

## Membership Fees – Consultation outcomes

This paper is provided for information only. This paper describes the results of the membership survey into attitudes towards the introduction of membership fees and the Board's decision to proceed with the establishment of LowCVP Partners. The Steering Group were asked to provide guidance on the scope of questions and fee levels to be addressed in the second consultation.

### 1 Introduction

The LowCVP Board has recognised a key threat to the future success of LowCVP is its ability to respond appropriately to the range of available opportunities. The Strategy to 2010 recognises the need to increase available resources to effectively respond to the growing agenda. The introduction of annual membership fees has been identified as the simple and secure means of raising revenue to support an expanded work programme but has the potential to affect participation in the Partnership and thereby reduce its influence. Accordingly, members have been consulted upon details of a possible scheme.

A consultation document explaining the reasons for and details of the possible scheme (Annex A) accompanied the survey questionnaire (Annex B). The survey was issued with several reminders and members provided with a 2.5 week period in which to respond.

### 2 Proposed scheme

It was proposed to graduate membership fees according to the means of the member such that small organisation (turnover <£1.5M, including all not for profit and public sector organisations) would pay £250 per year. A medium sized company (turnover >£1.5M < £50M) would pay £1,000 per year; and large company (turnover >£50M) would pay £5,000 per year. Fees would be introduced from April 2008 with a system to exempt, reduce or defer fees in case of hardship or for other good reason.

Active participation from small organisations was encouraged by providing an option of making an equivalent in-kind contribution of time equal of 4 man-days (30 hours) per year. Medium and large organisations were provided with the option to make a significant in-kind contribution instead of paying fees. In addition, members were asked whether fees should be:

- Entirely voluntary; or,
- Non-paying members should have a lower "Associate" status with reduced membership rights; or
- Fees should be a condition of membership

### 3 Survey outcomes

#### 3.1 Participation

58 members (20%) responded to the survey highlighting the generally low level of member engagement. 38% of responses were from the automotive industry, 10% from the energy industry, 17% from NGOs, 10% research organisations, 25% Others. There was under-representation from the energy industry (that other feedback had indicated was broadly supportive) and over-representation from NGOs compared to overall membership numbers. 58% of responses were from small organisations, 14% from medium-sized and 28% from large companies (greater than their overall representation within LowCVP).

#### 3.2 Support for fees

36% support the principle that members should make a financial contribution to the running costs of LowCVP while 24% are opposed. 40% indicate they support the principle in some circumstances including 22% that supported the principle, if current levels of Government funding are maintained, the Partnership retains its independence and added value can be demonstrated. With these provisos, about two-thirds of members agree they should contribute financially.

47% agree annual fees are an appropriate mechanism for raising revenue from members, 26% disagree and 27% are unsure (12% supporting fees if Government funding or LowCVP independence is maintained). A breakdown of the responses (as a percentage of the total responses) by the size of the member is shown below. With provisos 59% support fees, however, 44% of large companies, that would make the greatest financial contribution, oppose the introduction of annual fees.

	No	Maybe	Yes	Total
<b>Small</b>	18%	29%	53%	100%
<b>Medium</b>	25%	25%	50%	100%
<b>Large</b>	44%	25%	31%	100%

Within sectors, approximately equal numbers support and oppose fees from the automotive sector. A strong majority of members from environmental and consumer and “other” organisations supports fees. Research organisations are uncertain or oppose fees.

Sector	No	Maybe	Yes	Total
<b>Automotive</b>	9	5	8	22
<b>Energy</b>	1	3	2	6
<b>Environmental and consumer</b>	1	3	6	10
<b>Public</b>	0	1	2	3
<b>Research</b>	2	2	0	4
<b>Transport operator</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Other</b>	2	2	8	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>58</b>

Almost three-quarters of members therefore support raising revenues to extend the work of the Partnership – as agreed in the Strategy to 2010. 57% agree with the proposed purpose of fees to appoint two new posts within the Secretariat and to support the work programme. 17% supported the purpose - but oppose the use of annual fees to raise revenues; 12% oppose the proposed purpose of the fees and 14% expressed another view.

The breakdown of responses by member sector illustrates environmental and consumer organisations and “others” are the most supportive of fees and are willing to contribute along with 46% of automotive sector members. No sector has a significant number of members opposing the purpose of the fees.

### 3.3 Member responses to the proposed introduction of fees

Members were asked how they would respond if fees were:

- Mandatory – non payment, without being granted an exemption would lead to membership being discontinued
- Voluntary with reduced rights for non-contributors
- Entirely voluntary.

The results are shown below by size of organisation, but caution must be taken in interpretation due to the small sample for large and medium sized companies. For large organisations the proportion willing to pay increases as you move from an entirely voluntary scheme to one that is mandatory. There is a greater willingness to make an in-kind contribution if the scheme is entirely voluntary and fewer organisations decline to contribute. For medium and small organisations whether the scheme is mandatory or voluntary has a limited influence on willingness to pay.

<b>Fees are:</b>	<b>Agree to pay</b>	<b>Make in-kind contribution</b>	<b>Decline to pay</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Large</b>	<b>Organisation would ...</b>			
Mandatory	33%	0%	53%	13%
Voluntary with reduced rights for non-contributors	27%	13%	47%	13%
Entirely voluntary	20%	27%	33%	20%
<b>Medium</b>				
Mandatory	0%	50%	25%	25%
Voluntary with reduced rights for non-contributors	0%	50%	25%	25%
Entirely voluntary	0%	50%	25%	25%
<b>Small</b>				
Mandatory	19%	44%	28%	8%
Voluntary with reduced rights for non-contributors	14%	44%	28%	14%
Entirely voluntary	17%	50%	28%	6%

**4 Design of proposed fees**

Organisations that supported the principle that members should contribute to the running costs of LowCVP were asked about the optimum design of the proposed scheme.

77% thought introducing the scheme from April 2008 was appropriate and 9% proposed a delay. 61% indicated the proposed thresholds for membership categories were suitable. The remaining views were mixed with most indicating they would prefer more bands. Only 8% of respondents were classified as medium-sized and the rationale for additional bands is therefore weak. There was a common misunderstanding that the turnover was based upon the joining entity not the parent company – as stated in the consultation document.

Overall about two-thirds of those agreeing with the principle (that members should contribute towards the running costs) felt the proposed level of fees was appropriate. Around a third felt fees for medium and small organisations were too high. A quarter indicated fees for large organisations were too high and 12% too low. The results are shown below.

	<b>Too high</b>	<b>Appropriate</b>	<b>Too low</b>
<b>Small</b>	31%	69%	0%
<b>Medium</b>	38%	60%	2%
<b>Large</b>	26%	62%	12%

The proposed arrangements for in-kind contributions from small companies and not-for-profit and public sector organisations were felt to be appropriate by 56%. 16% felt the commitment of time (30 hours/yr) was too demanding and a similar number responded that small and not-for-profit organisations should be required to pay. 11% had another view.

**5 Conclusions**

The level of responses is typical of the low level of commitment from most Partnership’s members (overall about 20% are highly engaged, 20% somewhat active, 60% largely or entirely inactive). Although stakeholder groups and the size profile of organisations in the survey differed from the full LowCVP membership the overall outcomes are thought to be broadly representative.

Almost three-quarters of members support raising revenues to extend the work of the Partnership and support the direction of the strategy to 2010. About two-thirds of members agree, with provisos to the principle of contributing towards running costs. Only a few percent less (59%) support the use of annual fees to raise the revenue. Support is strongest amongst small and medium-sized members with 44% of large members opposing fees – reducing the ability to generate income. No stakeholder group totally opposed to the introduction of fees.

The detailed design of the fee proposal was supported by sizable majorities of members including the proposed implementation date and the level and thresholds for fees. The arrangements for small organisations were supported by a majority of members with diverse opinions expressed by others.

The outcomes of introducing fees are difficult to assess due to the small sample, particularly from large and medium sized organisations. Depending upon the scheme design, between a fifth and a third of large organisations are likely to pay, with up to a quarter making an alternative in-kind or other contribution and about half declining to contribute (unless the scheme is entirely voluntary). For medium-sized organisations it would appear about two-thirds would seek to make an in-kind contribution and a third decline to contribute. About two-thirds of small organisations are willing to contribute. Based upon these figures it is estimated an income of around £50-85K is likely to be generated, largely from larger companies. This would be sufficient to fund at least one post and may contribute some funds towards the work programme. This level of income is lower than originally hoped but nevertheless worthwhile. It is expected some medium sized companies will also financially contribute, making these conservative estimates.

The survey raises important questions about how many members view the “partnership” within LowCVP. With over 265 members, but valuable engagement from only about 100 organisations, LowCVP is more appropriately defined as a Government-funded stakeholder forum. A relatively small proportion of members perceive LowCVP as a genuine partnership between stakeholders. This needs to be recognised in taking forward any system for income generation from members and makes a mandatory scheme too divisive.

Amongst all members the survey identifies greatest support for a voluntary scheme with reduced rights for members as shown below. Notably an entirely voluntary scheme is not widely support – particularly by those willing to pay. It is essential that if a voluntary scheme is introduced it differentiates between members that do and don’t contribute but that this is done in a manner that is not unduly divisive.

Fees should be...	In principle are fees an appropriate way of raising revenue			
	No	Maybe	Yes	Total
<b>Entirely voluntary</b>	9%	5%	2%	<b>16%</b>
<b>Voluntary with differential rights between non/contributors</b>	3%	14%	26%	<b>43%</b>
<b>Mandatory</b>	2%	7%	17%	<b>26%</b>
<b>Other</b>	12%	2%	2%	<b>16%</b>
<b>Total</b>	26%	28%	47%	<b>100%</b>

The consultation document proposed that members not paying fees are given an “Associate” status with a possible option being that they could still attend meetings and actively participate but their views need not be reflected in partnership viewpoints and they could not be members of the Board or Steering Group. Given that most members view LowCVP as a stakeholder forum, the Director concluded, and Board agreed it would not be appropriate to reduce membership rights for non-payment at the present time.

The Director therefore proposed, and Board agreed that members which contribute fees (or make a substantial in-kind-contribution) are made LowCVP Partners (with other members retaining their current membership rights). Partners would be provided with the following additional influence:

1. Priority would be given to Partners that wished to participate on the Steering Group. However, Steering Group membership would continue to comprise a balance of stakeholders.
2. To chair a Working Group, the Steering Group or Board the organisation must be a Partner
3. As LowCVP moved to becoming a company limited by guarantee Partners would be given the opportunity to own LowCVP.
4. Names of Partners would be clearly shown on the LowCVP website and other appropriate literature. The Secretariat would, where possible, support Partner-led activities.

Excluding the points above, existing members would retain their current status, attend meetings and contribute opinions to LowCVP viewpoints. LowCVP could therefore continue to operate through consensus decision-making and as a multi-stakeholder forum with diverse views and interests expressed. This option has the benefit that existing members retain their status whilst offering benefits to those willing to make a greater contribution.

## 6 Next steps

The Board have agreed to proceed with the establishment of LowCVP Partners, but asked the Director to consult again with members on the basis of establishing Partners and specifically the level of fees that should be levied. This will enable the relationship between level of fees, willingness to pay and total income to be examined and an optimal solution defined.

The Director proposed to examine members' views concerning 3 levels of fees (using the same turnover thresholds as employed in the previous consultation):

	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
<b>Small</b>	£100	£250	£500
<b>Medium</b>	£500	£1,000	£2,000
<b>Large</b>	£1,000	£5,000	£7,500

Members were also asked about whether a significant in-kind contribution could provide an appropriate alternative contribution to justify Partner status.

Organisations were asked to indicate through the consultation their willingness to become Partners and contribute accordingly. These organisations would be invoiced in March.

As LowCVP moves to becoming an incorporated company limited by guarantee it is expected Partners would be given the option to become an owner of the new company.

## **Annex A: Membership Fees – Consultation**

### **1 Background**

The LowCVP is the most significant and diverse UK forum in which stakeholders engage to accelerate the shift to low carbon vehicles and fuels and stimulate opportunities for UK businesses. Interest in and deployment of technology to reduce road transport emissions have increased rapidly in the last few years. At the same time, LowCVP membership has doubled to 265 organisations.

The LowCVP Board has recognised a key threat to the future success of LowCVP is its ability to respond appropriately to the range of opportunities available. An inadequately resourced LowCVP (the secretariat presently has only 4.5 staff) is unable to coordinate appropriate member input to Government initiatives risking sub-optimal decision making and potentially missed opportunities. Current resources also limit the Partnership's ability to develop initiatives to support the market for low carbon vehicles and fuels. Unless Secretariat staffing is increased LowCVP's credibility will be reduced by its inability to respond in an informed and timely manner to key issues and its capacity to give leadership by taking forward meaningful initiatives.

This paper outlines the reasons, structure, costs and benefits of the proposed introduction of annual fees for membership. The outcomes of a survey of members will be used by the Board to inform its decision on whether, and if so, how to proceed with the introduction of fees.

### **2 Why support LowCVP?**

LowCVP is a unique forum in which diverse stakeholders collaborate to accelerate the shift to low carbon vehicles and fuels and maximise opportunities for UK businesses. Our membership embraces all major interests and provides expertise through which to build consensus and develop knowledge and understanding. LowCVP's close relationship with Government provides an effective forum through which to learn about and effectively influence policy and programme developments. It also provides a vehicle through which to develop collaborative initiatives and identify new partners with which to work. Some of LowCVP's extensive list of achievements are listed in Annex I to this document. If LowCVP didn't exist it would need to be created.

### **3 Why does LowCVP need to introduce membership fees?**

The growing agenda and demands from members necessitate increased resources within the Secretariat and to support the work programme. Specifically income will be used to create two new posts within the Secretariat whose work would be focussed upon:

1. Promoting the purchase of low carbon vehicles
2. Supporting the introduction of new low carbon vehicle technology and assisting UK business in benefitting from the shift.

Both roles will seek to take forward specific member-led initiatives to encourage the market and supply of low carbon technologies but work closely with Government initiatives in each area. The new roles would also allow the fuels agenda to continue to be supported by a dedicated person. Specific activities covered by the two new roles are detailed in Annex II but include enabling LowCVP to diversify its activities to address some aspects of the wider integrated approach to reducing road transport emissions (such as promoting eco-driving a specific request of motor industry stakeholders). It will also enable LowCVP to more actively engage in relevant EU discussions – such as regarding biofuels sustainability and consumer information. The posts will also enable LowCVP to more actively support the *Act on CO2* campaign and encourage adoption of low carbon vehicles by fleets thereby directly encouraging sales of low carbon vehicles.

### **4 What do I get for my money?**

Membership of LowCVP indicates an organisation's commitment to tackling greenhouse gas emissions from road transport. Membership of LowCVP enables organisations to:

1. Demonstrate leadership and their serious intent to encourage a low carbon transport future

2. Learn about the direction of UK and European policy developments including advance notice of the direction of thinking from officials
3. Raise and take forward their specific concerns with a wider, and therefore more influential, group of stakeholders
4. Effectively influence the direction of policy and scope of programmes and regulations. LowCVP's consensual, objective advice has been highly influential in shaping UK policy (see Annex I).
5. Input to the content and delivery of the LowCVP work programme to ensure this is focused upon members' key concerns and priorities
6. Ensure their voice, and the outcomes of Partnership initiatives, are effectively heard in relevant EU discussions
7. Engage with and develop effective working relationships with other members including supply chain companies, major fleets and environmental organisations
8. Receive discounts for the LowCVP annual conference and other events endorsed by the Partnership
9. Be informed about unique marketing opportunities for your business
10. Receive timely news updates on key developments, a monthly newsletter and access to the wealth of knowledge within the "Members Only" section of the website.

## **5 Won't introducing fees discourage participation from small and not-for-profit organisations and give greater influence to larger organisations?**

This has been a significant concern of members and is addressed in the design of the scheme by:

- Graduating fees allowing for ability to pay
- Allowing members to make alternative in-kind contributions
- Waiving fees for appropriate reasons (at the discretion of the Director).

LowCVP operates on a one-member one-view basis. It is not unduly influenced by the size of member organisations and will continue to reach decisions through consensus.

## **6 Won't introducing fees reduce membership and influence?**

The objective for the fees is to increase Partnership influence through better resourcing for its activities. Prior to a decision being made on fees the Board has insisted members are fully consulted, through this survey. In deciding whether, and if so how, to proceed the Board will carefully examine whether the introduction of fees will lead to a sizable number of members leaving the Partnership; or any significant stakeholder group becoming disassociated.

## **7 Why can't Government just increase its support for LowCVP?**

At present, LowCVP is largely funded by an annual Government grant from the DfT and DBERR. In-kind contributions (the value of members' time) broadly match this. Government Departments have indicated that the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review means they cannot significantly increase LowCVP funding in future years, although they have no plans to reduce funding if membership fees are introduced.

There is also benefit in obtaining a better balance of funding between Government and other bodies by not being solely, or largely dependent upon a single source of income. It is also hoped establishing fees will encourage members to become more fully engaged in the work and activities of LowCVP

## **8 How much might my organisation have to pay?**

It is proposed to graduate membership fees according to the means of the member such that for:

- Small organisation (turnover <£1.5M) - £250 per year  
This includes all not for profit and public sector organisations
- Medium company (turnover >£1.5M < £50M) - £1000 per year



- Large company (turnover >£50M) - £5000 per year.

## **9 When might fees be introduced?**

It is proposed that membership fees are introduced from April 2008 for medium and large companies and from April 2009 for small organisations. Turnover will be calculated based upon the joining entity, not the parent company, to ensure small specialist businesses within larger entities are not unduly burdened by disproportionately high fees.

## **10 Is there an alternative to paying fees?**

In the first year of the scheme small organisations will have the option of making an equivalent in-kind contribution of staff time equal to about 4 man-days (30 hours) of effort engaged in Partnership activities. Small organisations making this effort in 2008/9 will be exempt from the payment in April 09. Going forward each small organisation making an appropriate in-kind contribution will have fees waived for the following year.

Medium and large organisations will be asked to pay the membership fee in the first year, unless they make an alternative and significant in-kind contribution. Such agreements must be made in advance with the Director and may include: secondments of staff or provision of equipment or resources to deliver agreed projects. For medium and large organisations attendance at meetings and input to Partnership discussions would not be considered an appropriate alternative in-kind contribution.

Chairs of Working Groups and the Chair of the Steering Group will be considered to make such an appropriate in-kind contribution.

The Director will have the authority to exempt, reduce or defer fees in case of hardship or for other good reason. In the event a company does not agree with the decision of the Director they may appeal in writing to the LowCVP Board that will adjudicate.

## **11 How will in-kind contributions be calculated?**

In-kind contributions from members will be monitored by the Secretariat. To reduce administration the system will be simplified such that:

- Attendance at a Steering Group, Working Group or Sub-Group meeting will be equivalent to 5 man-hours effort
- Providing comments on a major LowCVP document will be equivalent to 3 man-hours effort
- Other special contributions will be judged by the Secretariat on their merits with advice from members.

The system will mean that for the average small organisation they will be exempted from paying fees in 2009/10 if they, for example, attend 3 working group and two sub-group meetings and contributed comments on two documents during 2008/9.

## **12 What happens if I do not pay fees?**

The proposal is for medium and large organisations to pay fees from April 2008. Those companies requesting special dispensation must do so before April 2008.

Small organisations will be exempted from paying fees in 2008/9 and their membership will continue. During 2008/9 small organisations will be periodically reminded of their responsibility to make an appropriate in-kind contribution if they wish to avoid the payment of fees in 2009/10. Small organisations that do not make an appropriate in-kind contribution during 2008/9, or obtain a dispensation from the Director, will be expected to pay membership fees of £250 in April 2009.

Whether there should be sanctions for members that do not pay fees remains a contentious issue. Members will be asked to express an opinion and preference in the survey. Possible options are:

1. No sanctions – fees are entirely voluntary

2. Members not paying fees are provided with “Associate” status. The rights of Associate Members would need to be defined. A possible option is that they could still attend meetings and actively participate but their views need not be reflected in partnership viewpoints and they could not be members of the Board or Steering Group.
3. Members not paying fees are not eligible to continue to participate.

### **13 Couldn't the major trade organisations pay instead, or provide staff?**

Not all members are also part of larger trade organisations and LowCVP also operates on the basis of one member one view. However, if groups of companies wish to approach the Director with a collective proposal this would be considered as an alternative to individual payments.

### **14 What happens if members reject paying fees?**

LowCVP will continue to operate but its planned activities and work programme will be significantly reduced. Specific proposals that are unlikely to proceed include:

- Extending activities to address aspects of the wider integrated approach such as eco-driving technologies, low rolling resistance tyres and appropriate vehicle maintenance
- Biofuels kitemark scheme (beyond the present feasibility study)
- Labelling for nearly new vehicles
- Public sector fleet initiative
- Work to support the *Act on CO2* campaign.

The Secretariat will also need to review the frequency of meetings. It will not be possible for LowCVP to respond and contribute to the range of anticipated Government reviews, announcements and new programmes or European developments.

Current resource dedicated to the fuels agenda will also be required to work on other areas of the LowCVP work programme, reducing the resources available for fuels.

### **15 What happens next?**

The outcomes of the survey and other inputs will inform discussions at the next Board meeting in November at which point a decision how to proceed will be made. Members will be informed at the beginning of December.

### **Addendum 1 What has LowCVP achieved?**

LowCVPs achievements include:

- Successful launch and roll out of fuel economy label
  - Now displayed in 84% of showrooms
  - 44% recognition amongst new car buyers
  - 70% car-buyers say it is important information in their purchase decision
- Overseeing the successful establishment of Cenex
  - Successfully lobbied for £6M Government funding of a public-private centre of excellence for low carbon and fuel cell technologies. LowCVP also oversaw the establishment of Cenex and is now represented on its Board ensuring activities benefit all parts of the motor industry
  - Developed a research, development and demonstration priorities matrix for low carbon vehicle technologies to inform priorities for funding support.
- Successfully managing the development of carbon and sustainability (C&S) reporting as part of the Renewable Transport Fuels Obligation
  - LowCVP undertook the original feasibility study leading to the introduction of sustainability reporting within the RTFO
  - It has also managed an extensive stakeholder engagement and piloting process to ensure the scheme was both robust but practical
- Promoting innovation in new policy and advertising approaches via competition ‘Challenges’

- Successive annual conferences featured innovative thinking on policy and advertising concepts to promote low carbon vehicles and fuels
- LowCVP studies have helped to:
  - Enhance understanding of car buyer behaviour – providing key inputs to inform the King Review and Act on CO2 campaign
  - Establish greenhouse gas savings from wheat to ethanol processes. The work was instrumental in demonstrating the importance of rewarding biofuels for their greenhouse gas savings that is now proposed from 2010
  - Establish CO2 emissions from a variety of vans operating with different drive cycles and loadings – further testing is planned
  - Define a low carbon bus – a key component of proposed future support for low carbon bus technologies
- Development of extensive communications services including specialist conferences, monthly newsletter, research and news information portal through the website.
- Successful engagement with Government (in 2006/7 we met with officials on more than 200 occasions). Our responses and inputs to a range of Government consultations have led to a range of recent announcements

#### LowCVP Recommendation

#### Government Announcement

☐ Support for small fleet trials & greater use of forward commitment procurement	☐ £20M public sector demonstration fund
☐ Increased Government procurement of low carbon vehicles	☐ New target of 130g/km (non-operational vehicles)
☐ Low Carbon Transport Innovation Platform	☐ £30M for funding Platform
☐ Public communications campaign to encourage low carbon car purchase	☐ £5M Act on CO2 campaign launched
☐ Funding of research on carbon emissions from vans and trucks	☐ Work to commence shortly with LowCVP
☐ Reform of bus subsidy to support low carbon models & greater local authority influence	☐ Putting Passengers First proposals
☐ Future linkage of RTFO certificates to biofuel GHG savings	☐ To commence in 2010 subject to caveats
☐ Increase incentives for low carbon vehicles	☐ Widening of VED bands
	☐ Reduced company car tax rates for vehicles <120g/km

#### Addendum – Outline roles for additional post

The role **promoting the purchase of low carbon vehicles** will specifically focus upon:

- Working with third parties and undertaking activities to increase public understanding and consumer demand for low carbon vehicles and fuels
- Working with third parties to increase awareness, understanding and the application of eco-driving techniques
- Investigating the most effective channels through which to promote improved vehicle maintenance, including tyre choice and optimal pressure, as a means of reducing CO2 emissions
- Developing a programme of work specifically tailored to businesses operating and managing fleets to encourage the adoption of low carbon choices
- Developing a programme of work to encourage local authorities to both procure and promote the use of low carbon vehicles
- Developing a programme of work to encourage fleets to both procure and promote the use of low carbon vehicles.

This role will seek to work closely with the DfT *Act on CO2* campaign and fulfil the ambition for LowCVP to diversify its activities to encompass some aspects of the Integrated Approach.

The role **supporting the introduction of new low carbon vehicle technologies** will focus upon:

- Activities to develop and promote new road-mapping tools
- Supporting potential transition to a hydrogen economy
- Supporting specific technologies to realise their potential. For example, electric vehicles, high blend biofuels, biomethane. (Note: these activities would seek to address specific issues encountered by technologies and would not represent LowCVP endorsement of one technology option over another).
- Ensuring widespread industry engagement in new Government initiatives in this area including:
  - Low Carbon Public Procurement Programme
  - Innovation Platform
  - King Review
- Activities to assist UK business benefit from the shift to low carbon technologies.

The two posts will enable the fuels agenda to continue to be supported by a dedicated resource within the Secretariat.

## **Annex 2 - Membership Fees – Questionnaire**

### **Section 1 - Member details**

Name (text box)

Organisation (text box)

Q1. Type of organisation (tick one)

- Automotive industry (including suppliers)
- Energy (fuels) industry
- Research
- Environmental or consumer organisation
- Transport operator
- Public sector
- Other

Q2 Size of organisation (tick one)

- Small (turnover <£1.5M, plus all not for profit and public sector)
- Medium (turnover >1.5M and < £50M)
- Large (turnover >£50M)

Q3 Would you personally be able to authorise payment of the fee? (tick one)

- Yes
- No
  - (please indicate who would have authority) (text box)
- Don't know

### **Section 2 – Appropriateness of fees**

Q4 In principle, is it appropriate for members to make a financial contribution towards the running costs of LowCVP? (tick one)

- Yes
- Maybe
  - (please explain the circumstances in which it would and wouldn't be appropriate) (text box)
- No

- Q5 In principle, are annual membership fees an appropriate way of LowCVP raising funds from members? (tick one)
- Yes
  - Maybe
    - (please explain the circumstances in which it would and wouldn't be appropriate) (text box)
  - No
    - (please explain your reasons) (text box)

*NB: if you answered No do not complete Section 3 below.*

- Q6 LowCVP proposes to introduce fees to fund two additional posts within the Secretariat and use any additional revenue to support the work programme. Do you agree that: (tick one)
- This is an appropriate use of annual fees
  - This is an appropriate objective – but annual fees are the wrong way of raising revenue
    - (please explain how you think LowCVP should raise the revenue required) (text box)
  - This is not an appropriate objective
  - Other
    - (please explain here) (text box)

Q7 On-balance, if LowCVP implemented annual fees in the ways proposed would your organisation (tick one in each row)

Fees are:	My organisation would ...			
	Agree to pay	Make in-kind contribution	Decline to pay	Other
Mandatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Entirely voluntary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Voluntary but reduced membership rights for non-contributors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please elaborate on your answer if required (text box)

**Section 3 – Design of fees** (only answer this section if you agree either fully, or with conditions, that annual fees are an appropriate way for LowCVP to raise funds from members – see Q5)

- Q8 If LowCVP introduced annual membership fees should this be: (tick one)
- Mandatory, such that only contributors may continue as members
  - Mandatory, with reduced membership rights for non-contributors
  - Entirely voluntary, with no distinction between those that do and don't contribute
  - Other
    - (please explain) (text box)
- Q9 LowCVP proposes fees should be payable from April 2008 for medium and large organisations and April 2009 for small organisations. Are the proposed dates of introduction: (tick one)
- Appropriate
  - Too soon
    - State when the fees should be introduced (text box)
  - Other
    - Please explain here (text box)

Q10 Are the proposed level of fees: (tick one for each size of organisation)

Size of organisation	Too high	Appropriate	Too low
Small, public sector and not for profit (£250 or 30 hrs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medium (£1,000)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large (£5,000)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Please add any comment here (text box)

Q11 Are the proposed thresholds (categories of membership): (tick one)

- Appropriate
- Inappropriate
  - State the thresholds you would prefer (text box)
- Other
  - Please explain here (text box)

Q12 Are the proposed arrangements for in-kind contributions from small companies and not for profit and public sector organisations: (tick one)

- Appropriate
- Too generous, the organisation should commit to providing more time
  - State the amount of in-kind contribution you believe is appropriate in hours (text box)
- Too demanding, the organisation should not need to commit to providing so much time
  - State the amount of in-kind contribution you believe is appropriate in hours (text box)
- Inappropriate, all organisations should make a financial contribution
- Other
  - Please explain here (text box)

Q13 Please add any additional comments here (text box)