

LONDON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Notes of a meeting held on 19 September 2006

10.00 am to 13.00 pm in Committee Room 4, City Hall

Present:

June Barnes (Chair)	East Thames Group
Nigel Bell	Imperial College
Dinah Cox	Race on the Agenda
Peter Head	Arup
Shaun McCarthy	BAA, Action Sustainability
Sue Riddlestone	BioRegional
Penny Shepherd	UK Social Investment Forum
Richard Stephenson	Transport for London
Robin Stott	Consultant Physician

Observers:

Penny Bramwell	Government Office for London
----------------	------------------------------

GLA:

Mark Watts	Senior Policy Adviser, Transport, Air Quality & Energy
Frances Mapstone	Head of Policy Support Unit
Shirley Rodrigues	Head of Environment
Emma Synnott	GLA Policy Support Unit
Niall Machin	GLA Policy Support Unit
Jane Anson	GLA Business Support Unit

Presentation given by:

Shaun McCarthy

Apologies:

Samantha Heath, Paul de Zylva, Mike Tuffrey, Ranjit Baxi,

1. Introductions and declarations of interest

Membership – Chair announced that Tom Burke's membership on the Commission had been relinquished. June had also had contact with Simon Woolley who had indicated that he would be in touch shortly about his future with the Commission.

Declarations of interest

JB noted that East Thames Group was bidding for the Olympic Village development.

PH noted that Arup was working with the ODA on supporting the SD elements of delivery.

Robin Stott is a trustee of Bioregional and is on the LSDC 2012 subgroup

Shaun McCarthy announced his application for the new post of Chair for the 2012 subgroup.

Emma Synnott – congratulations to Emma who was recently appointed Senior SD Officer.

One additional post for the Secretariat has been agreed and recruitment for the post ES has vacated is now underway. Recruitment for the other additional post will occur once it has been approved by the Assembly BMAC committee.

2. Best Value Review – draft Service Improvement Plan

NM reported on progress with the BVR and its three key stages: start up, evaluation and completion. Following a slight delay, the evaluation stage is expected to finish on 20 September. The Performance Review Advisory Group is keen to move towards the next phase and implement the LSDC recommendations.

The following **actions** were agreed before Annex C was discussed in more detail:

- Commissioner Code – to set out clear rules of engagement and responsibility including behaviour at meetings and the Chair’s role in ensuring that the Code is being followed.
- To revise the Code in a more positive way.
- Recruitment – to identify skills and knowledge before recruiting.
- To appoint individuals with expertise and from different sectors including the functional bodies but no observers.
- To consider how the LSDC should work with the press and media.
- Independence and Government – to request clarification about mutual obligations in relation to independence and the link to resources from the Mayor, GLA and functional bodies (could be in the form of an MOU).
- Terms of Reference – to include equal opportunities.
- Commissioners to comment by email with a view to completion at the end of the month;
- MOU/Code to cover the expectations of the Commission of the secretariat

SD Framework

It was noted that Defra was asking regions to review their frameworks so that they fall in line with the national framework (4Es and 4R and 5 overarching themes). JB noted that the LSDC Framework reflects key national aspirations but could be more explicitly contextualised within the national framework.

It was generally agreed not to change the LSDC Framework but to better define the social justice and environmental elements more clearly, particularly in relation to the Gaps and Opportunities report.

JB suggested that the Commission consider ways to contextualise the framework in the context of the national SD strategy at the away day.

Action:

ES and NM to prepare suggested amendments to the framework for consideration at the Away Day.

Annex C attached to the report.

Role and remit of LSDC (CAG 24 to 30)

It was queried whether the LSDC should adopt a watch-dog role for London. It was agreed that the Commission's role need not be a watch-dog role as London was generally taking SD issues more seriously. Agreed to review its role in a year to eighteen months time.

Independence and Governance (CAG 25)

Agreed to discuss the Commission's investment in legal status and independence status at the LSDC Awayday on 27th November.

Recruitment (CAG 26)

Agreed that the appointment of individuals who represent sectors is the right way forward. The interview panel would include the LSDC Chair unless their time as Chair is due to come to an end. Agreed that Members should serve no more than 6 years on the Commission and it was recommended to incorporate a rotation scheme so that members rotate every 2 to 4 years to fill casual vacancies. All members are to be asked in writing how long they wish to stay on the Commission.

Raising profile with Mayor and GLA Group (CAG 28)

Agreed to ask Mike Tuffrey to provide a brief note on the role of the Assembly for the next meeting.

Transparency

How best to engage with the public sector? It is proposed to host a sustainable development forum twice a year inviting interested parties to look at a particular topic and give feedback to the Commission. It was suggested that this proposal could be linked with the Mayor's State of London debate. Agreed to raise with Mark Watts and report back.

Make up of Commission (CAG 32)

Commissioners would be required to represent TfL, LDA, the Assembly, ALG and GOL. The purpose of interview would be to ascertain commitment from prospective members. Agreed to look at how the national strategy's 5 themes relate to the Commission's skills audit.

Action Secretariat

3. Defra SD Innovation Fund

RS reported that he would be writing to DEFRA about the DEFRA Innovation Fund in terms of the onerous requirements being placed on regional bodies for the level of funding provided.

It was noted that bids for the second round of funding were due with DEFRA in November. ES suggested that it would be useful if Commissioners sent in by email a one-page proposal for the Steering Group to consider. Offers will be subject to match funding or attached to other funds. Funding would not be available to add-on to an existing project unless it has an identifiable and separate outcome. Bids need to be in to the Steering Group by the 17th of November.

ES agreed to review the Commission's work programme against potential funding opportunities.

Action:

Commissioners to send through project proposals to ES by 20th October.
RS to write to DEFRA re reporting requirements

4. 2012 Games – Independent Assurance

SM gave a presentation on the 2012 Games Independent Assurance.

General comments included:

The question of whether the assurance framework would include a focus on legacy. SMC indicated that the remit agreed by the Olympic Board included a focus on legacy. PH noted that there is no masterplan for the legacy yet, and so it is almost impossible for effective planning of legacy to occur.

PS queried whether members appointed to sit on the 2012 Sub group would also sit on the Commission? The work had the potential to attract a lot of interest from SD experts but it was suggested that the time scale to make the appointments was possibly too short for a target date in November. It was proposed that more time would be made available to flag up opportunities and appoint people on a competitive basis.

JB suggested that individuals who apply be asked to identify whether they would also be interested in sitting on the full Commission.

It was noted that the varying interests of the ODA and other organisations needed to be made clearer in terms of legacy. The Olympic boroughs would necessarily want a relationship with legacy as a priority whereas the ODA is necessarily focussed on delivering infrastructure for the Games.

In terms of the Commission's capacity to comment more generally on issues beyond those in the scope of the Assurance framework, there needed to be a clear method for doing this which did not jeopardise the role of the LSDC 2012 Sub-Group in performing assurance.

It was proposed that where the Commission as a whole wanted to provide general advice to the ODA or the Mayor on the Olympics, this should occur through the Planning and Development Sub-Group.

The assurance role of the LSDC 2012 Sub-Group could be quarantined, from broader comments – maintaining the integrity of their role and their independence.

Action

- Planning and Development Subgroup chaired by Peter Head agreed to take general issues re the Olympics forward (separate to Assurance role).
- JB agreed to circulate a copy of a report East Thames has commissioned on disadvantaged communities and the Games to Commission members.

5. Challenge London Project

ES reported that the Commission would be appointing consultants to conduct the project in three stages over a three-month period and would be financed jointly by the LSDC and Defra. A copy of the consultant's brief would be circulated to the Executive Subgroup for comments. There would also be an opportunity for Commissioners to discuss the outcome of phase one of the project at the Awayday.

It was noted that it would be important for the assessment framework to incorporate the Commission's four Rs, and for the outcomes to be clear from the project in terms of the case study documentation.

Action

- ES to ensure the Commission's Framework is used as part of a checklist for assessing case studies, and to ensure that it addresses the national 5 themes contained in the UK SD strategy.

6. Awayday

JB outlined the agenda for the Away Day, focussing on:

- Report from consultants on phase one of the Sustainability Challenge London project and Commissioner feedback to consultants;
- Governance proposals for the Commission emanating from the Best Value Review;
- Commission workplan (reviewing priorities for 2006/07 and 2007/08)

JB noted that one of the key reasons for reviewing priorities for the workplan was to ensure that it is fit for purpose given the newly proposed funding from TfL and LDA including a new staff member.

JB indicated that there would be an effort to seek the Mayor's attendance at the end of the day to hear a wrap-up of the Commission's plans. In addition, it was suggested that Mark Watts present to the Commission on the Mayor's plans in terms of climate change.

Mark Watts agreed to do a presentation on climate change. He indicated that the timing for the Mayor was good and he would seek to ensure he is able to attend on the day.

Action

- Mark Watts agreed to present climate change at the Awayday.
- MW to see if the Mayor will be able to attend towards the end of the afternoon.

7. Sub group updates

GLA Group

It was noted that RS had been appointed as interim Chair of this group and would be able to provide an update on progress after the next meeting, scheduled for the 5th October.

Promotions

Proposals for revising the Commission's site on the GLA web was progressing well and details would be circulated to members.

Priorities for 2006/07 and 2007/8 to be agreed once the Commission has reviewed its work programme.

It was noted that the promotions group agreed to support the development of a proposal for the DEFRA Innovation Fund on sustainable finance.

Discussions at the last meeting also focussed on better refining the role of the LSDC in promoting SD in London. JB indicated that she would be discussing this issue with Murz and Mark when she met them in November.

MW welcomed the opportunity to discuss how the LSDC could contribute to the Mayoral promotions campaign. JB suggested that the LSDC might be able to particularly focus on the links between environmental, social and economic sustainability issues.

Olympic 2012 subgroup

Discussed in SMC's presentation.

Planning and Development sub-group

PH thanked Commissioners who commented on the SA scoping reports for water, waste, climate change adaptation and on the London Plan.

PH asked ES to check with the London Plan Team on what progress had been made in terms of aligning the BRE/WWF checklist with the SPG on Sustainable Design and Construction. ES noted that BRE had presented to a meeting of GLA representatives on the on-line version of the checklist, but there were still some issues to be resolved. ES agreed to arrange a meeting with Jane Carlsen to return to discussion on the WWF checklist.

It was also agreed that the Planning and Development Group needed to focus at its next meeting on the level of involvement of the LSDC in commenting on the London Plan Review proposals during the public consultation phase.

8. AoB.

JB sought views, projects and initiatives that Commissioners have been involved with which might be of interest to the Commission.

RS - Lewisham inaugural meeting of its SD group. Agreed that RS give a presentation about the LSDC.

PH - ARUP developing a project between Britain and China to establish a British/China research consortium to mirror activity. Proposal to be signed on 16 October. LDA and TfL might be interested. Also a possible case study for Challenge London - Culture SD. MW expressed an interest in the proposal and asked PH to send through further details.

PS - UK social investment forum is undertaking a project with London Energy Partnership on asset finance and low/zero carbon projects.

PS also noted that she is a trustee of London 21 responsible for LS Weeks (Love London) and also a trustee of Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association that plans to improve living and working conditions for local residents – making the point that sustainability must incorporate liveability in central London – not just enterprise.

DC – ROTA is very much focused on sustainable development. One project at the moment particularly focuses on homelessness in BAME households and aims to improve access to core services for homeless people.

JB – East Thames is working with the New Deal Team in the Thames Gateway to create a new CHP project working with partners to tackle climate change at a community level. Looking to use the CHP unit as an education tool/centre for sustainable energy and to fund local community projects.

NM - Bridge House Estates Trust Fund – CO2 footprint analysis. Looking at how to promote SD.

End of meeting

Next meeting of the full Commission is on 12 December 2006 at 10.00 am in Committee Room 1