



MINUTES OF PEMBROKESHIRE PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD
Tuesday 22nd November 2022 at 10.00am (Microsoft Teams meeting)

Present:

Cllr. Neil Prior	PCC (Chair)
Philip Kloer	Executive Medical Director, Hywel Dda UHB (Vice-Chair)
Tegryn Jones	Chief Executive, PCNPA
Sue Leonard	Chief Officer, PAVS
David Evans	Assistant Principal, Pembrokeshire College
Richard Brown	Assistant Chief Executive, PCC
Elaine Lorton	County Director, Pembrokeshire, Hywel Dda UHB
Rebecca Evans	Senior Public Health Officer, Public Health Wales
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
Tom Sawyer	Chief Executive Officer, MHPA
Rhian Jardine	Head of Development Planning & Marine Services, NRW
Darren Mutter	Head of Children's Services, PCC
Claire Germain	Deputy Director for Local Government Transformation and Partnerships, Welsh Government
Vikki Butler	CoPro Wales
Dyfed Bolton	Chief Inspector for Partnerships, DPP
Dan Tomkins	Head of Assurance, OPCC
Jenny McConnel	Change Analyst, FGO
Elle Henley-Herat	Change Maker, FGO

Support/Secretariat

Nick Evans	Corporate Policy and Partnerships Manager, PCC
Jemma Rees	Corporate Partnerships Support Officer, PCC
Lynne Richards	Corporate Partnerships Officer, PCC
Amy Richmond-Jones	Engagement, Planning and Performance Manager, MAWWFRS

Apologies

Anna Malloy	Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Manager, Port of Milford Haven
Maria Battle	Chair, Hywel Dda UHB
Cllr. Elwyn Williams	Chair MAWW Fire Authority
Jo McCarthy	Deputy Director of Public Health, HDUHB
Caroline Drayton	Operations Manager, NRW
Christine Harley	Head of Dyfed Powys Local Delivery Unit, HMPPS
Will Bramble	Chief Executive, PCC
Barry Walters	Principal, Pembrokeshire College

The meeting commenced at 10.05am.

1. Welcome and Apologies

NP welcomed the board and introduced JMC and EHH from FGO.

2. Minutes of last meeting/Action Log

Minor amendments were noted and the minutes were approved. All actions from the action log were complete.

3. Draft Well-being Plan (Nick Evans)

NE said the key decision to for the meeting was for the board to approve the draft Well-being Plan. The cover report included in the agenda pack set out the key issues after the last meeting and a follow up meeting had been held on 10th October with some members to agree the priority areas, which tied in with agenda item 4. The next step was for the draft to go out for consultation and NE emphasised the tight timescale and statutory partners were required to approve the plan independently of PSB through their own governance processes.

CG liked the clear plan for consultation and said the draft had good structure and was easy to follow and would provide additional written feedback on the drafting of the headlines. TJ had concerns on the deliverability of the outcomes which were echoed in the feedback, and queried whether the outcome for the poverty area should be to reduce poverty, rather than the production of reports. Some phrasing should resonate with the public better, such as “notice of motion” to “address the issue of having the worst child poverty rates”.

PK said that the outcomes appear like processes and not relatable to the public, and suggested the development of overall bold aims of PSB. When a group met to establish headlines, PK suggested not creating a specific work stream for health as each of the objectives would encompass health and well-being, but observed that there was no narrative within the headlines to underpin health and well-being.

EL said the public needed to understand how the outcomes would be measured and suggested a method to “check in” periodically to measure the delivery. The Healthier Pembrokeshire Group was established under the Accelerated Cluster Development Group, who used the WBA to create their headlines and suggested using the group to deliver the health and well-being objectives. EL was to write a reference to the group, detailing that health would be addressed by the alterative group, and send it to NE/LR.

RE observed that inequalities had not been mentioned in the plan and the group should engage with people who are experiencing inequalities, though this piece of work may not be the appropriate platform. Within the communities section, the PSB organisations should detail how they are changing their working to facilitate the strengthening of communities.

RB reiterated how tight the timeline was and asked for all written feedback to be sent as soon as possible and the amendments would be circulated. PK agreed the method for redrafting.

SPJ asked whether the 4th project area on economy, mentioned in the cover report, would be “parked” during the consultation period. CG suggested adding clarity to the consultation by including that the PSB were seeking views from the public on whether to perform work on the 4th project area.

TJ asked whether the bold aims suggested by PK could be included in the consultation. NE said that a significant amount of work had been undertaken to create the headlines and vision, and the engagement received for the WBA had been messy to analyse. NE suggested adding the development of the PSB vision to the PSB meeting in January where this could be discussed.

NE said any immediate significant changes to the draft plan would be limited as the formal consultation process was to be launched on Friday, but if partners had any significant change requests, it could be worked on during the consultation period. NP added that he did not expect any significant changes as partners had been involved in developing the draft Plan since October.

NP asked how much feedback was expected from the consultation and NE said public engagement was expected to be low but the more meaningful engagement would likely come from partners engaging with their stakeholders through existing networks. IT said historically, the public do not feel as though they make change during consultation exercises and urged partners to utilise all possible networks to help the public feel as though they have ownership over PSB. NE added that the PSB has no resources, which is why engagement is challenging. SL said the PSB engagement group, which brings together engagement officers from partner organisations to perform PSB consultation, had experienced difficulty in performing meaningful engagement during the WBA.

NP asked the group to agree on inclusion of the 4th project area in the consultation, which was approved. NE said on economic ambition, it would need to be assessed how the PSB could add value to the area of work in addition to what is already being performed by groups such as the Pembrokeshire Economic Ambition Board. The PSB should create relationships with the groups, rather than duplicating work. PK said this type of collaborative work would be a key test on how the PSB shares resources.

TJ said that there was a need to establish what each organisation could contribute to each headline area, particularly the economy as PSB partners employ around 20,000 people collectively, with significant procurement power. An action plan should be created detailing how each organisations could be part of the agenda and if an organisation felt they could not contribute, detailing their justification.

SL said the WBP is unique as it is place based rather than a classic population based, segmented plan, and also asked where the assets from the community asset transfers were as some may be within public services, meaning they could be utilised as resources.

NE confirmed with the group that the leads for each area were:

- Communities – NP – who invited all members to become involved with the work
- Climate – NRW
- Poverty – DM
- Economy – SPJ volunteered to be the link into this area as he sits on the PEAB and the Business Panel.

NP asked to schedule follow up conversations with leads/groups after the meeting to refine project plans during the consultation period.

TJ said, from previous experience, the group were efficient at creating plans but not good at delivery of actions and that working groups were already established for each project area apart from communities and suggested creating a working group.

NE asked for votes to approve the draft WBP for consultation, which was agreed unanimously.

4. Well-being Objectives – Formal advice from the Future Generations Commissioner’s Office (Elle – Henley-Herat / Jenny McConnell)

JMC performed a presentation outlining the feedback from FGO, which had been circulated in the morning prior to the meeting.

TJ said that as the written feedback had only been sent from FGO to PSB the night before the meeting, the board were unable to have a meaningful conversation and asked for this to be fed back to FGO. The culture section appeared under the climate banner and asked whether this was an error, and suggested including culture in the consultation to get local feedback as the FGO feedback said it was a missed opportunity. TJ also said he felt there was a disconnect between the national organisations and PSBs.

IT said on the subject of Welsh Language, PLANED sit on a new commission for Welsh speaking communities and could engage with those groups on that area.

5. Welsh Government Communities Policy – Feedback from meeting on 2nd November

NP had volunteered PSB to feed into the WG communities policy development. The initial meeting had contained positive discussion where questions were able to be asked such as “would the communities policy help us” and “what can WG do to help” where NP and SL answered with reducing bureaucracy and providing support to create an equal relationship.

SL believed the policy would be useful if it was created the right way, in an enabling framework format.

NP said the next steps was a follow up meeting.

6. AOB

NP had received a phone call from the chair of Carmarthenshire PSB asking if Pembrokeshire PSB had any interest in merging, but NP was of the opinion that Pembrokeshire should remain independent. NE said Carmarthenshire PSB had formally invited both Pembrokeshire and Ceredigion PSB’s to merge into a regional PSB around 2-3 years ago and that at that time there was no appetite to go down this road, but added that opportunities for regional working group with neighbouring PSB’s be taken when appropriate.

NE said a PSB meeting had been added in January 2023 to provide an update on progress of the WBP and the agenda may include a visioning session for PSB ambition as suggested by PK.

SL said TFC were running a series of webinars titled “Ideas Unlimited” funded by the Community Renewal Fund, with an in-person event in December which all members and organisation representatives were invited to.

NP urged all members to continue work between meetings.

The meeting ended at 11.45am.