

# The Climate Partnership (TCP)

14<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Board meeting via zoom

## Attendees

- Chair: Barnaby Briggs (BB)
- Sarah Bowden (SB)
- Chris Joyce (CJ)
- Simon Wilkes (SW)
- Rita Bulusu (RB)
- Cllr Donna Stimson (DS)
  
- Nick Baird – sent apologies

## **1. Introductions and update**

- BB has had about 25 meetings with stakeholders. Generally positive and there is a lot of activity already in this space. BB will bring some feedback to the next Board meeting
- BB will be speaking with Eton College who are developing an outreach strategy and interested in joining the TCP
- BB will circulate paperwork to set up CIC and confirming board members before 17 June
- Press release has been [released](#)
- Registering the CIC under The Climate Partnership – even if we need to register under The Climate Partnership and potentially change the public name later

## **2. Agree previous meeting minutes**

The only action was that Duncan Sharkey has confirmed BB as board chair and the Board Members are formally approved

## **3. Validate vision and mission**

**NB BB will redraft vision and mission based on the input from this meeting, noted here for the record:**

### Vision

SB – Reducing GHGs is only one part of addressing the climate issue and maybe we should consider including adaption which is missing from the current council strategy

- Should consider not just reversing biodiversity loss but also preserving existing biodiversity. Focus on the cause not the impact
- Should Windsor and Maidenhead be replaced with “the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead”

BB suggested including a map in the vision

SW – should we include reducing energy consumption not just reduce GHG emissions

DS – vision should be positive so instead of using language about ‘reducing or limiting impact’ make it an inspiration positive vision of the future

CJ – can flip the statement to a positive vision

SB – should be imagining the future. A previous group had created a positive vision of RBWM previously.

BB – is one issue more important than the other?

SB – the priority is health and wellbeing and we do that by reducing climate risk

SB- Is this the vision for TCP or what TCP will deliver

RB need to include the vision for RBWM and the vision for the TCP itself

### Mission

- SW – “Act as a catalyst for partners to initiate projects and access resources rather than as a sole funder” should be higher up in the list and is a greater priority
- CJ – scaling/ rolling out existing good ideas should be a priority for the TCP. TCP needs to be doing ‘tangible’ things and delivering change. Bringing people together
- SB – currently a mixture of the ‘what’ and the ‘how’. The council’s work on the corporate plan which had a structure
  - Need to divide up the mission into the what and how and maybe reflect the structure of council’s plan
  - Focus not just on tangible but scalable projects and a clear exist plan for the TCP so they are sustainable
- DS – the current vision is the mission, and the current mission is the ‘how’
  - So maybe update as needed
  - Need to fail fast but having done something before failing
- CJ – TCP can create the pilots of viable projects and then support others to scale
- SB – TCP to incubate and pilot
- CJ – particularly keen to support growth
- SB – do differently rather than just do more so TCP should be looking to how things can be done different
- BB – there is always a danger of ‘over consulting’ and too much feedback. Stakeholder consultation is an enabler rather than the core activity
- CJ – Shouldn’t be governing by committee. The intent of TCP is to broadly engage with people. Currently don’t want to rule anything out at this stage
- SW – consultation should be focussed on ‘how’ objectives can be achieved rather than on the details of what is being delivered
- BB – ‘stakeholder leadership’ is stakeholders able to lead, promoting unique ideas and creating a platform to discuss innovation
- SB – there is a different between listening and stakeholders having a vote on everything and we should be aiming for the latter
- SB – need to discuss whether the TCP has a role in lobbying rather than just showing examples of positive actions
- SW – different developers are at very different levels when it comes to net zero builders.
- SW – offering to do a tour of L&G’s Maidenhead current construction sites and their approach to biodiversity, net zero etc.

- SB – could invite other stakeholders to join the tour to highlight that TCP isn't a 'greenwashing' exercise
- CJ – does think TCP could be uniquely positioned to lobby gov as it will represent different stakeholders and therefore offers a stronger voice.
- CJ – thinks the tour is a good idea and work out how you can replicate some of the ideas or create a set of 'learnings' for business
- SB – these learnings can inform the planning process to what best practice looks like

#### 4. AOB

- BB – should the TCP be supporting a GWR funded cycling initiative specifically to reduce bike theft?
  - CJ – the borough is putting in a bid so TCP could support the borough's bid or can create a separate TCP bid
  - SW – TCP would benefit from the process of creating a bid and would be useful for the future
  - SB – Could the council be part of the TCP's bid
- CJ – bid is due in end of June. Current bid
  - SEN adaptive ebikes
  - Buying bikes for schools
  - Way finding
- SB – thinks it is quick win to get this
- BB to follow up with CJ on current borough bid

#### 5. Action items

Action	Owner	Due date
Send around on email the information requirements to confirm board members	BB	15 June
Redraft the vision and mission statements and circulate over email	BB/ RB	24 June and discussion at next Board meeting
BB to follow up with CJ on the GWR bid	BB/ CJ	asap
Stakeholder engagement feedback	BB	Next meeting