

Appendix 1 – Commissioning Options Considered

Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Outcome
<p>1. Do Nothing continue to arrange individual packages of support on a spot purchase basis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of commissioning/ procurement resources required. • Potential to allocate resource to shape the market and encourage upskilling of workers to increase supply instead of procurement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of control over service costs. • Providers not on standard KCC contract terms and conditions. • No minimum service quality defined, risk to KCC meeting our statutory requirements successfully. • Inconsistent service provision. • No processes in place to monitor outcomes for people being supported. • Risk of duplication in Children’s and Adults teams. • In breach of the Public Sector Regulations (2015) Light Touch Regime for health, social and education contracts and KCC’s Spending the Council’s Money. 	<p>Rejected</p>
<p>2. Procure services externally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased control over services purchased, in terms of quality, cost and allocated risk. • Establishes quality baselines in a market with no regulatory oversight. • Ensures service alignment and promotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk that providers will decline to engage with the council or take part in a procurement process, leading to a failed procurement. • Resources required to procure and manage contractual arrangements. 	<p>Recommended</p>

	<p>with MADE principles and other council strategies through design of service specification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilises expert skills and knowledge of local specialist providers. • Supports the development of organisations supporting the D/deaf community across the breadth of Kent. • Allows specialist providers to lead innovation in supporting people to maintain or improve their independence. 		
<p>3. Provide services in house</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control over service delivery and quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost: Purchasing service via list of providers on agreed terms allows flexibility in the volumes purchased. Resourcing permanently in-house commits to a potentially unnecessary level of resourcing and spend. • Lack of choice: Restricts the choice of people eligible for support to that provided by the council. • Does not take advantage of the specialist knowledge and skills available in provider organisations (often deaf-led VCSE organisations). • Current social care teams are designed as case 	<p>Rejected</p>

		management functions. Bringing this provision in-house would not sit functionally alongside the current design of the Sensory Services teams.	
4. Variation to an existing contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced resources required to run procurement process. • Utilisation of an existing well performing contract with known provider capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential contract to vary has just one year of a three-year term left (with the option for two further 1-year extension periods, at the discretion of the council), so may not offer a long term solution. • With the absence of a competitive procurement process there is less opportunity to demonstrate that value for money is being achieved. 	Rejected