

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD AT BY TEAMS ON WEDNESDAY, 7 JULY 2021

1. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

Present:

Neil Evans (Chair) (Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue Service)
Trish Buchan (Powys Teaching Health Board)
County Councillor Liz Rijnenberg (Powys County Council)
County Councillor Ann Webb (Brecon Beacons National Park Authority)
Peter Swanson (Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations)
Ian Phillips (Powys Teaching Health Board)
County Councillor Jonathan Wilkinson (Powys County Council)
Gavin Bown (Natural Resources Wales)

Officer in Attendance:

Wyn Richards (Powys County Council – Scrutiny Manager and Head of Democratic Services)
Catherine James (Powys County Council – Deputy Head of Transformation and Communications)
Rhian Jones (Powys County Council – Strategic Planning, Policy and Performance Manager)

Apologies for Absence:

County Councillor David Jones (Powys County Council)
Emma Palmer (Powys County Council – Head of Transformation and Communications)

2. MINUTES

The Chair was authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 04-05-2021 as a correct record.

3. WELL-BEING STEP 8 - SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY

Documents Considered:

- Quarter 4 Performance Report – Step 8 – 2020-21.
- Presentation – update on the Delivery Plan and Performance Report by the Step Lead.

Issues Discussed:

- Activities had been put on hold due to the pandemic. There had also been a change to the responsible individuals from partner organisations during the period. This had provided the opportunity to reflect on the original intent of the step and what the step was seeking to achieve.
- Other factors taken into account included Welsh Government's Green Recovery policy, the UK exit from the European Union, climate change, developments in the evidence base as well as progress in Wales and in the regional strategic context.

- Although work on the step was suspended due to the pandemic a working group had reconvened, reviewed the original intent to better understand the linkages and dependencies, understand current activities, projects and interventions from the various partners and capture this information in an online resource so that any gaps could be identified.
- Key actions had been reviewed, initially more around the timing of elements of the step. There might be a need to refine some of the detail in the step and move from a formal strategy to a more practical tool to better support conservation activities.
- Work on Step 8 had now resumed and better reflected the current circumstances and outlook. Refinements to the original intent had been identified and implemented and the step was largely on track to deliver the revised timetable.

- Questions:

<p>Is the purpose of step 8 now narrower than the strapline.</p>	<p>This was the challenge to revisit the original intent and better understand it. It may also be broadened out as a result of the forthcoming well-being assessment. The step is a co-ordination of all these activities.</p>
<p>The Committee expressed concern at the last meeting about the progress with the step, and also about the links between steps. Will this step look at biodiversity and pollution.</p>	<p>The step will look at biodiversity. There is a need to be careful not to over broaden the step so that it delivers something functional rather than being too ambitious. However this could also be drawn into other areas in future and join up in supporting other activities.</p>
<p>It is helpful that the step has been refocussed on a narrower area of interest with the mapping and realigning work to take it forward. Is there good engagement from other partners and is there enough resource available for the step. When will milestones and targets be set.</p>	<p>Resource will be an ongoing issue. Engagement has been good since the step resumed. This is why this has been narrowed to focus the aim of the step. However the focus could change again as a result of changes to the well-being plan.</p>
<p>Other partners are required to deliver sustainable options and organisations have their own sustainability officers. Why do these not feed into this step.</p>	<p>There is some of that work which falls within step 8 and other elements which fall within other steps such as step 7 (transport and fleet). The work tries to make clear that what is undertaken within step 8 does not cut across other PSB steps.</p>
<p>Looking at tangible outcomes and breaking that into assessment, action planning and review, is the step still at assessment stage.</p>	<p>That is a fair comment. Officers are trying to get through the step as quickly as possible but there is a need to get this right.</p>
<p>Should scrutiny have looked at the narrowing of the step.</p>	<p>All step leads were asked by the PSB to review their steps. There are also circumstances which have led</p>

	to changes to steps. Although the timetable has been revised as well as a few of the actions, the intent of the step is as originally set. What has been identified is a tool to better deliver the step. The level of change in the step is not that significant.
It is helpful that engagement is good, but due to the increased pressures on partners is this impacting on resourcing the step.	The buy in is there, but the pressure is the capacity of partners.
The timescales for the delivery of actions is ambitious. In terms of moving towards 2040 the step is behind for understandable reasons and it is not yet possible to set measurable targets so it feels as if the step is still at a very high level.	This is the challenge about delivering the step and this is not just about ticking a box.

The Committee commented that the timescales for the step are ambitious but realistic and met the 5 ways of working. Whilst the foundations are in place with the step it is when actions are being undertaken that the impact on communities will become apparent.

Recommendations to the Public Service Board:

1. That if there are significant changes to steps in future, it would assist the Committee if it could be advised of the background to better understand the change.

4. POWYS PSB DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21

Documents Considered:

- Powys PSB Draft Annual Report 2020-21.

Issues Discussed:

- The report was presented for information as it has to be published by the end of July. It provided an overview of information provided to the scrutiny committee over the year. There is a recognition that some of the steps have not moved forward as anticipated due to the pandemic. It is hoped to bring the document to the Committee earlier next year for scrutiny prior to its publication.

- Questions:

Partnership work is always difficult. The Council has undertaken much work but the report does not show a balance regarding the role of partners. Whilst the larger organisations have undertaken most of the work the document could	This is less about the report but about the engagement during the year from a cross section of partners. This is something the PSB probably needs to address.
---	---

have included observations about the role of smaller organisations in the achievements.	
This is just perception and its about getting a greater involvement from partners in future. The PSB needs to get more involvement from partners in terms of feedback as seeing smaller organisations involved will encourage more interest and buy-in.	
It is helpful to see that there has been progress at the end of the year despite the pandemic. The Health Board are looking at steps 11 and 12. Are steps 9 and 10 being considered together.	Steps 9 and 10 are being pulled together under the Mid Wales Growth Deal for delivery with the Council leading on these steps.

Outcomes:

- **Noted.**

5. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled for 7th October, 2021. It was suggested that it might be necessary to delay the meeting to align with the Q2 PSB reporting timeline.

AGREED to move the 7th October meeting to another date to be agreed with the Chair.

Members were advised to contact the Chair and Scrutiny Officer if there were any particular steps they wished to have considered at the next meeting. The Chair suggested that the meeting could consider Step 3 as this was led by the Fire Service.

Meeting ended 15:00

N Evans (Chair)