

**London Sustainable Development Commission – Business Planning Meeting  
City Hall Committee Room 3, 5 December 2017, 4.00-7.00pm**

**Attendees:** Ashok Sinha (AS, chair), Richard Templer (RT), James Cameron (JC), Claudia Webbe (CW), Samantha Heath (SH – for part of the meeting), Nicky Gavron (NG), Cassie Sutherland (CS), Nusrat Yousuf (NY), Paul Toyne (PTo), Maria Adebowale (MA), Syed Ahmed (SA), Anna Coote (AC), Julie Hirigoyen (JH), Nick Mabey (NM), Malini Mehra (MM), Dimitri Zenghelis (DZ), Alejandro Colsa (ACP), Haley Bowcock (HB), Amanda Coyle (ACoy), David Elliott (DE)

**Apologies:** Paul Turner (PTu), Karen Lawrence (KL), Sarah Chare (SC – Environment Agency)

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
1.	<p><b><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductory comments from the chair and welcome, quick round the table intros.</li> <li>• <b>AS</b> gave thanks to the commissioners for moving the work along since the last meeting; noting that the LSDC was now at full contingent (a press release had gone out yesterday), the green finance work is taking shape, the Quality of Life report is on track, and that the cleantech and innovation work continues apace. He also thanked the Secretariat for its proactive work and for the support of Deputy Mayor, Shirley Rodrigues for her support and assistance</li> <li>• <b>AS</b> gave overview of meeting and what we are expecting to achieve.</li> </ul>
2.	<p><b><u>Feedback from Last Full Commission meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AS</b> asked there were any issues arising from the minutes not already covered by the agenda or being handled by working groups; none were raised, so minutes were approved.</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b><u>New work streams – Part 1</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AS</b> outlined the stages for further work stream development. He explained that there were five projects for attendees to consider (an outline for each were circulated with the minutes, and are also annexed to these notes). He explained that these five projects had been subject to initial assessment, to ‘sense check’ against fit with current GLA work (to avoid duplication / support value-add). Following a pitch by the project proposers, there would be further discussion and interrogation of the proposals in a ‘world café’ set-up, to improve / refine the projects. He explained that later in the meeting, there would be a feedback session in which a decision would be made by the group as to which projects would go to the next phase, namely a full work-up, draft ToRs and expressions of interest by Commissioners to join the relevant new working groups</li> <li>• <b>AS</b> also clarified that there is no one-size approach to LSDC workstreams and its work in general: some strands might involve new analysis and think, others may involve providing expert input to GLA activities, others might involve creating formal responses to strategic consultations.</li> </ul>

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposers briefly set out their project outlines; these are annexed, but additional comments from the proposers are below:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Mentoring for boroughs (JH)</b>                    JH explained that this would be based on the ‘Public Practice’ model, in which planners are seconded into boroughs. She clarified that it would be working <i>with</i> senior leadership rather than aiming to fill a resourcing gap. She explained that initial feedback (from borough officers, LECF) was that there was something in this, but that there would be some work needed on resourcing.</li> <li><b>2. Sustainable lifestyles (JH)</b>                    JH explained that this would be a piece of work that would look to promote behaviour change for more sustainable lifestyles – since several of the Quality of Life indicators (household recycling, carbon, water use etc) cannot be addressed without engaging Londoners themselves. She explained that this essentially would be a communications campaign. She clarified that this would not be the LSDC playing an active <i>delivery</i> role as far as behaviour change programming goes, but felt that there was something the LSDC could do from a communications perspective to amplify the work of others.</li> <li><b>3. Quality of green space (DE)</b>                    DE explained that the project would provide a methodology for assessing the quality of green spaces that communities have access to, as well as usage of these spaces. He explained that while access is highly related to quality there is no current measure for this; the project would help address this and contribute to understanding of the state of green spaces why communities were/ were not accessing them. He explained that it was closely linked to the ambitions of the London Environment Strategy, and addressing the QoL indicator related to areas of deficiency of access to nature.</li> <li><b>4. Measuring the social value of regeneration (MA)</b>                    MA explained that this project would define a Social Value &amp; Inclusion Regeneration Framework (SVIRF). She explained that it would help set out a picture of what good social growth and regeneration looks like and mitigate any negative impacts of regeneration. She explained that she had met with GLA staff social policy team) to discuss and that there was appetite for this.</li> <li><b>5. New Energy Zones (NM)</b>                    NM set out the problem: London is the fastest growing city in the country, and there was a need to meet low carbon growth... but central government was not providing a model for how to do this. He explained that London could pioneer the kinds of integrated energy systems that are needed but that cannot be delivered by central governments. He explained that the project proposal is for the LSDC to be the ‘green team’ to bring in expertise (from within and without the commission) to help get a successful bid into the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund to deliver two new energy zones. He explained there was a critical path issue with this project (i.e. when the Fund</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
	<p>becomes live and whether GLA wanted to make a bid – as it would require someone ‘holding the pen’)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AS</b> asked for any clarifying questions/ comments before breaking out into the world cafe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>PTo</b> – emphasised the need to be realistic about and clearly identify resource implications; and to keep in mind outputs to which the LSDC had already committed (including the ‘white papers’ coming out of the QoL report).</li> <li>○ <b>MM</b> – raised point about timelines – some of the projects were time sensitive – <b>AS</b> explained that the aim was to keep to the process set out in the introduction in the first instance but to stay nimble in case swifter action is identified as needed.</li> <li>○ <b>AC</b> – asked about review periods and further opportunities to propose projects throughout the period of this current commission – <b>AS</b> confirmed that there would be an annual review of the work programme to ensure it is both on track and fit-for-purpose.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes from the world café discussions are <b>annexed</b>.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b><u>Existing work programmes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cleantech and Innovation sub group (RT)</b>  <b>RT</b> explained that there had been several updates to the ToRs since the previous LSDC meeting, to incorporate <i>inter alia</i> a focus on increasing inclusion in the sector. He explained that the group was also still working out where its work ended and the GLA’s began.   <b>AS</b> asked for a decision on the draft ToRs – these were approved. These will be further developed as needed as work programmes are progressed</li> <li>• <b>Finance sub group (NM)</b>  <b>NM</b> explained that the group’s work plan had been refined since the last LSDC meeting and in collaboration with the GLA, which was also doing a lot of work internally on green financing. He explained that overall work will answer the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What needs to be done (from policy, regulatory, market and institutional perspective) to attract the finance London needs to deliver a zero carbon, sustainable London, both short-term (to bridge the ‘Brexid Gap’) and long-term (to go ‘above and beyond’)?</li> <li>2. What does the Mayor need to do to achieve this, and what does he need to call on others to do?</li> </ol> He explained that achieving this would involve two main roles / work packages: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Convening / advising – including through workshopping solutions to specific market failures to help achieve Zero Carbon London, and advisory on GLA modelling to clarify scale of requirements.</li> <li>2. Research / Think-piece – using the outputs from the above (possibly with additional workshop?) to develop an external roadmap paper with short-term (bridging the ‘Brexid Gap’ and key demonstration project proposals) and long-term solutions (more ‘green sky’ proposals e.g. London GIB).</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
	<p><b>AS</b> asked for decision on the ToRs – these were approved (with the understanding that there would be refinements as the work programme was finalised).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Quality of Life Report (PT)</b>  <b>PT</b> explained that the report has been finalised by CAG (consultants), has been reviewed by the working group and with a sense check by several of the commissioners and GLA officers. He explained that the Secretariat was pressing ahead with final editing, design and print, with the expectation of online publishing on the 14/15th December. Data will also go on the London Datastore.</p> <p><b>PT</b> asked who would be interested in the next phase of the work (to develop linkage to the SDGs, drawing out the policy papers, etc) – the suggestion was to maintain existing working group membership, with additional membership as and when required.</p> <p><b>Action: All those interested in the next phase of the work to get in touch with the Secretariat.</b></p> </li> <li> <p><b>Communications and engagement (MM)</b>  <b>MM</b> provided an overview of the comms and engagement activities for the Quality of Life report launch, which would be a ‘soft’ launch and would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A press release + supportive mayoral quote, to go to the trade press</li> <li>- Publication on the LSDC website.</li> <li>- Social media from the @LondonSDC account, plus template tweets for commissioners to use from their own handles.</li> <li>- Report distribution via targeted letters and emails based on key audience segments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Commissioners encouraged to tweet on the day, and to let Haley know if there were any organisations with whom they would like to lead in report distribution</b></p> <p><b>MM</b> also explained that draft ToRs for a new sub-group have been developed. If agreed, the group would be responsible for developing and supporting delivery of a strategic communications and engagement strategy for the LSDC to cover the period up to the end of the mayoral term, with a particular emphasis on enhancing the LSDC’s digital media offering (including a new website) and creating LSDC events and publications.</p> <p><b>AS</b> asked for a decision on the ToRs – these were approved.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>LSDC official response to the London Plan</b></p> <p><b>NY</b> explained that there was an LSDC session booked for the 12 January, which should be in Commissioners’ calendars; there would be someone from the London Plan Team there to present, but they needed a steer on which particular areas to focus their presentation on (as the Plan is a hefty document).</p> <p><b>Action: ALL to get in touch with Secretariat with desired focus areas.</b></p> </li> </ul>

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
	<p><b>AS</b> explained that there was a need for a lead commissioner to work with a sub-group to pen the LSDC’s response (and to lead the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>); this could be decided based on the RSVPs to the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>. He also informed the meeting that the Secretariat would seek someone familiar with making input to planning matters to write the document on the basis of the agreed LSDC response.</p> <p><b>NG</b> explained that stakeholder presentations have all been streamed; this includes questions arising from stakeholders. She explained that she cannot lead (as she is head of the Planning Committee) but is keen to be involved in the group. She reminded commissioners that when reading the Plan, that to note whether things are in the main text or in the boxed policy text (if only the former, then the text is not binding)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Action: Secretariat to send links of the stakeholder sessions to commissioners - done</b></p>
5.	<p><b><u>New workstreams - Part 2</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final discussion on the project proposals was provided in plenary.</li> <li>• <b>DZ</b> asked if there was a template for sub-groups, as some may have smaller requirements than others. <b>AS</b> confirmed that there is a template and that there could be flexibility – but in deciding which streams to take forward there was a need to be strategic and to identify the niche that the LSDC was filling with a given piece of work.</li> <li>• <b>NG</b> asked whether the quality of green space proposal is something covered by the London Green Spaces Commission, as feels self-evident that this work be done. <b>NY</b> said that there was a need for a follow-up conversation with GLA’s Green Infrastructure Team.</li> <li>• <b>CW</b> said that there was a need to ensure that the work would not be duplicating anything that was going on internally at GLA / across the boroughs; <b>AS</b> explained that this was part of the selection criteria.</li> <li>• <b>NM</b> said that all seem valuable in their own right, but that there was a need to understand how they would fit within a broader strategic piece. <b>AS</b> explained that the topics covered by the proposals fit within a broad suite of policy areas that the LSDC should be working on.</li> <li>• <b>MA</b> asked if there were any of the five that should not be taken further; <b>JH</b> suggested that based on the world café session, the sustainable lifestyles project seemed the one with the least legs.</li> <li>• <b>AS</b> asked if there was consensus on which, if any, to strike off the list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There was consensus that the sustainable lifestyle project goes no further.</li> <li>○ <b>CW</b> suggested that mentoring for boroughs required additional scoping as she felt a lot was happening at borough level and so needed to test the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda item	Detail and actions (in red)
	<p>assumption that additional assistance (in the form of mentoring) was needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AS</b> suggested that the proposers take away the remaining four proposals and work them up in greater detail, based on criteria set by the secretariat.</li> <li>• <b>NM</b> explained that there were some clear stop/go points build into the NEZ proposal, and that he would share these in the final version.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Secretariat to provide project proposers with notes on their proposals.</b></p> <p><b>Action: Project proposers to refine their project ideas to support final decision-making in the next LSDC meeting.</b></p>
7.	<p><b><u>AOB and date of next meetings</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Quarterly CIB feedback</b> <b>AS</b> and <b>NY</b> explained that the LSDC would be required to provide quarterly updates to CIB (an internal GLA process); this was for information only; <b>NY</b> and <b>AS</b> would be doing the reports, so no action would be required by commissioners (beyond providing any additional sub-group details upon request).</li> <li>• <b>London ESIF Committee representative</b> <b>NY</b> explained that the ESIF (European Structural and Investment Funds) Committee provides advice and recommendations about how the fund is spent. Paul Turner is currently the LSDC representative, but is standing down from the committee. <b>AS</b> put out a call for volunteers; there were none, so <b>ACoy</b> happy to report back as she sits on the committee. <b>UPDATE:</b> CW has subsequently offered to be the LSDC rep on ESIF committee – Next meeting in January.</li> <li>• <b>LSx Sustainability Awards 2018</b> <b>NY</b> explained that LSx runs set of sustainability leadership awards; a brochure had been shared with all commissioners. <b>AS</b> explained that the LSDC was not a partner to the awards <i>per se</i>, but that commissioners were welcome participate (e.g. in judging panels) wearing their LSDC “hats”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Any volunteers to the LSx Sustainability Awards to get in touch with SH directly.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Next meeting: 20 March 2018.</b></li> </ul>