

Pembrokeshire Public Services Board
Bwrdd Gwasanaethau Cyhoeddus Sir Benfro



MINUTES OF PEMBROKESHIRE PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD
TUESDAY 26th JULY 2016 at 2.00pm
ROOM PA30 PEMBROKESHIRE ARCHIVES

Present:

Bernadine Rees	Chair, Hywel Dda University Health Board (Vice-Chair)
Ian Westley	Chief Executive, Pembrokeshire County Council (left 3.55pm)
Steve Moore	Chief Executive, Hywel Dda University Health Board
Dafydd Llewellyn	Police & Crime Commissioner, Dyfed Powys
Alec Don	Chief Executive, Port of Milford Haven
Sue Leonard	Chief Officer, Pembrokeshire Association of Voluntary Services
Tegryn Jones	Chief Executive, Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
Rob Quin	Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Mid & West Wales Fire & Rescue Service
John Hogg	Head of Operations South East, NRW
Ian Scale	Consultant in Public Health, Public Health Wales
Dr Steven Jones (SPJ)	Director of Development, Pembrokeshire County Council
Pam Kelly	Temp. Assistant Chief Constable, Dyfed Powys Police
Supt. Ian John	Dyfed Powys Police
Kate Chamberlain	Chief Executive of Healthcare Inspectorate Wales, Welsh Government
Jocelyn Llewellyn	Senior External Relations Manager, Job Centre Plus
Cllr H George	Cabinet Member for Environmental and Regulatory Services and Welsh Language (left 3.40pm)

In attendance

Polly Sills-Jones	Regional Wellbeing Assessment Co-ordinator (left 3.20pm)
Claire George	Partnership and Scrutiny Co-ordinator, PCC (left 3.20pm)
Martina Dunne	Head of National Park Direction, PCNPA (left 3.35pm)
CI Dyfed Bolton	Digital Communications and Cyber Crime Unit, Dyfed Powys Police
DS Rob Gravelle	Digital Communications and Cyber Crime Unit, Dyfed Powys Police

Support/Secretariat

Nick Evans	Partnership & Scrutiny Support Manager (Temp.), Pembrokeshire County Council
Lynne Richards	Partnership and Scrutiny Support Co-ordinator (Temp.), Pembrokeshire County Council

Apologies

Cllr Jamie Adams	Leader, Pembrokeshire County Council (Chair)
Andrea Winterton	SW Operations Manager Pembrokeshire, Marine and Monitoring, Natural Resources Wales
Helen Murray	Chief Executive, PLANED
Christine Harley	National Probation Service
Teresa Owen	Director of Public Health, Hywel Dda University Health Board
Sharron Lusher	Principal, Pembrokeshire College

The meeting commenced at 2.05pm.

1. Welcome and Apologies

Introductions were made and apologies received from those listed above.

2. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 24th May 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Action Log

Pt.1 – Christine Harley from the National Probation Service has now formally accepted her invitation to sit on the PSB

Pt.2 – Sharron Lusher, Principal of Pembrokeshire College has also been invited to attend and has accepted a place, on the PSB

Pts 3, 4, 12 & 13 – With regard to a logo/brand for the PSB, NE noted that it had been necessary to provide a Pembrokeshire logo in line with production of the Well-being Assessment survey and the logo used in the Agenda pack for today's meeting had been put forward. If there were no objections from partners this logo would be used for Pembrokeshire PSB in the future. Partners agreed that the logo be used for future Pembrokeshire PSB work (pt.13).

NE reminded partners that pts 3 and 4 were contingent on a Pembrokeshire PSB website being available and that the suggestion at the last meeting had been to approach students from Pembrokeshire College to take development of a website forward. However, this would not solve the requirements around maintenance and ongoing development of a website and therefore NE proposed that the suggestion at the last meeting to develop an in-house site which could be maintained by PCC be taken forward. Partners agreed with the proposal that a new internally hosted PSB website be developed. LR/NE would therefore commence work on a Pembrokeshire PSB website.

LR/NE

Pts 5,6 & 7 – NE reported that he had received a document from Alison Gittins, Head of Corporate and Partnership Governance, HDUHB, which contained an overview of the differences and commonalities between the terms of reference for Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion PSBs. He said that it was reassuring to note that Pembrokeshire's position regarding partner equality in decision making had been echoed by Sophie Howe, Future Generations Commissioner, at a recent meeting, when she had said that it was in the spirit of the Act that there was no separation in terms of decision making between statutory members and invited participants.

The specific section in the terms of reference relating to decision making discussed at the last meeting was as follows;

“Board decisions (for example the agreement of the assessment of local well-being and the local well-being plan) are only valid when made jointly and unanimously by the Board and with all statutory members present.”

After a brief discussion, it was agreed to remove the word 'unanimously' from the sentence, as this would lead to issues at a later date if it transpired that all partners were not in agreement on a particular issue. The terms of reference would be amended and re-circulated to partners.

LR

Pt.8 – Terms of Reference for the new Overview and Scrutiny Committees had been discussed by Council on 14th July. Provision for citizen co-optees on the new Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been agreed.

Pt.9 – Regarding the re-establishment of the Pembrokeshire Engagement Network, SL said that she had met with members of the Network and of Community Voice the previous week. She noted that the practitioners on the group were an important resource and something to consider utilising for future engagement activity.

Pt.16 – Partners discussed the development of a PSB Work Programme, as raised at the meeting on 24th May, with several partners noting the priorities of their organisations. It was agreed that these were a good starting point in developing a work programme for the PSB, but that the Board should also aim towards identifying a priority unique to the PSB as a collective group.

It was agreed that for the next meeting, partners would forward their Corporate Plans to the PSS team and these would form the basis for further discussions around collective priorities for the PSB.

**LR/NE
to co-
ordinate**

4. Finance Task & Finish Group update

LR noted that the briefing included in the agenda pack had asked for partners to consider where efficiencies existed and to indicate preferred areas for collaboration or to propose areas for future work had been circulated on 27th June; however, no responses had been received.

It was agreed that finance and cost efficiencies were a priority for all partners, however, it was acknowledged that finding a piece of work that all partners could sign up to was difficult. Partners reflected on what the barriers were to taking forward work under the banner of the Finance task and finish group. It was noted that there were certain areas where partners would not be able to collaborate (e.g. when national sharing partnerships exist) and also that there were pressures involved where partners had to service multiple PSBs.

Partners mentioned several areas where collaboration might be possible. Following this discussion it was agreed that a workshop would be held in September instead of a meeting, so that a programme of work for the PSB could be developed. Bearing in mind the need for this workshop to be as successful as possible, IW suggested that initial thoughts on structure and facilitation for the day be circulated and agreed beforehand. SM said that questions focusing on things partners were able to collaborate on and over what area, as well as queries around sustainability issues, might be useful as a starting point. It was also agreed that an experienced facilitator from within partner organisations should be used on the day.

**LR/NE
to co-
ordinate**

5. Property Task & Finish Group update

CG gave an update on discussions held at the last meeting of the task and finish group. It had been agreed within the group that a common approach to charging for desk space would be developed with assistance from Welsh Government. It was also suggested that a proposal be developed to review property requirements of partners within a specific area of the county as a starting point. It was suggested that the proposal was to focus on the Pembroke and Pembroke Dock area as there were a number of public buildings which were under-occupied and not up to a suitable standard to accommodate modern working practices. The PSB asked that St Davids also be added to the work programmes. An update would be provided at the next meeting.

CG

The PSB supported the proposal for the Pembroke and Pembroke Dock area and it was also suggested that partners share information on any future property collaboration projects with the wider board.

6. Well-being Assessment update

6i – Engagement update

PS-J provided partners with an update on the progress to date in developing the survey and engagement process. She also outlined the different levels of engagement that would be used, which would take the form of ‘tagging on’ to planned engagement events including visiting GP surgeries and supermarkets, as well as more in-depth focus groups with special interest groups. The engagement exercise would focus on three key questions;

1. What does Well-Being look like to you? Why?
2. How would you like it to look in the future
3. What needs to change to secure Social/Economic/Cultural/ Environmental Well-Being for Future Generations (25-50 years)

PS-J explained that responses to these questions could be submitted in virtually any format, including via Twitter or Facebook, or in a drawing or photograph. Responses would be attached to wellbeing trees which would be placed in a number of areas.

PS-J then outlined her next task, which would be to focus on the development and population of a Well-being matrix to consolidate;

- Existing National and local data sources e.g. Census
- Relevant legislation e.g. Environment Act
- Organisational guidance e.g. Age Cymru

The Assessment Report, a draft of which would be available by the end of the year, would then bring together the Well-being matrix with survey and engagement data collated during the engagement period.

CG then briefly updated partners on more of the detail behind the engagement process including the production of a toolkit, a copy of which would be provided to all senior engagement officers within partner organisations and would also be available electronically. It would then be the responsibility of these officers to utilise the toolkit in gathering data and responses to be added to that received from other events. CG listed some of the events that officers would be attending over the next few months. She asked partners to forward details to her of any groups or events that it would be useful for officers to engage with.

In response to concerns around the format in which the data would be made available, CG said that data from the Well-being survey would be available to all partners in an Excel spreadsheet format. PS-J also noted that a basic set of sub-themes would be made available for comment before consultation on the assessment took place. Several partners were also concerned about the ability of the engagement team to reach hard to reach groups or those who did not wish to engage in the process. PS-J stated that the timescales in place were restrictive and provided an overall challenge to undertaking engagement, but that the process would provide a basis for an ongoing approach in the future.

Partners were also concerned about the challenge in managing resource issues associated with the priorities in the Well-being Plan and possible conflicting regulatory requirements. KC said that there was no ‘one size fits all’ approach and that there was no correct answer

when it came to the results of the Well-being assessment as the needs of communities would be what was important.

6ii – Community areas

NE said that it was up to individual PSBs to define their own community areas for the purposes of the Well-being Assessment, and statutory guidance stated that these areas should be limited to those where there are significant differences in terms of underlying differences in the state of well-being and that the community areas should be defined using either Office for National Statistics' Statistical Output Areas at either Lower (LSOA), Middle (MSOA) or Upper USOA) level. He added that should there be bespoke pieces of work carried out in areas or towns these could be included as appendices in the Well-being Assessment as a study of a particular methodology which can be developed further over time. Regional engagement leads had already begun planning activity using USOAs as a basis for defining community areas, as by using larger statistical units it may be possible to identify significant trends and associations, e.g. public health data, which would not be available at lower geographies. NE noted that Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion PSBs had formally accepted this methodology as their preferred approach.

Partners also accepted the methodology proposed but agreed that the Board should aim for the future position of being able to represent smaller communities as appropriate. KC supported the proposal to work to recognised community boundaries.

7. PCNPA LDP stakeholder review – presentation

MD outlined her role in relation to the LDP and said that she wished to obtain advice from the PSB on the best way to engage with partners around the LDP review. She then outlined the stages in the review process and the links with the Well-being of Future Generations and Environment Acts.

MD said that in terms of engagement she could provide partners with individual chapters if necessary as they were completed, however, partners suggested that MD provide a presentation on the draft LDP in January 2017. NE/LR would liaise with MD regarding this.

LR/NE

8. Cyber Crime – presentation

CI Dyfed Bolton and DS Rob Gravelle from the Dyfed Powys Police Digital Communications and Cyber Crime Unit provided a presentation on Cyber Crime.

They began by giving an overview of the unit, where digital assets from across the force had been brought together as a centre for expertise based in HQ in Carmarthen. RG outlined those most at risk from cyber crime and noted that the purpose of the presentation was to make partners more aware of the issue and to ask for support in spreading information to customers, especially vulnerable ones. He explained that Cyber Crime was divided into two elements; cyber enabled crime, which was 'traditional' crime enhanced by the use of the internet; and cyber dependent crime, which was web-based. RG then gave an overview of the impact of cyber crime and the main types of cyber crime in the Dyfed Powys area, as follows;

- Phone scams
- Phishing
- Lottery Scams
- Talk-Talk scam (2015)
- Microsoft scam

He then explained what had been done to try and combat cyber crime incidents in Dyfed Powys, which included training 48 call handlers to recognise those who might be vulnerable to a cyber crime attack and pass this information on to cyber investigators. He noted that there had been nearly 80 reports of scams in Pembrokeshire during the last two months. Officers were now linking with Fire Service officers involved in the Safer Houses Scheme to identify those vulnerable to cyber crime, e.g. those in receipt of excessive direct mail, or vulnerable to online dating scams.

PK noted that cyber crime was the highest growth area in terms of criminality and that it was important to raise awareness of the issue with staff working or in contact with vulnerable individuals. DB went on to say that DPP would be providing training on 29th and 30th September in HQ for these frontline staff, and that there were currently approximately 15-20 spaces left. It was agreed that partners would forward names of staff in their organisations interested in undertaking the training to LR by the end of August so that details could be passed on to the Cyber Crime unit.

ALL/
LR

9. SIP Update – *Communities in Pembrokeshire feel safe* – Report of Community Safety Partnership

SPJ explained that the report submitted was the annual report of the Community Safety Partnership and provided updates on key service developments, relevant legislation, emerging issues and priorities for the partnership over the next 12 months.

In relation to ASB, SL asked whether work was taking place with those committing ASB offences. In terms of ASB SPJ advised that Gwalia are now delivering this service across Pembs and that they facilitate work with both perpetrators and victims of ASB as appropriate.

BR thanked SPJ for the excellent report and asked that this be fed back to the partnership.

10. Welfare Reform Update

JL provided a brief presentation to partners, beginning with an overview of priorities, the current situation with regard to unemployment, and the numbers of employers in the county that were willing to work with ex-offenders or single parents or who were willing to provide opportunities for work experience. With regard to work experience, JL provided brief details of the scheme in place with Hywel Dda University Health Board which was now in place across Pembrokeshire. Seven individuals now had work experience placements which included the opportunity to apply for internally advertised jobs. Four more individuals were due to start on the scheme during the next week with 8 would be starting the week after. JL also noted that the scheme was open to those aged 25+. A pilot work experience project would soon also be starting in Pembrokeshire County Council.

JL explained that the purpose of the presentation was to ask for support from the PSB in two specific areas;

- As employers, that PSB members –
 - Remain open to work experience opportunities
 - Share awareness of the benefits of employing individuals in receipt of Universal Credit
 - Review recruitment policies to support vulnerable groups
 - Become disability confident

Recommendation: That a PSB recruitment event or events is held

- As PSB partners –

- Be aware of digital support solutions
- Provide debt and budgeting support
- Raise awareness of Dynamic Purchasing opportunities
- Grouped services for vulnerable customers

Recommendation: That the PSB hold a partner awareness event

Partners were receptive to the recommendations however no agreement was made in relation to either due to the current commitments of the PSB.

11. PCC transformation service design principles – referral from Council meeting 14th July 2016

SPJ explained that the report circulated to partners had been presented to Council on 14th July and provided a framework for how the organisation would change in the future. The document had been produced against a background of a requirement to make substantial savings and the set of organisational objectives in the document would encourage more organised decision making and encourage new ways of working. SPJ noted that Council had asked for the document to be shared with partners, both for information and to raise awareness of the parameters that the authority would be operating in over the next few years.

JH said that NRW were undertaking a similar exercise, but noted that it was important to note that the behaviour change of some customers, particularly, vulnerable customers, was not altering as fast as service redesign and that this was a risk to achieving savings. JL, however, said that she had noticed a culture change in terms of the use of IT, as 90% of JSA claims were now made on line and the use of IT facilities in libraries by claimants was increasing. SL said that involving people in the design and delivery of services was important and that she would like to see this reflected in the local authority's transformation agenda. SM noted that it was important to be cognisant of the impact of decision making on other agencies and that this was a responsibility for each partner to be aware of.

12. Webcasting of PSB – referral from Notice of Motion tabled at Council on 14th July 2016

SPJ explained that partners were being asked to provide their views on the above matter so that their comments could inform a report to Corporate Governance Committee in September.

Partners had a lively discussion on the impact that webcasting of meetings might have and it was agreed that although transparency to the public was important, there were a number of reasons why webcasting was not appropriate at the current time;

- It would mean that meetings would have to take place in County Hall rather than in any other PCC or partner organisation location;
- There was some concern that webcasting meetings would impact upon the quality and level of discussion and debate;
- As the PSB was in its infancy, it was agreed that the partnership was not ready to take part in webcasting as it had not yet agreed its work programme or priorities for the year ahead.

It was agreed as an initial way forward that one meeting per year should be webcast, at the point when partners were ready to review the first year of their work programme. SPJ would feed this back to the Corporate Governance Committee in September.

SPJ

13. Draft SIP Annual Review

NE explained that the draft Single Integrated Plan Annual Review for 2015-16 had now been completed and that if partners had any comments that they should be returned to either himself or LR by the end of August.

ALL

SL welcomed the comments on the Plan from the Youth Assembly and it was suggested that a joint meeting with the Youth Assembly could be held at some point in the future.

14. AOB

NE informed partners that a letter had been received from the Arts Council for Wales, named as an 'other partner' in the Act, who were seeking to engage with the Pembrokeshire PSB. He noted that as part of the Well-being assessment engagement process PS-J and CG would meet with Arts Council representatives.

**NE/CG to
liaise with
Arts
Council**

Partners were reminded that an agreement had been made for them to commit to attending a workshop to develop a work programme for the PSB on the date of the next meeting on 21st September 2016. An email request and information would follow as discussed.

The meeting ended at 4.45pm.