



Report to	Public Services Board
Date of meeting	Monday 27 July 2020
Lead Member / Officer	Sian Williams, Natural Resources Wales (PSB Chair)
Report author	Nicola Kneale, Denbighshire County Council
Title	PSB's Well-being Priorities & Covid-19

1. What is the report about?

1.1. The PSB's Well-being Plan in light of covid-19.

2. What is the reason for making this report?

2.1. To facilitate a discussion that will enable PSB to reach consensus on whether it remains committed to its priorities in light of the covid-19 pandemic, and whether changes are needed and – if so – the process and timeline for making any changes.

3. What are the Recommendations?

3.1. That the PSB considers whether there are any collective recovery/renewal challenges in Appendix 1 that could be addressed collaboratively (please see paragraph 4.4).

3.2. That PSB considers whether it wishes to review its well-being objectives at present, giving consideration to the steps it will have to follow if it wishes to review them, and the process and timeline that it will have to follow to review its Well-being plan for 2023 (please see paragraphs 4.5-4.7).

4. Report details

4.1. The impact of covid-19 on the world and the business of the public sector is unprecedented in terms of the urgent, vast changes that have been required in the short-term. No one is unaffected, and everyone's well-being will be affected in the long-term to a greater or lesser extent. With such a massive change

having taken place in our external environment, it's appropriate for us to review our priorities to check they remain relevant and focussed on our critical goals.

- 4.2. To do this we'll remind ourselves of our current priorities, namely:
 - a. People – Supporting good mental well-being for all ages;
 - b. Community – Supporting community empowerment;
 - c. Place – Supporting environmental resilience.

- 4.3. We've asked PSB member organisations to share with us details of:
 - New priorities going forward;
 - Expected priorities in the recovery period;
 - Anticipated strains;
 - Anticipated opportunities.Their responses can be seen in Appendix 1.

- 4.4. These responses have been analysed, and the following commonalities were established:
 - a. Most organisations have not set new general, strategic priorities, though the focus of some may be adjusted;
 - b. Recovery priorities include tourism (economy) and bringing business back online under social distancing restrictions;
 - c. Pressures for most exist in terms of maintaining the well-being of staff and managing budget strains;
 - d. 'Silver linings' that present opportunity for positive future change include greater collaboration; increased agile working and its contribution to reduce travel time, costs, and associated carbon emissions.

- 4.5. Appendix 2 is statutory guidance that was published for PSBs alongside the Well-being of Future Generations Act 2015. Paragraph 89 states that a PSB must 'publish a local well-being plan no later than 12 months after each subsequent ordinary [local government] election.' With local government elections taking place in 2022, this means the PSB must publish a new plan in 2023.

- 4.6. Prior to this the PSB must publish a local assessment of well-being no later than 12 months before local government elections (i.e. between May 2021 and May

2022, though ideally this would be complete by December 2021 to enable newly elected local Councils to agree their local well-being plans).

4.7. Paragraph 127 of Appendix 3 states that a PSB can review its objectives at any point it wishes in the meantime, but that it must consult with the same people as it is required to when preparing a new well-being plan (paragraph 129).

Paragraph 157 outlines the required consultation periods and processes with various stakeholders, estimated to take 41 weeks in total. NB, the PSB would still be required to publish a new plan in 2023, following the procedures outlined.

5. What risks are there and is there anything we can do to reduce them?

5.1. If the PSB feels it needs to review its priorities there is a risk that the prescribed process does not lend itself to the expediency required. To mitigate against this, the PSB could alter the scope of some of its existing projects or consider new actions, but retain the overarching priorities.

5.2. There is a risk that the PSB reviews its priorities complying with the prescribed legislative process, and then has to repeat the exercise soon after (to comply with the requirement to review in 2023 – one year after local government elections). This is a lengthy and time-consuming process. The mitigation suggested in 5.1 might be relevant to address this risk too.