

Greater South East Net Zero Hub (GSENZH) Board Meeting - 6 June 2023 Conducted via online conference.

Attendees

<p>Ben Burfoot (BB) - (Reading Borough Council) - Berkshire LEP (Berks LEP) - Chair</p> <p>Sheryl French (SF) - (Cambridgeshire County Council) - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA)</p> <p>Esther Fadahunsi (EF) - CPCA - Finance Manager for Greater South East Net Zero Hub</p> <p>Richard Hall (RH) - Consultant for CPCA / Greater South East Net Zero Hub - Local Authority Delivery Phase 2, Sustainable Warmth and Home Upgrade Grant Phase 2</p> <p>Natasha Marshall - CPCA - Finance Officer for Greater South East Net Zero Hub</p> <p>Swapna Uddin - Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)</p> <p>Simon Wyke - Greater London Authority (GLA)</p>	<p>Peter Gudde (PG) - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Energy Project Manager</p> <p>Maxine Narburgh (MN) - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Regional Hub Manager</p> <p>Erica Sutton - Greater South East Net Zero Hub – Hub Support Coordinator</p> <p>Helen Pollock - Hertfordshire LEP (Herts LEP)</p> <p>Emma Bull - Local Partnerships</p> <p>Rachel Toresen-Owuor - Local Partnerships</p> <p>Nicolette Jeffreys – New Anglia LEP (NALEP)</p> <p>Sally Andreou - Oxfordshire LEP (OxLEP)</p> <p>Sarah Gilbert - Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)</p> <p>Jo Simmons (JS) - South East LEP (SELEP)</p> <p>Arthur Le Geyt - South East Midlands LEP (SEMLEP)</p>
--	---

Proxy Votes

Absent Board member:	Proxy instructions given to:
Ed Barlow - (Buckinghamshire Council) - Buckinghamshire LEP	Ben Burfoot - (Reading Borough Council) - Berkshire LEP

Minutes

1. Apologies, Introductions

- The meeting was chaired by Ben Burfoot, Berks LEP.
- Apologies were given by Susan Jones, Berks LEP; Ed Barlow (Buckinghamshire Council) Buckinghamshire LEP; Nick Bell, CPCA; Robert Emery, CPCA; Marsha Robert, Coast to Capital LEP; Chris Burchell, EnterpriseM3 LEP (EM3LEP); Marida Cable-Lewis, EM3LEP; Chris Starkie, NALEP and Lisa Roberts NALEP.
- The meeting welcomed new participants Sally Andreou, Skills Hub Manager for Oxfordshire LEP, and Nicolette Jeffreys, Clean Growth Manager for New Anglia LEP.

2. Minutes, Actions and Matters Arising

2.1 Minutes

- The following amendments were requested:
- OxLEP asked that actions taken by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), which has been acting as the OxLEP representative at GSENGH Board meetings, be attributed to OCC rather than OxLEP.
- Berks LEP offered the correction that regarding Action 8., Berkshire local authorities should be referred to rather than Reading Borough Council.
- Subject to the above changes, the minutes of the previous GSENGH Board meeting 25.04.23 were reviewed and agreed as a true account.

BOARD DECISION: The minutes of the previous GSENGH Board meeting 25.04.23 are agreed as a true account, subject to the amendments above.

ACTION 1. BB, Berks LEP to sign off the minutes of the GSENGH Board meeting 25.04.23 as agreed, subject to the following two amendments: 1) Actions taken during the meeting by Oxfordshire County Council, which has been acting as the Oxfordshire LEP representative at GSENGH Board meetings, should be attributed to OCC rather than OxLEP, and 2) Regarding Action 8, Berkshire local authorities should be referred to, rather than Reading Borough Council.

2.2 Actions and Matters Arising

- The actions from the previous Board meeting 25.04.23 were confirmed as complete or covered within the agenda, with the following exceptions:
- **Update to GSENGH Terms of Reference** – With reference to Action 5, MN, GSENGH advised that a meeting with the CPCA Monitoring Officer would take place 06.06.23 to discuss how a scheme of delegation would work in line with the Local Government Act.

ACTION 2. MN, GSENGH to provide an update on the GSENGH Terms of Reference and a scheme of delegation at the next GSENGH Board meeting 18.07.23 and in the meantime to update the GSENGH Board actions log concerning the CPCA Monitoring Officer meeting 06.06.23.

- **GSENGH Operating Strategy and Logic Model** – With reference to Action 16, MN highlighted that feedback was still welcome from the Board on the operating strategy and logic model.

3. Finance

- A report on the GSENGH financial position to 31 May 2023 was presented at the meeting by Esther Fadahunsi (EF), CPCA, Finance Manager for GSENGH.

ACTION 3. EF, CPCA to circulate to the GSENGH Board a copy of the report on the GSENGH financial position to 31 May 2023.

- EF, CPCA, highlighted the following points:
- **Capital Expenditure**
- EF, CPCA advised that an audit process had been undertaken since the last GSENGH Board meeting and therefore there have been adjustments to some of the figures previously presented on the financial year end 2022-23.
- The Local Authority Delivery Phase 3 (LAD3) element of the Sustainable Warmth retrofit programme has been extended to September 2023. The revised budget in the report reflects the managed closure plan. Invoices from one of the delivery partners, E.ON, are still awaited, so this is not reflected in the spend to date.
- The Home Upgrade Grant Phase 1 (HUG1) element of Sustainable Warmth retrofit programme closed in April 2023. The budget has been reduced and 80% of the underspend anticipated has been sent back to the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ). Work on the closure of the project is currently being done, which will establish the actual underspend. Invoices from E.ON are also awaited for HUG1.

- MN advised that there had been an opportunity to make an extra funding request to DESNZ for LAD3 in April/May 2023. GSEZHZ did not request extra funding for LAD3 in view of the DESNZ stipulation of a 20-day maximum TrustMark lodgement period after completion, which would have been too limited a timescale for the GSEZHZ delivery partners to meet. DESNZ has revised its requirements and is now prioritising the maximisation of delivery to end September 2023, rather than the requirement of a 20-day lodgement period, so GSEZHZ is now looking at whether it is feasible for an additional funding request to be made for LAD3.
- **Revenue Expenditure**
- The LAD3 budget includes an estimate for staff costs and consultant fees since, due to the year end, these have not yet been processed. No E.ON invoices have been included in the spending amounts shown.
- The spending for HUG1 has been revised down and there is some underspend. Work is still ongoing to collate the spend to date. Again, there is an estimate for staff and consultant costs, and no E.ON invoices have been included in the spend to date.
- Berks LEP commented that regarding the return of funding for the LAD3 scheme, and the amount provided by GSEZHZ to local authorities, Berkshire local authorities cannot adequately resource the local help needed with the 1% figure, so it is a shame to be returning money to DESNZ. MN clarified that the money comes from the 15% Administrative and Ancillary (A&A) budget and would not be returned by GSEZHZ. Actual E.ON fees and staff costs were yet to be taken account of in the figures provided. The budget is extremely tight and needs to be closely managed. Currently the local authority part of the 15% is 3%.
- HUG1 has an underspend and work is underway to pinpoint the position and way forward.
- Staffing costs have not been included for April and May 2023 in the Hub Core budget and the spend shown is for consultancy.
- The COP26 programme and budget line is now closed and will not appear in future reports.
- Net Zero Investment Design has a small underspend, which is from last financial year. We are expecting it to be fully spent this year.
- There is an underspend for Public Sector Decarbonisation due to a delay in recruitment (now being addressed with the recruitment campaign). The spending this month has been on licence fees and third-party payments.
- The underspend for Rural Community Energy Fund has been reprofiled and is now being spent, based on consultancy and third party payments. Staff costs for April and May 2023 are yet to be added to the figures shown.
- HUG2 last year had the mobilisation fee. This year HUG2 has consultancy fees added but no staff costs have been added yet.
- Once the analysis for staff costs is available, the figures will go up. There will be an update at the next meeting.
- GSEZHZ Board members had the following questions and comments about the financial report.
- Berks LEP commented that most of the money is being spent and gave congratulations to Maxine and the GSEZHZ team for meeting that challenge.
- OCC asked whether the HUG1 outturn position shown is the original funding allocation. MN advised that the budget was reduced by 50% prior to the start of the programme.

5. a) Solar Landholdings – Park and Ride

- The Hub Board approved in December 2022 an allocation of £15,000 technical consultancy funding to Essex County Council to commission a feasibility model for Solar Park and Ride, with additional benefits considered, including the creation of a template approach and outline business case. The Board also recommended that an uplift on the allocation could be requested once the project team had assessed the scope of the work.

- A paper on the Solar Landholdings – Park and Ride project was provided in advance of the meeting with the GSENZH Board Pack 06.06.23. A verbal update was then provided by Peter Gudde (PG) Energy Project Manager, Greater South East Net Zero Hub at the meeting.
- A recommendation was made by GSENZH to the GSENZH Board to approve increased grant funding up to £25,000, from a previously agreed allocation of £15,000, to be put alongside a DESNZ underspend allocation of £25,000 in support of developing Feasibility and Outline Business Case Models for Solar Park & Rides.
- PG, GSENZH explained that the project has involved several local authorities including Essex and Cambridgeshire County Councils and Reading Borough Council. Two work packages have been identified which have expanded the tools and scope of work, to include finance, adaptation, flexibility, the ability of the networks to cope, and diversity of environments. The current budget is too small and a £50k headroom is required. Full costs will be worked out going forward. The project has been working with the Innovate UK KTN Innovation Exchange process to carry out soft-market testing. Essex County Council will take the procurement forward on behalf of the project group and associated local authorities. Tools and templates and a decision logic are to be produced for the feasibility and business case, so that it can be tailored to the context, and will be in line with the HMT Green Book. The challenge will be to deliver the project by 30.09.23 in line with DESNZ funding rules, so the project will be delivered in phases and extend to year end.

BOARD DECISION: Approve increased grant funding up to £25,000, from a previously agreed allocation of £15,000, to be put alongside a DESNZ underspend allocation of £25,000 in support of developing Feasibility and Outline Business Case Models for Solar Park & Rides.

- GSENZH Board members had the following supplementary questions about the solar landholdings park and ride project:
- CPCA asked about the contribution by Essex County Council of £6k set out in the paper and whether other local authorities involved would also contribute financial support. PG, GSENZH advised that Essex County Council had suggested a call-out to other local authorities for further funding to expand the headroom if required.
- Berks LEP asked whether there was an option, if other local authorities contributed, whether the project could be shaped to those specific local authority needs. PG, GSENZH explained that Essex County Council is being used as a test bed, so a test best could be provided for other local authorities on the basis that they also contribute.
- CPCA advised that Cambridgeshire had two similar projects in progress already but observed that other local authorities might be interested in a project that had a core of replication along with detail for their own areas. PG, GSENZH advised that some local authorities are contributing knowledge and others need project help, however GSENZH could propose to Essex County that more than one local authority could be a test bed and make that suggestion to others.

ACTION 5. Peter Gudde, GSENZH to propose that one than one local authority contributes to the Solar Landholdings – Solar Park and Ride project on the basis that they will also act as a test bed for the project.

ACTION 6. Board members to contact Peter Gudde, GSENZH if a local authority in their own area wants to get involved as a test bed for the Solar Landholdings – Solar Park and Ride project.

b) Local Area Energy Planning Pathways – Strategic Funding Request

- An update on the strategic funding request for the Local Area Energy Planning Pathway project was provided to Board members in advance of the meeting with the GSENZH Board Pack 06.06.23. A verbal update was then provided by Peter Gudde (PG) Energy Project Manager, Greater South East Net Zero Hub at the meeting.
- PG, GSENZH explained that, as highlighted by Patrick Allcorn, DESNZ at the GSENZH Board meeting 25.05.23, a funding request for this financial year can be made to DESNZ by GSENZH for a critical strategic resource that can be delivered widely.

- The idea for the Local Area Energy Planning Pathways strategic project is based on the demand from local authorities for support for the development of local area energy planning. Some local authorities have used the Energy Systems Catapult protocol. Each local authority is in a different situation and funding for local area energy planning has come from innovation grant funding. Many local authorities do not have the capacity or capability and financing for local area energy planning development.
- The proposed project seeks to address this situation via a pathways approach and to enable the broad range of local authorities to move forward. It is in two parts: 1) Firstly research, which will look at the need and the tools available, and 2) Then outputs/ support, which will curate tools for different parts of the process and develop a decision logic to help local authorities steer through the process according to their need, for example in terms of timescale or funding available.
- MN, GSENGH asked the GSENGH Board to note that the project proposal was pending DESNZ review and that an update would be provided at the next meeting 18.07.23. DESNZ confirmed that other Net Zero Hubs have submitted similar projects and that a decision is yet to be taken by Patrick Allcorn to approve the proposals. PG, GSENGH commented that it would be of interest to see the other proposals submitted.
- GSENGH Board members had the following questions and comments about the Local Area Energy Planning Pathways project proposal:
- Berks LEP highlighted that a local area energy planning tool is being offered to local authorities by Distribution Network Operator (DNO), Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks (SSEN) but understood that this was to be made available on charged-for basis. MN, GSENGH observed that UK Power Networks is providing their local area energy planning tool to local authorities for free, funded by Ofgem. PG, GSENGH added that, as part of their investment planning, UKPN were also funding a staff team to support the tool.
- GLA asked whether the UKPN and SSEN tools were integrated with the Energy Systems Catapult tool. Berks LEP advised that the SSEN tool was bespoke to SSEN.
- GLA asked whether heat network zoning was picked up within the project proposal. PG, GSENGH confirmed that yes, all vectors would be covered in the proposal. The responsibilities of the Regional System Planner will include heat, which is currently unregulated. All vectors need to be integrated, for example hydrogen, and this requirement needs to be addressed.
- GLA asked whether local area energy planning coordination and regulation, zoning coordination, roles of organisations, roles of local authorities could be discussed at a future GSENGH meeting.
- Berks LEP commented that there was a need for DNOs to make provision for the larger scale network connections for heat networks, which were otherwise at risk.
- CPCA commented that the project work would be useful, and that it would be helpful to understand how local area energy planning and the Regional System Planner role, and how the hierarchy all fits together.

ACTION 7. PG, GSENGH to provide an update on the Local Area Energy Planning Pathways project proposal, and on any further developments with the Ofgem consultation on future energy institutions and governance at a future GSENGH Board meeting.

6. Regional Hub Manager Report

- A written report from the GSENGH Regional Hub Manager was provided to Board members in advance of the meeting with the GSENGH Board Pack 06.06.23.
- In consideration of the limited time available at the meeting for regular business, MN, GSENGH referred Board members to the written update, and a brief verbal update was provided on two significant and pressing area of activity:
- **Project Acceleration Fund**
- A proposal for a fund to utilise the estimated £500k GSENGH core underspend related to staff salary costs was highlighted. GSENGH would like to put out a call for projects. A £50k limit on individual bids is proposed. This amount is set to avoid any potential delays in project commencement that might otherwise be caused by procurement procedures and resourcing

of projects. The money needs to be spent quickly, but the fund should not be too resource intensive to manage. It is conceived as an acceleration or development fund or providing feasibility support for new projects and could be directed towards circular economy projects such as food waste. Applications need not be limited to local authorities.

- MN, GSENZH asked for any thoughts from Board members about this propose, to feed into the framework for the fund, which is yet to be agreed.
- GSENZH Board members had the following questions and comments about the project acceleration fund:
 - Berks LEP asked whether a prospectus would go out. MN, GSENZH confirmed that this was planned, but GSENZH was first looking for input from the Board to shape the strategic framework.
 - SELEP asked whether the funding was to go towards technical consultancy, and whether it needed to be spent in the current financial year. MN, GSENZH confirmed that this was so. SELEP suggested that the fastest and most practical way (although not necessarily the best way) to use the funding, would be through existing projects. It would be likely for new projects to take six months to start up and then the delivery timescale would be very limited.
 - Berks LEP asked whether the funding was revenue rather than capital funding. MN, GSENZH confirmed that it was revenue funding.
 - Berks LEP commented that circular economy and energy from waste were good themes but to use the funding in a timely way it would be better to broaden the themes applicable to the funding.
 - GLA agreed and suggested the themes of consumption-based emissions and engagement with citizens and communities, or whole life-cycle carbon in planning, both in construction and in retrofit.
 - MN GSENZH asked whether Board members knew of any suitable project work already being done that could be broadened to a regional level.
 - SELEP asked about the project design and what the outcomes need to be. MN, GSENZH advised that the outcomes could be broad. This could include investment, knowledge sharing, peer-to-peer learning, as well as carbon reduction.
 - SELEP asked whether the fund would provide a 100% grant as this would make the whole process quicker. MN, GSENZH confirmed that this was so.
 - OCC highlighted the existing ADEPT Future Highways Research Group project, which is looking at toolkits and embodied carbon in highways, and which has ambition to broaden out to include other areas with embodied carbon issues.
 - GLA highlighted that whole life-cycle carbon assessments for new buildings were being done as part of the London Plan, but potentially this could be extended to retrofit as well, and demolition versus retrofit.
 - SELEP observed that as regards the selection process, GSENZH would be considering 10 successful projects at £50k each. MN, GSENZH advised that there would be a need to link the projects to net zero outcomes and to enable the selection process to be done quickly. GSENZH would give this consideration and update the Board at its next meeting 18.07.23.
 - Berks LEP suggested that the fund could provide a £10k single award as lower value projects would be quicker to turn around.

ACTION 8. MN, GSENZH to provide a draft outline of the Project Acceleration Fund framework and circulate by email ahead of the next Board meeting 18.07.23.

- **GSENZH Recruitment**

- The GSENZH recruitment campaign being delivered for GSENZH by consultants Opus Recruitment Solutions is live: <https://opuspeoplesolutions.co.uk/clients/greater-south-east-net-zero-hub>. Twenty roles are being recruited.
- MN, GSENZH advised that volunteers are needed from the Board membership to support a stakeholder panel for the programme lead/senior roles (a 15-minute virtual slot) and for a recruitment panel. MN, GSENZH directed Board members to PDF page 27 of the GSENZH Board Pack 06.06.23 for further information.

ACTION 9. MN, GSENZH, to circulate further information to GSENZH Board members about the stakeholder and recruitment panel dates for the GSENZH recruitment campaign.

ACTION 10. Board members to email ES, GSENZH, with their availability to support the stakeholder/ recruitment panels.

7. Governance

a) Local Enterprise Partnerships – Integration with Local Authorities

- SELEP introduced the matter of LEP integration with local authorities. The context is that government is minded to cease the funding of LEPs, 31.03.24. A policy position is expected before the summer recess. A consultation exercise by the Department for Business and Trade has been carried out with LEPs to identify the implications on LEP functions if funding stops. This concluded in mid-May 2023 with the responses intended to inform the summer policy statement.
- The status of LEPs is 1) Already integrated into a combined authority, 2) Half-way through a county deal or 3) Not doing either of those things.
- For the SELEP area north of the Thames, a devolution deal is being pursued. South of the Thames, nothing is happening.
- Alongside the GSENZH governance work, there is a need to bring in what is happening with LEPs and integration. Currently, a consortium of LEPs make up the Net Zero Hub, so what will the composition of the Net Zero Hubs look like in future when the function of LEPs transfers into local authorities. Staff may start to transfer jobs in this financial year. What are other LEPs thinking?
- GSENZH Board members had the following questions and comments about LEP integration into local authorities:
- Herts LEP advised that the situation of Hertfordshire is unique. Hertfordshire County Council is the employer, so for Herts LEP to go into the county council is business as usual. It will be a name change, so there is less impact for Herts LEP.
- SELEP responded that a key issue is whether the partnership agreement still stands up, as the signatories, LEPs, may no longer be legal entities. There is the matter of representation, for example, and whether there is a geographical match, which might be OK for LEPs like Hertfordshire, but not others. A concern is what the networks are into the LEP region, and whether everyone is represented, which relates to the GSENZH governance work.
- MN, GSENZH commented that this is a timely conversation for the work that Local Partnerships is doing. We are mapping stakeholders and gaining an understanding of the context in its granularity. The process does not involve a hard stop, it is a transition, and continuity is important.
- Berks LEP observed that the current situation presented a stressful time for LEPs and wished them well.

ACTION 11. All Board members to email MN, GSENZH to advise, in outline, of the position/status of their LEP, i.e., what is known about the future in your LEP area (however well known).

b) Local Partnerships – Governance /Geographies/ Stakeholders / Strengths & Needs

- The meeting was attended by Emma Bull and Rachel Toresen-Ouwr from Local Partnerships, which has been commissioned by GSENZH to support the development of the GSENZH governance process.
- MN, GSENZH requested that Board members help to inform the Local Partnership work. GSENZH wants to understand what the local priorities are. Stakeholder mapping is being carried out by Local Partnerships, and this, and the sub-board representatives that it identifies, will influence what GSENZH does and how, so that its work reflects local needs and strategic objectives.
- Rachel Toresen-Ouwr, Local Partnerships, provided an overview of their work for GSENZH to this end:
- The first step, in supporting GSENZH with its governance and stakeholder mapping, and how to structure its sub-boards, is to carry out the mapping of stakeholders and the local policy and strategy landscape. There are many stakeholders across the region, so with input from

the GSENZH Board, Local Partnerships would like to sharpen the focus to prioritise who is involved. We want to identify groups and strategies within the northern, southern and London areas of the region that are focused on net zero and climate action and working on matters relevant to GSENZH core activity. We want to identify strategies and targets, and look at regional strengths, opportunities, and needs. This will help us to identify where the sub-board boundaries should lie. We need to consider cross-sectoral representation to inform representative membership of the boards.

ACTION 12. Local Partnerships to share the slide deck from their presentation to the GSENZH Board 06.06.23.

- To gather insight and help focus on strategic priorities, key questions for the GSENZ Board are:
 - What are the key infrastructure and development project opportunities within each area that the Board can use to best effect to leverage finance, etc.?
 - Where/what are the policies/targets/action plans that can: a) deliver net zero b) facilitate inward investment?
 - What are the specific needs, opportunities, and challenges of areas within the region? And where can value be added by the sub-boards?
 - What should the priorities of the sub-boards be?
 - Where is net zero leadership demonstrated in other areas, how can we take that learning and share it with others?
 - What are the existing regional clusters? E.g., Climate change partnerships, Local Transport Boards, Waste Partnerships, Growth Boards
- GSENZH Board members had the following questions and comments about the Local Partnerships work on governance, geographies, and stakeholders:
- Berks LEP advised that there are different net zero targets in each local authority. Some have ambition to move faster, whereas the national target is on a different trajectory. Has this been mapped? We only have one London representative (GLA) on the GSENZH Board, which would need expansion for the London sub-board.
- GLA envisaged that the London area /sub-board would engage via GLA, which would bring in other relevant institutions, and London Councils, which would coordinate and represent the Boroughs.
- RTO, LP confirmed that local authority targets would be part of the mapping exercise.
- SELEP advised that SELEP splits into three areas and has a federated Board: North is Essex, South End and Thurrock, with upper tier and unitary authorities going for a devolution deal. South is Kent and Medway. Then East Sussex and West Sussex align well together. These three areas of SELEP are functional economic areas in their own right. If considering which stakeholders are relevant to investment and decision-making, these should be included. There is a need to think about economic areas, as well as net zero activity. The Thames Estuary and the Thames Estuary Board is an area / organisation in its own right and has done work on a place-based energy plan for the Estuary. Note that Coast to Capital and EnterpriseM3 LEP representatives are missing from this discussion.
- CPCA advised that there are rural collaborations such as peatland and land-use frameworks to consider, such as the land-use framework across Cambridgeshire and Norfolk and Suffolk. CPCA asked whether waste partnerships and collaboration between different layers of government were relevant. Waste is an area of carbon emissions that is hard to treat so should be included.
- RTO, LP advised that LP is seeking to determine what the best representation is to feed into the governance process and support acceleration of delivery.
- SEMLEP advised that the Oxford-Cambridge Arc is now known as the Oxford-Cambridge Partnership. The Partnership is in transition and has a huge range of stakeholders, which

- includes minerals and waste, universities, economy and environment groups, and innovators in energy. SELEP can share contacts. It will be useful to follow up after the meeting.
- RTO, LP confirmed that after the meeting, LP can follow up one-to-one with GSENZH Board members for more detailed conversations.
 - SEMLEP suggested the [A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet project](#) as another relevant stakeholder.
 - Berks LEP suggested regulatory bodies, the Environment Agency, Ofgem, the new Regional System Planner role, water companies, rail networks.
 - New Anglia LEP advised that they would contact Local Partnerships after the meeting by email with their feedback, as they would need some time to ensure accuracy of information.
 - Herts LEP suggested leadership groups: the Hertfordshire County Council Climate Change Sustainability Partnership Group, and the Hemel Garden Communities and Herts IQ developments. LEPs are focused on industry sectors rather than infrastructure projects. For example, the film industry sector is significant in Hertfordshire.
 - SELEP suggested the Essex Climate Change Commission and SELEP Major Projects Group, which covers four or five major projects, including Lower Thames Crossing, to tackle cross-cutting themes like decarbonisation. The group may or may not self-sustain going forward but would be a useful group to involve.
 - Herts LEP suggested the Hertfordshire Growth Board. Herts LEP also observed that it would be useful for the GSENZH Board to understand what Local Partnerships know and what they do not know.
 - SELEP suggested business representation. LEPs are currently able to represent the business voice, a key aspect of decision-making and inward investment, which would be lost without the LEPs. Growth Boards and equivalents could also provide this representation.
 - Emma Bull (EB) Local Partnerships provided an overview of the stakeholder mapping exercise, which LP has in progress. In view of the limited time available at the meeting and the complexity of the exercise it was agreed to leave the mapping to individual Board member review after the meeting.
 - Berks LEP suggested that more business and economic partnership representation might be needed than was currently reflected in the stakeholder groups mapped to date.
 - OCC suggested that some individual stakeholders could have greater power and interest than others, for example, the Low Carbon Hub. *Individual* organisations, such as community energy companies and universities might be particularly powerful within an area, even though they might not be recognised as a powerful *type* of organisation in the context of the mapping exercise.
 - Berks LEP commented that some stakeholders could be very influential or a potential barrier, for example the Energy Networks Association, and this should also be recognised in the mapping exercise.
 - Local Partnerships presented to the Board a copy of the GSENZH regional map with options represented for the proposed north and south division, which are based on the existing LEP areas.
 - SELEP commented that the line on the map cuts through SELEP. If SELEP is integrated into local authorities, Essex should go into the north, with the boundary going through the Thames Estuary.
 - RTO, LP asked Board members to consider whether a north and south division is appropriate, given the range of other groupings, projects, and programmes at work in the region. Other options for the sub-board division may also arise out of the stakeholder and policy mapping and LP expects to present further information to the GSENZH Board in due course.
 - RTO, LP thanked the Board for the information they had provided thus far. RTO, LP proposed that the long-list of organisations identified by LP would be shared with the Board

by Local Partnerships via email, along with the stakeholder mapping exercise, and some questions for the Board to respond to. As the outputs are developed, these will be shared, and LP will come back to the Board for further feedback.

ACTION 13. Local Partnerships to share with Board members via email the long-list of stakeholders it has identified, along with the stakeholder mapping exercise and some questions for Board members to respond to.

ACTION 14. Board members to provide feedback by email to the material and questions provided to them by Local Partnerships.

8. Forward Plan and Horizon Scanning

- The latest GSENZH Board Forward Plan was circulated to Board members in advance of the meeting with the GSENZH Board Pack 06.06.23.
- MN highlighted that the Forward Plan for the next GSENZH Board meeting 18.07.23, included the following topics: Governance, stakeholder mapping, recruitment outcome, Net Zero Go (however, a decision is pending on this) and Project and Programme reports.
- MN suggested that the proposed Project Acceleration Fund framework should also be added to the Forward Plan.
- Berks LEP proposed that local area energy planning and the outcome of the Ofgem consultation be added to the Forward Plan when available. The timescale for the institution of the Regional Strategy Planners is 2028. A recent workshop with LGA and Ofgem stressed the RIIO-ED2 Plan and release of network capacity. We need to start operating to local area energy planning prior to 2028. Groups will be feeding into Ofgem in the interim and we need to keep abreast of that.

BOARD DECISION: The Forward Plan for the next GSENZH Board meeting 18.07.23, is to include the following topics: Governance, stakeholder mapping, recruitment outcome, Project and Programme reports, Project Acceleration Fund framework, and local area energy planning and the outcome of the Ofgem consultation, if available.

9. Any Other Business

- **Growth Hub Network** - SELEP highlighted the Growth Hub Network (business support service mechanism) which is needed for support for decarbonisation. The Network, particularly David Furr in the Department for Business and Trade, has been trying to reach out to Patrick Allcorn to start a conversation between the Growth Hub Network and the Net Zero Hubs. SELEP has suggested that this is done via the Net Zero Hub Regional Heads.

ACTION 15. SELEP to send MN, GSENZH, further details regarding the wish of the Growth Hub Network to connect with the Net Zero Hub Regional Heads.

ACTION 16. SU, DESNZ to feed back to Patrick Allcorn that David Furr in the Department for Business and Trade, has been trying to reach out to Patrick Allcorn to start a conversation between the Growth Hub Network and the Net Zero Hubs.

- **Local Net Zero Team (DESNZ)** – DESNZ advised that the DESNZ Local Net Zero Programme is now led in two parts with Oliva Blunn covering Finance and Policy and Patrick Allcorn covering Delivery, Demonstrators and Knowledge Transfer. Berks LEP welcomed having more time with Patrick Allcorn and working with Olivia Blunn in future.

10. Dates of Future Meetings

BOARD DECISION: The next regular GSENZH Board meeting is scheduled for 18 July 2023, 10:00-12:30. The meeting is to take place virtually. The meeting chair is to be confirmed.

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

**Minutes approved as a true and accurate record by Ed Barlow
(Buckinghamshire Council) – Buckinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership.**

SIGNATURE

DATE