

**CARDIFF AND VALE OF GLAMORGAN REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

**Via Teams**

**3rd April 2022**

**14:00 – 16:30**

**Minutes of the Meeting**

**Attendance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cllr Ben Gray (Chair) | Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health, Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Abigail Harris | Director of Planning and Strategy, Cardiff and Vale University Health Board |
| Cath Doman | Director of Health and Social Care Integration, Cardiff and Vale RPB |
| Charles Janczewski | Chair, Cardiff and Vale University Health Board |
| Helen White | Chief Executive, Taff Housing Association |
| Cllr Lynda Thorne | Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities, Cardiff Council |
| Lynne Aston | Assistant Finance Director, Cardiff and Vale UHB |
| Sam Austin | Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Operational Services, Llamau |
| Sheila Hendrickson-Brown | Chief Executive, Cardiff Third Sector Council |
| Sarah McGill | Corporate Director – People and Communities, Cardiff Council |
| Meredith Gardiner | Head of Partnerships and Assurance CAV RPB Team |
| Estelle Hitchon | Director of Partnerships and Engagement, Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust |
| Cllr Susan Elsmore | Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health, Cardiff Council |
| Rachel Connor | Chief Executive, Glamorgan Voluntary Services |
| Suzanne Rankin | Chief Executive Cardiff and Vale UHB |
| Sarah McCarty | Social Care Wales |
| Sarah Scire | Platfform |
| Lance Carver | Director of Social Services, Vale of Glamorgan Council |
| Andrew Templeton | Chief Executive at YMCA Cardiff Group |
| Malcolm Perrett | Policy Advisor, Care Forum Wales |
| **Secretariat** | |
| Olivia Headley-Grant  Rebecca Al-Nashee | CAV RPB Partnership Team |
| **Guests** | |
| Mark Briggs | Assistant Director of Innovation, Cardiff and Vale UHB |
| Lisa Dunsford | Director Of Operations, Cardiff and Vale UHB |
| Fiona Kinghorn | Executive Director of Public Health Wales |
| Suzanne Wood | Consultant in Public Health Medicine, Public Health Wales |

**Apologies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cllr Graham Hinchey | Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Cardiff Council |
| Caroline Bird | Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Cardiff and Vale UHB |
| Paula Ham | Director of Learning and Skills, Vale of Glamorgan Council |

| **Minute number** | **Minute** | **Lead** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 252 | 1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**   **Declaration of interests:**  None declared pre or post meeting.  Cllr Ben Gray welcomed all to the meeting. He ran through meeting etiquette and encouraged members to utilise the chat and hand raising functions to contribute to the discussion and during presentations. | Cllr Ben Gray |
| 253 | 1. **Strengthening social value in the work of the RPB**   **The Item focused on three main objectives:**   * + Re-establishment of the Social Value Forum   + To take forward an urgent partnership conversation on the impact of the Real Living Wage for commissioned services.   + Strengthening the voice of non-statutory representation and social value at the RPB through an SV champion and Vice Chair.   **Overview:**  Rachel Connor introduced the item, introducing some emerging thinking on strengthening the impact that the RPB has on generating social value through its work.  Rachel explained that the Social Value Forum has been helping and supporting the Regional Partnership board in meeting statutory responsibilities under the social services and Wellbeing Act for the last four years.  Rachel went on to say that there are now additional requirements on local authorities to provide leadership for the forum, and secretariat for supporting the meetings.  There is also a requirement that a report will be produced every three years on the activities and how the forum itself has contributed to the duties under section 16 of the Act. In other words, there is a requirement for the promotion of the development of social enterprises and cooperative organizations to provide care and support and those preventative services.  Rachel detailed that they are also looking to ensure that there is the involvement of people for whom care and support, or a preventative service is provided so that they are involved in that design and operation of those services. They are also looking at the availability of care and support and preventative services from third sector organizations. The proposal has been developed from a series of meetings that took place in April that involved Rachel Connor, Sheila Hendrickson-Brown, Councillor Gray, Third Sector Infrastructure Members and Partnership Team Members from Integrated Health and Social Care.  Rachel then handed over to Sheila Hendrickson-Brown to explain the proposals set out in the paper for what the forum would look like as it is redeveloped, coming out of the pandemic.  Sheila explained that they are looking to present something that they hope can be a solution and so they are looking at practical things that could happen in order to help shape Social Value and to ensure that Social Value is integrated into the workings of the RPB.  Sheila clarified what the paper produced sets out, in terms of the ideas around what the Social Value forum could do. This included How the membership could be made up, how frequently it can meet and agenda items.  **Discussion:**  Abi Harris mentioned that it would be worth having a discussion around who from the Health Board would be most suitable to appoint in terms of decision-making authority. She felt that more information needs to be given on the ask in terms of the right membership.  Abi also acknowledged the link between the Social Value, Market Stability Reports and Joint Commissioning.  Cllr Gray felt that if the forum needed input around strategic flow, that could conflict with the commissioning side of things.  Sarah McGill discussed some existing forums that are similar and suggested that we should consider these first.  Sarah suggested that if there is something similar in the vale, instead of having three separate boards, we could investigate how we can bring all those activities together, which could create hugely significant budgets.  Sam Austin welcomed the idea, but also mentioned that there are other pressing issues on the third sector currently which align with some of the issues and strategic direction that the RPB wants to go into. These include National Living Wage, the Real Living Wage, the delivery of services and struggling Social Care providers within the Third and Independent Sectors. Who have very low salaries.  Malcolm Perrett said that as a representative of the independent sector and some third sector organisations, the independent sector is seen as not offering social value, and that needs to be repositioned because the social value provided by the independent sector is significant.  Cllr Gray expressed how he felt that this reiterated the point that impact is not about one section of the RPB. He also expressed a keen interest for members who are interested from the independent third sector to contact Cath to express interest in potentially coming forward as a vice chair.  **Decision:**  The RPB **noted** the priorities and **approved** the recommended approach.  **Action:**   * To present on the impact of the Real Living Wage at the next SLG meeting. * To appoint a Social Value Champion for non-statutory representation at the RPB. * To seek appointment for a Vice Chair for the RPB from a non-statutory member. | Sheila Hendrickson-Brown / Rachel Connor |
| 254 | 1. **Regional Integration Fund: acceleration fund - emerging plans**   **Key points:**   * The RPB agreed the ‘embedding’ part of the Regional Integration Fund at the last meeting, which is £16.2m of the total fund. * This item will provide an update on progress to develop the ‘accelerating change’ part of the fund.   **Overview:**  Cath Doman introduced the item and apologised for a lack of recommendations to be able to put forwards to the RPB currently, explaining that there is still a significant amount of work to do and that the funding is limited.  Cath talked the RPB through the Welsh Government Funding model slide, explaining that we are currently discussing the Accelerating Change fund, explaining that there are a considerable number of risks that we need to go through. She mentioned that the proposals are far in excess of the resources that we have available.  Cath explained that we need to improve on understanding the impact measures, and that we need to build those into our programmes.  Cath expressed that there have been perpetual struggles with leadership capacity due to recruitment issues which have been exacerbated by covid, and how that is reflected across our entire system at the moment. She also said that we need to have an approach as to how we manage slippage.  Cath expressed that one of the most challenging areas is the requirement to taper off the funding, and that we are going to have to build into our financial planning rounds. She also gave an update on where the RIF (Regional Integration Fund) is currently, explaining that there are going to be some conversations later today to try to pin down exactly where the risks in our system are and how we align our funding to that.  **Discussion**  Estelle Hitchon felt that we need to figure out which elements will not happen unless we use this funding to lever for it, not meaning that the others are not worthy, but if we do believe that they are worthy as organisations, we would have to work out how to reorient what we have got.  Abi Harris discussed the need to build onto and add onto what we already have in existence, rather than starting something completely different and new.  Malcolm Perrett reminded the RPB of when Cluster working first came to the RPB for discussion as a pilot project and requested an update on whether the commitment towards using the independent sector as part of these clusters is being considered.  Cath Doman explained that this is just beginning to get off the ground, and that it still needs to be tested out in various places.  Lance Carver expressed an understanding that the item being reviewed is indicative rather than a finalized deal. He reiterated Estelle Hitchon’s point, noting the difficulties incurred when there are a lot of innovative ideas but limited funding.  Lance also reminded the RPB about recent feedback received from the Welsh Government in relation to other parts of the bid that also need to be taken into account.  **Decision:**   * The RPB **noted** the priorities and **approved** the recommended approach. | Cath Doman |
| 256 | 1. **New capital funding streams**   **The item focused on:**   * Briefing the RPB on emerging new Capital Funding arrangements * The Housing with Care Fund * Integration and Rebalancing Capital Fund   **Key Points:**   * Guidance is still emerging from the Welsh Government. * Arrangements will need to be in place to oversee the coordination and prioritisation of partnership capital schemes.   **Overview:**  Meredith Gardiner introduced the item, explaining that item 4.1 gives a brief overview of the information that we know so far from the Welsh Government on two funding streams for Capital Funding that we anticipate from 2022 onwards.  Meredith explained that we are anticipating that the Housing with Care fund will be allocated around 7.6 million pounds. She then introduced Health and Social Care Integration and Rebalancing, explaining that there is not a specific allocation for each region.  Meredith explained that we are working with the Welsh Government at the moment on developing the detailed guidance. Meredith firstly wanted to draw the RPB’s attention to the funds, and then to the expectations that the Welsh Government are indicating for Regional Partnership Boards across Wales.  Meredith noted that there is an affirmed direction that all RPB’s should be putting together a much more strategic overview of the range of capital plans that each of their partners hold within each region, so that they can have a much more strategic and prioritised direction in the long term for capital developments that we would want to take forward.  Meredith explained that item 4.2 is the letter itself from the Welsh Government and gave a brief overview, summarising that what they are requiring as a minimum is that RPB’s should bring together partners to consider Capital Investment from several different policy areas, including housing, sustainable communities, substance misuse and regeneration.  Meredith also explained that we are required to establish capital planning subgroups, which draw in relevant expertise from partner organisations to ensure robust and effective capital program management.  Meredith explained what is being set out for approval by the RPB today, which is to establish a Capital Steering group and to drive forward the preparatory work for the state change in planning requirements. She explained that we would anticipate membership from the Health Board, the two local authorities and Social Value colleagues.  She continued to say that group members would be responsible for things such as looking towards shared priorities for Capital Development across the region and considering which projects are likely to be able to utilise funding for the financial year, and then to inform the process for longer term planning. This information would then be brought to the Regional Partnership Board for consideration.  **Discussion:**  Cllr Ben Gray felt that the item needed to find a way of forming itself back into the RPB’s core structure. He agreed with Meredith in that there is a need for a steering group in order to drive the project forward.  Helen White expressed that it would be helpful to ensure that there is close alignment with strategic housing funding in terms of ensuring that the impact is maximized, because of the amount of investment that they have managed to draw through Social Housing Capital Grant for housing in Cardiff and the Vale.  Meredith agreed with Helen, explaining that it is an expectation from Welsh government that the Capital Steering group should be working hand in hand with colleagues within both local authorities so that we are aligning the priorities for both funding streams.  Suzanne Rankin agreed that this was an excellent suggestion, detailing that co-location of services is a great opportunity.  Suzanne felt that we should think carefully about how we optimize the existing infrastructure and then consider how we can bring in new infrastructure.  She also felt that in terms of the rebalancing the residential care market piece, there is a tremendous opportunity, but also a lot of unmet need currently. She expressed interest in working closely with Partnership colleagues regarding this and had the opinion that this strategic activity would serve us well.  **Decision:**  The RPB   * **Noted** the new capital funding streams. * **Approved** the establishment of a Capital Steering Group.   **Action:**   * To establish a Capital Steering Group. | Meredith Gardiner |
| 257 | 1. **Cardiff and Vale of Glamorgan Population Needs Assessment 2022**   **Key points:**   * RPB members have previously received the PNA electronically prior to the requirement to publish it on 1st April   **Overview:**  Fiona Kinghorn introduced the item, explaining that Suzanne Wood will be sharing the key themes.  Fiona stated that she is looking for a formal sign off today, as they had to publish the PNA on the 1st of April 2022 to meet statutory timelines. She expressed gratitude towards comments from the RPB on a draft that was brought forward previously, stating that they were extremely helpful to the finalisation of the PNA.  she explained the importance of highlighting that there are other pieces of work that can triangulate and support elements that colleagues had highlighted. She said that they are currently working on a health inclusion plan, which includes the Traveller community and other groups.  Fiona explained that it is a statutory requirement to produce an assessment of the Kern support needs of our local population every electoral cycle, under the social services and wellbeing Wales Act 2014. Fiona detailed that the aim of this is to provide useful evidence to help underpin and sense check against the shape of our statutory service provision and our future and organizational partnership, service development and provision. This also includes the third sector.  Suzanne Wood gave an explanation of the code of Practice, detailing that there are 9 core themes; which include Children and Young People, Learning Disabilities and Autism. Suzanne said that the Code of Practice also allows for additional themes relevant to specific health board areas. Due to this, their team have replicated what was done in the 2017 Population Needs Assessment and included substance misuse, asylum seekers, refugees, and veterans in the 2022 version.  Suzanne mentioned that the themes within the PNA are matched across to the framing of Starting Well, Living Well and Ageing Well, which are the overarching RPB programme themes.  Suzanne went onto explain that when pulling together the PNA, they utilised bespoke engagement methods which included surveys for the general population, and surveys for children and young people. There were also interviews with service providers as well as 23 focus groups which covered the 17 chapters that are the population groups.  Suzanne stated that within the papers provided to the RPB pre-meeting, they would find the formal full PNA report, the required Equality and Health Impact Assessment, overarching themes, and a summary in sway of the selected findings which is aimed at the general public.  Suzanne went onto explain the emerging themes that were found by the assessment. These included social isolation, mental health and wellbeing, employment, inequality, and core components of service.  She also mentioned that since the PNA was launched in 2017, these needs have been exacerbated by COVID-19 and the restrictions. She noted the disproportionate impact that COVID-19 has had upon certain population sectors to do with deprivation, and that people strongly expressed that they would like a range of preventative services, Including social support and advocacy.  Suzanne explained that many people had mentioned the assets that were already supporting their wellbeing. This was at an individual community and population level and went on to discuss issues with Cardiff inclusive recruitment, for example, into service provision to make services more amenable to their needs.  She also briefly went over the other themes discovered by the assessment. These included transitional points from children's services, adult services, HMP Cardiff and community services. There was also mention of education and employment accommodation.  Suzanne concluded by stating that the PNA will be considered in the development of the Area Plan, and that it has already contributed to the Cardiff and Vale UHB Market Stability Report. She explained that what they are looking for in future with regards to the PNA is for it to become a “hybrid” model, which will have rolling updates of quantitative data and periodic updates of the engagement findings to keep the PNA up to date.  **Discussion:**  Sheila Hendrickson-Brown thanked Fiona and Suzanne for the report and for the steps that were taken around engagement and trying to ensure that they had the widest possible range of voices contributing. Sheila went on to express concern with the timescales that were involved and accuracy of some of the data due to the study sample being small.  Suzanne responded to Sheila acknowledging that timescales were tight, and then explaining that the main point of the focus groups is the depth of analysis rather than the sample size. She also noted that the RPB engagement framework is going to be taking place and looking at particular population groups in the future.  **Decision:**  The RPB   * Formally **noted** and **approved** the Population Needs Assessment for Cardiff and the Vale of Glamorgan | Fiona Kinghorn |
| 258 | 1. **Emerging partnership planning environment:** 2. Area Plan development 3. Pan cluster planning groups 4. Delivery resource   **Key points:**  The publication of the PNA marks the beginning of a new 5-year planning and delivery round for the RPB.  **Area Plan development**  **Overview:**  Cath Doman introduced the Area Plan, describing it as a neat segue from the sign off of the PNA and the Market Stability report. Cath explained that those reports create the information that give us an assessment of our needs and the stability of our market to be able to meet those needs.  Cath vocalized that what needs to come now is the development of an area plan, which comes out every electoral cycle.  Cath detailed the requirements associated with the area plan, explaining that we had recently received guidance from the Welsh Government on this which supplements the guidance that is associated with the legislation.  She stated that we are required, having published the Population Needs Assessment and the forthcoming Market Stability Report, to publish our next area plan by the 1st of April 2023.  She went on to say that there is a new expectation that there will be an annual review and there will be annual delivery plans with clear milestones, delivery and progress.  Cath explained that this piece of work is about drawing together the Regional Integration Fund Investment Planning work, the Wellbeing Plans that will come out of both Public Service Boards, the five to ten year Strategic Capital Plan, the health boards, IMTP, and the PAN Cluster Planning groups that Lisa will shortly be taking the RPB through. She also went on to say that the piece will need to reflect the six National Models of Care, and that there is a Ministerial requirement to develop those six National Models.  She detailed that this would include topics such as a clearer approach to prevention and intervention through coordinated care, to keeping children close to home and enabling flow out of hospital.  Cath added that there was also a new requirement, which is to pay attention to the development needs of the RPB itself, to develop ourselves as an RPB in order to make sure we are as effective and impactful as we can be.  She ran through the Core Themes; which are children and young people, older people, health and physical disabilities, learning disabilities, autism, mental health, sensory impairment, carers who need support, violence against women, domestic abuse and sexual violence.  Cath explained that there is not an expectation that we do a vast amount of public engagement on this topic, but we are expected to ensure that we are talking to the right people to ensure that our area plan is strategically coherent. This means that we would be expected to involve our RPB citizen, third sector and provider reps. She added that there is the opportunity to involve citizen panels and the Social Value Forum.  She then outlined the delivery plan, which will have to be published in April 2023, suggesting that we should aim to have a final draft by December 2022. Cath asked the RPB to think about what they would like to see in the Area Plan, and whether they would like a series of workshops to explore the possibilities.  **Discussion:**  Cllr Ben Gray expressed the importance of all members contributing towards the first stage of producing the joint Area Plan, in order to ensure that our priorities are clearly identified.  Abi Harris felt that the overview given was immensely helpful, and reiterated Cllr Gray’s view that all members should offer their contributions. She expressed the need to determine what we would like to keep from the previous Area Plan, and what we would like to do differently.  She went on to say that she feels there is a need for clarity with regards to our vision and overarching sense of the priorities emerging from the Population Needs Assessment.  Thirdly, Abi felt that we need to do engagement on the priorities as we as we've worked through them, adding that she would find a series of workshops to be helpful.  Ben agreed with Abi’s point about possibly arranging workshops. He also expressed a need to get something in the diary, ideally before the next Regional Partnership Board meeting.  **Decision:**   * The RPB **noted** the priorities and **approved** the recommended approach.   **Pan cluster planning groups**  **Overview:**  Lisa introduced the PAN Cluster Panning Group item, firstly talking the RPB through an Intro and Context slide.  She then moved onto the next slide, which explained the differences between Professional Collaboratives, Clusters and Pan Cluster Planning Groups. Lisa said that there is more work to be done around how we can link the cluster plans with health boards and other strategic plans across Cardiff and Vale. She then detailed professional collaboratives; which include GP’s, Optometry, Dental and Pharmacy.  Lisa went on to talk to the PAN Cluster Planning Group at county level slide, explaining the cluster groups further. The next slide that Lisa talked to explained the PCPG membership in more detail.  Next, Lisa moved on to explain how all the information links together to achieve delivery of what is needed at cluster level, locality level, county level or across Cardiff and the Vale. The following slide from Lisa explained the Development of a Partnership Agreement to underpin the Vale Alliance.  She went on to explain the Phased Road Map towards the formation of a Vale Alliance, and then how it will be delivered. The next slide detailed milestones and actions.  Finally, Lisa talked to a slide that listed the actions that the RPB members are invited to undertake.  **Discussion:**  Charles Janczewskiagreed thatwe do need clarity from Welsh Government on what the expectation is for the RPB and constituent parts by the end of March 2023. He felt that we need to get not just the governance of the Pan Cluster Planning groups correct, but also how it impacts on the governance of each constituent organization that forms part of that group. He also agreed that engaging all members of the RPB will be critical part of the process in due course. He reiterated that it mustn't be dominated by the health board and must be undertaken as a Partnership.  Lance Carver agreed with Charles’ points. He added that this has come to Social Care late as what is ultimately a Welsh Government health strategy that social care are expected to join. Lance felt that this could cause tensions, as will not be co-designed and co-created.  Lance went onto say that he felt it would be useful to see if other parts of the Welsh Government had heard of it, as well as whether they have been cited on it and are also jointly engineering it.  Sarah McGill commented that the approach fits in well with our locality focused approach, expressing that she felt there are a lot of reasons to recommend it as a way of thinking about how we bring our services together.  Sarah also went on to suggest that one of our areas of focus needs to be on a manageable set of arrangements that understand that there is a lot going on in various forms and does not try and replicate it.  Sarah felt that we should think about how we leverage the things that we must do effectively and think about whether we need to keep everything going as it is currently, as she felt that there could be a risk of being overhwelmed.  Lisa Dunsford responded to some of the points made, saying that they have been linking in with the national team and it does seem that there is quite a lot of prescription around what has come out. Equally, she felt that there is a recognition that with it being a transition year, that there will be some learning.  Charles Janczewski clarified that although he is concerned about the size and magnitude of this work, it's absolutely the right direction of travel for the populations we serve, as long as we do it together and we work and plan together to give the best possible service we can to everyone across Cardiff and the Vale.  Charles also expressed that he is nervous about just how much work this will entail, commenting that he does not want to wait until March 2023 to find out what we need to do. He felt that he we need that information and clarity now so that we can start an effective planning and implementation process.  Abi Harris expressed a feeling that we need to guard against too much prescription on this, as it needs to reflect the different localities that it’s used in. She felt that in order to get the best from colleagues working within the clusters, they need to be given space to develop this themselves.  **Decision:**   * The RPB **noted** the priorities and **approved** the recommended approach. | Cath Doman  Lisa Dunsford  Cath Doman  Tom Bowring |
| 259 | 1. **Regional Innovation Coordination Hubs plan 22/23**   **Overview:**  Mark Briggs introduced himself as the assistant director for innovation within cavuhb. Mark introduced the item and plan associated with it, explaining that this plan was developed in partnership with the Welsh Government.  Mark explained that the plan is to support the primary RP (Research Partners) B plans around SWP, LWP, AWP. Its aligned to a 250k budget, most of which is around staffing costs. Mark said that what they are trying to do is to identify some of the bigger challenges within the RPB, identifying where there has been significant activity and development to make sure that success and best practice is communicated out.  Mark explained that some of the key activities and elements will be working with the Kings Fund who will be developing an expert report reviewing some of the locality models of the initiatives within the RPB in order to identify best practice and to make recommendations as to how we might steer the RPB in future.  **Discussion:**  Abi Harris welcomes the work and expressed that it would be helpful to see some sort of learning evidence that we can apply.  **Decision:**   * The RPB **noted** the priorities and **approved** the recommended approach. | Meredith Gardiner  Cath Doman |
| 260 | **8. Starting Well Partnership:**  **key messages and minutes**  Charles Janczewski introduced the item, explaining that they had to cancel their April meeting due to apologies. He mentioned that the work is continuing across four primary areas. These areas have been identified by the RPB as to where the Starting Well Partnership can be beneficial by working together collaboratively for the benefit of children and young people. He mentioned that engagement is a key feature of their work and that they have not done a lot of work around this area yet, and that it is more of a future focus.  Sarah McGill took over from Charles, she felt that the work of the Safe Accommodation project should be at the centre of attention, as it shows the value of having real data and live cases to focus in on. She noted successes that they have had as a team in moving forward specific cases.  She went on to say that we should use the Safe Accommodation project should be used as an example as to how we ought to be designing the new set of arrangements going forward. She felt that it is crucial to use real time data in order to help us understand where we need to be focusing our attention.  For information | Charles Janczewski / Sarah McGill |
| 261 | **9. Ageing Well Partnership:**  **key messages and minutes**  Abi Harris expressed that they are making a lot more progress around the Dementia Programme. She said that they have been doing a some refocusing of that to ensure that it felt more health orientated.  Abi mentioned difficulties with regards to meeting with people in relation to the At Home Programme, due to these being the same people that are part of day-to-day operational delivery.  She felt that they have not had all the information required in order to guide and support the work and enable them to know what is really making a difference, but that they have a programme of work, so it's now about pressing ahead and trying to do that in the most streamline way possible.  Cath Doman mentioned that they are going into some detailed planning now around what exactly the integrated locality model means in terms of the spectrum between Cooperation and collaboration right through to integration.  Cllr Ben Gray felt that it was worth reflecting in terms of the Dementia plans, that the Deputy Minister was very keen on hearing what developments are happening and at the same time was curious as to the nest agenda. He felt that she was keen that we are clear with what we are achieving and how we are moving forward with our Dementia plans and work in that area.  For information | Cllr Susan Elsmore/  Abi Harris |
| 262 | **10. Annual Report plan and timeline**  Meredith made the RPB aware of the Annual Report Plan and Timeline. Acknowledging that the Annual Report plan must be submitted by the end of June and that there is not another Regional Partnership Board meeting before that time, and so requested that the SLG consider it ahead of rhe RPB ratification in July.  Meredith also requested comments from across the RPB membership by the 6th of May on key achievements, challenges, how well do you feel citizen, carer and third sector voices are represented, and any key ideas for improving engagement with these groups that could be included within the annual report.  For information | Meredith Gardiner / Catherine Hughes |
| 263 | **11. Q4 21/22 returns and financial outturn**  **Cardiff and Vale Transformation Evaluation by RSM**  **National ICF Evaluation by OB3**  Year-end position, for information. | Meredith Gardiner  Lynne Aston |
|  | **12.1 Minutes of the last meeting**  No amendments identified and minutes of the last meeting were agreed by RPB.  **12.2 Action Log Review**  All actions completed. No actions are outstanding. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**   |  | | --- | | **Dates of future RPB formal meetings:**  Tue 03/05/2022 13:00 - 15:00 via Teams | |