

Pembrokeshire Public Services Board

Bwrdd Gwasanaethau Cyhoeddus Sir Benfro



MINUTES OF PEMBROKESHIRE PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD Tuesday 27th September 2022 at 10.00am (Microsoft Teams meeting)

Present:

Cllr. Neil Prior	PCC (Chair)
Philip Kloer	Executive Medical Director, Hywel Dda UHB (Vice-Chair)
Sue Leonard	Chief Officer, PAVS
Anna Malloy	Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Manager, Port of Milford Haven
David Evans	Assistant Principal, Pembrokeshire College
Cllr. Elwyn Williams	Chair MAWW Fire Authority
Rebecca Evans	Senior Public Health Officer, Public Health Wales
Jo McCarthy	Deputy Director of Public Health, HDUHB
Alison Perry	Director of Commissioning, Officer of Police and Crime Commissioner
Darren Thomas	Head of Infrastructure, PCC
Darren Mutter	Head of Children's Services, PCC
Caroline Drayton	Operations Manager, NRW
Claire Germain	Deputy Director for Local Government Transformation and Partnerships, Welsh Government
Ceri Jackson	Head of Corporate Communications & Business Development, MAWWFRS
Abi Marriott	Project Coordinator, PLANED
Vikki Butler	CoPro Wales
Dyfed Bolton	Chief Inspector for Partnerships, DPP
Alan Netherwood	Netherwood Sustainable Futures
Jetske Germing	Managing Director, Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum
Alex Cameron-Smith	Community and Climate Change Engagement Coordinator, PCF
Nia Simes	NGDP Graduate, PCC
Huw Rowlands	NGDP Graduate, PCC

Support/Secretariat

Nick Evans	Corporate Policy and Partnerships Manager, PCC
Jemma Rees	Corporate Partnerships Support Officer, PCC
Lynne Richards	Corporate Partnerships Officer, PCC

Apologies

Maria Battle	Chair, Hywel Dda UHB
Richard Brown	Assistant Chief Executive, PCC
Tegryn Jones	Chief Executive, PCNPA
Dr Steven Jones (SPJ)	Director of Community Services, PCC
Mydrian Harries	Assistant Chief Officer- Director of Resources, MAWW FRS

Iwan Thomas	Chief Executive Officer, PLANED
Will Bramble	Chief Executive, PCC
Supt. Anthony Evans	Dyfed Powys Police
Barry Walters	Principal, Pembrokeshire College
Elaine Lorton	County Director, HDUHB

The meeting commenced at 10.05am.

1. Welcome and Apologies

NP welcomed PSB and said he hoped for a focused, productive meeting. Apologies were listed from those above. RE and JMC were moving to working within HDUHB from PHW, with their roles remaining the same but not representing PHW.

2. Minutes of last meeting/Action Log

The minutes of the last meeting held on 19th July 2022 were confirmed as an accurate record. NP noted a spelling error where “doorstop” should read “doorstep”.

The actions from the action log were as follows:

Action 1- NP had conducted some conversations with PSB members and has further scheduled. CG expressed interest in having a meeting with NP to offer WG links.

Action 2 – was outstanding and PK would contact RB to find the contact within Swansea University.

Action 3- A meeting was scheduled between SL and PK, and SL was also meeting with WB around social health.

Action 4 – Was ongoing and organisations could continue to express interest around Engagement HQ use.

Action 5 – Was a resulting action from the PSB Engagement group, where it was identified that there was a need to listen to conversations within the community, which required coordination and SL was trying to secure funding.

Action 6 – NE and NP had expressed interest in involvement in the pilot, which was successful and were awaiting a date for a meeting with WG.

3. Well-being Plan Development (Nick Evans)

NE said the topic was to be the key discussion of the meeting. The headline findings from the engagement exercise were circulated within the agenda pack and the gaps identified matched with the Well-Being objectives. The next steps were to identify how to respond to the observations and the timeline for the work also included in the papers. The gaps identified by the engagement exercise were listed, though PSB did not need to address all the gaps but needed a rationale to justify excluding them. For example, housing had not been included in the previous WBP as it was felt that it was not a PSB influenced area. The areas selected to be part of the plan needed to demonstrate clear, collaborative PSB working to improve the situation.

NE drew attention to the timeline, highlighting the current activities over the next few weeks to develop the draft plan, which did not need to be highly detailed but required enough detail for the PSB to consult on. Information had been included in the document outlining the steps which would be needed in order to signing off the plan in March, and he noted that the statutory

members needed to present the draft to their boards for sign off before the Plan was published at the beginning of May 2023.

NE said an action resulting from the previous PSB meeting was to perform a mapping exercise on working groups against the objectives, which was detailed in the paper. The majority of the areas were simple, with working groups directly aligning with objectives and therefore could take on the action planning role. There were some gaps identified which required discussion as there are existing groups within the county that ~~perform~~ undertake work in these areas that may not be PSB linked groups.

NP asked for the group to be objective in how efficient the existing subgroups had been and requested clarity on work ownership and focus. PK said the outcomes from the objectives needed to be identified and to take a retrospective look at what the previous subgroups had achieved in relation to the original objectives.

SL said from experience as a subgroup leader, the groups worked to the best of their ability and created joint actions across many services, though some actions being reported to PSB would have happened without PSB involvement. In comparison to the RPB, which receives funding and significant support, the PSB does not receive any funding and minimal support so an assessment needs to be made on how to resource work.

DT said for the Climate Adaptation work, resources were sought through grant funding and had obvious deliverables. The PSB is the only group to pull together all organisations for a single work focus and suggested for PSBs to collectively write to WG to add strength to the request for resources.

CG said PSBs were supposed to be a collective resource and to utilise alternative resources, adding that WG should provide guidance on where to access funding for work. The viewpoint should be how to collectively work in a different way.

NP asked DM whether he felt the PSB added to the poverty work or whether the work would have occurred regardless, and DM replied saying the work would have happened as poverty is such a key issue but the PSB has facilitated coordinating the involvement of other organisations in the work. The group is the newest subgroup to be formed from PSB, containing key decision makers and has good energy driving the work forward resulting in the work progressing at speed, as actions are not needing to be signed off. The group was currently operational focused but more consultation would be required for the medium/long term plan. NP said the main board should be an enabler for longer-term work and to not hinder immediate actions.

DM said there was an overlap of the subgroups work over a number of the objectives and the board allowed higher level linking and overlapping. SL asked DM if there was a block to the work, did he feel the PSB could solve the problem. DM replied saying due to the multiagency buy in, it would be a surprise if such a significant block would arise. The poverty emergency is at the same level as the pandemic so there is already the sense of urgency around the topic but in answer, yes to the removal of the block but it would be an unlikely scenario.

NP asked whether there was a way of assessing whether there was the correct membership in each of the subgroups and JMC suggested this was a piece of work for individual organisations to assess who was the most appropriate representative. NP said the PSB should be aware of collaborating with work that individual organisations were already conducting.

DM said the poverty group was working well due to the urgency in the situation and existing operational actions within each organisation, and anticipates a slower work rate on the development of strategy. PK asked how the PSB would help in the development of the poverty strategy and identifying the actions in 5 years' time, and how the PSB would coordinate the overlaps of work of the subgroups.

DT said within the Climate Change work area, the specific actions were not particularly defined and had the opposite experience of DM where all PSB members were on board but there was no specific coordination and no clear direction forward, highlighting the requirement to join up work.

CG said on the topic of housing, an identified gap from the engagement exercise, does the PSB have any direct leavers or direct secondary impacts for example Welsh language, culture or poverty that could be influenced.

NP prior summarised that there was a need for clarity on the achievements of the subgroups, addressing the collective resources, collective working to reduce duplication, and how the PSB can support strategic development. DM said on poverty, there would be lots of activity in the next few months and over the next year so data could be collected after the year to obtain a measure of the outcomes, therefore demonstrating the effectiveness of the group. SL said there were a number of community groups that could be utilised in the delivery of the WBP.

NP suggested conducting a second meeting to assess areas that could be targeted and NE said that the group needed to be mindful of the timescale as the draft must be produced by November for sign off by the PSB at their November meeting and if this did not happen then deadlines may be missed.

JMC asked NE were there any major gaps identified if all the existing subgroups were functioning as expected and NE said the skills/growth area, though SL had mentioned the PEAB, where utilising this group to deliver actions-would prevent duplication.

PK suggested utilising the existing leads of the subgroups to help produce the draft plan while simultaneously assessing the work of the group. There also appeared to be a gap within the health area and suggested contacting EL and JMC to discuss.

NE said the plan needing to be produced at this point was a draft and, though it would be useful to establish actions with mechanisms of delivery and monitoring, the rough outline needed to be established as a priority by the November PSB meeting.

SL said the WG deadlines tend to be a challenge and asked whether work could continue during the 12 weeks consultation period, and where there are active subgroups, messages needed to be clear on the protocols and actions expected from PSB. CG said there needed to be meaningful consultation conducted over the 12 week period but the PSB could be open and honest that there were still areas needing to be finalised, however there needed to be enough content to in the draft to consult on.

NE would arrange a follow up meeting for further discussion on how to take forward action planning for the draft Plan.

4. Climate Adaptation Strategy for Pembrokeshire

DT said the PSB Climate Change subgroup was created with AW as Chair and DT as Vice Chair, to produce the Adaptation Strategy and oversee the resulting work programme. AW had stepped down as NRW PSB representative and CD was now the new representative.

AN provided a presentation, giving overview of the finalised Climate Adaptation Strategy. JG said at the subgroup meeting, AN was asked to prioritise a top 5 actions from the strategy but was unable to as all the actions were of equal importance. PCF had applied for funding for community engagement and to support the PSB Climate Adaptation work, which would be of particular importance as climate was an identified well-being objective.

DT had not received any further comments from members and was seeking approval for adoption of the plan, the Climate Change subgroup to have a new nominated chair and to develop an action plan going forward. DT also noted that there was a significant amount of work contained in the strategy and to be mindful that if the PSB signed up to the strategy and did not deliver, there may be “backlash”. In summary, DT was seeking PSB to adopt the plan, develop a mechanism for delivery and obtain grant funding as mentioned by JG.

AN said a broad spectrum of issues had been identified, therefore resulting in a significant amount of work needing to be carried out. From WLGA work, it had been identified there was a lot of leadership around climate change across Wales.

SL said the 5-year plan detailed in the strategy was optimistic due to the number of actions listed. AN said PSB was not expected to deliver on all the actions but to start work on each of them. He offered to help with categorising the actions into short, medium and long term and funding would need to be sought to work on the actions, which would cause delay. SL said some areas were already being assessed in the WBP and are cross cutting so to be aware when starting work on executing the actions.

NP noted that Climate Change was only one section of the WBP, the 24 actions would require significant leadership and resourcing which may impact other areas of the WBP. AN said the actions were not just for PSB to execute but for the group to proactively push key organisations into delivering the strategy, acting as a figurehead and facilitator.

CD said the delivery of the work would need to be shared and correct ownership sought as if work was started, it would need to be continued forward. SL suggested signing off on the strategy at the meeting but to have further conversations over the deliverables. NE added the strategy would be incorporated into the WBP as a whole.

The strategy was approved with further work to be discussed.

5. Pembrokeshire PSB Annual Report 2021-22

LR said the draft report outlined the PSB activity over the last 12 months and also reflected on the previous WBP and the issues encountered in delivery. CG said the WBP reflection was very helpful but was disappointed with some comments about WG not prioritising PSBs as there is a number of mechanisms providing support and wanted to reassure the PSB. LR replied, saying the comments had been emailed by long standing PSB members directly. LR was to amend the language used in the feedback section.

SL was pleased to hear the feedback from CG but did not approve of the regional working push by WG as many PSBs were merging to create regional groups and CJsCs, and emphasised the need to keep a county focus to acknowledge the resources communities hold. The PSBs have a critical role in facilitating the community assets which could not be done from a regional viewpoint as work needs to be hyper local, and added she was delighted that the PSB was to be involved in the Communities Policy pilot.

CG said regional working was identified to be the most appropriate method in certain areas of work and Gwent were a PSB who had merged but were still expected to perform the work down to community level.

The board approved the report.

6. AOB

CD said there was currently no chair of the Climate Change subgroup and offered to step in the role left vacant by AW. NP said the nomination of chair would be finalised after the meeting to assess the subgroups. DT wanted to highlight the next meeting of the group was before the next PSB meeting and was happy to remain as Vice Chair. PK supported the nomination of CD.

NE said a diary marker had been circulated for a regional involvement event and that date had been changed to 29th September and would circulate the information. SL said PAVS, PLANED and CoPro Wales were working on strengthening engagement and would be interested in attending the event, but it may be difficult with short notice.

The meeting ended at 12.30pm.