

## Greater South East Net Zero Hub (GSENZH) Board Meeting - 7 March 2023

This meeting was conducted via online conference.

### Attendees

<p><b>Ben Burfoot</b> - (Reading Borough Council) - Berkshire LEP (Berks LEP)</p> <p><b>Ed Barlow</b> - (Buckinghamshire Council) Buckinghamshire LEP (Bucks LEP)</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>Patrick Allcorn</b> - Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)</p> <p><b>Swapna Uddin</b> - Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)</p> <p><b>Simon Wyke</b> - Greater London Authority (GLA)</p>	<p><b>Chris Bailey</b> - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Energy Efficiency Programme Manager</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>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 (Herts LEP) - <b>Chair</b></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; Robert Emery, CPCA; Marsha Robert, Coast to Capital LEP; Chris Burchell, EnterpriseM3 LEP (EM3LEP); Marida Cable-Lewis, EM3LEP; and Chris Starkie, New Anglia LEP.

#### 2. Minutes, Actions and Matters Arising

##### 2.1 Minutes

- The minutes of the previous GSENZH Board meeting 24.01.23 were reviewed and agreed as a true account.

**BOARD DECISION:** The minutes of the previous GSENZH Board meeting 24.01.23 are agreed as a true account.

**ACTION 1.** HP to sign off the minutes of the GSENZH Board meeting 24.01.23 as agreed.

## 2.2 Actions and Matters Arising

- The actions from the previous Board meeting 24.012.23 were confirmed as complete or covered within the agenda, with the following exceptions:
- **GSENZH Terms of Reference** - With reference to Action 4, Sheryl French (SF) CPCA and Jo Simmons (JS) SELEP are still to read the draft GSENZH Terms of Reference and offer any comments to Maxine Narburgh (MN), GSENZH. MN advised that a few more weeks are still available for SF and JS to give their feedback, and that GSENZH now has legal resource to work on the update of the Terms of Reference.
- **GSENZH Needs Assessment** – With regard to Action 6, MN advised that no questions had been forthcoming from GSENZH Board members about the Needs Assessment on public sector decarbonisation produced by Local Partnerships. Helen Pollock, Herts LEP, as chair, proposed that this action be left open to give Board members a further opportunity to look at the document.
- **ENDS Report - Top 33 Net Zero Review Issues** – Regarding Action 9, SF has provided the ENDS report to MN. MN is still to circulate the ENDS report to Board members.
- **Net Zero Forum Representatives** – With reference to Action 11, Swapna Uddin (SU) DESNZ, is still to establish who the representatives are for the Greater South East region on the Net Zero Forum.
- **DESNZ National View and Direction for GSENZH** – Regarding Action 13, SU is still to confirm whether BEIS can provide an update, as a standing item at future GSENZH Board meetings, on the national view and direction for GSENZH, to ensure strategic alignment to national policies and priorities.

## 3. Finance

- A report on the GSENZH financial position to 31 January 2023 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** – The total revenue budget is £15.208 million, with a £6.931 underspend, which will be reprofiled into the next financial year.
- The core Energy Hub revenue budget of £2.186 million has a £0.952 million spend, a further c.£1 million will be spent by the end of the financial year, and £1.153 million is to be reprofiled into future financial years.
- For COP26, the revenue budget of £23k has been fully allocated and will be fully spent this year.
- The Net Zero Investment Design revenue budget has a budget of £1.500 million, of which £0.873 million has been spent and the remainder will be reprofiled into future years.
- Staffing recruitment issues have impacted on Public Sector Decarbonisation revenue spending which is at £0.108 million of its £1.150 million budget, and this is therefore to be reprofiled into future years. MN added that GSENZH is intending to recharge time spent on the work done by Energy Project Managers on Public Sector Decarbonisation, and that going forward, there is a strategy for recruitment and an associate model to address recruitment issues and staff capacity.
- Rural Community Energy Fund revenue has spent £1.241 million of its £1.974 million budget. This leaves an underspend of £0.554 million, which is to be reprofiled into future years.
- Local Authority Delivery Phase 3 (LAD3) and Home Upgrade Grant (HUG1) have a revenue budget of £5.950 million and £2.424 million, respectively. LAD3 and HUG1 have a respective spend of £1.839 million and £0.477 million. Further spending for LAD3 of £3.515 million is forecast for this year. Some of this will be reprofiled to September 2023, due to the project extension by DESNZ and most of the budget is expected to be spent. An underspend of £0.767 million is forecast for HUG1, which will be returned to DESNZ.
- The Board had no questions or comments about the revenue expenditure.

- **Capital Expenditure** - The retrofit programme Local Authority Delivery Phase 2 (LAD2) is complete, and the total expenditure has been established. Of the £79.350 million initial budget, £55.350 million has been returned to DESNZ. Of the £24 million remaining, sourcing is a spend of £0.999 million and a £0.001 million underspend, while the capital spend is £20.287 million, leaving a total £2.714 million underspend to be returned to DESNZ.
- There has already been sizeable capital spend of £10,478 million for LAD3 from its £33.676 million budget, with £11.281 million to be reprofiled. It is expected that the LAD3 capital budget will be completed spent.
- There is a £7.131 million capital underspend for Home Upgrade Grant Phase 1 (HUG1) due to the performance of the programme. Of this £2.799 million will be reprofiled and £4.332 million underspend will be returned to DESNZ.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the capital expenditure:
- Berks LEP queried the difference between the level of capital spend for LAD3 at £10.478 million and the level of outturn forecast at £22.395 million and the forecast variance to be reprofiled of £11.281 million. CPCA also asked whether this forecast was realistic. EF advised that there is a time lag between the work being carried out by suppliers and the billing for it being submitted to GSENZH to be recorded, which is reflected in this difference. This is being tracked by GSENZH, which understands the amount of work that has been already carried out by suppliers and the respective invoicing still awaited from it.
- OxLEP asked whether the HUG1 underspend described in the financial report was 'new' underspend from an already reprofiled budget. MN confirmed that GSENZH has already returned 50% of the HUG1 capital budget in view of the hard stop to the scheme expected in March 2023 that was originally put in place by DESNZ. DESNZ has made it a requirement that HUG1 stops to avoid overlap with the start of Home Upgrade Grant Phase 2 (HUG2). The policy framework for HUG1 is not delivering so it will be better to stop it and start HUG2, which has a policy framework that can be delivered and will do more for residents. OxLEP observed that Oxfordshire County Council is in a similar position, and that many other local authorities are facing diffused funding and funding clawbacks. OxLEP proposed that it would be helpful to have a collective statement about the HUG1 scheme to maintain local authority confidence in the Home Upgrade Grant scheme going forward. Herts LEP agreed that communication with local authorities is important and that it is challenging to maintain confidence and important to do so to help unblock challenges. OxLEP added that it is important for local authorities to recognise that others are going through similar challenges and that they can support each other, MN suggested that this be raised with the Sustainable Warmth Project Board as a mechanism to take this forward.

**ACTION 2.** MN to ask the Sustainable Warmth Project Board to consider the creation of collective statement about the Home Upgrade Grant scheme, about how it will improve through transition from HUG1 to HUG2, to maintain confidence in the scheme going forward, and to help local authorities recognise that others are going through similar challenges and that they can support each other.

- MN observed that GSENZH did not have a wider local authority forum beyond the Sustainable Warmth Project Board and suggested that the Board could help to facilitate the process of a collective statement by gathering views from other local authorities.
- GLA proposed that local authorities could make a collective ask for a devolved funding approach so that they can design and develop retrofit programmes at a local level, based on outcomes set by central government, rather than them being designed at central government level, and not fitting local need.
- Herts LEP agreed that a forum of local authorities would help to pick up on issues. Funding streams and activities all have an impact on the supply chain and a local authority forum would provide a better picture of what is going on.

- MN proposed that GSENZH convene a meeting for local authorities to focus on lessons learned and key issues from retrofit programmes, and that an agenda be developed by GLA and OxLEP, so that GSENZH could reach out to local authority consortia leads. MN suggested that other Net Zero Hub Regional Heads be invited to feed in the national picture. GLA agreed that it would be more powerful if everyone has the same message and if consensus could be gained across the Net Zero Hubs. It would be helpful to get retrofit programmes right for the future and make better use of central government money.

**ACTION 3.** Simon Wyke (SW) GLA and Sarah Gilbert (SG) OxLEP to develop an agenda for a meeting of local authorities across the region to focus on lessons learned and key issues to inform the way forward for retrofit programmes in future.

**ACTION 4.** MN to convene a meeting of local authorities (consortia leads) across the region, and other Net Zero Hub Regional Heads, to focus on lessons learned and key issues to inform the way forward for retrofit programmes in future, once the agenda has been worked up by SW and SG.

- Berks LEP asked whether there was a retrofit board in existence that would be able to support this situation. MN advised that a Retrofit Task Force has been set up with terms of reference to look at broader retrofit issues but did not yet have a membership. Industry has set up a National Retrofit Hub for commercial partners and trade associations. This has a board, but it is still in the process of developing its working structure. There is currently no forum focused on retrofit for local authorities and the regional Net Zero Hubs, so this is worth convening and could feed into these other groups once they are fully functioning.
- GLA commented that the Net Zero Review report had recommended the formation of a national retrofit body. MN advised that a National Retrofit Scheme is proposed by government with £50m to be put into a body that would cover areas that are not covered by local authorities. However, this remains to be confirmed.
- CPCA observed that a body to help local authorities that are struggling with retrofit is quite challenging. The main issues are the density and numbers of housing, and supply chain availability and skill set. Focus is needed on dispersed rural communities, which are not as attractive to the supply chain as urban communities and how you can incentivise the supply chain across all areas. MN agreed that the supply chain and skills are an issue and observed that the Home Upgrade Grant schemes are targeting rural and off-gas properties. There is a need to build local supply chains and procurement to deliver across HUG, ECO, and able-to-pay schemes, which requires the enablement of bottom-up confidence building in the market and a top-down interventions.

#### 4. Net Zero Review

- The GSENZH Board meeting was joined by Patrick Allcorn (PA), Local Net Zero Team, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, to brief Board members about the [Net Zero Review](#). Patrick Allcorn gave a talk, which highlighted the following points:
- The Net Zero Review was commissioned by the previous prime minister, Liz Truss, as an independent examination of how to optimise the transition to net zero.
- The resultant report, [Mission Zero](#), sets out 139 recommendations across different infrastructure, and has six pillars. Pillar 4: Net Zero and the Community is predominantly about local authorities rather than the community. The parts of the report most relevant to local authority delivery of net zero are renewables and land use, and green choices and engagement with the public.
- Within Pillar 4, there are 10 recommendations. This includes issues of planning and the simplification of funding to avoid overhead costs and impact on the supply chain of continuous bidding.
- There is a call for local authorities to have a statutory duty and missions to cover key problems and suggestions around local government mechanisms like information sharing and reporting.

- The Mission Zero report was launched in January 2023 and subsequently the Local Net Zero Forum has met to consider the report and its recommendations. The Forum includes 15 local authority networks such as Adept, LGA, UK100 and APSE. The Minister has met with councillors and leaders from 12 local authorities to get a political view on the report's recommendations. DESNZ will make a published response to Mission Zero with recommendations, which will be based on these inputs.
- There is other policy thinking in progress: The Climate Change Committee has 300 recommendations, some of which are on Local Net Zero. The [Green Finance Strategy](#) update has been delayed so that it can take account of the Mission Zero report. The response to the judicial review of the government's net zero strategy to achieve carbon emissions targets is due shortly.
- The Board had the following questions and comments for Patrick Allcorn in response to the briefing:
- CPCA asked about the status of the Missions Zero Coalition, which is being set up by Chris Skidmore MP as a follow-up to the Net Zero Review. PA advised that this is something being done independently by Chris Skidmore, and it aims to look at how a long-term structure could be put in place that all political parties can support with long-term funding horizon. It is not part of the net zero review and crosses over with what the DESNZ Local Net Zero team, Energy Systems Catapult, Connected Places Catapult, Innovate UK, and the UK Investment Bank and Green Finance Institute are trying to do.
- OxLEP asked about the timeline of the Green Finance strategy update and the outcome of the response to the judicial review. PA advised that the date for the government's response to the judicial review is end March 2023. The Green Finance Strategy update is in the hands of No. 10.
- GLA asked whether PA had any reflections on the feedback that DESNZ has gathered from stakeholders about the Net Zero Review. PA reflected the views of stakeholders that the idea of net zero as a statutory duty for local authorities appeared to be divisive. The recommendation in the report is formulated such that the duty is "to take net zero into consideration". However, most local authorities already do so, and the wording is vague, so it is difficult to price in terms of the resourcing required to deliver it. Statutory duty is not in the interest of local authorities at it is punitive and is something that they are already trying to do. Statutory duty might be a good thing, but it needs to be well defined and costed so that it is not an additional burden on local government funds. The simplification of funding is favoured if it is ringfenced within net zero, such as retrofit competitions, but the simplification of funding per se is not, as it could become lost within core budgets. There is support for net zero being at the heart of devolution. There is no agreement about what powers local government should have. Devolved funding is welcome but not the responsibility for targets such as fuel poverty. What is broadly supported is the creation of frameworks, missions, and better information sharing, to accelerate what is already being done with the Net Zero Hubs. There was agreement that local authorities should not have to reinvent solutions to net zero problems, so that local authorities can accelerate at the rate of the fastest rather than the slowest. GLA commented that devolution of funding to design programmes on a local basis and thereby optimise delivery would be very helpful.
- CPCA commented that at a recently attended Adept meeting, there was a discussion about local authority funding cuts and that not having a statutory duty was regarded by some local authorities as making it difficult for local authorities to keep staff. CPCA's reflection was that on balance local authorities seem to want net zero to be a statutory duty. PA confirmed that this view was held by some organisations and that others held the view that a general duty to look at net zero was unhelpful, as it could create a tick-box requirement without real change and carried a risk of local authorities being faced with judicial reviews, which would then dictate the duty and then require government time to be spent negotiating the delivery of that rather than delivering net zero. Some alternative approaches suggested were to make it a duty to report and plan, or for the duty to be output based, so that you can identify whether it has been completed or not. We can look at how a statutory duty can be progressive and avoid limiting local authorities that want to go further, faster but are made to stop by a



sceptical local decision-maker, because they have achieved the minimum requirement of a statutory duty.

- GLA commented that the position is nuanced. A statutory duty legitimises activity and opportunities to secure budget. It is good that you are thinking through how it can empower and enable local authorities.
- PA asked the Board whether a statutory duty is the right tool. It must go through the process of legislation and the budget then must be agreed with HM Treasury. It will induce delay by two years rather than enabling support now. It is not a simple choice.
- Bucks LEP commented that it does not seem right for local authorities to have lesser formal responsibilities in respect of climate change than large companies. The need to focus on urgent matters now is appreciated, but equally, in 18-24 months' time, we do not want to have the same discussion about how to get more action from authorities who are not as actively engaged as they might or should be.
- Berks LEP asked what the recommendations were to the Net Zero Hubs in respect of the Net Zero Review, about the right way to engage with local authorities or add value. PA advised that the Net Zero Hubs are already ahead of the game to create a framework of support. The challenge is more how to leverage money better, and how to accelerate the sharing of learning and technical assistance, which is needed but not affordable to local authorities on an individual basis, and what are the skills that the Net Zero Hubs can provide. For example, local authorities each require their own lawyer, but templates and training could be provided via the Net Zero Hubs to give them a better knowledge base for net zero. Other things do not require separate arrangements, for example, a heat network technical expert could be shared. There is a balance between what can be provided centrally and what local authorities can do individually. A key consideration is to ensure that no one gets left behind. For example, with the retrofit programmes, some local authorities have teams of people working to get funding, while others do not and get nothing. The Net Zero Hubs help to rebalance this situation, for example the provision of additional capacity, such as the OnGen service, to help local authorities bid into the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme.

## 6. Arup GSENGH Evaluation

- A briefing was provided by Maxine Narburgh (MN) Regional Head, GSENGH on the recent Arup GSENGH evaluation. MN shared a slide presentation with the Board to highlight some key points. The slide deck is to be circulated to the Board with the minutes of the meeting.

**ACTION 6. ES to circulate to the Board with the GSENGH Board minutes 07.03.2023, the slide deck used for the Arup GSENGH evaluation briefing.**

- The Board had the following questions and comments about the GSENGH evaluation:
- Herts LEP commented that there were a lot of recommendations and that communications, awareness and governance, were key items.
- Bucks LEP asked about how a drive to increase demand would work, given that GSENGH resources were already stretched. MN advised that a business case for the additional resource for GSENGH is currently going through the CPCA sign-off process. GSENGH is pausing on new technical assistance requests while resources, strategy, frameworks, decision-making, priorities, and operational strategy are put in place.
- Bucks LEP asked about the 45% of projects that would not have gone ahead without GSENGH and asked whether this meant that 55% would have gone ahead and a proposed that GSENGH should reduce involvement in these kinds of projects. MN clarified that in addition to the 45% of projects that would not have gone ahead without GSENGH, a further 35% had been accelerated by 6-18 months. Of the remainder, 10% were stalled, so only 10% fall into the category that they would have happened anyway. These projects would be filtered out in future.
- Berks LEP remarked on the phenomenal achievements of GSENGH and the breadth of its activity, especially given the small size of the team and the large number of local authorities that it had to support. Berks LEP asked whether more could be said about the operating strategy. There has been a strategic vacuum for some time, following the LEP Energy Strategies, and it is a time of uncertainty given the background of devolution and the

response to the Net Zero Review. How do we position our strategic direction so that it continues to add value? Where are we looking for future growth, i.e., where is it important for local authorities to have support from GSEZHZ? For example, with retrofit, many local authorities have not been able to do this by themselves and recognise the role of GSEZHZ. MN advised that the operating strategy is required by the new DESNZ MOU. When the LEP Energy Strategies were created there was no net zero target. Much has changed. GSEZHZ wants to ground the operating strategy in local strategic priorities. Local Partnerships has been commissioned by GSEZHZ to investigate this and feed it into the GSEZHZ strategy and governance. The framework for an operating strategy will be a live document as it will take time to develop. GSEZHZ is going to have a north and south team and is changing its governance structure, and it is looking to engage stakeholders, including the Board to inform these developments. GSEZHZ needs to think about the mix of projects for high carbon savings but also needs to address strategic needs. There are commercial drivers from DESNZ, and there is a need for a portfolio of projects to meet this as well as to unblock barriers.

- Herts LEP commented that GSEZHZ is doing a great job and the aim should be to grow the organisation. The operating strategy, combined with communications and engagement will support this.

## 8. Regional Hub Manager Report

- A briefing was provided by Maxine Narburgh (MN) Regional Head, GSEZHZ on three significant areas of current activity:
- **Local Energy Advice Demonstrator (LEAD) Launch** – MN confirmed that a draft MOU has been received from DESNZ, and that a Letter of Intent to enable the launch of this programme is expected imminently from DESNZ. The guidance, application process and assessment scoring produced by the Net Zero Hubs are also to be signed off by DESNZ. The timeline for these things is awaited.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the launch of the LEAD programme:
- Herts LEP asked whether the pre-election period was likely to impact on communications for the launch and for local authority applicants to seek any necessary approvals from committees. MN advised that the Net Zero Hubs have highlighted these issues to DESNZ. However, communications such as the GSEZHZ website are ready, and GSEZHZ has already held a webinar to engage likely applicants and raise awareness.
- **Resource Proposal (Staffing)** – MN advised that GSEZHZ is working with Local Partnerships in respect of the GSEZHZ Needs Assessment and to take account of the Arup GSEZHZ evaluation recommendations. The CPCA Human Resources team has asked MN for a business plan for the increase to the GSEZHZ team. Once this is approved, job evaluations and their sign-off will need to be done. This is in preparation. A promotional flipbook has been prepared to support recruitment activities.
- MN shared a presentation slide showing the updated future GSEZHZ organisational structure, which also illustrates how the process of recruitment will be phased. The slide is to be circulated to the Board with the minutes of the meeting.

**ACTION 7. ES to circulate to Board members with the Board minutes 07.03.2023, the slide used to illustrate the updated future GSEZHZ organisational structure.**

- The Board had the following questions and comments about the resource proposal (staffing):
- Herts LEP asked about the timescale for recruitment. MN advised that the process required, which includes business case approval, job evaluations, advertising the roles, interviews and tasks for candidates, and notice periods for appointees, would enable new recruits to be in post in June 2023 at the earliest. The more senior posts would be recruited first.
- Berks LEP asked what the Regional Projects Manager role would involve as this has only has one direct report. MN advised that this was formerly the RCEF Programme Manager role. RCEF is closing by September 2023 but will be replaced with the LEAD programme, which the RCEF Project Coordinator will support. MN advised that it will be helpful to keep the role broad. The intention is that in future the post holder will look at the able-to-pay

market, as well as other strategic projects, and there are likely to be DESNZ programmes coming forward that the post-holder will be required to oversee. There will be potential for growth of the team in the future.

- CPCA asked whether MN would have enough senior support given what was illustrated on the new organisational structure slide. MN advised that the programme leads will have strategic responsibility and will lead a team. The new structure will help improve capacity. The role of Deputy Manager will provide capacity for the governance responsibility and the strategic stakeholder manager will help to support the linkages between national and local.
- Herts LEP commented that the new structure would reduce the risk of dependency on a single critical individual, which had been highlighted in the Arup evaluation. MN further advised that a call-off framework is to put in place alongside recruitment, so that even if recruitment proves challenging, GSENZH will still have the necessary team to deliver for local authorities.
- **Local Partnerships Governance Review and Target Operating Model Scope of Work -** MN then shared with the Board a proposal for a scope of work to carry out the governance review and target operating model, provided by Local Partnerships. This included the following elements:
  1. Stakeholder mapping which will be achieved through desktop research and workshops. This will help to identify strategic themes and priorities.
  2. A review and development of governance, which will help to develop a framework with delegations, and a Terms of Reference.
  3. Management frameworks which will be updated to align with the new Terms of Reference and strategic priorities
  4. Operating strategy which will give support to the draft strategy.
- MN advised the Board that GSENZH does not have the capacity to take the work forward internally, hence the involvement of Local Partnerships, which makes use of the capacity-building funding of £170k supplied for the purpose by DESNZ.
- The Board had the following questions and comments about the resource proposal (staffing):
- Herts LEP commented that the scope made sense and Bucks LEP commented that the scope looks good.
- Berks LEP queried the approach of using a consultant to do this work and whether they would have enough knowledge, experience, and insight to do it. MN advised that the GSENZH will take the lead on writing the operating strategy, and that the work being done by Local Partnerships on stakeholder information gathering will feed into this.
- **Reporting Information to Partners/Stakeholders –** MN noted that the Board has given feedback that the DESNZ quarterly report has been useful and there have been requests to share it and the Board Papers with stakeholders.
- MN explained that the DESNZ quarterly report contains confidential information about external organisations (GSENZH clients) so is not suitable to be put into the public domain. MN asked for feedback about what information the Board wants to send out to stakeholders, so that this can be built into GSENZH communications planning.
- Herts LEP advised that many stakeholders do not know enough about GSENZH and that not enough information about it was getting out to the people who needed it. Herts LEP asked whether it was possible that the parts that were unsuitable for sharing could be removed, and then the documents could be forwarded on. MN advised that reports such as the needs assessment are public and can be shared. MN asked whether it would be useful for the Board to have more case studies to share and advised that it would be useful for GSENZH to understand the target audience. The GSENZH newsletter and LinkedIn is a way in which GSENZH currently reaches a wider audience.
- Bucks LEP commented that they found the newsletter to be sufficient, however, the conversation about information for sharing with stakeholders probably needed more time and would be better covered in another discussion.
- Herts LEP proposed that the item be carried forward to a future Board meeting.

**ACTION 8. MN to include on a future GSENZH Board meeting agenda, a discussion about what information is needed by the Board to share with their stakeholders.**



## 9. Forward Plan and Horizon Scanning

- MN advised that the GSEZNH new Terms of Reference and operating strategy will feature on the Board agenda going forward and asked what else the Board would like to prioritise for their future meetings.

## 10. Any Other Business

- **Net Zero Forum** - DESNZ provided an update on Actions 11 and 12 from the Board GSEZNH meeting 24.01.2023. A list of Net Zero Forum membership organisations is now available for circulation to the Board. The meeting notes covering the feedback given at the Forum about the Net Zero Review report are not being shared, but a key point summary is now available for circulation to the Board.

**ACTION 9.** ES to circulate with the Board minutes 07.03.2023, the Net Zero Forum membership organisation list and the key point summary about the Net Zero Review relating to the feedback given at the Net Zero Forum, which have been provided by DESNZ.

- **Thanks to Regional Head** - Herts LEP as chair, on behalf of the Board, thanked Maxine Narburgh, as Regional Head, GSEZNH, for her hard work.

## 11. Dates of Future Meetings

**BOARD DECISION:** The next GSEZNH Board meeting is scheduled to take place in person at London Councils in central London, 25 April 2023, 11:00-14:30. The meeting will be joined by Patrick Allcorn, Head of Local Net Zero, DESNZ, to discuss strategic objectives. Ben Burfoot, Berks LEP is to chair, and Arthur Le Geyt, SEMLEP, is to step forward as chair if Ben is not available.

- Subsequent Board meeting dates are scheduled 10:00-12:30, to take place virtually, on the following dates:
  - 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)