

## Attendance

| LSDC  | Secretariat and GLA  |
|---|--|
| <p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ashok Sinha (AS, Chair)</li> <li>Syed Ahmed (SA)</li> <li>James Cameron (JC)</li> <li>David Elliott (DE)</li> <li>Nicky Gavron (NG)</li> <li>Julie Hirigoyen (JH)</li> <li>Nick Mabey (NM)</li> <li>Malini Mehra (MM)</li> <li>Prof Richard Templar (RT)</li> <li>Dr Paul Toyne (PT)</li> <li>Karen Lawrence (KL)</li> <li>Dimitri Zenghelis (DZ)</li> <li>Maria Adebowale-Schwarte (MA)</li> <li>Cllr Claudia Webbe (CW)</li> </ul> <p>Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samantha Heath (SH)</li> <li>Charlie Wood (ChW)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nusrat Yousuf (NY)</li> <li>Abby Crisostomo (ABC)</li> <li>Shelley McSpirit (SMc)</li> <li>Ben Shaw (BS)</li> <li>Jude Hassall (JHa)</li> </ul> |

## Meeting notes and actions

### 1. Welcome, introduction from chair

Summary:

Chair welcomed commissioners, new GLA recruits and noted apologies. AS updated the commission on budget status following the Exec meeting.

- Existing budget confirmed to cover work so far for 2019/20
- Additional work committed to by the commission required additional budget

Exec took the view to ask for additional GLA funds to cover the extra work which has been requested but not yet confirmed – LSDC should work on the basis that this additional money will not be forthcoming, although a bid had been submitted for additional funds.

AS noted that exec committee had identified potential savings and that the commission should try to identify opportunities for external funding for the green finance and social value regeneration work in particular.

AS also noted that there was no danger to existing committed work streams however future work streams budget was not yet secured.

NY to circulate revised budget paper to any interested commissioners.

**Action:**

- **Commissioners to indicate whether they wish to see the budget paper**
- **NY to circulate papers to any interested commissioners**
- **Commissioners to review funding opportunities for their individual areas of commission work where appropriate.**

## **2. Feedback from the last full commission meeting**

Chair sought confirmation of minutes from the previous LSDC meeting – these were passed.

Chair also confirmed that all outstanding actions were either done or on this agenda.

## **3. Results of the effectiveness review and discussion**

Summary:

Thanks given for the work on this and for putting together the summary paper and recommendations. The aim of this session was to sign off the review as an accurate summary of actions and accept the recommendations for future work.

The findings of the review were presented. It was noted that the LSDC was incredibly busy at present and therefore the recommendations should be actioned later in the year Dec. Key observations were that it was important to get the balance right between the two main motivators within the commission, i.e. inform and influence policy to achieve step change, and as a catalyst for action, that it was also important to frame the commission's work in relation to the SDG's and that the commission should refresh the findings when a tighter focus around the work to be delivered this year has been agreed.

Overriding recommendation was to adopt the findings as effective recommendations.

Feedback from commissioners was:

- There is an assumption made in the work around the theory of change exercise, but it wasn't clear from the work what that actually is? Is that to be done in the Autumn?
- In Autumn the need for the theory of change to be developed would be cross matched with resources as elements of this approach needed consideration.
- Noted that theory of change work can be time consuming and work on it should be strict and time limited. Also noted that the role in stimulating and encouraging research e.g. SVR proposal and attempts to involve that in the London Plan development was not reflected and could be added to the table in the paper.
- Noted that the next steps would be to reframe the work of the LSDC around the SDG mapping and communicate appropriately.
- Could use the Comms meeting for this.
- **Actions:**
  - **Comms Sub-group to develop a timeframe for delivery of the recommendations following the structure outlined within the review**

## **4. Social Value of Regeneration: ToR and work programme update**

Summary:

Commission asked to sign off the proposed ToR for the sub group. Noted that commitment to the issue was still there and that efforts had been made to integrate it into the London Plan.

Commission agreed to sign off the ToR.

Feedback from commissioners was:

- Noted the next step is to conduct a scoping study which Sec would lead on. Asked commissioners to please pass on details of leads and contacts to Sec to help with this work
- Noted that a colleague from UKGBC would link up with Sec on this.

**Actions:**

- **Scoping study work to be planned and started - aim to complete by end of April**
- **Commissioners to send contacts and leads to JHa to follow up**
- **JH to link JHa up with her contact at UKGBC**

## 5. Green finance work programme discussion

Summary: *(see presentation attached)*

Chair noted that the objective of the subcommittee is to produce compelling and potentially transformative proposals that the Mayor can adopt and champion, aiming to bring the gap between large scale private finance and a new pipeline of attractive projects; and that he was pleased at the excellent work done by the group in recent weeks, hoping that we would soon be in a position to develop concrete proposals..

Commissioners gave a summary of the state of play, upcoming work and the issues that need to be overcome to make it land.

Introduction:

- Key issue of how to unlock finance to achieve environmental objectives was long running and required a wider focus than just the city. Objective was to look at the actions needed to create investment. Not possible to cover the broad range of sectors covered by the commission so decided the initial focus would be on carbon and energy.
- Observations made about the Mayors existing energy programmes, that they were individually commendable however they were not talking to each other.
- Progress summarised so far, tender issued, consultant chosen, challenge workshop delivered, 30 + attendees, cross section of attendees including LEP's, Treasury, boroughs, finance community.
- Draft report was received, and some concern expressed as to its scope and ambition Whiteboard session was then convened at E3G to develop ideas further. Aim was to provide a set of actionable recommendations, but view was that this was not forthcoming from the first report Feedback from those who received the report was robust and of the view that the report was insufficiently thorough but provided a useful staging post in the commissions thinking. Decisions were needed as to next steps regarding the use of the report. 3 options were presented:
  - Publish as is
  - Don't publish

- LSDC to rework and produce a separate short report

Decision needed as to what to do next:

- All agreed with the need to link more clearly with the 1.5 degrees C report.
- Highlighted need to develop an influencing strategy which included 2 stages: Short and long term. Short term actions could centre around the use of offset payments.
- Low carbon incentives were all running down and the one opportunity was to use offsetting revenue. Noted the opportunity of a 'golden period' of pre grid decarbonisation and the presence of offsetting revenue. Need to take advantage of this and set the policy in place now.
- The case was made for resources on the ground within each borough and that the potential revenues could fund 60 additional borough energy posts. Discussions were had around the structure and workings of the offsetting schemes, that it was only for capital expenditure but ringfenced for green projects, there were model case study boroughs e.g. Islington using this vehicle successfully. That the money came in sporadically and there was therefore the need to have a single financial institution to hold the money for dispersal, and that a simple structure could be set up quickly.

Feedback from commissioners on SA introductory piece was:

Are offset payments fixed or not ?

They aren't fixed although most boroughs used the GLA £60 rate and noted that boroughs lack the skills and resources to calculate their own rate.

Noted that it was a useful concept which could work well for community schemes

Noted the need for braver policy making within boroughs, but examples existed of this including Tower Hamlets and Islington.

Noted that as the mayor had committed to zero carbon by 2050, was there a danger of developers asking for offset money back as they would be being charged for carbon that wouldn't exist?

Recommended the concept of pooled contributions.

Discussion followed with a review of the longer-term opportunity. Noted that this would only happen and gain political traction if it was a big idea and that it should be informed by and designed with inclusivity and engagement in mind. Key challenges for London were decarbonisation and digitisation but need to ensure that the solutions were inclusive, how to ensure all Londoners benefit. 3 points of fragmentation were noted which this solution was trying to address:

- Financial fragmentation – too many small dispersed pots of money
- Capacity fragmentation – the resource is too small and scattered. Whether borough level is the right scale, too small, needs clusters to be developed?
- Sector fragmentation – meaning that can't integrate financial and resource flows as sectors operate in silos.

Need to build clean, resilient, scaleable, inclusive ways to shape the money flowing into London now. Can't be supported through bottom up change alone, needs change at an institutional level also and requires an institution of some sort with devolved money and power.

Work done as part of the whiteboard session to design what it would do and how. Work needed to look at where the money is flowing and ensure it goes to those who need it, ensure fair share concept is adhered to. Grand plan developed to do this. Central concept is an overarching institution. 4 streams of work under the financing future London concept:

- Future finance
- Future infrastructure
- Future Jobs/communities
- Future markets

Idea is to bring all of these into one institution with a grand vision. Recognise that need to focus initially on core elements and build on that. Start with demonstrator shadow piece building alliances with boroughs and create a case for scaling up. Core thing is to recognise it as a journey. Potential to use this to build the right London, increase the focus beyond carbon to wider economic development.

Feedback from commissioners was:

A fascinating piece of work potentially very big scale but could be piloted by a few boroughs initially.

Noted that academic input would be valuable and concept would be very attractive to academics for work. Also noted the need to answer the question of what's in it for the mayor? – London owning and shaping its own future and influencing the world.

Noted that London can be seen as a supplicant, this vehicle allows London to ask for a fair share to then disperse, changes the power dynamic.

How quickly it could be delivered? – will need to add a timeframe in the report

Noted that this shouldn't be seen as a separate green thing, should be about making the millions invested in London more sustainable.

What relationship would the Mayor have with this institution? – also needs to be addressed in the report

Suggested that the institution should be owned by the boroughs and the Mayor – Mayor would have a golden share. Need to work together to transform London but would need governance and political will.

Noted the need to look back at institutions that hadn't worked in the past and learn from that.

How best can the Commission use the UK 100 report.

Noted that the report was only a part of what was actually a larger process which had led to this point and had to be seen within this context. The process had yielded good results and the report formed part of that background and learning process.

Noted that if intention was to reach out to other sectors then more evidence was needed as this focussed on carbon and energy.

A big ambitious idea of this nature would be more likely to get the attention needed but now need to take it to the next step.

Suggested that funding would be needed to build a knowledge platform, learn from past mistakes, e.g. G.I.B. Evidence also needed from other sectors including Environment Agency, green infrastructure, and heat sector. Need also to reach out to boroughs who were very engaged when attending the previous discussion sessions as part of this work. Early wins possible on this due to the spending review, need to take the opportunity to grab it.

This was inspirational stuff, the sub group should keep going, that offline conversation was needed about timescale what is producible and when it might be ready, so as to set up the necessary engagement needed the Mayor's team.

### **Actions:**

- **Subgroup to define short and long term outputs, next steps, actions and timescales for taking the work forward.**
- **Sec to set up sub-group meeting to discuss next steps and work programme delivery**
- **BS to flesh out existing report, gaps and proposed new structure**
- **Sec to identify resources needed to compile evidence report;**
- **Subgroup, Secretariat and Chair to produce a short (3 page) routemap to present to Shirley R and the Mayor's team, with full development of the final proposal(s) to be contingent on their buy-in.**
- **Sec to organise meetings with relevant DM's**

## **6. SDG's and Young Londoners**

Update given on the progress of the Young Londoners SDG work.

- Context was how London can deliver against the SDG's, and how to align the QoL's with the SDG's but through the lens of the 16-24yr old audience.
- Parallel strand was also about the use of the SDG's as an overarching framework for the GLA, and to understand how they fit within GLA high level strategies.
- Unique survey of young Londoners now complete, sample size of 2000 which was viewed as substantial and results of this and the Verto game will feed into the understanding of the relationship with the indicators and SDG's. Aim of the work was to really understand what young Londoners think about the decisions made by this generation and the impact they will have on the younger generation, couched in their own language and translated back to relate to the SDG's.
- Survey results used to identify issues that matter most to young Londoners and also to shape a game to achieve further engagement, and to shape action to make it relevant and useful to the young. Opportunity to inform policy, and shape it to attract younger voters.
- Highlights included where youth get their news – online and free news, that London youth were relatively political, 65% had voted, and priority issues which was topped by housing, mental health and child poverty concerns. Environmental issues were not seen as needing action, commissioners wondered why they received lower priority.
- Commissioners were asked to now tap into their networks to promote the game which will be released in the next few weeks.

Feedback from commissioners was:

Noted that it would be sensible to align this work with the LCAW activity, which was to be geared towards a young audience. Committee decided on doing one thing well and as this is unique work it should be capitalised on.

Is there enough knowledge around the table to link some of the issues with wider environmental issues e.g. mental health links to quality green space and access to nature.

Noted that young people were knitting themes together in unique ways, but that there was frustration with caring about issues but not knowing what to do about them.

Noted that this was ground breaking work and highlights the need to understand the current mindset of young people. Issues of disconnection with locale due to the lack of provision for young people with institutions to connect them in to their communities. How can young people be enabled to connect with their local environments and if they don't connect locally then how can we expect them to connect with global issues such as climate change?

Noted that it may not be a deficit as such, they may want to be part of their communities but for some reasons aren't able to be.

Commended all commissioners to read the report, noted the high ranking of mental health issues and wondered if this could be a result of media focus as well. Also noted the importance of schools and their role, noted that young people felt schools were not equipping them for the modern workplace especially for entering the digital economy. Could the role of the London Sustainable Schools Network be harnessed to see how the SDG's could be incorporated into school plans.

How can the data be used and protected.

All agreed to keep the results and data confidential until commission was ready to publish the final report.

### **Actions:**

- **Verto Game to be finalised and launched in the next two weeks**
- **Sec to construct supporting email, to be circulated with the game to all commissioners to push out to their networks and social media**
- **All data and results to remain confidential until commission decide how to share it**

## **7. London Climate Action Week**

Summary:

Commissioners asked for ideas on event and structure for LCAW. To be themed around young people as a result of the work done on the SDG's and young Londoners.

Feedback from commissioners was:

Could we do something in the assembly? Event would need to be interesting but not intimidating.

Could the top three suggestions be incorporated into the Verto game and get young Londoners to decide?

Could we create Young LSDC Commissioners?

Is there an opportunity to use young influencers to multiply the message. Invite e.g. DJ's to discuss pressing issues with audience of young Londoners?

As the voting %ges were quite high is this an opportunity to bring in a political journalist to challenge the preconceptions about youth vote and engagement?

Small group probably needed to take this forward, asked for volunteers – MM, PT, JC, NG, DE, MA. Next staging point to be decided. Could this group join up with the comms sub group as overlap with membership of this group.

### **Actions:**

- **Meeting with comms sub group to be scheduled to be linked to the next SDG sub group meeting**
- **Sec to email to commissioners to confirm involvement in LCAW action group**

**8. Other group updates**

No questions were raised relating to sub group papers submitted

**Actions:**

- **NY to send out all meeting dates with minutes**