

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE HELD AT BY TEAMS ON MONDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2021**

<b>1. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES</b>
------------------------------------

**Present:**

Trish Buchan (Powys Teaching Health Board) (Chair)  
Councillor Steve Evans (Brecon Beacons National Park Authority)  
Councillor David Jones (Powys County Council)  
Liz Davis (Brecon Beacons National Park Authority)  
Peter Swanson (Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations)  
Ian Phillips (Powys Teaching Health Board)

**Officer in Attendance:**

Wyn Richards (Scrutiny Manager and Head of Democratic Services – Powys County Council)  
Rhian Jones (Strategic Planning, Policy and Performance Manager - Powys County Council)

**Apologies for Absence:**

Neil Evans (Chair) (Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue Service)  
Councillor Jonathan Wilkinson (Powys County Council)  
Councillor Liz Rjinenberg (Powys County Council)

<b>2. MINUTES</b>
-------------------

The Chair was authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 07-07-2021 as a correct record.

The Chair commented that a new population needs assessment was to be undertaken which was likely to mean a revision of the Public Service Board Well-Being Plan – Towards 2040.

<b>3. SCRUTINY OF WELL-BEING STEPS</b>
--

3.1. Scrutiny of Step 3 - Transport Infrastructure

**Documents Considered:**

- Step 3 – Transport Infrastructure – Quarter 1 and 2 Update Reports together with the revised Step 3 delivery plan.

**Issues Discussed:**

- Transport links – some transport routes being phased out in rural villages. This needs to be considered as part of the infrastructure as not everyone drives.

- This is difficult to scrutinise until the steps behind this are known in respect of what is to be delivered. There is a need to understand the outcomes and measures and what joins these together.
- A Member commented that there were two schools in his ward with no-one claiming Free School Meals which might suggest that the ward was wealthy. However the ward is classed as one of the worst wards in Wales in respect of transport deprivation.
- The Committee questioned whether this was ambitious enough, and is it merely sorting things out for the current generation rather than for future generations. Some of this is about carbon reduction.
- The action in this step is mainly around mapping charging points for electric vehicles.
- Objectives – what consultations have been undertaken with the public to see if this is what is wanted.
- This objective was established five years ago and based on the population assessment at that time. Powys is currently undertaking a new assessment which will be going out to consultation at the end of the week.
- The Committee was advised that the draft well-being assessment was being finalised and will be out for circulation this week.
- The document does not provide a meaningful and balanced account of progress against milestones and targets. It might be the case that conversations are needed with Welsh Government first before milestones are set and it would be better to say that in the document.
- There are no comparisons in the document or detail as to how far forward the step has progressed, to be able to identify what progress has been made.
- The Committee questioned whether the overall RAG status should be amber or probably red. However this was difficult to assess as the Committee did not possess enough information to make that judgement.
- Without Step 2 being delivered (Performance Framework which was led by BBNPA) then the others might automatically fail. There was a previous presentation and a template prepared but the Committee was unsure if the template had been rolled out.
- Unless you know what each organisation is doing in collaboration it is difficult to scrutinise this. There appears to be limited partnership working at present.
- There seems to be a disconnect between the original intention of the step and plotting the EV (electric vehicle) points across Powys. The original purpose seems to have been lost.
- The whole reason for collaboration is that transport routes do not stop at county boundaries.
- Due to Covid and budgetary pressures, other rural areas have undertaken innovative initiatives such as post vans in rural areas having seats fitted (Scotland). The Committee suggested that more innovative ideas were required for this step e.g. car sharing schemes. There are other schemes being undertaken elsewhere e.g. transport innovation in the National Park which could have been captured within this step.
- There is no detail in the step in respect of walking and cycling and the concept of the twenty minute village i.e. people having access to facilities within twenty minutes from home.

**Outcomes:**

- Liz Davies (BBNPA) to raise the issue of the Performance Framework with the Step Lead Organisation (BBNPA) to see if this can be progressed.
- 3.2. Quarter 2 Highlight Report - 12 Well-Being Steps

**Documents Considered:**

- Quarter 2 Highlight Reports for Well-Being Steps 1,3,6,7,9,10.

**Issues Discussed:**

- The six reports are the only ones submitted by the step leads due to other pressures.
- Step 1:
  - The Well-Being Plan will need to be updated before it can be scrutinised and it is time for this to be refreshed, which will start now with the needs assessment which will go out for consultation this week.
  - The vision is for 2040 – is this achievable? Sometimes its getting an understanding across various organisations that takes the time to get things started.
  - Development of a Communications and engagement plan – how is this amber the Committee did not have sight of the reports from all the steps to understand what collaborative work was being undertaken.
- Steps 11 and 12 – North Powys Well-Being project is moving ahead.
- There has been limited progress on some items within the steps.
- Is this a moment for a stocktake as we know that the world has changed and resources are stretched. Should we be doing a smaller number of things and doing them better?
- If you have a programme with a number of elements which are amber this is a concern as to whether the programme can be delivered.
- Step 3 – already discussed.
  - This should therefore be amber or red.
- Step 6:
  - There is a need to look at the formatting of these documents as currently they are difficult to read.
  - This step shows that much is happening, but it is a good summation of what has happened in Powys, and not captured what has been undertaken by partners e.g. development of healthcare posts PTHB and apprenticeships, and Black Mountain College in National Park.
  - It is usual to look for any additionality delivered in a collaborative plan. However, some of this is what is being done anyway. This reads too much about actions undertaken by Powys. However this does not include collaborative information.
  - The whole basis of the PSB is organisations working together and the Committee suggested that there was no evidence of that.
  - Skill Development areas are very traditional and there is no evidence of increasing the skill base such as developing carbon technologies. This is a traditional platform of learning and not set for the future.

- There is also a need to make sure that traditional skills are also looking to the future.
- Step 7:
  - This step appears that it does not have the resource to support it at present as it shows an amber rating for support.
  - It has identified the need to get partners together as a first step.
  - Not sure how a Local Authority can develop an energy strategy for communities as this is at a micro level.
  - There is insufficient information to be able to scrutinise this.
  - The Committee required clarification of the overall objective and the intention of this step.
  - All of the steps are not setting out clearly what needs to be achieved and therefore this makes it difficult to comment about progress.
- Steps 9 and 10: Being taken forward by the Mid Wales Growth Deal (MWGD).
  - There is insufficient information at present as to what is happening.
  - A big collaboration such as the MWGD will mean realigning the work of the PSB. The Committee needs and understanding of how all these projects interlink and how this links to the Well-Being Steps.
  - The Committee questioned whether these steps be now taken out of the Well-Being steps as they are being dealt with by the MWGD.
- There is an interdependency between the steps but there is lack of information and a performance framework to assist the committee scrutinise this information properly.
- What is the evidence about regeneration in a rural area.
- Concern about those who have not submitted information on the steps. Difficult for the Committee to scrutinise if no information is provided. However the Committee does understand the circumstances that people are working within and expressed its gratitude to those that have submitted reports.

**The Scrutiny Committee made the following observations to the Public Service Board:**

- The Committee acknowledged:
  - that the current review of the Highlight report would be limited as a new Well-Being Assessment had been completed and would be subject to consultation imminently. This was likely to change the aims of Vision 2040 and the Steps and outcomes to deliver that vision.
  - that the pandemic had, and was continuing to have, a significant impact on organisations and that resources available to deliver the Well-Being Steps were stretched. The Committee questioned whether the PSB should focus on a reduced number of steps, rather than a too wide ranging number of steps in future. This was highlighted by some of the step leads not having reported progress in Quarter 2.
- The Committee expressed concern at the lack of development of a consistent performance reporting framework for the Well-Being Steps, which made the review of the steps by scrutiny more difficult.

- The step reports often capture information relating to a particular organisation only, for example Step 6, which gave a good overview of what was happening in the Council but did not capture details of what was happening in collaboration with others or in other partnerships.
- The Committee felt that the highlight report lacked sufficient information about the objectives contributing to the overall step as well as detail of what had been achieved to date to be able to undertake an overall assessment of the step's progress.
- In relation to steps which were now being dealt with elsewhere such as under the banner of the Mid Wales Growth Deal, the Committee questioned why it should be continuing to look at these in future particularly as there was a separate scrutiny committee for the Growth Deal.
- The Committee suggested that there needs to be a realignment of the projects to ensure that how the steps interlink as well as how they interlink with projects such as the Mid Wales Growth Deal to assist the scrutiny assessment of how the overall project is drawn together and being delivered.

#### **Scrutiny Recommendations to the Public Service Board:**

- 1 That the development of a consistent performance framework be progressed as a matter of urgency**

<b>4.</b>	<b>WORK PROGRAMME</b>
-----------	-----------------------

The Committee noted that future meetings were scheduled as follows:

26-01-22	14.00 – 16.00
09-03-22	14.00 – 16.00
27-10-22	10.00 – 12.00

**County Councillor**