



Gwent Public Services Board

4th Business Meeting – 13:00pm Thursday 30th June 2022
Notes of Meeting

Present:

Name	Organisation represented
Pam Kelly (PK)	Gwent Police (Chair for the meeting)
Cllr Sean Morgan (Cllr SM)	Caerphilly County Borough Council
Cllr Jane Mudd (Cllr JM)	Newport City Council
Huw Morse (HM)	South Wales Fire and Rescue Service (SWF&RS)
Ann Lloyd (AL)	Chair ABUHB
Anne Evans (AE)	Torfaen Voluntary Alliance
Stephen Tiley (ST)	Gwent Association of Voluntary Organisations (GAVO)
Dr Sarah Aitken (Dr SA)	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Maureen Howell (MH)	Welsh Government
Amanda Lewis (AL)	National Probation Service
Beverly Owen (BO)	Newport City Council
Paul Matthews (PM)	Monmouthshire County Council
Christina Harray (CH)	Caerphilly CBC
Jeff Cuthbert (JC)	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent
Damien McCann (DM)	Blaenau Gwent CBC
Steve Morgan (SM)	Natural Resources Wales
Cllr Mary Ann Brocklesby (MAB)	Monmouthshire County Council
Nicola Prygodzicz (NP)	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Cllr Steven Thomas (ST)	Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
Cllr Steve Broadwick (SB)	South Wales Fire & Rescue Authority
Cllr Anthony Hunt	Torfaen CBC

In Attendance:

Kathryn Peters (KP)	Caerphilly CBC
Sharran Lloyd (SL)	Monmouthshire CC
Richard Jones (RJ)	Monmouthshire CC
Lyndon Puddy (LPu)	Torfaen CBC
Paul Cooke (PC)	Caerphilly CBC
Sarah King (SK)	Blaenau Gwent CBC
David Arnold (DA)	Blaenau Gwent CBC
Allan Dallimore (AD)	Caerphilly CBC
Heather Delonnette (HD)	Caerphilly CBC
Vicki Doyle (VD)	Caerphilly CBC
Ellie Fry (EF)	Blaenau Gwent CBC
Mark Cadwallader (MC)	University of South Wales
Tracy McKim (TM)	Newport CC
Lee Parker (LPa)	Torfaen CBC
Sam Slater (SS)	Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Gwent
Sarah Tipping (STi)	Torfaen CBC
Will Beer (WB)	Aneurin Bevan UHB

Apologies:

Paul Massey	Caerphilly CBC
Huw Jakeway	South Wales Fire & Rescue Service
Ben Calvert	University of South Wales
Glyn Jones	Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Sian Curley	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent

0. Welcome and Appointment of New Chair

KP began the meeting as there was no current Chair of the PSB, and the Vice Chair (Huw Jakeway) was unavailable. It had been agreed that PK would chair the meeting. **Action: KP to arrange for an email to be sent out regarding the appointment of a new Chair so this could be agreed before the next meeting of the PSB.**

1. Introductions and Apologies

PK welcomed attendees to the meeting and ran through the list of apologies received. PSB members introduced themselves.

2. Notes and Matters Arising from the meeting of the Gwent PSB on 10th March 2021

The draft minutes were agreed as accurate. All action points from the previous meeting had been completed or were on the agenda for this meeting.

3. Well-being Plan Development – Response Analysis Update

HD attended the meeting to present the response analysis work that had been undertaken, and discussed the main points of covering report on this topic. She noted that the objectives need to be based on the Well-being Assessment and the issues that highlighted, although she acknowledged that things have moved on from this with the war in Ukraine and cost of living crisis. At PSB meeting in March was agreed that there would be three areas of focus for the response analysis – community cohesion (including community safety and substance misuse), environment (including climate and nature emergencies), and health and well-being inequalities (including housing and related issues). She noted that in preparing the Plan we have to work in a way that encompasses the five ways of working – long term, prevention, collaboration, involvement and integrated. She also noted that the outline objectives should be integrated, holistic and outcome focused, complementing and reinforcing one another rather than heading off in different directions. They should be areas where the PSB can add most value, rather than perhaps easier issues to deal with, and they should not be retrofitted to work that is already happening. Once the objectives have been agreed the reasonable steps will fall out of those. She stated that the 14-week consultation with the Future Generations Commissioner had begun, and we will continue to work with them during the development of the Plan.

SM expressed the thanks of PSB to the Leads in developing the Assessment and response analysis to date, particularly the work of Caerphilly in leading on this. He stated his view was that the areas are the right ones but agreed that more work was needed for them to need to be more cross cutting, and there are likely to look different. He noted his interest in how the process of developing the objectives and steps would happen. He also noted the need to keep abreast of developments around the economy and the work that is being done elsewhere via the Cardiff City Region.

PM also thanked the officers involved to date. He agreed that areas of focus are right and also agreed that more work was needed to develop much clearer objectives with easily understood language. He stressed the need to continue asking what is it that only the PSB can do.

Cllr JM also thanked everyone for the work so far. She noted that there is emerging clarity in terms of the relationship and alignment between the Marmot principles, the Well-being Assessment and the objectives. She stated that Marmot is not just a health issue and is also firmly rooted in the wider socio-economic determinants of health and well-being. She noted the importance of concentrating on fulfilment of our statutory responsibilities, and anything else is an addition which can be developed over time.

HD acknowledged that there is more work to be done around the language used and what the objectives say, as at the moment they are quite high level. She agreed that the alignment with Marmot is helpful, although there is probably a need to widen the focus to inequalities in general rather than specifically health. She noted that officers will want to come back to PSB informally over the next few months to sound out members on the revised objectives.

Dr SA welcomed the reference to inequalities in general rather than just health as that was what the Assessment told us. She noted that there are global threats in terms of the cost of living, climate change, infections etc. which disproportionately affect those with the least. She stated that Marmot is written in plain English and ABUHB have invited in IHE to help give their view on what works given their experience. She noted that Marmot also covers community cohesion and climate change, so it could be used as a framework for the direction of travel.

JC's view was that the interlinking of objectives is clear, but he supported the need to use clear language. He asked HD how the PSB could support in getting this done.

HD noted that the drafting group is being repurposed to contribute to the Plan and further develop the cross-cutting work that is needed. **Action: HD to provide informal feedback on the ongoing development of the Plan to PSB members.** She also noted that the Commissioner's Office can also help us to refine and hone the objectives.

PK noted that an important part of this activity is translating the Plan into delivery, which is what ultimately the PSB needs to focus on. She asked whether Marmot could provide the framework for all three areas that were considered under the response analysis.

Dr SA suggested that there could be an overarching objective around achieving equity across our whole population, which is long term in terms of the ultimate goal for future generations. She noted that the latest health data shows that we are going in the wrong direction, so if equity is the overarching objective, how we get there is the life course approach that Marmot describes in the principles. What we do in the next five years will take us there or lay the foundations for how we get there.

PM noted that the greatest weakness of the Marmot framework is the perception that it is about health, when clearly it is not - it is a framework of equity or inequality depending on your view. He stated that environmental degradation is a major concern, so it fits comfortably in this space. He agreed that there was merit in having one framework rather than two or three different ones, which would make it easier for the PSB to work collectively. He noted the need to bedrock this as it is likely that some of PSB will move onto other things in the next five years, so others will need to pick it up and carry it on.

CH noted that Marmot provides a unique opportunity, but it will involve adopting new approach and some risk, and suggested that PSB members may need to provide some help to the drafting team up until September. She stated that she was happy to act as a conduit to other Chief Executive's in order to keep the momentum going. PK suggested adding points of contact to chat.

Dr SA suggested that when the meeting covered the Marmot agenda item the PSB might want to consider a process to bring Marmot and the Plan together. PK supported this as there may be PSB members that may not be so familiar with Marmot.

Commented [DH1]: Should this be PSB?

4. Shared Prosperity Fund

EF attended the meeting to give an update on the SPF to PSB members. She noted this was a UK Government fund which very fast moving at the moment, and one of the important principles of the funding is to share information at the different stages. A conditional allocation has been given from the SPF across the UK, and for the Cardiff City Region there is a combined allocation of £230m, plus £48m for an initiative called 'Multiply' which is about adult numeracy.

The SPF is mostly revenue, although some capital expenditure is eligible, and a maximum percentage split has been suggested by the UK Government for the region. The regional allocation of both revenue and capital in 2023 is £28m, with £56m in 2024 and £146m in 2025. It is hoped that the SPF will

continue after the initial three years. Once a response is received from Westminster in relation to the Regional Investment Plan that has been prepared, it is likely that there will only be four months delivery in the current year.

The region has included allocations for each of the three SPF investment priority areas, which are communities and place, skills and employability, and business support. Under each of these priorities there is a list of interventions that are eligible for funding, and the region has gathered evidence such as Well-being Plans, local plans, regional strategies etc. to try and match the evidence to the interventions. EF noted that the detail of individual projects has not yet been agreed, although allocations have been identified in relation to need.

Allocations will be delivered at both local and regional levels, and there are a number of local interventions emerging that could be drawn up into regional interventions. All ten local authorities in the CCR have worked on their local investment plan, and these are being submitted to the UK Government through the Regional Investment Plan, led by Rhondda Cynon Taff Council. She noted that the work is iterative and still live, so the information being shared is as up to date as possible at the current time.

The Regional Investment Plan identifies common and regional themes to act as umbrella themes for the CCR area:

- Communities and place
 - Development and resilience of communities by improving facilities
 - Access to services and supporting community-based organisations
 - Action to support individuals and community-based organisations to deal with the challenges of the current economic, environment and the cost-of-living crisis
 - Supporting the improvement and redevelopment of town centres and community policies to revitalize them, improving access to and facilities for local people and communities and sport, culture, arts and heritage
 - Supporting action to improve services and facilities for young people
 - Action to support decarbonization, energy efficiency, green initiatives and communities and places
- Support for local businesses
 - Business premises development and improvement
 - Small business support and development including finance for growth and resilience
 - Small business support for key growth sectors, research and development and innovation
 - Support for growth and development of the visitor economy, including businesses facilities and events
 - Action to support decarbonization, energy efficiency and green economy initiatives for businesses and social enterprises
- People and skills
 - Regional employability and skills framework
 - People in employment in key sectors
 - Employed and economically inactive people
 - Young people entering into employment

EF noted that regional joint commissioning will run across all three priorities and local delivery, which will include projects such as employer support programmes, business club projects, improving digital inclusion and future skills pathway. 1st August is the deadline for submitting the Regional Investment Plan and the local investment plans will still be developing following this date. She stated that the Regional Plan is very much an umbrella document and that further and more detailed consultation will be undertaken as part of the next stage.

She noted that the regional commissioning component and the delivery mechanisms are not yet clear and the final guidance from UK Government has not been received. Agreement has tentatively been reached that there are activities that will be considered for commissioning collectively. Also, there are

areas for the Third Sector to be involved in as they are already doing work in certain areas.

PK asked what the ask of the PSB is. EF replied that the Gwent initiatives are potentially part of regional initiatives so projects may be taken forward at a Gwent level or the CCR level. She noted the importance of taking the public sector and other important partners of the PSB with the work so they can understand where it is. The next round of consultation will get into the deeper detail of some of the priorities and themes that have been identified and the potential for commissioning. EF stated that at this stage it is about the PSB being happy with the Regional Plan and then having further involvement as the work progresses.

ST asked what the timeframe for involvement from partners is, particularly voluntary sector. He noted that there is also a need to get community organisations to come forward with possible projects and ideas. EF stated that UK Government have been informed that this detailed consultation would not happen before 1st August, and it would take place August and October. ST asked whether there was an opportunity for some of the PSB partners to be involved before the submission of the Regional Plan. EF responded that what is being done now is very high level, so the work isn't at a stage for discussing the detail of projects. Once the key themes have been agreed there will be an opportunity able to have that conversation on a local basis. She noted that Higher/Further Education have said that they want a lot of money from this funding source, but they have been told that they cannot expect to get all their funding from this. She stated that a lot of partners have already been involved through partnership groups such as the Regional Employability and Skills Group, but she was happy to speak to anyone that has not been involved to date.

Dr SA asked whether we are we making things hard for ourselves in terms of identifying needs – we already have the Well-being Assessment which identifies all the issues and inequalities so could we use that for this purpose. She noted that there is also a need for this work to link in with Gwent Well-being Plan once it is developed. EF noted that a lot of the evidence has come from the current Well-being Plans, and these are the documents being used to look at the evidence locally.

JC requested details of the figures quoted in the presentation. He also noted Welsh Government have been sidestepped in this process by the UK Government and asked whether there is a mechanism for involving WG in the process. EF noted that she is already working closely with partners across the CCR and WG colleagues and trying to link up with WG priorities and policies. She noted that WG are not necessarily on board with having their funding used to match the SPF, however they are not averse, so it may be possible to have projects sitting alongside one another and match up funding rather than being used to match fund, so those are the sort of conversations that are happening. The focus is on trying to ensure that there are as few gaps as possible, and that funding is wrapped around the SPF with things already being done to make the funding go further. **Action: EF to provide a summary of the figures discussed in her presentation.**

Cllr JM acknowledged that officers are working to really tight timeframes, and they need to keep the momentum going. She stated that what would be helpful if for EF to share the themes and categories to reassure PSB members of what has been included. She noted that there will also be further opportunities to engage in the process in the future once the Regional Plan has been approved. **Action: EF to share details of the themes and categories that are being taken forward.**

PK noted that sometimes when new funding is available, something else drops off, so the PSB needs to understand the impact of potentially losing other money and the possible impact on Gwent. EF noted that the SPF is a replacement for European funding, so there will not be this source going forward.

5. Update on Gwent Marmot Region

Dr SA continued the earlier conversation about Marmot being a framework to address inequalities and the Well-being Assessment in the round, rather than just for health. She discussed the original six Marmot principles plus the two new ones – tackling racial discrimination and its outcomes, and pursuing environmental sustainability and health equity. She noted that the impact of any external threat is greatest on those who have less and that the latest data on childhood obesity and healthy life

expectancy is included in her report. She stated that as previously predicted, the impact of the pandemic has been to widen inequalities in Gwent, so it is no longer theoretical. She gave the example of childhood obesity as a lifestyle measure, which is actually a measure of equity as it is about the affordability of a health diet and many other things. She noted that the recommendations included in her report are that the data is going in the wrong direction, to agree the establishment of a terms of reference for the Marmot Programme Leadership Group and to approve the two additional Marmot principles. PSB members were also asked to agree that Marmot is the framework by which we address inequalities, to agree the principles for the communication strategy and note the timeline for the programme.

PK asked whether the inequalities for women in particular going are wrong direction in Gwent and why we might be out of kilter with other areas. Dr SA responded that this was not just being seen in the UK it is internationally also, with America leading the way as it is lifestyle related. For example. She noted that there is a lag between an increase in the proportion of the population smoking and the effect on death rates. Women also took up smoking later than men, so the rates for men are coming down faster than for women, so that is a contributory factor.

HD commented via the meeting chat that we need to make sure that Marmot and the Well-being plan are aligned and supporting each other.

MH endorsed the paper from a WG perspective and stated that it is something that they are really interested in. She noted that a Minister is meeting with Michael Marmot the same day to discuss the broader approach that WG is developing in terms of addressing inequalities and tackling poverty. She requested to be an observer on the Leadership Group so she can feedback to WG on how the work progresses and develops.

PSB members agreed the establishment of a terms of reference for the Leadership Group. Dr SA stated that she sees the Leadership Group working within the parameters set by the PSB, so if members are content with the two new Marmot principles and the communication principles the Leadership Group can work within that between now and the September meeting and ensure that the point about alignment is picked up.

SM stated that the adoption of principles 7 and 8 were important. His view was that there does not need to be specific environmental representation on the Leadership Group, but he wanted to have a conversation with Dr SA around what the pursuance of environmental sustainability and health equity together could look like. Dr SA responded that the suggested membership of the Leadership Group was detailed in the report, and it can increase, but she did not want to reproduce the PSB membership in full. PK suggested that through the PSB secretariat a briefing could be produced for the future Chair of the PSB. She acknowledged that this was a learning curve for the PSB and there was potentially something exciting in terms of shaping the thinking of the PSB.

PSB members agreed to keep membership of the sub-group small (as set out in the proposed Terms of Reference) to ensure that it did not replicate the PSB and would therefore not open up to additional nominations for the time being.

6. Update on the Response to the Humanitarian Crisis in Ukraine

As Superintendent Mike Richards was not in attendance, LP gave a verbal update. Supt MR is meeting with all local authorities across Gwent on a weekly/fortnightly basis as necessary in terms of getting consistency and coordination across Gwent, as well as information exchange. At a Gwent level, Supt MR is also chairing a Tensions Monitoring Group, and presently there are no areas of concern at a local authority or Gwent Police level. Meetings are also taking place weekly with WG in terms of the operational interface not now that the Super Sponsor Scheme is up and running. Within each local authority there are also independent task groups that have been set up with invitations to all relevant parties. These groups discuss how we are doing in terms of supporting and engaging with our Ukrainian families, integrating in communities etc.

LP outlined the various schemes that are running including the Ukraine Family Scheme, the Homes for Ukraine scheme and the WG sponsored Super Sponsor Scheme, which was originally for 1,000 visas,

and which are currently being supported by a number of welcome centres across the UK. To date 3,260 applications have been received under the first two schemes, 2,803 applications have been accepted and 1,892 Ukrainians have arrived. In relation to the WG Super Sponsor Scheme 4,878 applications have been received, 3,984 visas have been issued and 1,087 people have arrived.

He noted that in terms of welcome centres in Gwent, the Monmouthshire hub was established in April and is currently operating and a maximum capacity of 225 guests in 128 rooms, and two families have already moved on from the centre. In Blaenau Gwent there is a 36-room capacity unit and Newport have been working with WG on higher than normal hotel provision to support welcome centre provision.

In terms of other pressures across Gwent and Wales as a whole, officers are trying to support all the schemes in addition to the other Home Office schemes, such as the Afghan scheme that all authorities are signed up to also, so as local authorities we are working hard to find alternative provision to welcome centres and work collectively. He acknowledged that it was difficult unless hosts are coming forward and the teams are finding that a number of people are dropping out of the schemes. He noted that the Super Sponsor Scheme is currently paused, and the numbers are in excess of the 1,000 visa that were originally expected. Local authorities are working with WG on how we can support them further, but every local authority across Gwent is struggling with temporary provision, linked to our existing populations in terms of the housing register and homelessness. He also noted that translation services are also under pressure as there are only six interpreters. Authorities are also starting to recruit additional community safety and community cohesion officers to work collectively with families in terms of offering support to both the guests coming in and also the sponsor, which is critical. Colleagues in health and education are also reporting pressures to their services.

BO acknowledged that the health pressures are significant and may be about to go over a cliff. She noted that some individuals have quite significant support needs, and data sharing is a significant issue. Health have offered to help WG in terms of problem solving, as they are the experts in the field. She noted that more support is needed in terms of checks and safeguarding, but we also need better accommodation solutions that are not just about RSL's but also, for example, about accommodation blocks. We need to think creatively of what can be done with support from WG.

Dr SA noted that health screening is under significant pressure. She noted that agreement has been reached with WG that the clinic at Magor will be initial point of contact via 111 for all welcome centres.

PK asked what the ask of the PSB was. LP acknowledged that the right people are around the table in order to pull together the various strands and pressures. He noted that the key issue being raised by housing colleagues is that there is a supply issue, as there is not an endless supply of housing, and housing is being lost from the private rented sector. He stated that he had contacted WG to ask whether they had considered military defence accommodation that could potentially be used not only for the Ukrainian scheme but also for the other schemes we are all signed up to. He had a positive response to this so more conversations are likely to take place.

7. Developing a Regional Scrutiny

DA discussed the main points of the report circulated with the agenda. He noted that once a Regional Scrutiny has been established, the plan is to maintain the individual local authority Scrutiny committees in order to continue to monitor progress under the existing Well-being Plans, and also to scrutinize local activity. The Regional Scrutiny will operate from the Autumn and will effectively scrutinize the development of the Well-being Plan. There will be elected representation from the five local authorities and representation from the four statutory members outlined in the report.

He noted that a precedent had been set by the CCR that RCT would host the Regional Scrutiny and would be paid £15k annually to support the operation of the committee, and it was proposed that the same would happen for the Well-being Plan. This means that if 9 PSB member organisations commit just under £2k then one organisation would take on the resourcing of the committee. He noted it would be for the PSB to decide who took on this role.

JC asked for some clarity around the recommendation in relation to the membership of the committee

from local authorities and other organisations, and this was provided.

Cllr JM noted that she had been unable to find anything in the report about the mechanism for reporting back, and asked what happens to the outputs from the PSB in terms of reporting to the Regional Scrutiny committee. Obviously they will hold the PSB partners to account, but where does that output then go, and how is it filtered back to member organisations. DA responded that within the local Scrutiny committee there has to be political balance, and he wasn't sure if this would be the same for the Regional Scrutiny. He agreed to take this back and check what was intended in relation to political balance. He noted that the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the local Scrutiny committees would be co-opted members or invited members on the Local Delivery Groups to feed back the views of Scrutiny, so whether the plan is for the Chair and Vice Chair of Regional scrutiny to attend the PSB is something to be considered.

CH noted that in relation to resourcing the Regional Scrutiny committee there have been no discussions amongst Chief Executive's about this issue. DA noted that this was something that will need further discussion. CH suggested that this issue is brought back to the next meeting to allow Chief Executive's a chance to discuss.

SM noted that he was currently discussing NRW's representation on the Regional Scrutiny with their Board in terms of whether they can offer someone as there are 15 PSBs across Wales. He was hopeful that he would know more by September.

8. Participatory Budgeting

WB presented the report, the purpose of which was to seek agreement on the future arrangements for participatory budgeting across Gwent following the formation of the Gwent PSB. He explained that participatory budgeting is a democratic process that enables people to have more direct control and decision-making powers over how public budgets are spent.

He noted that the Future Generations Commissioner has recommended that public bodies explore the use of participatory budgeting to empower communities and develop community led solutions, and also as a way of building trust in public bodies.

He stated that participatory budgeting has been established in each of the five local authority areas, an approach first piloted by Newport using some money from the Home Office to deal with serious and organised crime in their area, and that approach has been built on over the years.

He noted that the report included details of the progress been made in each of the local authority areas over the last 3-4 years and the different models that have been adopted. In terms of future plans, the general view is that there is merit in continuing to trial this approach to community involvement and developing community led solutions, and it sits very well within the spirit of the Well-being of Future Generations Act. It is particularly important at the moment in the context of the pandemic recovery and the ambitions around the Marmot region.

A suggestion has been made to establishing a learning network across the five local authorities to share the learning from the approaches taken and also probably a shared approach to how the impact that this program is having on our communities can be evaluated.

He stated that in terms of funding and governance, the proposal is that the overall governance remains with the Gwent PSB, but there is default decision making down through each of the local well-being partnerships and the five local authority areas. A further recommendation is that the local authorities continue to act as the budget holder and recipients for the funds, and that each local authority area can utilize up to 10% of those budgets to help with the management costs. He acknowledged that if it is managed poorly, it can be quite divisive, so it has to be a very well-run process.

Cllr JM noted that this had been a very successful programme in Newport and had really worked well. She was interested in the concept of establishing a learning network and what can be learnt from one another in terms of good practice, and also the challenges and how they can be overcome.

PSB members supported all the recommendations included in the report.

9. PSB Terms of Reference – incorporating Openness and Transparency

It was agreed to circulate these to PSB members outside the meeting for agreement. **Action P Massey to circulate**

10. AOB and Format of Future Meetings

CH asked whether PSB members were happy to continue with virtual meetings, whether they wanted to move to a hybrid model which had been tried previously, or whether they wanted to return to face-to-face meetings. Her view was that digital meetings work well when participants can get online, and face-to-face meetings could be used if a workshop is needed, for example.

Dr SA supported this view and noted that there would need to be workshop associated with the Marmot work, so that would provide an opportunity to meet face-to-face. PSB members agreed to continue with virtual meetings and face-to-face where required.

JC discussed the Harm to Hope programme, the UK Government's drug policing strategy in Wales. He has discussed a coordinated approach with WG, although it is a programme that the UK Government are launching and funding. It covers issues such as prosecution of drug dealers, dealing with people who are addicted and prevention issues. He noted that there are some issues about how the money is being allocated in WG, but these are being resolved. It is clearly a matter that goes right down to the local level as it involves drug addiction, solvent abuse etc. which can have very negative impacts in our communities and on community safety and community cohesion.

He stated that over future meetings the PSB will need to consider what joint action can be developed to assist the programme for the benefit of communities.

PK asked for anyone interested in chairing future PSB meetings to put themselves forward, so that before the next meeting we have some nominations and can vote at the next meeting. She then thanked everyone for their attendance.

Action Point Summary

Agenda Item #	Action detail	Responsible
0	Send email regarding the appointment of a new Chair so this could be agreed before the next meeting of the PSB.	KP
3	Provide informal feedback on the ongoing development of the Well-being Plan to PSB members	HD
4	Provide a summary of the figures discussed in her presentation on Shared Prosperity Fund. And to share details of the themes and categories that are being taken forward	EF
9	Circulate revised Terms of Reference for comment by PSB	P Massey