

LSDC Full Commission Meeting
Thursday, 5th March 2015, 1.30 – 5pm
City Hall (Chamber)

<p>Attendees – Commissioners Greg Barker (Chair) Paul Turner (Deputy Chair) Nicky Gavron Paul de Zylva Karen Lawrence Paul Toyne Bridget Jackson Richard Templar David Brownlow James Cameron Miriam Maes Sir Evelyn de Rothschild James Byrne Dan Epstein Howard Davidson (EA Rep standing in for Peter Ainsworth)</p>	<p>Attendees – GLA Matthew Pencharz Jeremy Skinner</p> <p>Attendees – Secretariat Patrick Feehily Nusrat Yousuf Jem McKenna-Percy Patrick Elf Eleanor Byrne</p> <p>Apologies Jeremy Oppenheim Peter Ainsworth</p>
---	---

MINUTES

1. Introduction

The Chair welcomed Commissioners, GLA Officers and Secretariat, and noted apologies as reflected above, followed by introductions from all Commissioners detailing their background and experience.

2. GLA Forward Look: GLA Group Plans and Priorities– presentation from Matthew Pencharz, Senior Advisor (Environment and Energy) and Jeremy Skinner, Senior Manager (Growth and Enterprise).

See attached presentations

- Matthew Pencharz (MP) gave Commissioners an overview of the responsibilities of the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the challenges for London.
- He reflected on the huge potential of the green economy and its key role to enable sustainable growth in London.
- MP also highlighted that the LSDC has huge importance in helping support delivery of the London Infrastructure Plan (LIP), the green economy and raise London’s profile further as the best big city in the world.
- In this context he noted that London should not only be known as a tech and finance centre but also as a clean tech centre.

- Jeremy Skinner (JS) then spoke about the LIP giving the Commissioners an idea of how the Mayor intends to provide growth opportunities and serve demand of new affordable houses.
- In this context JS mentioned the newly formed London Infrastructure Delivery Board which was set up to ensure integrated planning. This is a great opportunity for the LSDC to influence developments since Greg Barker (GB), Chair of the LSDC, is also part of the board.

3. Introduction – Scene setting and purpose of the day

Setting out boundaries for the day

- GB and Deputy Chair Paul Turner (PTu) explained the purpose of the meeting, gave an introduction of the working ‘journey’, and set the agenda for the day.
- Both updated Commissioners on recent discussions between themselves and the Mayor, Boris Johnson.
- GB, however, also made clear that the LSDC needs to come up with punchy ideas which have the potential to have a real impact. GB said that the LSDC first has to deliver which will enable it to raise its profile and influence.
- On this, Miriam Maes (MM) highlighted that the Commission needs to understand where carbon emissions are coming from and that energy efficiency should be one key focus area of the commission.
- James Cameron (JC) added that the build environment has to be understood as part of infrastructure planning and that he would like to make sure that London understands that better and that it is included in the working groups at the LSDC.
- Additionally to this, the Chair made the point that there are plenty of other groups out there speaking about very similar things. The LSDC must not forget that it has to work for London, and that the commission has to come up with projects which are scalable and have *additionality* which is important to drive innovation and improve the reputation of the LSDC. PTu said that this can be achieved through business contacts during normal work.
- Dan Epstein (DE) stated that he sees that there is another role for the LSDC which is to promote projects and bring together people.

Website

In this context GB mentioned that the LSDC website (www.Londonsdc.org) definitely needs improvement but acknowledged that we needed to get the ‘product’ (the LSDC’s work, impact and contribution) right before being able to maximise communications.

- Karen Lawrence (KL) noted that the website was reasonable given the small budget of the Commission and Bridget Jackson (BJ) agreed, reiterating that only with interesting and timely content is it possible to drive traffic and that it is the responsibility of the commission to come up with meaningful projects.

- DE also added that the commission needs to communicate and promote differently so the public understands issues better - is this the role of the LSDC to communicate with Public or stakeholders? PF suggested that instead of promoting sustainability directly, it might be the Commission's role to recommend this be done by more appropriate organisations.

Measurement of impact of LSDC

Howard Davidson (HD) asked if the LSDC has a matrix, indicators or (key performance indicators (KPIs) in place to track progress. Responses are briefly summarised below:

- Nusrat Yousuf (NY) answered that the Quality of Life (QoL) indicators are not new data collected by the LSDC and collected from elsewhere and reflect trends, and that collection is primarily done by the GLA.
- Patrick Feehily (PF) then asked rhetorically if it is the responsibility of commissioners to measure LSDC's impact or if commission needs to outsource it.
- GB agreed that the commission needs KPIs and asked for volunteers to do a first draft to measure future impact evaluation.

Action: JC and RT agreed to liaise over the next few weeks. The outcomes will be presented at the next meeting.

4. Review: LSDC programmes and progress to date

Project summaries – Successes, Outcomes, Challenges and Recommendations

- PTu asked the existing commissioners to provide new commissioners with a brief overview of projects.
- In this context, PTo said that work around carbon measurement was a huge success.
- Paul de Zylva (PdZ) added that the Olympic Games were the most sustainable games ever and a huge success for the LSDC which was instrumental in making sure SD was at the heart of the games.
- PF highlighted that momentum was created in the past for Olympics and now also for the closed loop work. He added that part of the reason why the GLA and LSDC Secretariat renewed the commission was that they felt that they could further drive momentum and that it is now time to come up with stimulating projects to build on these past successes.
- RT highlighted that one way of doing this might be to not only to advise but collectively execute and deliver these new projects. However this would be a new way of working for the LSDC and would need resources. How could the LSDC enable others to do this?
- GB responded that the commission must careful not to be interested in something that won't be implemented in the future.
- RT highlighted that mayoral support would be key to actually delivering something.

Green Means Business Roundtable

- EG and NY provided commissioners with more information about Roundtable event - Tuesday, 24th March at City Hall

Action: Commissioners to forward Green Means Business Roundtable invite to key stakeholders.

5. LSDC – Commissioner and Sec perspectives

- KL provided commissioners with SWOT analysis on what worked well and what needs to improve.
- Main points included:
 - Important to have discussion at early stage of project development so conflicts can be avoided
 - Key to provide stories and interesting projects so Secretariat can feed website with content.
 - Lack of resources.
 - Threat that new Mayor comes up with new priorities.
- The commission felt that it is important to concentrate on meaningful projects which have public and cross-party support.

Lack of resources at LSDC

- GB asked Secretariat if there is any restriction in place that the Commission cannot make use of private money. PF responded that he was not aware of any restriction.
- On this, Sir Evelyn de Rothschild highlighted that it is usually easy to get the private sector involved and the relevance of Public-Private partnerships.
- David Brownlow (DB) agreed by saying that Commission needs to target potential stakeholders and seek sponsorship on the basis of specific projects rather than in general.

6. LSDC the new focus – work priorities

- A conversation about different subgroups ensued and the results are summarised in the table below:

Name of subgroup	Chair of subgroup	Area of be covered by sub group
Green Economy/Clean-Tech subgroup	James Cameron - Chair Richard Templer (Ed Gillespie – former chair) Other members to be approached by chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clean-tech• Green entrepreneurship• Growing the green economy

Circular Economy Subgroup	Paul Turner – Chair Bridget Jackson Other members to be approached by chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource efficiency • Sharing economy • Materials
Energy	Miriam Maes – Chair Dan Epstein Other members to be approached by chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy • energy efficiency • decentralised energy - Heat systems • Policy framework

Action: Commissioners to get in touch with different chairs of subgroups if they want to be involved in the different work streams. Secretariat to co-ordinate.

Further points – working groups

- NG suggested setting up infrastructure working group and JC agreed.
- DE highlighted need for joined up working and system thinking. In addition the issue of a policy framework for major developments and opportunity areas was raised – to be led by Dan Epstein. This work would be cross cutting and cover all three sub groups
- GB suggested that DE and MM get in touch with JC and NG to speak about potential integration of Infrastructure subgroup.

Action: Dan and others to speak off line about cross cutting work of integration of infrastructure group and to decide where best fit or if a separate sub group

Action: NY to send Old Oak and Park Royal (OPDC) Master plan to commissioners - done

Action: Chairs of subgroups to discuss with GB priority areas. 3 point plans to be developed for each sub group with a time line for when these will be delivered by and what resources will be needed. Secretariat to liaise with sub group chairs and provide appropriate templates for projects.

Competitions

GB suggested the idea of organising a competition which could trigger innovative thinking and which could shift the focus on LSDC and raise profile. Ideas raised in this section included:

- Tall building challenge
- Green entrepreneurship competition (though have the mayors low carbon entrepreneurs comp already and many others in this domain already)
- Innovation Challenge
- Multi-purpose design/infrastructure challenge

Action: Commission to discuss the potential of competitions further during next meeting.

Existing projects

- NY asked Commission if they have any thought on how to proceed with existing projects such as Sowing the Seeds and PAS2070.
- GB responded by suggesting that there is potential to naturally integrate some parts of work into new work streams.
- Additionally, KL noted that London Leaders need to evolve in line with the developing workstreams and would consider this with the Secretariat after the next Full Commission meeting.

7. Communications Overview

- EG noted that following this meeting a communications and engagement strategy would be developed with the secretariat. This would include updating the vision statement.
- EG noted that the Commission had been hesitant to engage proactively on communications in the past but that given recent LSDC developments a Communications and Engagement strategy was being put together that would need to develop in line with the 'product' or work streams.
- Commissioners were asked for their thoughts on the Vision and it was agreed that the city indicators work might best inform this.

Action: EG, BJ and Secretariat to consider a re-drafted vision for next meeting.

8. Date of next meeting: 9th June