

**Pembrokeshire Public Services Board**  
**Bwrdd Gwasanaethau Cyhoeddus Sir Benfro**



**MINUTES OF PEMBROKESHIRE PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD**  
**WEDNESDAY 30<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2016 at 2.00pm**  
**MILFORD HAVEN PORT AUTHORITY OFFICES**

**Present:**

Cllr Jamie Adams	Leader, Pembrokeshire County Council (Chair)
Ian Westley	Chief Executive, Pembrokeshire County Council
Dafydd Llywelyn	Police & Crime Commissioner, Dyfed Powys
Alec Don	Chief Executive, Port of Milford Haven
Judith Hardisty	Vice-Chair, Hywel Dda University Health Board
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
Amelia John	Deputy Director Communities Division, Welsh Government
Dave Evans	Pembrokeshire College
Ian Scale	Consultant in Public Health, Public Health Wales
Dr Steven Jones (SPJ)	Director of Development, Pembrokeshire County Council
Rowland Rees-Evans	Vice-Chair, Mid & West Wales Fire Authority
Catrin Bradley	PLANED
Andrea Winterton	SW Operations Manager Pembrokeshire, Marine and Monitoring, Natural Resources Wales
Supt. Ian John	Dyfed Powys Police
Paul Morris	Dyfed Powys Police

*In attendance*  
Claire George

Partnership and Scrutiny Support Co-ordinator, PCC

*Support/Secretariat*  
Nick Evans

Partnership & Scrutiny Support Manager, Pembrokeshire County Council

Lynne Richards

Partnership and Scrutiny Support Co-ordinator, Pembrokeshire County Council

**Apologies**

Bernadine Rees	Chair, Hywel Dda University Health Board (Vice-Chair)
Steve Moore	Chief Executive, Hywel Dda University Health Board
Sarah Jennings	Director of Governance, Communication and Engagement, Hywel Dda University Health Board
Teresa Owen	Director of Public Health, Hywel Dda University Health Board
Sharron Lusher	Principal, Pembrokeshire College
Jocelyn Llewhellin	Senior External Relations Manager, Job Centre Plus
Pam Kelly	Temp. Assistant Chief Constable, Dyfed Powys Police
Kate Chamberlain	Welsh Government

The meeting commenced at 2.10pm.

### **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 26<sup>th</sup> July 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **3. Action Log**

Pt.7 – Cyber Crime training – Following the presentation to the PSB in July, IJ confirmed that there had been good representation from Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire at the training events in September.

Pt.10 – Arts Council – CG noted that officers from Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion had met with a representative from the Arts Council to discuss how each PSB functioned and how each would like to engage with them. Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion had asked that a representative attend all their PSB meetings. Pembrokeshire had requested that they be available to attend meetings only when agendas were relevant.

It was agreed that a representative from the Arts Council should be invited to attend a meeting sooner rather than later, as engagement with the Arts Council would be an important part of the work of the PSB.

**NE/CG**

### **4. Progressing actions from the PSB Workshop**

Partners were reminded that following the Workshop held in September, it had been agreed that a number of actions would be taken forward as follows;

- (a) Hold an event for front-line staff on a locality basis
- (b) Produce a vision statement and develop a set of principles for PSB working
- (c) Develop a Pride in Pembrokeshire award sponsored by the PSB
- (d) Develop a protocol for sharing data to improve joint working

NE asked that lead officers be confirmed for each of the above actions alongside support requirements.

#### **(a) Front-line Staff event**

IJ fed back on proposals to hold a practitioner engagement event following discussions held with colleagues from Health. It was hoped that this event would empower and create relationships between front-line staff from different agencies and between front-line staff and senior staff, as well as breaking down barriers between agencies.

It was suggested that the event be held in Pembrokeshire Archives following the next PSB meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> January and that up to 10 representatives from each agency be invited to attend.

There was some discussion around whether mid-level managers should also be invited to attend the event, however, it was agreed that in the first instance only front-line staff would be invited. It was noted that a suitable room in the Archives was available on the specified date. IJ would contact LR outside the meeting regarding support for the event.

IJ

(b) Vision Statement/Principles for PSB working

NE said that there had been no response from PK as yet, however, he had discussed the proposed action with SJ and IE and it could be said that the Act itself as well as the terms of reference for the Board laid out its principles, however, it was for the Board to decide if it wished to undertake further work. JA said that he was keen to explore taking this action forward in a simpler way to make the openness, transparency and accountability of the Board clear. He felt strongly that this message should be translated in a straightforward way as he was concerned that the Board had been referred to as a 'quango' and the perception that decisions were being made behind closed doors. IW agreed and noted that this approach should resolve the negative perception that the Board had in some quarters, as there was a risk to the work of the group going forward if the issue was not resolved.

TJ noted that part of the problem was a communication issue within organisations and that perhaps partners should therefore do more to promote the work of the PSB within their organisations. AW also suggested that something could be done to promote the PSB as part of activity around publication of the Well-being Assessment. RQ also suggested that the work of the PSB could be promoted more frequently in order to make the successes of the group known.

The discussion then moved on to whether partners might be more committed to the work of the PSB if all had a financial stake in the work of the group. JA asked AJ whether she was aware of any other PSBs that had committed funding towards their work and what the outcome had been. She said that she was aware that discussions around funding had been held, however, she was unaware of the outcome but would respond once she had looked into it. SL and AW said that they were also aware that similar conversations regarding funding had taken place in other PSBs.

AD suggested that a business approach whereby each partner contribute towards a defined executive resource dedicated to promoting the Plan and meeting its objectives could be a way forward. JA suggested that statutory partners be asked to commit £5k towards developing such an opportunity during the next year in order to build a central resource. IW suggested that all partners should be included in the proposal which would assist with resourcing of the PSB. It was agreed that JA would circulate a written request to all partners.

JA

(c) Pride in Pembrokeshire Award

SPJ gave an outline of his Pride in Pembrokeshire proposal, developed following the September workshop. Contact had been made with the Western Telegraph who were happy in principle to go forward with the proposal. It was hoped that the award would;

- Promote the work of the PSB and make it more visible to the public
- Promote the Well-being Plan process
- Pick up on the FG Commissioner's message that PSBs should 'spread the word'

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that this proposal should be taken forward utilizing the funding mentioned under (b) above, should the approach to funding be successful.

(d) Data Sharing

It was agreed that the proposal would be taken forward by inviting a member of the Information Commissioner's office to attend a future event to provide an overview of what data can and cannot be shared. IJ noted that this was something that other PSBs might also be interested in, especially in light of the crossover in membership from some organisations. It was agreed that members of the PSB plus Legal/Information Governance representatives would be invited to attend an event (to be arranged) and that representatives from other PSBs would also be invited to attend.

NE/LR

## 5. Well-being of Future Generations Act

### a) Well-being Assessment update

CG gave an overview of progress to date including some of the headline information coming through from the survey and events that had been held over the summer. Several differences had been noted between the community areas and carers issues had been identified as an important area for a large number of respondents. Gender differences with regard where people were obtaining information, advice and guidance had also been identified.

CG noted that a draft working document would be available shortly and this would be circulated to engagement contacts and PSB members for comment, before being put forward for agreement at the January PSB meeting, prior to consultation in February. NE noted that it would be up to each organisation to determine what would be required under its own governance arrangements in order for PSB representatives to be authorised to approve the Well-being Assessment. CG reminded partners that area statements and the future trends report were still to be published and had therefore had no influence on the current document, so the document should be viewed as a 'live' document and regularly reviewed. CG then explained how the document had been structured according to life-stage, and that hopefully this was a more developmental approach to prevention, intervention etc.

### (b) Key activity timeline

NE presented a timeline detailing planned activity and milestones in the delivery of the Well-being Assessment and Well-being Plan, which had been developed in order to manage the process of developing both documents. Partners noted the key activities and associated timescales.

## 6. Scrutiny of the Public Services Board

JA gave an outline of the requirements in terms of scrutiny of the PSB and noted that the Chair of the designated Scrutiny Committee was observing the meeting. He also outlined

the requirements around partners' attendance at Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings, noting that partners could only be scrutinised on their organisation's contribution to the work of the PSB.

The issue of webcasting of meetings had recently been discussed again at the Council's Corporate Governance Committee and a Notice of Motion had been submitted to Council for the 8<sup>th</sup> December meeting. JA explained that although Council might make a decision regarding webcasting of meetings this would not be a binding decision on the PSB. It was noted that the reasons for not webcasting meetings had already been discussed and had not changed. JA noted that it was a regular occurrence in other areas for PSB meetings to be held at partner agencies' offices and also unprecedented for meetings to be webcast.

## **7. SIP Review – Environment Theme**

CG stated that the update circulated was the annual update from the Pembrokeshire Environment Forum. She highlighted a number of developments which had taken place over the year, including; the publication of the State of Wildlife Report by the Pembrokeshire Biodiversity Partnership, which had a high level of commitment from partners; the current Welsh Government consultation on Nitrate Vulnerable Zones and; the work of the Environment Forum on resilient communities. CG noted that there was limited capacity to take forward the work of the group at present due to PSB requirements and also because the long-standing Chair of the group had recently retired. CG said that she wished to thank him for his commitment as he had been the driving force behind the forum for many years. JA said that he would write to Mr Davies on behalf of the PSB to convey their thanks.

JA

## **8. Property Task & Finish Group update**

CG said that there had been little progress with the work of the group and that there were several reasons for this, including the impact of agencies' transformation agendas. DL noted that this was probably one area where no 'quick win' was available and that maybe there was an issue around the ability of those attending the group to make decisions on behalf of their organisations.

RQ suggested that a Board member should Chair the group, in order to promote engagement between partners and help solve any issues. He agreed to Chair the group and would contact CG regarding dates of any future meetings. Further updates on the work of the group would be provided when available.

## **9. Resilient Communities – letter from Welsh Government**

AJ gave partners an overview of the background around the subject of resilient communities, which included the announcement around Communities First, plans for alignment of grants such as Flying Start and Families First and a greater focus on Early Years, Employability and Empowerment.

There would be a two stage period of engagement around the three Es, the first stage during consultation around Communities First within this context and the second stage during January/February 2017 around streamlining and simplifying contact in terms of outcome agreements. AJ said that PSBs were better placed to understand the needs of their areas than WG and the direction of travel within the context of the WBFG Act would

also be considered. Within regard to Communities First, a phased approach to closure would be taken across 2017/18 if closure of the scheme was taken forward. TJ asked that WG recognise the issue of rural poverty when it came to funding and JA asked that differing funding levels across counties also be taken into account. He cited the example of the funding formula for Carmarthenshire, which if applied to Pembrokeshire, would mean that the authority would be £11.4m better off. IW noted that there was also a practical issue around grant funding in terms of redundancy costs connected with grants such as Flying Start and Families First, and asked that authorities be made aware of funding for the next financial year sooner rather than later. AJ said that she would pass these messages back to the Minister, noting that the direction of travel was to move away from hypothecated funding and that it would be useful to come back to the Board at some point to discuss this further.

AJ

#### **10. Referral from HSCWB Joint Commissioning Partnership**

JG gave a brief outline of discussions held at the last partnership meeting, where partners had discussed data in relation to adult services costs and domiciliary care and the fact that this could not be compared against health data. This had led partners to decide to re-focus their activities with regard to data in order to better measure impact, which was especially important moving forward in order to be able to meet the requirements of the SSWB Act and the way that information, advice and assistance was delivered to customers.

Partners briefly discussed the importance of enabling communities to find solutions for themselves and also the importance of front-line staff in helping this approach to move forward.

#### **11. AOB**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 4.25pm.