this was possible and whether the local representatives for the region could be identified. This identification would also be useful information in respect of Board governance and representation.

**ACTION 11.** SU to find out who the representatives are for the Greater South East region on the Net Zero Forum.

**ACTION 12.** SU to find out whether it is possible to request an update on the feedback given about the Net Zero Review at the 25.01.23 Net Zero Forum meeting.

- HertsLEP asked whether it was possible for a standing item to be added to the GSENZH Board agenda, for BEIS to provide an update on the national view and direction for the Hub, to ensure strategic alignment to national policies and priorities, which has been proposed as part of the Arup evaluation recommendations.

**ACTION 13.** SU to find out whether BEIS can provide an update, as a standing item at future GSENZH Board meetings, on the national view and direction for the Hub, to ensure strategic alignment to national policies and priorities.

- **BOARD DECISION:** The next meeting of the GSENZH Board, 07.03.23 will consider the following items: the Local Energy Advice Demonstrator programme scope and MOU, an overview of the key findings of the Arup GSENZH evaluation, and a briefing on the Net Zero Review from either BEIS or GSENZH. If it can be made available, there will also be an update on the feedback given about the Net Zero Review at the Net Zero Forum meeting 25.01.23. If possible, BEIS is to provide an update as a standing item at future GSENZH Board meetings on the national view and direction for the Hub, to ensure strategic alignment to national policies and priorities. The items: Ofgem and DNOs, hydrogen development and



carbon capture and store, and EV update, which are currently scheduled for the Board meeting of 25.04.23 will be moved to a later meeting date(s).

#### 9. Any Other Business

- The NALEP representative, Ellen Goodwin, advised that she is leaving the LEP to take a lead on the NHS sustainability agenda and that this would be her last meeting. Ellen commented that her involvement on the GSENGH Board had been an enjoyable experience. On behalf of all members, HertsLEP as chair wished Ellen well and thanked her for her contribution to the GSENGH Board.

#### 10. Dates of Future Meetings

**BOARD DECISION:** The next Board meeting is scheduled to take place on 7 March 2023, 10:00-12:30. The meeting is to take place virtually. Helen Pollock, HertsLEP is to chair.

- Subsequent Board meeting dates are scheduled 10:00-12:30, to take place virtually, on the following dates:
  - 25 April 2023 (**Note: to be an in-person meeting;** chair to be confirmed)
  - 6 June 2023 (meeting chair to be confirmed)
  - 18 July 2023 (meeting chair to be confirmed)
  - 5 September 2023 (meeting chair to be confirmed)
  - 17 October 2023 (meeting chair to be confirmed)
  - 5 December 2023 (meeting chair to be confirmed)
  - 23 January 2024 (meeting chair to be confirmed)

<b>Minutes approved as a true and accurate record by Helen Pollock – Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership.</b>	
<b>SIGNATURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>