

		IP
3.0	<p>LiFE Review – Paper 15.05.02 (Confidential)</p> <p>IP presented the paper. It was confirmed that if the contracts were terminated that we were not liable for debt. IP explained an additional option of providing the LiFE tool free and charge for on-site assessment. This would include removing the document repository aspect of the tool and moving the tool to the EAUC website and therefore terminating the current contracts with Wildfire and ESD Consulting. It was discussed the main issues were lack of control and the reputational risk and it was agreed that the programme cannot continue as currently so a change of the programme is required.</p> <p>Actions/suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed to make the tool free to Members to add value to Membership • A framework agreement for consultants for providing paid for support should be agreed with sector procurement groups • Accreditation to be available for each priority area (with less value than the whole Award, e.g. British Standards). It was discussed that an annual cycle was too short and suggestions were to mirror similar schemes such as ISO 14001 which has a 3 year cycle, with a two year cycle as minimum • Communications are critical. There is a requirement to recognise those that have already gone through the programme to show continuity, as well as current participants. A suggestion was that this group could form a stakeholder group to advise on future improvements • Guidance on presentation of evidence will be required – e.g. expectations of documents/evidence prior to assessment • It was suggested that internal assessment by students could be recommended (similar to QAA) – this may not be applicable across all Priority Areas such as Leadership and Governance. • A quick taster or overview of where the institution currently scores was suggested • Due to reputational risk it was suggested not to link with the Green League • A timetabled plan of action needs to be drawn up • A suggestion for a revised name to go with the launch such as LiFE Plus to show distinction • ESD Consulting will continue as the key partner but on a new basis. 	IP
4.0	<p>Corporate Relationship Manager Post Review – Paper 15.05.03 (Confidential)</p> <p>IP presented the paper. DS commented that it appeared dysfunctional that the post is not responsible for the Conference and Green Gown Awards income. DS commented that many Members were uncomfortable with Company Member offers and a more holistic approach should be taken. FG provided an overview of responses received from the MAC (6 responses received) with the majority valuing case studies from Company Members as well as out of sector case studies. The company's own sustainability journey was not considered to be as important as a presumption exists that the EAUC have verified this. Resources on the website seem to be the most favoured form of sharing knowledge. The responses regarding Company Member offers were more negative and potential breach of procurement guidelines were a concern as well as conflict with existing consortiums.</p>	



IB joined the meeting and presented an overview. IB stated that the approach taken is to build relationships. When he joined in June 2011, the economy was in recession. The majority of existing contacts were people who ran events and not the appropriate budget holders. The trend moving forward is that companies are starting to get their budgets back and are getting interested in colleges due to external funding (such as CCIF) and universities are spending more. However companies used to attend 7-8 conferences a year and now they are focusing on more like 4 per year and we need to ensure that we keep the EAUC as one of the 4. There has been an upward trend of income from Membership and sponsorship but it all takes time. Retention rates are also on the way up which reduces the churn and resources to maintain Members. There has been a rise in the number of Company Members attending the Conference. Larger companies are more interested in the Platinum sponsorship and have the mind-set for sharing knowledge, such as webinars and case studies so there is potential in this area. Smaller companies have lower budgets and therefore raise lower income yet require more support. The Board asked the following questions to IB:

- WP asked what the forecast is for income for the rest of the year in 2013. IB responded with estimates of £40k for Membership and £5-10k for sponsorship so a total of £50k. IB noted that following a recent relaunch of a Company Offer on electric vehicles received 16 enquires and there is potential with others such as Linden, however this one is more complex.
- WP asked what IB thought about opportunities to get rid of smaller companies and focus on larger companies. IB responded that if support for smaller companies could be more 'automated' to involve minimal handling this would allow him to spend most of his time on the larger companies. IB noted that it has taken time to migrate companies from the lower levels to the higher levels (e.g. from Bronze to Silver/Gold). IB noted that generally the larger companies are offering services and the lower end are offering products.
- RB commented that he has experienced positive relationships from the 3 companies that he has dealt with through IB
- DS asked how we appeal to SMT and get out of the estates ghetto to obtain the big picture of a whole institution approach. IB responded that the Sustainability Exchange offers companies to show where they are at in their sustainability journey. DS outlined that other associations such as AUA attract larger companies such as lawyers and accountants and asked what implications and opportunities there are for us. IB responded that he has had discussions with KPMG and Total Gas and Power whom both wanted to join however IB was not convinced they were up to scratch and was mostly greenwash so it was not pursued. IP reiterated that a reposition is required with different language to become more attractive to others.
- HM asked whether there is an opportunity for companies to buy from universities and whether we could broker the relationships to do this. IB responded that some companies have individual relationships with universities but to broker this for all companies and universities would be too big a task but perhaps we could provide a forum.
- HSJ asked to clarify why KPMG was not pursued. IB said he felt he needed to protect the EAUC brand.
- IP commented that there could be value in us brokering relationships with



	<p>leaders and companies yet we do not have the relationships with leaders to pursue this currently. WP commented that this would be an excellent Member benefit as it would be a privilege to get exposed to VC's and get insight such as a round table or think tank. DS agreed that we need to get out of estates but we are not there with the contacts we have. IB responded that he has been working with Roger Bond on such an idea based on futurology and companies such as Interface, EDF and ARUP want that.</p> <p>RB thanked IB for the very helpful insight and IB left the meeting.</p> <p>IP outlined the reason for the post was to diversify income and not rely on Educational income and that the Board, at the time, did not wish to focus on trusts/grants and other forms of fundraising. It was agreed that it will take time and income needs to be reflective of this.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed to retain the post and for it to become a mainstream activity with reporting integrated within normal Board business meetings • It was agreed to review the role with the following suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the strategy such as focussing on the top end and quality rather than quantity - Review the responsibility of the post - such as including Conference and Green Gown Awards - Explore resilience building to include trusts etc to have multiple income streams - Explore potential to include Educational Membership – to gain new Members 	<p>IP</p>
<p>AOB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair trade Community of Practice – DS tabled a proposal to set up a fair trade Community of Practice. FG to follow up. FG explained that a Group Strategy has been set up which illustrates the support offered to Groups. FG will send out to the Board. DS asked for a link to the TSN's to be added to the Community of Practice page on the website. FG to action. • HEFCE Performance Indicators – IP raised the funding council's performance indicators consultation. It was agreed that the EAUC should respond and express frustration that nothing exists. IP to frame a response and send to the Board for comments. IP asked the Board for assistance in leading on this – Board members are to contact IP. 	<p>FG IP Board</p>
	<p>Next Meetings: Wednesday 26th June – Business Meeting (virtual) – 1030-1330 Tuesday 17th September – Business Meeting (virtual) – 0930 – 1230 Tuesday 22nd October – Strategic Meeting (face to face) – all day Wednesday 4th December – Business Meeting (virtual) – 0930 -1230</p>	

