Bracknell Forest Council Record of Decision

Work Programme Reference	l117694

1. **TITLE:** Social Value Policy

2. **SERVICE AREA:** Resources

3. PURPOSE OF DECISION

The adoption of a Social Value Policy to be applied across all Council commissioning and procurement, in line with the Social Value Act

4 IS KEY DECISION Yes

5. **DECISION MADE BY:** Executive

6. **DECISION:**

RESOLVED that

- i. the adoption of the new Social Value Policy (attachment 1) under the Local Target methodology is approved.
- ii. the adoption of the Bracknell Forest Council Social Value Matrix (attachment 2), developed by the Bracknell Forest community is approved, to operate as the Council's current Local Targets under the Policy. The Matrix is not fixed and the specific targets will be reviewed annually and adjusted to reflect the changing needs of the community.

7. REASON FOR DECISION

- 1. The Local Target methodology sets a broad range of targets that are reflective of the needs and goals of the local community. It should be noted that as per the Act, the community should be the primary driver behind these targets so they may not be reflective of the Council Plan or other officer or Member objectives.
- 2. These targets can be adjusted, so will remain reflective of the local community whilst it changes, but individual community consultation for every relevant contract will not be required.
- 3. Officers are not required to apply every target in the Matrix to every contract. Instead they select the 5 or 6 they believe are most relevant and appropriate to the contract they are commissioning and the market they are approaching. This balances flexibility to match the wide variety of contracts the Council commissions, and the need to give both officers and bidders some structure, process and guidance to deliver a complex requirement
- 4. The Local Target methodology will also give a framework to support the evaluation, monitoring and management of incredibly diverse social value offers an area the Council has historically needed to improve.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 1. Two other methodologies for assessing social value outcomes were considered;
- The national Themes, Outcomes & Measures (TOMs)
- Commissioner Created
- 2. The TOMs were created by a private company, the Social Value Group, but have been adopted by the Local Government Association as national best practise. However:
- As they are national they lack a lot of local nuance. Many Local Authorities using them find they get social value offers that don't reflect their local community, e.g.
- veteran employment in areas with a low veteran population.
- They are inflexible, so it's possible to 'run out' of a social value TOM because your Local Authority has delivered on it, but it remains as a target and you continue to receive bids against it
- They are very complex for both officers and bidders there are 198 TOMs.
- As they are based upon money they can lead to problematic bidder behaviours, e.g. offering payment in place of a social value commitment.
- 3. Commissioner Created was designed by Milton Keynes City Council. It gives a requirement that social value be included, but leaves the 'how' entirely within the hands of each commissioning officer. It can lead to incredibly creative and successful social value offers. However:
- The lack of guidance and support often leaves both officers and bidders at a loss as to how to proceed.
- Whilst it can support very innovative and creative offers, the majority will be basic and low impact, i.e. plant a small number of trees, employ 1 apprentice etc. These low level offers are also repeated again and again by the same bidders across multiple contracts
- 4. Neither the TOMs nor Commissioner Created models were selected due to the issues identified with each above.
- 9. **DOCUMENT CONSIDERED:** Report of the Executive Director: Resources
- 10. **DECLARED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** None

Date Decision Made	Final Day of Call-in Period
23 April 2024	1 May 2024