



AGENDA

SELECT COMMITTEE - COMMISSIONING

Wednesday, 29th January, 2014, at 10.00 am

Ask for: **Denise Fitch**

**Stour Room, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**

Telephone **01622 694269**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting in the meeting room

Membership

Mr M J Angell (Chairman), Mr M Baldock, Mr M A C Balfour, Mr H Birkby, Mr N J D Chard, Mr G Cowan, Mr T Gates, Mr C R Pearman and Mr M J Vye

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

- 1 Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting.
- 2 Questions/themes that the Committee are investigating as agreed in the Terms of Reference (16/12/13) (Pages 3 - 6)
- 3 **10.00am** - Keith Harrison, Chief Executive Action with Communities in Rural Kent (Pages 7 - 16)
- 4 **11.00am** - Roger House, Chairman - Kent and Medway Region, Tim Colman, Director of Partnership Working Limited, Alison Parmar, Development Manager - Kent & Medway Federation of Small Businesses (Pages 17 - 20)
- 5 12.00am - Jan Perfect, Chief Executive Case Kent (Pages 21 - 22)
- 6 Wrap up/key points

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services
(01622) 694002

Tuesday, 21 January 2014

KCC Commissioning and Procurement Select Committee Themes

The questions/themes that the Committee are investigating as agreed in the Terms of Reference (16/12/13) are:-

What do we (KCC) need to do next to become a better commissioning authority – with a particular focus on removing barriers to entry for the provision of KCC services from new providers, particularly small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and members of the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector (VCSE).

Is KCC using its commissioning processes to ensure it meets its duties under the Social Value Act?

How, in becoming a commissioning authority can the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector (VCSE) play a more important role in the provision of KCC services.

The issues to be explored are

- a) the strategic context and our role as a commissioning organisation
- b) the costs of entry into KCC commissioning and procurement exercises, and if these costs present a significant barrier to new providers
- c) how any barriers to entry for new providers might be mitigated or removed
- d) the extent to which KCC decommissions and re-commissions services based on provider performance
- e) How KCC can best discharge its responsibilities through the Social Value Act
- f) the type of social benefits that should be sought through commissioning /procurement practices (e.g. apprenticeships)
- g) the extent that social value requirements be sought throughout the KCC supply chain

Themes in detail: This is intended to give a flavour of the issues that the Committee might wish to explore through their Hearings, it is not intended to be prescriptive or relate to a specific witness and is to aid thinking.

a) Role as Commissioning Organisation and Strategic Context

- What is Commissioning?
- Do we understand as an organisation what we want or are trying to achieve? Are we sufficiently focused? Are we a provider or commissioning organisation?
- Do we have a clear understanding of our role as a commissioning organisation?
- What is our commissioning strategy?
- Are there any strategic barriers to achieving the transformation Kent needs through commissioning? How might we mitigate these?
- Is there clarity around budgets & commissioners ability to enact the strategic direction?
- What does successful commissioning look like? What do we do well and what can we improve? Are we an intelligent client? Do we know what we want and don't want?
- How do we balance our service requirements and budget of council and using the VCSE sector?
- Where can County Council Members add most benefit within a commissioning organisation?

b) Market Development - What are the costs of entry into KCC commissioning and procurement exercises and do these costs present a significant barrier to new providers?

- What are the costs of entry into KCC commissioning? Is access to the market equitable?
- How does this affect the sectors? Business return/profit?
- What does this mean from a provider perspective?

c) Market Development - How might any barriers to entry for new providers be mitigated or removed?

- What are the barriers for providers? How might these be mitigated? e.g. costs of insurance, contract length, capacity, skills, Legal/Tupe)
- How proportionate is paperwork to spend/contract value? What have we/can we do online to reduce burdens?
- How much of our provision is with VCSE, SME's? What are our targets/guidelines for procuring Kent business? Services from VCSE? SMEs?
- How are we supporting VCSE? How can the VCSE play a more important role in the provision of KCC services as we become a commissioning authority? What else might we do?
- How do we work with SME's? What else might we do?
- What are the implications of subcontracting? What are the learning points about large suppliers using SME's/VCS's? What might we do to support large private suppliers and VCS sector working together?
- How is Kent actively shaping and developing the market, what else might we do?
- What part does the construction of the proposal and contract type chosen influence which providers tender?
- Can VCSE sector and SME's build own capacity? Maintain rate of growth?

d) Commissioning/Contract Management –

Do we decommission / re-commission services based on performance?

- Why is re-commissioning/de-commissioning important? Are the processes clear?
- Do we have a clear picture of what we are spending and with whom?
- How are we developing the market through decommissioning and re-commissioning? What are the benefits of particular procurement models (e.g. Dynamic purchasing model)?
- How is decommissioning influenced by nature of service and market?
- Contract monitoring – What are the realities of outcome focused commissioning? How successfully are we monitoring outcome focused contracts? Are the outcomes specified the right ones for contract – activity or outcome based? Do we understand model procuring into/service pathways and key part supplier plays, interdependencies and specific attributable outcomes? What can we learn?
- How do we reward providers for past performance? Do we assess past experience of providers in procurement process? How can we build previous experience of providers into procurement process?
- What is our approach to managing contracts, in particular poorly performing providers? What do we need to get better at?

- Is there clarity of roles between commissioner and provider/supply? Do we understand our role as a commissioning organisation and have the skills to support this? Are we good commissioners?
- How can the right commissioning and contract management help meet KCC's savings targets? In managing contracts what do we do well, what should we do better? How might we modernise our approach? Do contracts include good specifications and the necessary levers? How have other LA's approached this e.g. Essex?
- How should we balance the need for contracts that give time for innovation, companies to make a return and enable Kent to decommission and ensure good market development? Within our contracts is there capacity through length of contract for service re-design and innovation?
- What are our relationships like with suppliers – how could these be better?
- What impact does length of contract have on providers entering the market, performance managing a provider on outcomes, provider gain and added social value?

e) How can KCC best discharge its responsibilities through the Social Value Act

f) What type of social benefits should be sought through commissioning and procurement?

- Are we meeting the duties of the social value act?
- How can we use commissioning to ensure meet duties under social value act?
- How have we worked with providers to achieve social value? (e.g. apprenticeships, waste)
- Do our procurement systems allow wider public value judgements to be included in the assessment of tenders so that the added value of the voluntary and community sectors can be recognised in the decision about procuring our goods and services?
- How does the nature of the added social value depend on the procurement model, sector or individual provider?
- To what extent should social value requirements be sought throughout the KCC supply chain?

This page is intentionally left blank

External Witness Biographies - 29th January 2014

Action With Communities in Rural Kent

Action with Communities in Rural Kent is a rural development charity, formed as the Kent rural Community Council in 1923, which provides information, training, guidance and networking opportunities for around 600 community-led regeneration projects each year. Key bodies worked with include Parish Councils, community groups, formal charities, social enterprises, small and micro-enterprises.

The ethos of the charity is that nobody should be disadvantaged because they live or work in a rural area. Key current agendas worked on include management of community owned assets, provision of affordable housing, community-led planning, access to basic services and rural economic growth (including helping people return to work.) The charity is co-financed by over 40 organisations from public, private and civil society sectors, with KCC accounting for around 6% of turnover.

Attending the Select Committee today is Keith Harrison, Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank

Action with Communities in Rural Kent Evidence Paper 2 to Kent County Council Procurement & Commissioning Select Committee, January 2014

This paper seeks to provide insight on one set of related questions set out in Kent County Council's *Commissioning TOR Summary for Witnesses* paper, and received by Action with Communities in Rural Kent on 16th January 2014. Action with Communities in Rural Kent (ACRK) is a rural development charity that has worked with Kent County Council on numerous agendas since 1923.

What are the implications of subcontracting? What are the learning points about large suppliers using SMEs / VCSs? What might we do to support large private suppliers and VCS sector working together?

The implications of subcontracting are numerous. Positives for Kent County Council (KCC) may include being able to draw upon expertise in particular fields, investing in VCSEs and SMEs that can attract match-funding not available to the public sector or even reduce costs by not paying a public sector pension.

The main learning points that ACRK would wish to highlight concern the financial risks associated with subcontracted work through major private sector organisations – especially where contracts are only offered on a 'performance related' basis. ACRK is operating two such projects at the time of writing, albeit both are tied to private sector companies' ability to deliver on HM Government targets and use is being made of ACRK to access 'hard to reach' groups, communities and individuals. One of these contracts is ACRK's largest source of income (around 30% for 2013/14), but also required six months of start-up costs to be incurred that will have taken over two years to recoup.

An organisation such as ACRK would seek to generate a surplus through such sub-contracted work, so as to subsidise areas of activity where its work is not funded fully (e.g. enabling of affordable housing in rural areas, technical guidance for safe and legal operation of village halls, etc.)

This indicates that, from a VCSE perspective, commissioning is not always a matter that can be considered in isolation; the work commissioned is often contributing to a 'greater public good.' There is a risk that the greater public good can remain undelivered, or be reduced, if a major commission does not bring about necessary (and timely) business benefits for the VCSE organisation delivering commissioned activity.

One idea that might be considered is either to help VCSEs bankroll such activity (e.g. via an interest-free loan), or act as a financial guarantor so that a private sector organisation has confidence that a particular subcontract can be delivered.

Interest free loans have been supplied by County Councils to help ACRK's equivalents in counties such as Bedfordshire and Surrey to deliver large-scale EU-financed regeneration schemes (LEADER in the former, ESF in the latter – which is underpinning current delivery by ACRK in Kent.) In counties such as Cornwall, Wiltshire and Cumbria different financial relationships have been put in place whereby ACRK's equivalents operate such contracts (at lesser cost to the taxpayer) but County Councils act as accountable bodies.

With regard to the large commission that should account for around 30% of ACRK's income during 2013/14, it is worth noting that for delivery of work has been a significant enough success for staff to be invited to a House of Commons reception, in late 2013, to help celebrate service results. The financial management of this success has been a challenge however.

Suggestion

1. Consider establishing bankrolling facilities or a guarantor function to help enable VCSE organisations to take on contracts with larger private sector companies.

Further information:

Action with Communities in Rural Kent, The Old Granary, Penstock Hall Farm, Canterbury Road, Brabourne, Kent TN25 5LL. Tel: 01303-813790 E-mail: info@ruralkent.org.uk

Action with Communities in Rural Kent Evidence Paper 1 to Kent County Council Procurement & Commissioning Select Committee, January 2014

This paper seeks to provide insight on one set of related questions set out in Kent County Council's *Commissioning TOR Summary for Witnesses* paper, and received by Action with Communities in Rural Kent on 16th January 2014. Action with Communities in Rural Kent (ACRK) is a rural development charity that has worked with Kent County Council on numerous agendas since 1923.

How are we supporting the VCSE? How can the VCSE play a more important role in the provision of KCC services as we become a commissioning authority? What else might we do?

Kent County Council (KCC) could be construed, maybe incorrectly, as supporting the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector in a disconnected, questionably-informed and financially inconsistent way. This can change if KCC utilises the VCSE in a research and development capacity, to help inform future policy formulation and subsequent service design. Such an approach would help the VCSE to play a more important role in the provision of KCC services.

- Evidence of disconnection exists in there being little demonstrable ability of the authority to work with VCSE organisations coherently across KCC directorates. An ACRK example is in its work with KCC on support for village halls – covering economic development, communities and emergency planning agendas (see case study 1 below.)
- Evidence that suggests KCC being questionably informed includes it not picking up on good practice from other parts of the country that support VCSE and / or SME innovation. ACRK examples of this include operation of major rural and / or community regeneration programmes, introduction of projects to help people remain independent in their own communities or reduce fuel poverty (see case study 2 below.)
- Evidence of supporting the VCSE in a financially inconsistent way is clear in the disparate approach to supporting infrastructure across the county and, in ACRK's experience, working to budget parameters set initially in the early 1990s. Additionally KCC has invested in new structures and mechanisms to deliver activity that could have been, or already, provided by organisations such as ACRK. Some examples of variations in funding, and comparisons with other mechanisms are listed in Case Study 3.

Case Studies

Case Study 1

ACRK operates a village halls support services across Kent and Medway, providing information, training, guidance and networking opportunities for the

Trustees of all 400+ community-owned buildings. In any given year ACRK will work to address issues, and help plan new work with around 160 of these. Halls can join a body called the Kent Community Halls Committee, which itself is a formal sub-committee of ACRK's own Management Committee (i.e. its Board.)

ACRK's work on village halls brings it in to contact with KCC on a variety of fronts. Part of KCC's core grant agreement (from the Economic Development section of the authority) contributes to operating costs, while significant time is taken up providing technical support to applicants and KCC staff involved in operation of the Community & Village Halls Grant Fund (operated by ACRK on behalf of KCC until around ten years ago, but managed 'in house' by KCC now via the Customer & Communities section.) Additional activity has taken place at various points over the past decade with KCC's Emergency Planning, Libraries and Environmental sections, although usually on an incremental basis.

KCC funding for ACRK village halls work came close to disappearing in 2013 – in part as it was not deemed to be an economic development activity. This exposed what may be seen as a 'division by direction' modus operandi; one department investing in ACRK but its halls activity supporting work of three other KCC sections. Further discussion led ultimately to the possibility of an additional £10,000 being found to help support the work, but that was ultimately not forthcoming and flexibility in use of the core grant remained.

Case Study 2

ACRK often seeks investment to pilot new ways of alleviating disadvantage across rural Kent. Being a small organisation, ACRK does not have large reserves; those it has have been used to invest in renovating a building for sub-letting purposes, and bankrolling 'payment by results' agreements. As such, innovation often has to be backed with new money.

Two examples of projects that ACRK has tried to introduce, based on good practice in other parts of the country, are Village Agents and Multi-Community Fuel (and other goods) Buying.

Village Agents is a scheme where a network of individuals, often only working around 10 hours a week, are the 'face' of key older / vulnerable people's services in a community. The scheme started in Gloucestershire, and now operates in counties such as Staffordshire, Essex, and Wiltshire. Transposing results from Gloucestershire suggests that over £7million might have been saved in bed nights alone if this scheme had operated in Kent since 2008 (this is on top of the annual adult social care budget savings achieved for the County Council in Gloucestershire.) County Councils are normal co-financiers of Village Agents schemes; there is no project operating currently in Kent, although KCC and ACRK are involved in a Big Lottery Fund bid that could see a small pilot operate in Thanet from late 2014.

21 of ACRK's 37 equivalents around England have established multi-village fuel (and indeed other goods, such as rock salt) buying consortia in the past three years. In some cases (e.g. Sussex), County Councils invested a modest sum (sometimes just £5 - £10,000) to help start these consortia. KCC was approached but more interested in an individual village application process for support – which tends to have less buying power. ACRK did find another VCSE interested in investing, but they decided not to provide money as the return on investment would not generate sufficient surpluses for them. ACRK had planned for a lower surplus, over a three-year period, than the other VCSE wished for.

ACRK has also played a key role in attracting external investment to Kent – sometimes to deliver specific funding or development / regeneration programmes. A small number of these schemes have ended up being run by KCC. In various counties (e.g. Bedfordshire, Cornwall, Cumbria, Durham, Sussex, Wiltshire etc.), ACRK's equivalents have been used to 'front' such programmes – in part as they are closer to the intended beneficiaries of available grant funding, and also as delivery is cheaper (e.g. they do not pay a local government pension.) In Surrey ACRK's equivalent has attracted major European investment that it cannot afford to bankroll; Surrey County Council has stepped in to provide an interest free loan (this is also the model used in Bedfordshire to enable delivery of the Greensand Ridge LEADER programme) to enable a particular programme to run. In Kent this does not currently happen, but might be considered for the future. If a VCSE organisation can attract investment to Kent (because it has the expertise) but cannot bankroll the work, should it be expected to pass that work on to a more costly (to the public purse) organisation? Alternatively, should VCSE organisations not bit to attract external investment if they are unable to bankroll anticipated activity? **Is it not more prudent to assist bankrolling the entrepreneurial success of that VCSE organisation?**

Case Study 3

A list of figures suggestive, perhaps wrongly, of inconsistent approaches to funding infrastructure includes:

- ACRK core grant from KCC = £37,000 per annum (49% of national average)
- CVS core grants from KCC range between £0 and in excess of £100,000 (for territories smaller than ACRK covers)
- Average core County Council grant to Rural Community Council 2012: £75,000
- Average total County Council in a Rural Community Council 2012: £289,000
- Average County Council investment per head of rural population: £0.81

- KCC investment per head of rural population: £0.19 (23% of national average)
- Highest KCC annual investment in ACRK since 2000: £118,000 (2011/12)
- KCC investment per jobs created or sustained through ACRK 2013/14: £282
- KCC investment per jobs created or sustained through Marsh Million: £1,667
- Reputed size of tender on community asset mapping for information ACRK holds largely already: £80,000

It may be seeking the impossible to redress the disparities in funding apparent above; these come from the perspective of one VCSE organisation whereas decisions relating to the figures given are taken in various parts of KCC (or other County Councils where rural communities or the benefits of utilising the VCSE sector may be of greater priority.)

A solution may be to conduct a review of infrastructure funding – and look beyond general infrastructure into arenas such as rural, funding advice, legacy models (e.g. Community Foundations too – **benchmark against other counties and introduce a degree of parity with transparent and fair formulae.**

Suggestions

1. Consideration given to providing a bank-rolling facility to help enable VCSE organisations attract further external investment to Kent
2. A review of VCSE infrastructure funding that results in a parity across the county generally and, on a thematic basis, with appropriately benchmarked national comparators.

Further information:

Action with Communities in Rural Kent, The Old Granary, Penstock Hall Farm, Canterbury Road, Brabourne, Kent TN25 5LL. Tel: 01303-813790 E-mail: info@ruralkent.org.uk

Action with Communities in Rural Kent Evidence Paper 3 to Kent County Council Procurement & Commissioning Select Committee, January 2014

This paper seeks to provide insight on one set of related questions set out in Kent County Council's *Commissioning TOR Summary for Witnesses* paper, and received by Action with Communities in Rural Kent on 16th January 2014. Action with Communities in Rural Kent (ACRK) is a rural development charity that has worked with Kent County Council on numerous agendas since 1923.

Why is re-commissioning / de-commissioning important? Are the processes clear?

ACRK considers re-commissioning and de-commissioning to be very important for a range of reasons. Processes for each are usually clear, but there can be difficulties when working in a multi-agency partnership arena; this is something that ACRK wishes to bring to the attention of KCC.

Re-commissioning is important as a management tool. Any organisation using public funds will wish to ensure that best use of investment is being made. A re-commission can be beneficial for a contracted organisation as it demonstrates continued faith in its ability to deliver, and this can be used to attract additional investment from other sources (or for other work.) Again, this demonstrates that commissioning from the VCSE cannot be conducted in isolation; an understanding of the wider VCSE operational context is required.

In certain fields of work re-commissioning, provided that appropriate timescales are in place, also enables the retention of particular skills, knowledge and other resources. Such retention can ensure continued – or even improved – service delivery.

De-commissioning is also an important management tool, and can be used to try and secure better use of public funds for KCC. It may be that a particular service is no longer needed, or that performance issues are perceived to be impacting negatively on delivery.

ACRK's experiences of commissioned work through KCC is generally positive. Commissioning process for sub-contracting have usually been very straightforward and transparent.

Commissioning and de-commissioning can become difficult in a multi-agency partnership scenario. ACRK is involved in a process at the time of writing where a partnership it called together (and initially attracted the funding to operate) is reviewing whether or not ACRK should continue as the managing body. Various contract law, property and employment issues are connected to this process and so the situation is somewhat complex. At the core of the issue is a multi-agency partnership operating to an implied contract; hence little is clear.

The partnership in question has overseen some great success – including several national awards and greater revenue for one of the funders – but questions have arisen over the quality of management since late 2013 and KCC has, on behalf of the partnership, spoken with potential alternative providers. Much time and effort is being invested by ACRK to try and keep this particular workstream, with the potential that it could be lost by April 2014 (n.b. this would be to the financial detriment of ACRK and, as indicated in other evidence papers, this is a matter that would have knock-on effects for other areas of ACRK work.)

A solution to this situation is to ensure that all multi-agency partnerships, or other joint-commissioning structures, are bound by formal agreements setting out clear roles and responsibilities.

Suggestion

1. Ensure that any joint-commissioning or multi-agency partnerships are governed by clear formal agreements, setting out precise roles and responsibilities of all parties.

Further information:

Action with Communities in Rural Kent, The Old Granary, Penstock Hall Farm, Canterbury Road, Brabourne, Kent TN25 5LL. Tel: 01303-813790 E-mail: info@ruralkent.org.uk

External Witness Biographies - 29th January 2014

Kent & Medway Federation of Small Businesses

The Federation of Small Business is the voice of small business promoting and protecting the interests of the self-employed, and people who own or run a small business.

Kent & Medway Region, support and act on behalf of over 6,500 members across 5 branches.

- East Kent: covering Canterbury, Dover and Thanet area
- Mid Kent: covering Maidstone area
- North Kent: covering Dartford, Gravesham, Medway and Swale area
- South Kent: covering Ashford & Shepway area
- West Kent: covering Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells area

Attending the Select Committee today is:

1. Roger House, Chairman Kent and Medway Region with
2. Tim Colman, Director of Partnership Working Limited and
3. Alison Parmar, Development Manager

Plus possibly two Small Business Owners / K&MFSB Members

This page is intentionally left blank

Outline Notes Regarding Consultation with Kent County Council Select Committee Commissioning and Procurement of Services

Context

These notes are prepared by a Director of Partnership Working Limited (PWL), a micro-business with offices in Kent and Hampshire. PWL specialises in provision of support to public and private sector bodies involved in the procurement process, whether as “buyers” or “sellers”.

PWL also has considerable experience of working with the voluntary sector.

We confirm that as at the time of the consultation, PWL are not directly or indirectly involved in any tenders or other procurement processes involving KCC.

Overview

There can be no doubt whatever of the benefits of procuring goods and services from MSE's (Micro and Small Enterprises – with less than 50 employees) and the voluntary sector.

A number of recent reports – including the 2013 Federation of Small Businesses report on Public Sector Procurement – have shown that procuring from small, local, organisations has a major impact on the economic sustainability of the area, both in pure fiscal and social terms.

Small organisations also have a history of very competitive prices and greater flexibility than large organisations – particularly if there are changes to the scope of contract during the supply process.

However there are barriers to MSE involvement, including:

- Lack of transparency regarding low value contracts that are available. For MSE's – including the voluntary sector – contracts as low as £5,000 can be of considerable interest, yet tend not to be publicised.
- Lack of understanding of the procurement process – including the “mechanics” of actually completing tender documentation, and deciding whether or not to bid.
- Contract terms that are disproportionate to the contract value - including levels of insurance and turnover.
- Aggregation of contracts to the point where their value excludes small suppliers.
- Pre Qualification Questionnaires that are disproportionate to the value of the contract – i.e. too complicated and too long.

These issues all have solutions which are proven and used by other Local Authorities across the United Kingdom.

- Low value contracts can be publicised through portals such as CompeteFor or the SouthEast portal.
- Many LA's run regular training sessions explaining the procurement process to MSE's, explaining how to get "ready to bid" and then how to actually answer the questions raised in the tender document.
- Many LA's are now introducing contract terms that are proportionate to the risk involved in that particular procurement exercise.
- Specific dis-aggregation of contracts into lots that are accessible to MSE's is increasingly common across the UK – with LA's such as Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council leading the way in this process to the point where they have won an award for their "small business friendly" approach to procurement. The recently announced changes to EU Procurement Legislation will also include "encouragement" to split large contracts in to small lots.
- Hampshire County Council have developed a simplified PQQ that works very well at all levels of procurement across the county, and which is now being adopted by individual LA's as well as HCC themselves. However the proposal by Lord Young to completely eliminate PQQ's will have a devastating effect on both small suppliers and LA's. LA procurement teams will see their own costs rise as they will need to evaluate more full tender responses, and many MSE's have stated that always having to participate in full tenders will be too costly and will lead to them totally withdrawing from Public Sector business.

Consortium Bidding

Many LA's apparently encourage consortium bidding yet introduce contract conditions that prevent all but the largest organisations forming consortia. Whilst EU legislation is clear regarding how consortia are established for contracts over the EU Threshold, there needs to be a similar approach by KCC – particularly regarding consortia where members are MSE's or small voluntary organisation.

Payment Terms

A major barrier to MSE participation in Public Sector tenders – even as sub-contractors – is the difficulty in getting paid. Indeed many small businesses are forced out of business due to cash flow problems caused by late payment.

It is therefore strongly recommended that KCC should require Tier 1 suppliers to pass on prompt payment terms to their sub-contractors and thereafter all the way down through the supply chain.

Tim Colman – Director



External Witness Biographies - 29th January 2014

CASE Kent

Established in 1987, CASE provides specialist expertise, information and support to develop the skills local people need to run successful not-for-profit organisations and groups, primarily in the districts of Ashford, Dover, Shepway and Thanet.

CASE Kent have a strong track record for helping groups find funding and make effective use of resources, for ensuring that people working in the sector run their organisations effectively, for bringing groups together to speak in one voice, and for representing the sector to ensure that that voice is heard.

Attending the Select Committee today is Jan Perfect, Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank