

Public Service Board
Wednesday 8th November 2017 at County Hall, Usk

Minutes

Attendees:

Huw Jakeway	South Wales Fire and Rescue Service
Sharran Lloyd	Monmouthshire County Council
Paul Matthews (chair)	Monmouthshire County Council
David Barnes (minutes)	Monmouthshire County Council
Steve Morgan	Natural Resources Wales
Julian Williams	Gwent Police
Nick Wood	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Steven Tilley (for Martin Featherstone)	GAVO
Eleri Thomas (for Jeff Cuthbert)	Office of Police & Crime Commissioner
Jeff Scrivens	South Wales Fire and Rescue Service
Paula Kennedy	Melin Homes
Hazel Clatworthy	Monmouthshire County Council
Peter Fox	Monmouthshire County Council
Sarah Aitken	Public Health Wales
Matthew Gatehouse	Monmouthshire County Council
Catherine King	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Chris Edmondson	Community Member

Apologies:

Jeff Cuthbert	Office of Police & Crime Commissioner
Martin Swain	Welsh Government
Martin Featherstone	GAVO
Lyn Webber	Office of Police & Crime Commissioner
Sophie Howe	Office of Future Generations Commissioner

1. Welcome and apologies

PM welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (8th February 2017) & Matters Arising

No issues or matters arising were raised from the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Sophie Howe – Future Generations Commissioner

Sophie Howe was unable to attend the meeting. Apologies were received.

4. Wellbeing Plan & Next Steps

MG provided some context to the group, explaining the extensive engagement exercise that was undertaken as part of the Wellbeing Assessment which was signed off in the summer.

In the subsequent months, work has been done around the Wellbeing Objectives and thought has gone into identify the steps needed for the PSB to sign up to in the future. A workshop was held in Cwrt Bleddyn which was well attended by partners, industry experts as well as Town and Community Councils – with the opportunity to discuss some of the things that public services should be working on in the future.

The formal 12 week consultation is now needed, where things may change if more evidence emerges or if suggestions are made that could make a difference.

MG asked whether the PSB thought the Objectives remain the right ones. Are the steps listed under the Objectives correct? If the draft Plan is signed off, we are entering the next phase of the work that is all about putting the actions into place.

SL talked to her paper around the next steps for the PSB. Conscious that the involvement and collaboration is not limited to those partners sat in the room – bodies such as the Town and Community Councils and others need to be involved and to feel ownership on the Plan. It's about having the balance of making real change at a strategic level but it needs to be tangible at a community level.

CK commented that it's looking great, and asked whether advice from the Future Generations Commissioner has been considered in the final draft?

MG responded that we have had a 13 week consultation period with the office of the Commissioner, and was pretty happy that the issues have been taken into account. There is a good dialogue between us, and they (FG Commissioner's Office) have said that some of the feedback is for the longer term and doesn't need to be immediately address in the plan. The points we could address have been captured but there are a number we need to improve – with future trends being a good example, where funding has been commissioned at a Gwent level to access that level of knowledge we are not expert in.

HC added that the steer we are getting is that they are not interested in the minutia of things, but of how the PSB can work differently and how the objectives we chose can be evidenced – although we can really benefit from the signposting Sophie Howe has done in her feedback.

SA commented that it's a really good plan and likes the simplicity of the box providing the clear ambition. Adding that it's an ambitious and achievable response.

NW stated that the plan represents the County well, but the next steps around consultation is done in a way that engages the population, making use of social media elements. Post sign-off the focus needs to be on the doing, for the Plan not to become a dry document.

CE suggested having some examples/case studies of what we are going to be doing in order to make the discussion more open. The idea of an independent chair of the PSB, and independent chairs of working groups from the community might give the using of the plan quite a lot of credibility. There is a lot of content around poverty – we should be pushing every employer in Monmouthshire to be living wage employers.

SM said that the document is excellent and that the hardest part is the next stage of how we are going to do it. We need to be selfish with our time at PSB to commit to getting the 'how' right. With regards to the 3rd aspiration "Consider our impact on the environment", SM asked that the wording is more firm than the 'consider' used.

ACTION: Alter wording of aspiration.

HJ commented that the plan is evidenced based and that a lot of work has gone into it – but is more interested in what happens next and the difference we make. As an organisation SWFRS have engagement staff that could be made available to contribute.

PK stated the need to work together and that the ethos is pushed down through the partner organisations – and that thinking outside the box is an important point, to try and come up with new solutions. The Plan will only translate into outcome if we commit to that and change some of the behaviours.

MG noted that the consultation is slightly different to last time, initial thoughts are to go out and about with a smaller number of events and to run some mini 'moonshot' sessions – a process used by Google to try and open the mindset in order to solve complex problems, rather than falling back to the same old solutions. The session could also be open to others. Further thought has gone into running a cohort through the Evolve process, which MCC has used recently – where people are brought together for a week to try and tackle the central issue.

SA said that we need to be clear about who our audience is, and to get people who have been working in partnerships in the old way to get them thinking in a new way is important. HC replied that the PSB, FG Commissioner and Welsh Government need to be able to relate to the plan as well as the public. We will be looking to create visual 'Plans on a Page', to effectively summarise.

PM stated that for him, its about community members and generating a willingness to participate and attaching to something. We are about to get to the starting line and we should be excited and full of energy, and is confident we can do good things.

HJ asked PM if it's fair that the Plan is not owned by MCC but the PSB is leaning a lot on them. PM replied that we are approaching the point of looking at that, we haven't discussed in the past as it would have distracted us from the work.

5. AOB

HJ explained that SWFRS have a tragic history of Domestic Violence/Domestic Abuse (DV/DA), but 3/4 years ago became White Ribbon accredited and each year a themed event to support the Not in My Name campaign. This year, SWFRS are branding their vehicles with large stickers displaying the White Ribbon.

PM asked whether any other partners are interested in doing something similar, as a PSB we need visibility and this can make a clear statement that public services are together on certain issues.

PF encouraged others to embrace the suggestion, to be proactive on what the White Ribbon means – having the logo is one important message but we need to help people understand why.

JW was happy to receive details and take part.

-END-

Action	Responsible
Alter the wording for the environmental aspiration, replacing the word 'Consider'.	MG
PSB support staff to begin consultation workshops with partnerships to explore the challenges within each of the objectives in more detail	SL & RJ