

Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH) Board Meeting - 13 July 2021

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, this meeting was conducted via online conference.

Attendees

Patrick Allcorn (PA) - Head of Local Energy, Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

Swapna Uddin (SU) - Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

Ed Barlow (EB) (Buckinghamshire Council) - Buckinghamshire LEP (BucksLEP - **Board Chair**)

Matt Wragg – Coast to Capital LEP (C2CLEP)

Jennie Pell – Enterprise M3 LEP (EM3LEP)

John Taylor (JT) – Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH) – **Rural Community Energy Fund Grant Approvals**

Maxine Narburgh (MN) - Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH)

Erica Sutton (ES) - Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH) - Secretariat support

Simon Wyke - Greater London Authority (GLA)

Helen Pollock – Hertfordshire LEP (HertsLEP)

Sarah Gilbert - (Oxfordshire County Council) – Oxfordshire LEP (OxLEP)

Jo Simmons - South East LEP (SELEP)

Arthur Le Geyt - South East Midlands LEP (SEMLEP)

Ben Burfoot - (Reading Borough Council) - Thames Valley Berkshire LEP (TVBLEP)

Minutes

1. Apologies, Introductions

- Apologies were given by **Domenico Cirillo**, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), **Robert Emery**, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), **Ahmed Goga** Oxfordshire LEP (OxLEP), **Ellen Goodwin** - New Anglia LEP (NALEP), **Chris Starkie** - New Anglia LEP (NALEP).

2. Minutes, Actions and Matters Arising

2.1 Minutes

BOARD DECISION: The minutes of the previous GSEEH Board meeting, 15.06.21, were agreed as a true account, subject to a non-material amendment to a comment from C2CLEP under section 7, Forward Plan, on page 8.

ACTION 1. EB to sign off the amended minutes of the GSEEH Board meeting 15.06.21 as agreed.

2.2 Actions and Matters Arising

- MN advised that the GSEEH supply chain engagement team are now in post. Following a two-week orientation period, the team will begin to meet stakeholders and the action from the GSEEH Board meeting 15.07.21, to link them to iConsult and LOCASE, will be carried out. MN requested that the Board advise of any further relevant organisations and contact details for this purpose.

ACTION 2. Board members to advise MN of any further relevant contacts (in addition to iConsult and LOCASE) for the new GSEEH supply chain engagement team to connect with.

3. Finance Update

- MN presented a summary report of the GSEEH finances for Local Energy Capacity Support and the Rural Community Energy Fund (RCEF). MN advised that the figures for the outturn to the end of the financial year 2021 were pending finalisation by the CPCA Finance Team.
- After taking account of the funds spent and committed, an amount of £600k **Local Energy Capacity Support** funding is available for allocation. MN proposed that this be allocated to additional core staffing, to employ a programme manager and four specialist project managers for 18 months, with £150k for specialist consultancy, to support the LEP areas.
- The **RCEF** grant funding has been profiled to the end of the financial year and an underspend of £300k has been identified. This may be reallocated to other Energy Hub regions. This is because, as part of the Spending Review, BEIS will be requesting the continuance of the Fund, and that it be extended to urban areas. New GSEEH staff dedicated to RCEF are starting in July 2021 and will be funded from the RCEF core budget.
- The Board had the following comments and questions about the **Local Energy Capacity Support** finances:
 - TVBLEP asked how the Local Energy Capacity Support surplus has arisen. MN advised that this derives from provision by BEIS of two further Memoranda of Understanding for core funding to 2023, plus some underspend. These are £170,500 (08/20) £1.025 million (02/21) and £578,947 (02/21). This funding was to extend the core team to 03/2023, undertake ringfenced research projects/tasks and to increase capacity for delivery. The Board had held off allocating remaining budget funds until the position concerning the Accountable Body was determined.
 - TVBLEP asked about a variance for the line item Community Energy England. MN explained that the organisation has carried out the work it had been commissioned to do but their invoice is awaited.
 - BucksLEP observed that while, at an earlier time, the LEP had pushed for more technical consultancy budget to be made available, the outcome has been that the budget has not been fully used. On the other hand, the GSEEH operations team have been very much drawn upon for support, so the LEP was content with the proposal to allocate the £600k to employ a programme manager and four specialist project managers. BucksLEP highlighted the need to for employment arrangements to be on a temporary basis, of not more than 20 months, to avoid any issue of redundancy, and that it was important to identify what was to be achieved with this staff resource.
 - EM3LEP confirmed that they were content that a specialist resource is to be made available to be drawn upon, also noting that the technical consultancy budget had not been drawn on as expected. EM3LEP suggested that the technical consultancy budget resource could be re-labelled to make it more useful and asked how the other Energy Hubs were using their technical consultancy budget. MN advised that it has been used for strategic commissioning, such as the exploration of a potential transport hub, rather than by public sector organisations bidding into a pot of funding.
 - HertsLEP added their support to the proposal for additional core staff.
 - TVBLEP advised that it was important to take time to understand where resources were most stretched and to identify requirements prior to recruitment.

BOARD DECISION: The Board supports the proposal to allocate £600k Local Energy Capacity Support budget to additional core staffing, and to employ a programme manager and four specialist project managers for 18 months, with an allocation of £150k for specialist consultancy.

ACTION 3. MN to prepare a team staff structure and budget and circulate to the Board by email for information and any comments.

- The Board had the following comments and questions about **RCEF** finances:
 - OxLEP noted that demand for the Fund was present and asked whether there was time for more projects to come forward. OxLEP has been promoting the Fund locally. MN advised that the GSEEH team has allowed for five Stage 1 projects for each of the next three funding rounds, plus the conversion of Stage 1 projects to Stage 2, so there is flexibility for more projects to come into the pipeline. One option could be to outsource the marketing of the Fund and to spend some of the funding on that.
 - BucksLEP concurred that there was more interest in RCEF still to come from Buckinghamshire.
 - EM3LEP raised a concern that new staff would be promoting the Fund and then be left short of funds to distribute. MN advised that £300k was not a huge proportion of the funding and that the reallocation option could be reviewed once the GSEEH RCEF officer was in post. The RCEF officer could be put in touch with Board to understand what else was in the pipeline.
 - TVBLEP asked how the £300k had been calculated and commented that the proposal for reallocation was a surprise and that they considered it to be premature. MN explained that the funding profile of the allocation had not been shown in the finance presentation. It has been developed by allocating expressions of interest to the end of the financial year, along with Stage 1 projects expected to apply for Stage 2 funding.

ACTION 4. MN to circulate to the Board a summary of what is committed and profiled of the RCEF grant funding

- TVBLEP asked for further information about the urban community energy fund. MN explained that this would be an additional community energy funding request put to the Spending Review by BEIS. It would expand the scope of the Fund to both urban as well as rural community groups. It has not yet been confirmed that it will be made available. TVBLEP highlighted that although the urban scope of the fund is not yet confirmed, their intention is to speak with Paul Kemp, as Energy Project Manager for the LEP area, and to have a pre-pipeline discussion and gather intelligence from colleagues about potential urban groups and projects to bring forward.

4. BEIS Thought Piece – GSEEH Future Role & Governance

- Patrick Allcorn, BEIS, joined the meeting to share some emergent thinking from the Department about the future role and governance of the Energy Hubs and to seek feedback from the Board on these developing ideas concerning GSEEH.
- BEIS set out the following points:
 - The role of the Local Energy Hubs as centres of technical assistance for Net Zero is being considered in the context of the anticipated Net-Zero and Levelling-Up strategies and the forthcoming Spending Review.
 - There is a question of how broad to make the remit of the Local Energy Hubs, and what other needs of its stakeholders the GSEEH can help with. Given the level of resource and breadth of support required, help with Net Zero cannot feasibly be met via officer provision within individual local authorities.
 - Some key questions for the Board to consider are what role the GSEEH takes, what size and scale of organisation is sensible for the GSEEH, whether the current role of London is sensible going forward, and the role of the OxCam Arc.
 - There is also the matter of governance for the Board to consider. Originally the Board was comprised of Local Enterprise Partnerships rather than local authority representatives, due to the funding LEPs administered and because their remit was broad. Now there is less certainty about the role of LEPs, with one year of additional funding, and a refocus on growth and business, rather than funding. With this change of role, is another form of governance needed? A further consideration is the range of funding programmes being put through the Local Energy Hubs, where they are delivery partners as well as administrators of the funding. Governance therefore needs to be

robust. The community make-up of local authorities is different from the LEPs and there is a need to ensure that local authorities are represented and have a voice.

- The Board gave the following comments and questions:
 - The Chair asked when a response from the Board is required by BEIS. PA advised that the conversation within BEIS is ongoing. The Levelling-Up and Net Zero strategies are expected in the autumn, so to have influence, the sooner the Board provides feedback, the better.
 - Bucks LEP commented that it was evident from PA's advice that it would not be possible to provide resource on an individual local authority basis. The broadening of the GSEEH's remit, to include domestic retrofit and transport decarbonisation, as is already happening, is beneficial. Additional specialist resource would be helpful to complement the existing multi-skilled team. It would be helpful to know what benefit or issue identified by BEIS concerning London needs to be addressed. This would enable the Board to give better feedback on the point.
 - TVBLEP noted that concerning Net Zero, domestic retrofit is a considerable element. Local Authority Delivery schemes are struggling due to supply chain limitations. The GSEEH has a role to play in supporting their readiness for delivery and is a useful resource for local authorities. The make-up of the GSEEH Board is a combination of LEPs, secondments to LEPs and local authorities. It is possible for the Board to pivot to a local-authority centric model as there is close attachment to local authorities anyway. The role of London is under-represented within GSEEH and needs thought. TVBLEP suggested that the considerations raised by PA could be added as a standing item to help the Board develop its thinking.
 - BucksLEP observed that the next GSEEH Board meeting is in September 2021 so further discussion at meetings would be limited in the timescale. There are likely to be different areas of interest across the eleven LEPs, so the content of a collective response to BEIS could be bland and not add much value. PA confirmed that BEIS would prefer individual views so that it has a range of perspectives to consider, and that this would be more useful than a single 'compromised' version.
 - C2CLEP highlighted the value that LEPs have added to the GSEEH and Board. C2CLEP, EM3LEP and SELEP have been working as the TriLEP. LEPs have provided a more regional strategic space in which to operate across political administrative areas. Local authorities might struggle to take on governance in addition to their other delivery commitments. C2CLEP asked whether the matter should be considered as part of the LEP review. LEP CEOs were involved in the review so it would be helpful to include them in deliberations. C2CLEP also asked what the link is between BEIS, the Energy Hubs and the LEP review process. PA advised that conversations are taking place via the Cities and Local Growth Unit, but the future of LEPs is not based on the Energy Hubs.
 - GLA observed that the current relationship with the GSEEH works well. There are challenges related to the scale of the region. London's challenges are different to the rest of the Greater South East, due to its scale and its composition of 33 Boroughs. The approach of separating the Greater South East counties and London is more sensible than dividing the South East region into north and south with London going to one or the other. The benefit of London working separately would be that it could tailor activity and deploy funding to tackle its specific challenges. It is still important to work closely together to benefit the supply chain and economic development and growth, for example, the levelling-up agenda and tackling environmental issues. The more demand that can be created, the more stimulation of investment, growth and economic activity can be enabled.
 - OxLEP highlighted the unique opportunity around the OxCam Arc and the benefit of having a geography that fitted it. PA advised that discussions were taking place with Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, the OxCamb Arc and Arc partners and what support can be offered for Net Zero. The view is that the Arc is better as a subset, rather than a stand-alone entity, working to get the benefits of collaboration, knowledge, skills sharing.

- EM3LEP observed that LEPs having a remove from local political agendas can be helpful. Regarding geography, EM3LEP raised the opportunity to revisit the inclusion of Solent as part of the GSSEH.
- SEMLEP agreed that resource was the biggest consideration and the ability to service multiple communities in a different way. Regarding the LEP role, it was useful to look at the pipeline and demand to identify how to adapt the geography and where to put resources.
- C2CLEP highlighted the importance and need for resourcing of LEPs to be involved in the Energy Hubs, the benefit of partnership working brought by C2CLEP involvement and the changes that it had brought about to its business model to make it more sustainable.
- BEIS summarised some key take-aways from the conversation prior to leaving the meeting: the importance of a strategic fit, the benefit of being one step removed and of de-politicisation that LEPs brought, being independent, able to prioritise objectively and without the pull or push of election issues. There is also the question of delegated power. Since LEPs have a business focus, where the auditable buy-in would come from. This would be an added role for LEPs.
- The Board Chair asked the meeting to consider how they would like to provide more considered feedback to BEIS, and whether a collation of views in a single document as a combined LEP response was wanted.
- The Board responded with the following comments and questions:
 - OxLEP confirmed that it is willing to do a joint response, although noted there is also value in an individual response. OxLEP suggested it would be useful to clarify what questions the Board is being asked to answer. This could include the breadth of Local Energy Hub activity, the geography of the GSEEH, including how it interacts with London, the governance of the GSEEH and the removal of politics from it, how the consideration of the Energy Hub's future role interacts with the LEP review.
 - MN clarified that BEIS is not seeking to split the GSEEH into multiple Energy Hubs, though potentially two Energy Hubs, and it does not want GSEEH to be separated from London. There is value in joint working. MN highlighted that the Greater South East region does not have a devolved regional body other than the GLA. A key question is to identify the Greater South East's offer, and how a narrative could be created about the regions within it to attract inward investment. MN further highlighted that the future GSEEH governance role would require financial decisions to be made, and a delegation and responsibility would be required for that, rather than a responsibility for creating a *process* for it, as is the Board's current role. A key question is whether there is a place for LEPs to have that central role.
 - C2CLEP observed that it is important for the Board to provide a value-added answer. The Board needs to know what questions BEIS has and what its thinking is around these, otherwise the Board's response is not going to be informative. C2CLEP reminded everyone that Board members have not been resourced to contribute to the GSEEH. There is the role of CEOs to consider in the response. Regarding geography, there is a potential six LEP narrative around airport towns.
 - TVBLEP proposed that LEP responses could be given on an individual LEP basis and then synthesised. TVBLEP wants to see what C2CLEP and the OxCamb Arc are saying as it will also affect what TVBLEP say. An iterative process is needed.
 - BucksLEP proposed that the Board requests from PA, five or six areas for comment with any supporting information and provides back to BEIS a blend of LEP individual and collective response, to include a range of views, explaining where and why there are differences, and identifying where there is common agreement. This could be reviewed at the next GSEEH Board meeting in September 2021.
 - OxLEP suggested that the Board's response would need to be given much sooner. MN confirmed that this was so. MN offered to clarify the BEIS question points and provide a template for each LEP to individually respond back, so that the raw information could be presented to BEIS quickly and enable BEIS could see for themselves where there are consistencies and differences of view. The Board could look at points of discussion and where to add value afterwards.

ACTION 5. MN to clarify the BEIS question points on GSEEH future role and governance and provide a template and timeframe for LEPs to individually respond back to the BEIS (PA) thought piece.

- TVBLEP noted that it was disappointing that such short notice is being given by BEIS for the Board to feedback, especially given the sub-regional complexity that needs to be processed and the time to gain feedback that it requires.
- OxLEP agreed that there is a need to get ahead of processes of this kind to shape the conversation.
- MN agreed that the GSEEH is not always deeply engaged about relevant matters and the preference is to contribute ideas to developing thinking rather than responding after concepts had been created. Consultations are also carried out at very short notice and while these have been enabled within the timeframe, they could be improved.
- SELEP suggested that a way to get into the conversation early would be with the LEP network to deal with the LEP review. There are several working groups on different issues. Where Net Zero and the Energy Hub sits could fit into a working group.

ACTION 6. JP is to flag to the relevant EM3LEP working group contact that feedback is being sought by BEIS on the GSEEH future role and governance.

ACTION 7. JS is to flag to the SELEP Chief Commercial Officer that feedback is being sought by BEIS on the GSEEH future role and governance.

- C2CLEP flagged that the LEP Network and Energy Systems Catapult have an existing meeting set up to discuss co-working.

6. COP26 – Events

- An update was provided to the Board by MN about the local events being planned in the region, which aim to boost awareness and the impact of COP26. The events are funded by BEIS and the GSEEH is administering and supporting their delivery.
- **Planet Mark Zero Carbon Tour** - The electric bus tour now has the following stopping points identified:
 - 31 August – Cambridge: Flagship Event
 - 2 September – Brighton: Flagship Event. This is to be rearranged as the local authority does not have the capacity to deliver it. JT is in discussion with C2CLEP about a south coast alternative.
 - 4&5 September – Farnborough: Hampshire County Council have been engaged and EM3LEP will have a presence.
 - 6 September – Hemel Hempstead: A joint event hosted by Prologis
 - 7 September – Oxford: Flagship Event.
- The Board raised the following questions and comments:
 - C2CLEP noted that the timescale was not helpful to the arrangement of an alternative stop-off to replace Brighton, but the involvement of LOCASE or Brighton University would be explored.
 - SELEP highlighted that the TriLEP has funding for financial support from a £7k underspend, which it could contribute to a Flagship Event on the Tour. There is also interest from Kent County Council to be involved. MN advised that a venue would need to be offered as match funding in kind. The Flagship Event format comprised a speaker in the morning and business engagement in the afternoon and was intended to share local authority and community stories about Net Zero from which case studies would be required. Streaming of the Flagship Events is also expected. GSEEH must firm up arrangements by 16.07.21 so it is important to provide further information as soon as possible to enable involvement. The aim is to get a spread of stops across the Greater South East region, so Ipswich will be prioritised as a stop-off.

ACTION 8. JS to provide further information to MN by 16.07.21 concerning TriLEP/ Kent County Council interest in a Flagship Event or stop-off on the Planet Mark Zero Carbon Tour.

- TVBLEP advised that Reading is hosting a Climate Festival in the third week of September, which could link to the COP26 local events.

ACTION 9. MN to check whether the Reading Climate Festival (third week in September) can link to the COP26 local events.

- HertsLEP noted that demand to be involved in the Planet Mark Zero Carbon Tour has been high so to achieve a stop-off was an accomplishment. Money to help support the stop-offs has been lacking. HertsLEP asked whether GSEEH are involved in the Prologis event in Hemel Hempstead on 6 September. MN advised that the GSSEH focus has been on the Flagship Events and that other events are being overseen by Planet Mark, but MN would see what other requirement there is for GSEEH to facilitate these.
- **Regional Green Zone Events** – MN highlighted to the Board that while the Planet Mark Zero Carbon Tour Flagship Events were valuable for capturing the Net Zero narrative and developing case studies, the Green Zone events were much higher profile and significant. They provide an opportunity for strategic messaging and will be streamed during the COP26 fortnight. MN proposed that the Great South East should aim to run more than the minimum of two Green Zone events and asked for the Board's feedback.
- The Board raised the following questions and comments:
 - BucksLEP asked whether corporate sponsorship is possible. MN advised that the GSEEH has a £40k budget for a human resource to develop and coordinate the Green Zone events. A broad range of event types are possible. The events can be recorded and saved as well as streamed. BucksLEP suggested Bosch (hydrogen) or Westcott Venture Park. HertsLEP proposed BRE for smart construction and sustainable buildings and Rothamstead for sustainable agriculture. MN confirmed that as the events cover Net Zero, that the events could be broader than having an energy focus.
 - BucksLEP advised that its communications lead is writing a brief and will explore what organisations within the LEP could be involved.
 - TVBLEP highlighted that Reading Borough Council is expecting its EV bus to be available soon and it expects an EV waste vehicle in September 2021.
 - C2CLEP advised that Greater Brighton has ten pledges on energy and water, cross-sector activity (with work on hydrogen being a successful spin-out from it) and plans to create a joint local-authority procurement pipeline for home decarbonisation. MetroBus is a national leader for hydrogen buses. Manor Royal Business Improvement District has ambitions for green energy.
 - SEMLEP highlighted that Cranfield University has carried out work on sustainable air transport, including hydrogen-powered aircraft.
- MN reminded the Board that the Scope for the COP Domestic Campaign, which provides further details, had been circulated to them 01.07.21 with the minutes of the previous meeting. GSEEH will look at sponsorship packages and strengths in different areas (being mindful of the creation of case studies) and will welcome feedback from the Board.

ACTION 10. Board members to send any other ideas for the Green Zone events to MN.

- C2CLEP mentioned the south-east seven cluster of local authorities, which have expressed an interest to do something for COP26.
- BucksLEP suggested that airports might be interested in participating in the Green Zone events. C2CLEP and SELEP highlighted the Catalyst South 'airport towns' event taking place on 14.07.21.

7. Operational Update

- An update on the various elements of the GSEEH Programme of Work was set out in the GSEEH Board Papers 13.07.21, which were circulated to Board members in advance of the meeting. MN highlighted the following elements:
- **Project Pipeline** – GSEEH is now using a new BEIS reporting template. This will also enhance the reporting to the Board. MN advised that the pipeline value is £113m completed commissioned short-list projects and £384m current short-list projects.
- **Green Home Grant, Local Authority Delivery, Phase 2 (LAD2)** - Posts have successfully been recruited at GSEEH for the programme. The programme manager will start in October

2021. Four out of the five project managers will join in August 2021. Two supply chain engagement officers have already started work at GSEEH w/o 12.07.21.

- The introductory meetings between Managing Agents and Consortia have been done. The one-to-one meetings between Managing Agents and the 137 local authorities are still being completed.
- As regards contract arrangements, these have been amended so that Managing Agents can contract directly with installers and householders. This reduces the risk of liability for the local authorities. An issue has arisen with the Managing Agent Framework contracts. There is a cap of 8% on the Managing Agent fee. However, the Managing Agents all want an increase to the percentage due to the extra responsibility. To keep fees down, GSEEH has enabled mitigation to the procurement arrangements for the Managing Agents.
- The latest Dynamic Procurement System (DPS) round has just closed and new suppliers are being reviewed. Of 126 registrations, 14 have approval. Installers that provide ventilation measures and/or windows and doors are required and need engagement. A total of £2.8bn of retrofit supply chain capacity is now queued up for the Great South East region. An Excel spreadsheet of full details was circulated to the Board in advance of the meeting with the GSEEH Board Papers 13.07.21. In response to a query from EM3LEP, MN clarified that the DPS opens every month for applications from new suppliers and measures.
- In support of the delivery of domestic retrofit, Local Partnerships has published a domestic [retrofit handbook for local authorities](#), and Energy Systems Catapult has produced a consumer insights toolkit.
- A round table with Lord Callanan, Under Secretary of State at BEIS, and the five Local Energy Hubs took place 07.07.21. The meeting covered the different regional approach and delivery model for LAD2 by the Local Energy Hubs and the value this has added. The role of the Local Energy Hubs going forward was also discussed. It is expected that a follow-up conversation will be arranged.
- Green Home Grant, Local Authority Delivery, Phase 1A and 1B (LAD1A & LAD1B) – There is an extension for LAD1A to August 2021 and LAD1B to September 2021. The PAS2030:2019 transition has been extended for LAD1.
- **Sustainable Warmth Fund** – The funding competition launched in June 2021 closes 04.08.21. MN advised in response to a query raised by OxLEP about timescales that GSEEH has reiterated to BEIS that timelines for the delivery and mobilisation of the schemes is not ideal. LAD2 will end in December 2021 and the Sustainable Warmth programme will commence in January 2022, completing in March 2023. Local authorities can bid directly to BEIS or as consortia, or GSEEH can be the lead to develop bids for consortia. The GSEEH MA Framework and DPS can be used by local authorities for their procurement needs, regardless of whether they are part of a GSEEH-led consortia bid.
- **Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund** – This launches the third week of August 2021 with a six-week turn around. **Social Housing Technical Assistance (SHTA)** is to be provided by Turner Townshend with a launch at the end of July 2021. Turner Townshend will provide one-to-one support to enable potential applicants to be bid-ready for the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund. TVBLEP asked whether the GSEEH DPS can be used for the Fund. MN asked TVBLEP to confirm what measures they required and will check whether these are available.

ACTION 11. BB to confirm to MN what retrofit measures might be required for the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund.

ACTION 12. MN to confirm whether measures requested by BB for the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund are available via the GSEEH DPS.

- **Modernising Energy Data Applications** – A project funded by Innovate UK. The second phase application deadline is 14.07.21. This is followed by a 'show and tell' 20.07.21. Six competitors will bid for the next round. MN will provide an update at the next Board meeting.

ACTION 13. MN to provide the Board with an update on outcome of the application and bid to the Modernising Energy Data Applications competition.

- **Public Sector Skills Fund** – BEIS is to supply funding to GSEEH to enable the Energy Hub to support public sector organisations in planning the decarbonisation of their buildings. A budget of £1.3m is to be provided. This includes £800,000 for staff (a programme manager,

surveyors and technical support) and software, with an allocation for strategic consultancy of £70k and an allocation for extra design consultancy of £400k.

- GSEEH is working with Energy Systems Catapult and will access and build on the Catapult's shareable resources and toolkits to as another means of support to public sector organisations. MN will circulate a paper with further information on the programme to the GSEEH Board in September 2021.

ACTION 14. MN to provide the Board with a paper to provide further information on the Public Sector Skills Fund programme.

- The Board raised the following questions and comments about the Operational Update:
 - SEMLEP asked about the GSEEH work to map renewable charging infrastructure, which had been raised at the previous Board meeting 15.06.21. MN explained that the operations team are engaging with local authorities to identify their needs and establishing what the market is delivering, to identify where the gaps are.

8. Forward Plan

- BucksLEP suggested that the LEP Review be added to the Forward Plan as an item for September 2021. C2CLEP agreed with this proposal, noting that more should hopefully be known by then, especially on the nature of the relationship between Energy Hubs and LEPs.

BOARD DECISION: The Board agreed that the LEP Review should be added as an item to the GSEEH Board Forward Plan for September 2021.

ACTION 15. MN to add the LEP Review to the GSEEH Board Forward Plan for September 2021.

9. Any Other Business

- There was no other business raised.

10. Dates of Future Meetings

BOARD DECISION: The next GSEEH Board meeting, **7 September 2021**, 10:00-12:30, is to take place virtually, using the Microsoft Teams software facility.

- Subsequent Board meeting dates are scheduled 10:00-12:30, to take place virtually, on the following dates:
 - 19 October 2021
 - 7 December 2021
 - 25 January 2022