

**Public Service Board**  
**Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2018 at County Hall, Usk**

**Minutes**

**Attendees:**

Eric Bellew (for 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
David Letellier (for Steve Morgan)	Natural Resources Wales
Martin Featherstone	GAVO
Paula Kennedy	Melin Homes
Matthew Gatehouse	Monmouthshire County Council
Chris Edmondson	Community Member
Sian Curley	Office of Police & Crime Commissioner
Peter Fox	Monmouthshire County Council
Hazel Clatworthy	Monmouthshire County Council
Peter Carr	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board

**Apologies:**

Huw Jakeway	South Wales Fire and Rescue Service
Diane Watkins	Aneurin Bevan Health Board
John Keegan	Monmouthshire Housing
Steve Morgan	Natural Resources Wales

### **1. Welcome and apologies**

PM welcomed all to the meeting.

### **2. Minutes of the last meeting (4<sup>th</sup> April 2018) & Matters Arising**

The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

### **3. Wellbeing Plan**

MG provided some context to the group on the process. Asking the PSB to review the paper and its recommendations around the ambition, resourcing and sequencing of the steps set out in the Wellbeing Plan.

SL gave a presentation where 4 clusters were introduced as a means of grouping some of the similar steps under the headings of 'Economy & Skills', 'Transport', 'Housing' and 'Individual Wellbeing'. Alongside this, there would be other steps that are 'building blocks' and would impact on each cluster.

EB asked what baseline data we have at the moment, and do we know what success would look like for each cluster. SL explained that we are setting the ambition/vision at the moment, trying to discover what we need to explore in more detail and understand what we are looking to deliver. MG added that these are complex issues that we have failed to shift in conventional ways, and are things we will struggle to measure with traditional metrics.

PC commented that the metrics would need to be subjective as people in the community might have different views to us. MG responded that this work was done as part of the Wellbeing Assessment, and the Happiness Pulse will also aid with this. CE added that she was concerned that the people likely to respond are likely to be from higher economic groups and would like to see us putting a lot of effort into schools and early years.

MF stated that he was at the Programme Board session where the step leads discussed their area, and that he got a sense they were up for the challenge, and it's up to PSB to respond to that energy and ambition. MF said that it's helpful to reflect on the clusters but we need to raise the bar a bit, and perhaps not talk so much about the process.

PM noted that he wasn't interested in talking process, and offered his opinion on each of the clusters, agreeing with each cluster – saying that they are easier to follow than the original document.

PK said that there was nothing to disagree with and we need to support it, and that the PSB should provide leadership by going back to individual organisations and stating that 'we are behind this'.

PF echoed PK's comments, saying that the Council's Corporate Plan references the steps set out but we now need to get into the action. Also, asking if projects could be put aside the bubbles in the diagram to see it fleshed out a bit more.

PM asked MG, SL and HC to rank the 4 clusters from 1-4 for levels of clarity and ambiguity, based on the conversations they have been party to.

In order, SL scored the clusters 2, 2, 2, 3. Highlighting that the LDP is a crucial piece of work for the Housing cluster.

MG commented that there are elements in each cluster that are 1, but also some would be close to 3 – also reflecting that not all partners have done their homework so there isn't enough understanding of what the vision could be. Scoring the clusters 1, 2, 2.5, 3. HC scored them 3, 2, 2.5, 2.5 – noting that the issue with business is that there is no business representative on the PSB and no obvious partnership to tap into.

PM commented that there doesn't seem to be sufficient levels of clarity to move forward, unless we have explicit clarity then we can't change current plans to direct to this line of work. Adding that we have to accept we're not quite where we want to be, and we need to make the clusters a 1.

When asked by PF, PM said that he sees a 1 as being something that with 5 years of work, we will be able to see a difference. Also having a sense of how we can intervene to get there, with a series of interventions to commit and stick to over 5 years that are significant enough for us to be interested.

HC emphasised that we were hoping to have a more complete pack to come to the meeting, some of the steps require the need to get the people round the table to work out issues and potential solutions.

DL agreed that we ought to have clarity, but asked if we are clear that we have the resources to do this, can we say if we are being ambitious enough or being too ambitious? SL responded that we would have to look at the sequencing and how we take the steps forward, recognising that we may not have the resource for it all but there would be some that could be prioritised that may impact on others.

SC explained that work is currently being done on the Police & Crime Plan, and align it to the Wellbeing Objectives, noting that from a policing perspective we are not as coordinated ourselves to be able to link with the PSB.

PK stated that we need to give permission to the PB to take their work to the next level that can give us confidence to allocate resources.

PF asked how would the money flow, how can we invest very early to ensure the long term benefit and see the tangible outcome as we want to see progress. PM replied that we need clarity, we don't have the answers yet as we haven't set the problem.

PM summarised that we are not quite there but we are moving. The intensity needs to be raised so as to not have this conversation again.

#### **4. Feedback from PSB Scrutiny Committee**

MG informed the group that the Scrutiny Committee meet roughly 2 weeks before PSB. For the last meeting there was a fairly low turnout which maybe reflects the complexity of the agenda, and the level of process documents going before them.

HC also noted that the Committee did say they would like to invite partners to future meetings to see how they are working. The next meeting is October time, and it would be expected that an invite for 2 partners to attend that meeting and 2 invites for each subsequent meeting.

PM stated that a sequence will be established and circulated.

#### **5. Developing Regional Work**

MG provided some background, that £74k was made available by Welsh Government to work at a regional level. GSWAG (Gwent Strategic Wellbeing Assessment Group) agreed to fund 2 pieces of work for 2017/18, one of which was to Happy City – who ran a Happiness Pulse and a Wellbeing Index. The pulse questionnaire provided a sense of wellbeing throughout Monmouthshire, whereas the index highlighted Monmouthshire as lacking in income inequality, ecological footprint and transport deficit.

The second piece of work was by Ash Futures, who looked at various different scenarios for the future and what that would look like. The overview paper has been circulated, members should contact David Barnes if they would like a copy of the full reports.

When asked by PF, MG explained that the Happy City work was £50k, with Ash Futures costing £24k. Adding the Welsh Government wouldn't allow us to take our split and spend it elsewhere.

## **6. Domestic Homicide Review (DHR)**

SL stated that the pilot is currently running, with the VAWDASV board overseeing the DHR & APR pilot - along with Welsh Government, Home Office and a professor from Cardiff University as interested observers.

As part of the process, the PSB have been asked to take a closer role in the pilot, and have asked SL as a PSB Supporting Officer to sit on the review board to ensure that communication is strengthened between the pilot and PSB.

If happy, the board will look at how they report back into the PSB, whether it be to the full PSB or just to CSP (Community Safety Partnership) partners around the table.

## **7. Any Other Business**

None

-END-

<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
Report back to Programme Board on gaining clarity for each cluster	SL
Establish sequence for PSB scrutiny invites	MG