NEWPORT FAIRNESS COMMISSION

Newport Fairness Commission (NFC) response to the public consultation of the Community Well-Being Profile (Newport) 2016

February 2017

VERY IMPORTANT: The NFC sees its role as facilitating a critical reflection on policy and Newport City Council practice, rather than it being a recommender of specific policy and/or practice. Therefore, selective extracts from this response should not be used to support particular Council policies, and interpretations of the well-being profile data, as if these policies and interpretations are also being recommended by the NFC.

Introduction and overview

This document has been produced by a working group comprised of NFC members at its December 2016 meeting, and was set-up specifically for the purpose of responding to the Community Well-Being Profile (Newport) – the first draft being published by Newport City Council for public consultation at this time too. The working group met in January 2017 and divided the work into four main areas corresponding with the four well-being types identified in the profile – namely, economic well-being, social well-being, cultural well-being, and environmental well-being. Members of the working group were designated one area each (Terry Price for economic well-being; Kate Thomas for social well-being; Elin Maher for cultural well-being; Gideon Calder for environmental well-being) – with the Chair of the NFC (Steve Smith) coordinating the four responses in preparing a first draft of the NFC's response, which was then shared with the other members of the working group for comment. A final draft of our entire response was then prepared by the Chair and is presented here.

The Community Well-Being Profile provides a rich set of data and analysis reflecting the obligations under the Well-being of Future Generations Act (2015) for councils to produce such a document, accompanied with some contextual explanation of the Act and its overall aims and objectives. The profile is generally clearly laid out, and offers a wealth of information on the current state of well-being (defined according to various criteria) across Newport, with predicted trends. However, it is not a decision making document, and does not explore, amongst other things; the contentious issues concerning the meaning of well-being and how this term might be variously understood; the relationship between well-being (whatever meaning used) and other social values, such as fairness; and what kind of priorities and trade-offs should be made between groups of people regarding their well-being, and particularly given the extensive cuts made to local government funding in recent years and which plan to be extended to the medium-to-long-term future.

The well-being profile will clearly be of considerable use in informing these debates (and for this reason should be commended), but it needs to also be critiqued in the light of the subsequent contentious questions and concerns which will no doubt ensue as a result of considering the above issues. As such, it is also the NFC's view that we must not miss the opportunity to consider the place of fairness in a future Wales intent on enhancing the well-being of all its citizens and across its often disparate and divided communities. For example, and more specifically, the various references to the value of equality within the profile might have been better served by also referencing to the value of fairness, and the four parameters of debate about fairness defined by the NFC in its report to Council in November 2013 (see the NFC website http://www.newportfairnesscommission.org/). In addition, there were times when there was understandably considerable focus on certain social categories, such as age and ethnicity, but with the profile perhaps lacking information on other social categories, such as gender and disability. Moreover, it is also important to recognise the possibility of cross-cutting divisions and their implications, within many citizens occupying multiple social categories of disadvantage and vulnerability, which again might have been explored more in the profile.

Regarding the public involvement in measuring and informing this profile, while this is an essential and commendable part of the consultation process, it is notoriously difficult to gain a fully informed and representative picture of public perceptions. The NFC recognises that Council has made considerable and concerted efforts to provide such a picture, but we are still left with questions relating to the representativeness of the responses made, given how many citizens were included.

As a result, the question of what weight should be given to these responses becomes a moot point, alongside the other statistical information provided by Government agencies, and so on.

In summary, the NFC concludes that all these issues combined, demonstrate the importance of seeing this profile as an extremely useful 'work-in-progress' underpinning *further* consultation and meaningful debate on effective data management and collection regarding the City of Newport, and, in turn, how the values of well-being *and* fairness can be meaningfully understood and promoted within and across the City.

Breakdown of the profile into *types* of well-being

Given our conclusions and analysis in the introduction and overview above, the following provides a more detailed interpretation of the data collected in the profile according to each type of well-being identified by the profile, in the light of (a) some of the main themes identified for each of the well-being types (b) some of the main limitations of the data collected, and (c) how these themes and the limitations of the data bear on the four parameters of debate about fairness, and identified by the NFC in its report to Council in November 2013 (and referenced above).

It is also important to highlight that, given the wealth of data provided by the profile, the analysis below provided by the NFC is also a 'work-in-progress' and so should not be interpreted as a definitive or exhaustive statement from the Commission regarding the subsequent issues that ought to be, or will be, considered in the future. In short, the NFC sees community profiling of this kind, and the part it will play as the Well-Being of Future Generations Act (2015) is fully implemented, as an excellent opportunity to develop a more coordinated response to enhancing well-being across both Wales and Newport, alongside the promotion of other significant social values, such as fairness.

Type 1 - Economic well-being (also including education):
   (a) Some of the main themes identified in the profile regarding this well-being type
   - There are significant differences between wards across Newport regarding the experience of economic well-being, with poverty being deeply imbedded in certain parts of Newport.
   - The percentage of low income families in Newport has declined across the City, but still the figure is high compared with Wale overall.
   - Workless households are decreasing in Newport but the numbers are still high compared with Wales overall.
   - Economic forecasts are avoided by the profile because of the difficulty in interpreting data and in making economic predictions.
   - The development of the City centre is perceived by the public and Council as central to the economic development of Newport.
   - While business activity is increasing in Newport there is a very heavy reliance on the public sector for jobs and economic activity more generally.
   - Pay increases are less in Newport compared with Wales overall.
   - The highest paid workers in Newport tend not to live in Newport.
   - Young unemployed figures are still relatively high, despite large reductions in these figures compared with the rest of Wales and the UK.
   - Newport workers are more skilled compared with Wales overall.
   - Regarding the future generation of workers in Newport, the educational achievements at Nursery or Foundation level is higher than could be expected given other social indicators, but with considerable variances across the City – with similar results for Key stage 2

(measured at 11 years). However, at key stage 3 (measured at 14 years) the results are not so good – with Newport's rankings across Wales declining in all subject areas except for Maths. Again, the variances across the City are significant.

- Nevertheless, the results for GCSE achievement has improved but has improved at a lesser rate than in Wales overall.
- The gender gap in educational achievement has also decreased in Newport, with girls losing ground on boys and, in fact contrary to national trends, becoming worse than boys in many subjects.
- The gap in educational achievement between Free School Meal students (FSM) and non-FSM students has decreased at a greater rate than Wales overall.

(b) Some of the main limitations of the date collected

- To better understand economic differences across the City it would have been useful to also have information on assets and wealth. There is a large amount of data presented in the profile on earned income and benefits, but none of these other key indicators of economic disparity. Is it possible to obtain data concerning the ownership of assets across the City and also incomes which are earned *and* unearned?
- When looking at relative levels of economic disadvantage it would be useful to know whether, or the extent to which, more negative measures aggregate with individuals. So, are some citizens subject to multiple adverse measures of economic indicators, and if so, how many are who are they? This question is obviously important when examining possible policy solutions as these citizens may require more sophisticated multiple interventions, than would be otherwise needed. Moreover, even in more deprived areas some individuals may be shouldering a disproportionate share of vulnerability and disadvantage, compared with other individuals living in the same areas.
- There is excellent data presented in the profile on qualifications and educational achievements, but how does this data 'fit' with future workforce needs? So, an important issue regarding the enhancement of future economic well-being is not only the *level* of education and qualifications achieved, but the *type* of achievement and its relationship to future labour market supply and demand trends. Also, how does Welsh Government's policy regarding its priority for education relate more precisely to economic well-being enhancement, and the relationship between polices on, say, nursery provision and child care for those parents encouraged to engage in paid work?
- A significant future consideration regarding economic well-being is the issue of 'Channel-shift' – i.e. the push to transform and transfer service-delivery online. The question this 'shift' then raises is how some consumer and other groups might be more excluded from economic activity as a result, thus undermining their economic well-being. It is also unclear from the profile how much business views are included and sought, and what strategies (if any) will be put in place by business to deal with this problem, and other related issues.
- Given the extension of eligible ages for state pension entitlements, and the anticipation that the workforce will become older in the future, should the working age statistics more routinely extend beyond the age of 65? Also, how do issues such as gender and disability overlap in relation to the labour market – there are for example gender statistics presented in the profile, but little or no combinations with other social categories which might, again, signify multiple economic disadvantage.
- Information on wages and gender comparisons are based on averages, however there are little or no indicators of wage differentials i.e. what is the range of typical wages – top to

bottom, plus are there differentials in job security? Also, how are different wage levels distributed within and between sectors, and across social categories such as age and disability. Also, how does the statistical data relating to gender and education, correlate, or *not*, with the statistical data in relation to gender and employment? Is there any data from private businesses indicating any gender, age or disability differentials? What implications does any of this data have on issues of fairness, and the four parameters of debate about fairness identified by the NFC?

- Information on benefits, qualifications, and material deprivation also does not readily compare with data on social categories such as gender, and disability.
- To what extent are compensatory resources provided for those geographical areas who perform less well within Newport, and in recognition of differentials across the City concerning economic well-being and educational achievement? This is a particularly important question, given some quite worrying trends in school attainment as children grow-up compared to Welsh averages overall, and the quite stark contrasts between some wards within the City.

(c) How do (a) and (b) above bear on the four parameters of debate about fairness as identified by the NFC?

Parameter 1   Equal treatment while recognising difference
It is important when developing and considering the well-being profile to consider further questions which are not addressed in the profile but relate directly to this parameter. For example, how can the data be used to set economic priorities, particularly in regard to the effect of Council policy on different sections of the community? So, what trade-offs should be made between groups within Newport concerning economic well-being, and what decisions should be made regarding the targeting of disadvantage groups given the differentials that exist across the City between groups or wards? And, how should these trade-offs be balanced when promoting economic well-being for the City *overall*?

Parameter 2   Mutual obligations between citizens and local government
Again, there are clearly large disparities across the City in terms of both individual and group economic well-being, and across a range of measures. Given these disparities, it is important to address the question as to what obligations local government has in relation to enhancing employment and education for disadvantaged areas, and the subsequent obligations placed on individual citizens when/if these local government obligations are fulfilled? Also, what onus of responsibility is placed on local government to reduce these disparities, given additional sociological data which is long-established and publically available. That is, concerning the profound effect of class advantage/disadvantage and the inheritance of 'cultural capital' on educational achievement, and the resulting disparities of economic well-being for future generations?

Parameter 3   Interdependency and reciprocity within community relations
Economic well-being is a key determinant in enabling citizens to positively participate in the life of the community over periods of time, for their own and others' benefit. The current and future economic patterns result in many areas of the City experiencing inevitable and entrenched barriers to participation. Further data needs to be collected to fully identify those most at risk of the latter outcome, raising a number of questions directly relating to this parameter. For example, how much redistribution should occur to ensure the widest economic participation

possible across the City? How much are certain contributions undervalued in our community, given what might be seen as the overly-persistent link made in the profile data between paid work and economic contributions? For example, which forms of unpaid work should be also focused on in any economic well-being profile to determine the various ways interdependency and reciprocity is manifested within and across Newport?

Parameter 4   Transparency and accountability in decision-making
Council has systematically attempted to gather public views and perceptions concerning the well-being profile, and this is to be commended in relation to this parameter. However, what is less clear is how this information will then aid decision-making and the setting of priorities. In this context, it is important to identify not only what these decisions and priorities might be, but also *how* these decisions and priority-setting are made, *and* what this might mean for different communities engaged in this process. It is centrally important for Council to both provide and publicise some kind of overview of the 'next steps' of public engagement in this regard, and precisely how these choices might be conveyed and opinions sought, alongside identifying and articulating the key principles that govern this engagement process?

Type 2 – Social Well-Being
(a) Some of the main themes identified in the profile regarding this well-being type
Long term trends in budget restrictions and the status and effectiveness of preventive measures
- Even in the spotlight of the newly introduced Well-being of Future Generations Act (2015), budget cuts and future proposals to reduce local government funding, will likely perpetuate and entrench disadvantage for vulnerable groups across the City.
- Moreover, in the future, local government responses will have to either abandon or radically reform traditional ways of providing 'lower impact/preventative services' as a response to receiving less funding.
- Therefore, it is vital that all citizens understand that service commitments are being made in terms of defining more tightly those mutual obligations and responsibilities between funders, providers, and service-users (and see observations in relation to parameter 2 below). The question which follows is whether this tightening will be able to maintain affordable quality services supporting the quality of life only for those who are defined as especially vulnerable and disadvantaged? And, whether maintaining affordable quality services for a more widely defined set of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups is sustainable in the future?

Integration of service provision and inter-agency collaboration
- The Well-Being of Future Generations Act (2015), quite rightly, focuses on the integration of the provision of different government agency services to service-users, and also between providers. Subsequently, opportunities will be provided for greater collaboration on data production and interpretation between stakeholders that will, hopefully, allow better targeted resources.
- There should also be a move away from what might be termed a 'stake-holder mentality and organisational protectionism' about budgets, toward the notion of shared responsibilities in joint assessments for those needing services, including services towards unpaid carers. We also anticipate that this will produce more openness and transparency between partner organisations.
- However, there is a trend towards centralising certain public services which might make it more difficult to identify and address local issues. Plus, many partnerships between the statutory and non-statutory sectors have seen greater disparities in power relations.

- Therefore, greater collaboration should be underpinned by a more 'benign and equal balance' in the distribution of power, but recognising that this aspiration can be threatened by over-governmental reliance on private sector services, and as the public sector has shrunk.

Public involvement and citizen responsibilities
- Individual citizens (and those whose care citizens are responsible for) will likely have increasing responsibilities to enhance their own well-being and those who they are caring for as government services are continually reduced.
- Recognition of an individual's life experience (both positive and detrimental), and in particular the effects of adverse influences on their well-being will need to be accommodated for and addressed to combat social divisions across the City.
- It is to be welcomed that the newly appointed Public Service Boards (PSBs) have brought together diverse stakeholders, but again it is important to stress that currently all services are dependent on adequate future central government spending if the various detrimental effects of the cuts to date are to be prevented. If this funding is not forthcoming, then it is likely to lead to large diminishments of well-being for those who are vulnerable and disadvantaged, and greater inequalities and divisions across the City.

(b) Some of the main limitations of the date collected
- Decreases in the demand for specific health treatments such as drug treatment programmes, could be linked to less funding being provided, and/or pressures on other spending priorities.
- There is a need to follow local indicators of, for example, poor mental well-being in children, and to establish if there is a link between these indicators and detrimental life style choices in adult life.
- The profile perhaps focuses on those areas where there is copious data and where this data is most prominently presented or focussed on by particular agencies. This could mask or ignore other perspectives or sources of data, and subsequently alternative understanding of social well-being promotion not reflected in the data.
- Young people's 'risky behaviour' has shown a strong association with negative health outcomes, but local data has not been collected via 'Public Health Wales' which might highlight the detrimental outcomes of Adverse Childhood Experiences on social well-being.
- Major detrimental influences on well-being in later life such as dementia or loneliness and isolation is also not reported.
- Health improvement needs to be correlated with identified effective support, through for example, housing and community interventions, which then leads to declines in 'high risk behaviour'.

(c) How do (a) and (b) above bear on the four parameters of debate about fairness as identified by the NFC?

Parameter 1   Equal treatment while recognising difference
It is important when developing and considering the well-being profile to consider further questions not addressed in the profile directly concerning this parameter. For example, how can the data be used to set social well-being priorities, particularly in regard to the effect of policy on different sections of the community? What trade-offs should be made between groups within Newport concerning their social well-being and the targeting of disadvantage groups given the differentials that exist across the City between groups or wards? How should these trade-offs be balanced when promoting social well-being overall for the City?

Parameter 2 Mutual obligations between citizens and local government

Again, there are clearly large disparities across the City in terms of both individual and group social well-being, and across a range of measures. Given these disparities, it is important to ask the question as to what obligations local government has in relation to enhancing social well-being for those disadvantaged areas, and the subsequent onus of responsibility placed on individual citizens when/if these obligations are fulfilled? Also, what is the onus of responsibility on local government to reduce these disparities, given additional sociological data which is long-established concerning the profound effect of class advantage/disadvantage and 'cultural capital' on social well-being, and the resulting social well-being of future generations?

Parameter 3 Interdependency and reciprocity within community relations

Social well-being is a key determinant enabling citizens to positively participate in the life of the community over periods of time, for their own and others' benefit. Clearly the current and likely equality/inequality patterns result in many areas of the City experiencing entrenched barriers to this participation. Further data need to be collected to fully identify those most at risk of this latter outcome, raising a number of questions concerning this parameter. For example, how much resource redistribution should occur to ensure the enhancement of social well-being and the widest participation possible across the City? How much are certain contributions to the enhancement of social well-being undervalued in our community? For example, which forms of unpaid care work should be also focused on in any well-being profile to determine the various ways interdependency and reciprocity is manifested within and across Newport?

Parameter 4 Transparency and accountability in decision-making

Council has systematically attempted to gather public views and perceptions concerning the well-being profile, and this is to be commended in relation to this parameter. However, what is less clear is how this information will aid decision-making and the setting of priorities for the promotion of social well-being. In this context, it is important to identify not only what these decisions and priorities might be, but also *how* these decisions and priority-setting will be made, and what this might mean for different communities engaged in this process. It would be important for Council to provide and publicise some kind of overview of the 'next steps' in this regard, and how the choices might be conveyed and opinions sought, alongside articulating the key principles that govern this process?

Type 3 – Cultural well-being

New Zeland's Ministry for Culture and Heritage's definition of Cultural well-being:

"The *vitality* that communities and individuals *enjoy* through: participation in recreation, creative and *cultural* activities; and the freedom to retain, interpret and express their arts, history, heritage and traditions."

http://www.mch.govt.nz/what-we-do/our-projects/completed/cultural-well-being

(a) Some of the main themes identified in the profile regarding this well-being type
- There is limited measures available at national level to support a full assesment of cultural well-being.

- The Well-being of Future Generation Act (2015) specifies a number of statutory reviews to take into account: for example, play opportunities and strategic assesment (and as linked to section 6 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988)
- This part of the profile is seperated into sub-sections: Engagement, How is Welsh used in the Community, Speaking Welsh, Using Welsh Daily, Welsh Language in the Future, How Cohesive are our communities, and Hate Crime. But what else do we know anout cultural well-being in Newport, Arts and Heritage and Sports?
- The older age groups are either losing their skills in relation to this type of well-being or moving away.
- The people in the younger age groups are either gaining skills in Newport, for example, having benefitted from a Welsh medium education, or are moving into Newport already with Welsh language skills.
- If this trend continues in the long term it will result in a growth in the number and proportion of Welsh speakers in Newport.
- An interesting question emerges (and reflects national thinking on this issue) that Welsh *use* needs more focus than Welsh *speaking.*
- From April 2013 to July 2016, there is a significant growing trend indicating that the level of 'feeling a sense of belonging to the City' has steadily increased, particularly in the majority perception that Newport is becoming 'a better place to live'.
- Community accord seems buoyant in Newport but reported hate crimes have remained between 98 and 110 incidents per year over the past few years but hate *incidents* have risen from 203 in 13/14 to 258 in 15/6.
- There is no evidence to date of serious inter-community conflict in Newport.

(c) Some of the main limitations of the date collected

- *How is Welsh used in the Community?*

This section depends soley on data of speakers and does not examine the societies and agencies that exist in Newport that *use* the Welsh language.[1] Regarding the latter, there are two Welsh speaking churches, The Newport Welsh Society, Merched y Wawr, Menter Iaith Casnewydd, Urdd clubs, plus informal Welsh learning groups across the City. Filling these gaps in data would demonstrate better the vitality of the Welsh language within the community, and would reflect more qualitative measures of use rather than just drawing from quantitative data on the numbers of Welsh speakers.

- *Accuracy of Census data and the question of the 'good intention' of the responder:*

While we might agree that the census data does not depict the most accurate picture (for example, the correlation between pupils in school and the numbers of Welsh speakers recorded in the census), is there not a further question of identifying what might be termed 'genuine good intention' here on behalf of the responder? Shouldn't we therefore accept the goodwill of the responder and note that there is a will for the child to be a fluent Welsh speaker at some point, evne though this might not be the case in many instances? Also, how can we be so sure that those students and staff not in Welsh Medium schools are not Welsh speaking? In short, specific circumstances are complex and nuanced, and these could have been more fully represented and articulated in the profile.

---

[1] There is a further set of data available for the use of the Welsh Language called the Welsh language use survey: http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/Welsh-language-use-survey/?skip=1&lang=en. Disappointingly, this data base was not used for the profile.

- *What else do we know about cultural well-being in Newport? Arts & Heritage?*
This part of the profile is very short. So, should this profile explore the cultural opportunities availabe in the area as well as the numbers of users of these opportunities? For example, there is no mention of the locations available to partake in arts and heritage within Newport City, and the extent to which these facilities are used from year-to-year by citizens?

(c) How do (a) and (b) above bear on the four parameters of debate about fairness as identified by the NFC?

Parameter 1   Equal treatment while recognising difference
It is important when developing and considering the well-being profile to consider further questions not addressed in the profile, and directly relating to this parameter. For example, how can the data be used to set cultural well-being priorities, particularly in regard to the effect on different sections of the community? What trade-offs should be made between groups within Newport concerning their cultural well-being and the targeting of disadvantage groups given the other differentials identified in the profile that exist across the City between groups or wards? How should these trade-offs be balanced when promoting cultural well-being in the City overall? Are there good reasons to treat certain cultural endeavous differrently given the definition of what might be understood as specifically Welsh culture. For example, the Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011 gives the Welsh Language official status in Wales, which means that Welsh should be treated no less favourably than the English language in Wales. However, given the percentage of speakers in Newport isn't that high in density, perhaps there is need to invest in assisting Welsh speakers to be able to *use* their language and target these groups accordingly.

Parameter 2   Mutual obligations between citizens and local government
Again, there are clearly large disparities across the City in terms of both individual and group cultural well-being, and across a range of measures. Given these disparities, it is important to ask the question as to what obligations local government has in relation to enhancing cultural well-being for those disadvantaged areas, and the subsequent onus of responsibility placed on individual citizens when/if these obligations are fulfilled? Also, what is the onus of responsibility on local government to reduce these disparities, given additional sociological data which is long-established concerning the profound effect of class advantage/disadvantage and 'cultural capital' on well-being enhancement? There are also important questions regarding the enhancement of cultural well-being as related to this parameter, and concerns the proper relationship between community and private provision, verus local government provision. For example, in a city where the percentage of Welsh speakers is low and community and private provision is also low, does local government have a heightened set of obligations to fill this gap in line with its goal of promoting the Welsh language? Also, how does leisure, arts, and sports facilities relate to the affordability of subsidised services from local government? And, how important are these facilities for the enhancement of health, and so other types of well-being identified in the profile, and particularly for disadvantaged communities across the City?

Parameter 3   Interdependency and reciprocity within community relations
Cultural well-being is a key determinant of enabling citizens to positively participate in the life of the community over periods of time, for their own and others' benefit. Clearly the current and likely equality/inequality patterns result in many areas of the City experiencing inevitable and entrenched barriers to this kind of participation. Further data need to be collected to fully identify those most at risk of this outcome, raising a number of questions concerning this parameter. For example, how much resource redistribution should occur to ensure the widest cultural participation possible across the City? How much are certain contributions to the enhancement of cultural well-being

undervalued in our community? Which forms of unpaid cultural activities should be also focused on in any well-being profile to determine the various ways interdependency and reciprocity is manifested within Newport? More specifically, in relation to the Welsh language, it important to note that language transfer between generations is a key aspect to linguistic longevity, but how is this process facilitated within Newport?

Parameter 4   Transparency and accountability in decision-making

Council has systematically attempted to gather public views and perceptions concerning the well-being profile, and this is to be commended in relation to this parameter. However, what is less clear is how this information will aid decision-making and the setting of priorities for the promotion of cultural well-being. In this context, it is important to identify not only what these decisions and priorities might be, but also *how* these decisions and priority-setting are made, and what this might mean for different communities engaged in this process. It would be important for Council to provide and publicise some kind of overview of the 'next steps' in this regard, and how the choices might be conveyed and opinions sought, alongside articulating the key principles that govern this process? Also, it is important to note that only 20% of participants of the people panel survey felt that they could influence decisions affecting their local area. How accessible, then, are these kinds of consultations for the wider population of Newport? Is there enough 'follow on' campaigns from decisions made i.e. 'you said this so we did this'? Budget constraints might limit Council's capacity to operationalise this process but this then raises questions about the ability local government has to raise participation levels in policy making and in its consultation.

Type 3 – Environmental well-being

(a) *Some of the main themes identified in the profile regarding this well-being type*

- Parks and green spaces are especially highly valued by respondents to the Your Newport survey – with a substantial number of respondents stating that they would like to see green spaces better maintained, or further green spaces created (including cycle paths and children's play areas).
- Litter and fly-tipping are the most frequently raised environmental 'negatives' in the Your Newport survey.
- In the survey undertaken through the Newport Citizens Panel and Communities First clients, these statement receive 'positive' net rates of agreement:
  - Protection of wildlife
  - Enjoyment of outdoor spaces
  - Protection from flooding
  - Development and protection of land
  - Transport and travel

… while these receive more negative responses than positive:

- - Attractiveness, cleanliness and safety of neighbourhoods
  - Attractiveness, cleanliness and safety of city centre
- C02 emissions in Newport are consistently higher than the Welsh average – and although the gap has recently closed, this has been down to a rise in the Wales-wide levels, rather than a reduction in Newport's (which have also risen).
- Newport's capacity of renewable energy equipment is above that in all of the other former counties of Gwent, bar Monmouthshire.

(b) *Some of the main limitations of the date collected*

- It would be helpful to have a breakdown of residency for those survey respondents rating their neighbourhood negatively (see above) – and to know, e.g., whether they are concentrated in certain parts of the City.

- The data in the section 'What is the makeup of the Environment in Newport?' (p. 134ff) is difficult to interpret – but also seems particularly crucial. Key terms such as 'Lower Super Output Areas' are not defined.
- It would be helpful to have a clear comparison of council wards, in terms of quality of the physical environment. This is especially important due to the intersectionality between the environment and other aspects of deprivation and inequality (see below).
- While data on CO_2 emissions are included (pp. 145, 146), separate data on NOx (nitrogen oxide) emissions are not. (It does though feature in the combined pollution data on p. 147.) We know that NOx is actually more harmful at the local level (e.g., in its effects on air quality, and as a threat to children's health) than CO_2 – hence the current pressure for tighter regulation of diesel engines, which are a major cause.

(c) How do (a) and (b) above bear on the four parameters of debate about fairness as identified by the NFC?

Parameter 1   Equal treatment while recognising difference
It is important when developing and considering the well-being profile to consider further questions not addressed in the profile concerning this parameter. For example, how can the data be used to set environmental well-being priorities, particularly in regard to the effect on different sections of the community? What trade-offs should be made between groups within Newport concerning their environmental well-being and the targeting of disadvantage groups given the other well-being differentials that exist across the City between groups or wards? How should these trade-offs be balanced when promoting environmental well-being overall? More specifically, environmental factors are in some respects a great equalizer: air and water quality, e.g., affect us all. But in other respects, they affect people differently according to where they live; their income; their age; whether, how much and where they work, and so on. We also know that there are correlations between ethnic and cultural background, and, for example, use of green spaces and the countryside. The data from the profile gives us a broad picture, but not enough to gauge how environmental factors intersect with other aspects of potential deprivation and inequality.

Parameter 2   Mutual obligations between citizens and local government
Again, there are potentially large disparities across the City in terms of both individual and group environmental well-being, and across a range of measures. Given these disparities, it is important to ask the question as to what obligations local government has in relation to enhancing environmental well-being for those disadvantaged areas, and the subsequent onus of responsibility placed on individual citizens when/if these obligations are fulfilled? More specifically, environmental factors such as recycling rates, reliability of public transport as an alternative to the car, the availability of cycle paths and provision and use of parks, are clearly pertinent to the obligations between citizens and government – and to people's well-being, both in the present and future. Again, the data presented in the profile gives only a partial picture on this score.

Parameter 3   Interdependency and reciprocity within community relations
Environmental well-being is a key determinant of enabling citizens to positively participate in the life of the community over periods of time, for their own and others' benefit. Clearly the current and likely equality/inequality patterns result in many areas of the City experiencing inevitable and entrenched barriers to this participation. Further data need to be collected to fully identify those most at risk of this outcome, raising a number of questions concerning this parameter. More specifically, the environment highlights perhaps more strongly than any other aspect of well-being relations between current and future generations. In some senses, these are not reciprocal: those yet to be born cannot do anything for us. But we do a good deal to shape the circumstances in which they will live, and their opportunities for well-being. Every aspect of this well-being profile

has a direct bearing on those relations. But it also, focussing only on the present, highlights how the use of shared public spaces, amenities and vital resources such as air and water is a primary aspect of our interdependency.

Parameter 4   Transparency and accountability in decision-making
Council has systematically attempted to gather public views and perceptions concerning the well-being profile, and this is to be commended in relation to this parameter. However, what is less clear is how this information will aid decision-making and the setting of priorities for the promotion of environmental well-being. In this context, it will be important in the future to identify not only what these decisions and priorities might be, but also *how* these decisions and priority-setting will be made, and what this might mean for different communities engaged in this process. It would be important for Council to provide and publicise some kind of overview of the 'next steps' in this regard, and how the choices might be conveyed and opinions sought, alongside articulating the key principles that govern this process? More specifically, environmental well-being certainly raises important questions around transparency – e.g., in the provision of data such as that provided in the profile, and the importance of open consultation on how shared spaces and resources are used and allocated. Various *potential* issues are raised by the data presented, from the point of view of transparency and accountability – but these tend already to be dealt with via the statutory monitoring of e.g. air and water quality.

End