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INSIGHTS FROM POLICY & PRACTICE

This document provides insights into current social procurement policy and practice within the public sector in Australia. It incorporates input drawn from interviews with representatives of three State Government departments (see end panes in each section for details), and also from resource materials previously produced by a range of interested parties (which can be accessed via the Social Procurement Australasia website).

WHAT IS SOCIAL PROCUREMENT?

Social procurement is the intentional generation of social value through procurement and commissioning processes. It occurs when organisations buying a good or service or delivering works choose to purchase a social outcome - over and above the products or services required.

Social procurement can take many forms, which can be loosely grouped into direct and indirect approaches. Direct approaches involve purchasing from for-social-benefit entities, such as: not-for-profits, social enterprises, Australian Disability Enterprises, Aboriginal-owned businesses, social businesses, worker or community owned cooperatives and others. Indirect approaches involve including social clauses (e.g. employment targets for long-term unemployed) in ‘regular’ contracts with private sector providers, screening supply chains for ethical considerations, and the like.

Interest in social procurement is growing as elected officials, senior government officers, commissioners and procurement staff increasingly recognise the economic efficiency of using a single pool of money to achieve multiple organisational objectives.

SOCIAL PROCUREMENT IS STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT

Social procurement acts on whole-of-government thinking and provides sophisticated tools for improving the complex ‘quality of life’ outcomes that are the core business of the public sector. There are many versions of ‘quality of life’ indicators, but they generally include some combination of: health status; work and life balance; education and skills; social connections; civic engagement and governance; environmental quality; personal security; and subjective well-being.

Whole-of-government thinking around complex policy objectives has contributed to an increased awareness of the strategic potential of procurement as a function. Aligning budgetary spends to deliver maximum ‘value for money’ against policy priorities is now seen as good practice, and as a result a much more holistic understanding of what constitutes value in this context is emerging. The notion that value is achieved simply through lowest price is seen as naïve with considerations of value now being broader, and including outcomes such as: fitness for purpose; the experience and capacity of the purchaser; reliability; timeliness; delivery; innovation; product servicing; added social, economic or environmental value; creation of strategic partnerships; contribution to meeting government policy objectives; and costs and benefits over the life-cycle of a product or service.

The emerging recognition of the strategic potential of social procurement in Australia also draws on significant advancements in this area in other countries. Increasingly, government entities at all levels are recognising the ‘value leak’ that occurs when procurement policies and programs fail to embed the delivery of social and environmental outcomes in tenders and contracts.
There is no one best way to ‘do’ social procurement, as the case studies that follow and those available in other materials demonstrate. The aim of the ‘Doing Social Procurement: Insights From Policy & Practice’ project is to shed light on the variety of approaches in use. Not surprisingly, a common theme is that involving people who have a passion for more effective and innovative approaches to procurement, and for the specific social issue to be targeted, is important at all stages of the process. This type of committed leadership - at the political, executive and technical levels - plays a critical role in designing and implementing successful strategies.

**DESIGNING SOCIAL PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES**

Critical to developing effective social procurement strategies is clarity of focus around what specific policy objectives, and consequently what social outcomes, it will be designed to assist with delivering. The more specific the social outcomes statements are, the greater the opportunity for success. Taking the time to get this stage right, including engaging internal and external stakeholders in the process, is possibly the most important aspect of developing a successful social procurement strategy as everything else flows from here.

"... our push is to say spend more time in planning ... work out your outcomes. A lot of social procurement is about up front, before you buy something, getting really specific ... if you want a social outcome build that in to your strategy and your tender documents" Alex Taylor, Director Client Procurement Services and Bindy Syminton, Senior Procurement Manager ADE Procurement, WA Department of Finance.

Outcomes-based approaches are becoming more prevalent in public sector procurement generally, as they are increasingly recognised as key to unlocking the strategic potential of procurement as a function and for delivering a number of benefits to the purchaser, including: stimulating innovation; increasing supplier diversity; building supplier capacity; and improving efficiencies associated with the tendering and contracting process.

Outcomes-based approaches essentially pose issues and opportunities to the market (‘what’ is to be achieved), rather than specifying the manner in which a contract will be delivered (the ‘how’). They tend to offer greater scope for developing innovative and robust social procurement strategies because they allow specialists in the market to apply their expertise to how the outcome might best be generated, rather than assuming that government is in the best position to determine this. As there is less focus on meticulously detailing the goods or services to be purchased at the front end, in addition to being more effective the resulting outcomes-based tenders and contracts can also be less expensive to generate.

---

**IMPLEMENTING SOCIAL PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES**

As in the following sections demonstrate, to realise the potential of a social procurement strategy it can be useful to invest in other contextual factors, such as developing: internal knowledge and skills; a network of specialty for-social-benefit suppliers; the capacities of commercial suppliers; and / or the market more broadly.

In recognition of this, successful social procurement strategies are often multi-pronged, having several implementation elements that work in parallel. Realising the full potential of social procurement takes time as it requires changing culture, both internally amongst staff and externally amongst suppliers. Some insights are provided below – please note however, that this area of practice is evolving rapidly as innovations are tested, refined and adopted.

- Dedicate staff time to the activity, restructure a position (or even a team!) if you need to.
- Where possible involve staff who have an interest in and passion for the social issue to be targeted. Especially in the early stages, a lynchpin ‘intrapreneur’ can make all the difference to moving the strategy off paper and into practice.
- Support agencies to interpret ‘big-picture’ policies into their own context, language and culture. Linking broad-brush ‘whole of government’ policies to their own priorities and objectives will make them meaningful and drive local ownership over implementation. They will also become ‘demonstrators’ for other agencies.
- Undertake an opportunity analysis across the breadth of procurement activities at whatever level of reach is possible at the time. Look for (for example): existing contracts that are coming up for renewal in six to twelve months’ time; contracts where the manager is not satisfied with the incumbent provider; areas where there is interest in service innovation; and where there may be opportunities to match the identified policy objectives with particular types of for-social-benefit suppliers.
- Involve subject matter experts who have intimate knowledge of the service or product to be purchased in the design of tender documentation (including the crafting of social outcome statements), tender evaluation panels, contract management and evaluation techniques.
- Be aware that there are different approaches to social procurement – direct, indirect, or a combination of both –

---

“When you’re doing outcomes-based procurement you’ve actually got much greater scope for social procurement to occur.” Don Jones, Director Procurement & Construction Reform, NSW Office of Finance & Services.
and ensure the approach chosen is best suited to the policy objectives and social outcomes statements related to the specific opportunity.

- Support internal stakeholders to learn and improve in an iterative way and over time, building confidence and improving sophistication from contract to contract.
- Build confidence and trust in new suppliers amongst contract managers through, for example, hosting site visits and using trials and other short term market-testing approaches.
- Engage the potential supplier network early in the process. Research the level of capacity present in the market as this will play a major role in determining the shape of the strategy. Seek their input to how capacity could be improved over time.
- Maintain focus and attention on all strands of the strategy as it moves forward, particularly supporting the development of appropriate capacities within the supplier network – both for-social-benefit and commercial providers. As internal appetites and requirements evolve and deepen this becomes a critical success factor. The best idea is just an idea until it can be matched with a willing and capable delivery organisation.
- Work with industry-based associations and third party intermediary organisations on matters such as: training and skills development; how specific types of suppliers might be validated; and to develop industry-specific systems and processes to support engagement with the policy direction.
- Always consider what potential unintended consequences may result from a particular approach and build mitigation into the strategy (ensuring unsustainable levels of risk aren’t pushed ‘down the line’ is a common issue here). Keep talking to suppliers and other stakeholders as contract delivery unfolds and if a negative unplanned impact becomes evident, be prepared to adapt the strategy in response.

“...setting up the policies was really important, getting buy in from senior management ...but it’s not as simple as just rolling them out” *Caroline Lock, Manager Procurement & Grants and Sandra Clarke, Procurement Financial Analyst, SA Department for Communities & Social Inclusion.*

EVALUATING AND REPORTING ON SOCIAL PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES

Evaluating and reporting on social outcomes should be integrated into regular contract management processes. However, reflecting the inherent complexity of working with social issues, there is no best way of undertaking this. Advances in approaches to monitoring, evaluating and reporting on social outcomes continue to be progressed around the world, with some receiving greater profile than others. Developing an approach that meets the requirements of the policy, the information needs of internal stakeholders, and provides enough detail to ‘tell the story’ externally, will be an ongoing process for most agencies. Some useful ideas for progressing this include:

- Invest in the development of systems (and consider bespoke approaches) that support management, evaluation and reporting of social outcomes and associated processes. But be prepared for this to take time to evolve. Involve staff closely in design and deployment so their expertise is captured and to build ownership over ongoing use.
- Agencies that are less familiar with working with outcomes-based models and/or social issues could partner with colleagues from Community Services oriented departments, where outcomes-based contracting has been evolving for some time. Aligning approaches with other departments within the same government makes sense also.
- Outcomes-based approaches can include the method for evaluating the success of the contract as part of the specifications to be detailed by the supplier. Working with the market in this way will help to drive appropriate and relevant innovation in this critical area.

Supporting groups of suppliers (who focus on similar social issues or work in similar industries, for example) to collaborate to develop their capacities and systems is an effective approach. Similarly, assisting industry associations and/or third party intermediaries to develop tools and processes helps create a ‘level playing field’ for all suppliers in a particular sector.

The insights presented here draw on input provided for the individual case that follow. Our thanks to the interviewees: Don Jones, Director Procurement & Construction Reform, NSW Office of Finance & Services; Caroline Lock, Manager Procurement & Grants and Sandra Clarke, Procurement Financial Analyst, SA Department for Communities & Social Inclusion; Alex Taylor, Director Client Procurement Services and Bindy Syminton, Senior Procurement Manager ADE Procurement, WA Department of Finance.
The NSW 2015 Aboriginal Participation in Construction (APIC) Policy came into effect on 1st May 2015, replacing two earlier versions. It applies to all subsequent relevant NSW Government construction contracts and supports the NSW Government Plan for Aboriginal Affairs (Opportunity, Choice, Healing, Responsibility, Empowerment - OCHRE). It is intended to contribute to four key OCHRE policy aims. One of these aims is increasing the number of Aboriginal-owned businesses in the NSW Government supply chain, and thereby generating social value in the form of more and more meaningful economic participation opportunities for Aboriginal people.

The approach was developed in response to experience with the implementation of the previous policy, and feedback from both Aboriginal communities and the construction industry. An emphasis on skills development and employment in the previous policy meant Aboriginal people were being trained, sometimes multiple times on different construction projects, and allocated to primarily short-term entry-level positions to meet quotas and the like. The unintentional skewing affecting the policy was contributing to became evident, and for policy makers and stakeholders both the unrealised social outcomes and the financial inefficiencies were clear. The new policy has shifted the emphasis, moving from applying an indirect to a direct form of social procurement (see p.3) to generate the desired social value outcome.

Through the review process projects where positive and longer-term outcomes were achieved for Aboriginal communities were examined and it was identified that these often included a deliberate strategy to encourage the participation of local Aboriginal-owned businesses. Aboriginal-owned businesses employ a high percentage of Aboriginal people, and the earnings generated flow in large-part back into Aboriginal communities. The opportunity to design the policy lever to deliver real jobs and real skills through explicitly encouraging Indigenous entrepreneurship, and business development in particular, was identified.

“... in teasing it out, sometimes there was a deliberate strategy to encourage local industry participation ... It wasn’t about necessarily doing something different, it was the emphasis within the procurement processes that made the difference”.

NSW ABORIGINAL PARTICIPATION IN CONSTRUCTION POLICY (2015) – A focus on Aboriginal owned businesses
To support Aboriginal participation in construction projects, the policy specifies a target project spend as a percentage of the total estimated value of the contract, for each of three project categories (Category 1 - those primarily directed to Aboriginal communities; Category 2 - projects over $10 million; Category 3 - projects over $1 million). Short and long term targets are specified for each category, and it is noted that the mandatory minimum target will be adjusted upwards towards the long term goal as they are progressively achieved. For projects where Aboriginal communities are the primary beneficiary and/or stakeholder the track record is strong, and so the focus was on broadening this out to provide multifaceted opportunities for participation in the more mainstream, and usually much larger, projects. The application of the targets to all NSW Government construction projects recognised that having a uniform approach across government is preferable for the construction industry also, as it provides certainty about current expectations and the direction policy is going in.

Critically, the policy also requires that an Aboriginal Participation Plan be submitted within 60 days of the contract being awarded, and a Participation Report when the project reaches 90 per cent completion. Category 1 and Category 2 projects are also required to provide their Aboriginal Participation Plans and Participation reports to the NSW Procurement Board for publication and they must remain on the Board’s website (ProcurePoint) for at least two years from the conclusion of the project.

**SOCIAL PROCUREMENT IS STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT**

Over recent years the strategic potential of procurement as a function has become increasingly recognised, both inside and outside government. Aligning budgetary spends to deliver maximum ‘value for money’ against policy priorities is now seen as good practice, and as a result a much more holistic understanding of what constitutes value in this context is emerging. The notion that value is achieved simply through lowest price is seen as naïve with considerations of value now being broader, and including: fitness for purpose; the experience and capacity of the purchaser; reliability; timeliness; delivery; innovation; product servicing; added social, economic or environmental value; creation of strategic partnerships; contribution to meeting government policy objectives; and costs and benefits over the life-cycle of a product or service. As a result, social procurement is increasingly recognised as a strategic activity. It is also one of the pillars within sustainable procurement models, and in NSW Government the adoption of a new Government Resource Efficiency Policy in July 2014 also provided a catalyst for the model underpinning the new APIC policy.

“... social procurement is good procurement ...”

Development of appropriate contracts and their ongoing management is clearly a more complex and specialised task in this context. NSW Government is implementing its strategic procurement framework using an outcomes-based approach to identifying and generating value through its contracting activity. Hundreds of pages of prescriptive tendering manuals have been replaced with a 14 page document that outlines the principles that should be considered (including how social value outcomes might be generated) and how markets should be approached. As there is less focus on meticulously detailing the goods or services to be purchased at the front end, in addition to being more effective the resulting outcomes-based tenders and contracts can also be less expensive to generate.
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NSW Government procurement staff will also be looking for the ‘track record’ component to include their performance on delivery against social outcomes, and strong and ongoing relationships with Aboriginal-owned businesses will be an important aspect of this. Over time, market competition will drive continued innovation and improvements in both the types of opportunities developed with Aboriginal communities, and in how the outcomes generated through these are demonstrated and reported on.

NSW Government delivers many large and often specialised construction projects, for which there are a relatively small number of ‘head contractors’ available. The stability and diversity of the supply chain over the longer term is therefore also a key concern. The APIc policy helps to address this through playing a key market shaping role, using government purchasing power to drive innovation on a range of fronts. Facilitating collaboration between large construction companies and smaller for-social-benefit suppliers (in this case, Aboriginal-owned businesses) brings specialist capabilities to the table whilst also helping to disrupt potential stagnation in the supplier market.

Each NSW agency is developing its own interpretation of the policy, as relevant to the nature of its business. Some agencies have taken a lead in this area, translating the general guidance into language and formats that reflect their priorities and work well with the existing culture. This localised ownership greatly increases the adoption and uptake potential, and demonstrates to other agencies how the overarching policy can be made relevant and achievable. Through this process, the experience is that social procurement is highly adaptable to different contexts and can offer ‘neat’ solutions to translating complex policy objectives into practical implementation models.

**MARKET DRIVEN INNOVATION**

The APIc policy’s outcomes-based model is designed to facilitate collaboration between Aboriginal owned businesses and large construction companies on how positive social and economic outcomes may be generated for Aboriginal people. NSW Government has removed centrally conceived prescriptions, acknowledging that there is no ‘one way’ and that government may not be best placed to determine the shape or form appropriate for specific communities. By asking contractors to identify how they will meet the policy goals, rather than telling them what will be purchased, the opportunity for innovation is opened up. Responses require collaboration with Aboriginal communities, to determine what would be most useful and how strategies could best be implemented. As it is now required that the agreed outcomes be published, publicly accountable commitments - between contractors, those communities, and stakeholders more broadly - are being created.

As a result, the reputational risk to the construction companies is significant and it is the intention that this will drive social outcome performance. As they tender for subsequent contracts

NSW Government procurement staff will also be looking for the ‘track record’ component to include their performance on delivery against social outcomes, and strong and ongoing relationships with Aboriginal-owned businesses will be an important aspect of this. Over time, market competition will drive continued innovation and improvements in both the types of opportunities developed with Aboriginal communities, and in how the outcomes generated through these are demonstrated and reported on.

NSW Government delivers many large and often specialised construction projects, for which there are a relatively small number of ‘head contractors’ available. The stability and diversity of the supply chain over the longer term is therefore also a key concern. The APIc policy helps to address this through playing a key market shaping role, using government purchasing power to drive innovation on a range of fronts. Facilitating collaboration between large construction companies and smaller for-social-benefit suppliers (in this case, Aboriginal-owned businesses) brings specialist capabilities to the table whilst also helping to disrupt potential stagnation in the supplier market.

**BUILDING CAPACITY**

Whilst including complex outcomes in construction contracts is not entirely new, the latest iteration of the policy takes the approach to a new level. NSW Government recognises that developmental pathways are needed to assist both sides of the market to mature into the roles this approach requires, and importantly the implementation of the APIc policy is supported by several complementary initiatives. One of these is the new Procurement Innovation Stream: This allows agencies to source outcomes-based trials and proof of concept testing contracts for goods and services valued up to $250,000 and for delivery over a fairly short time period. Agencies can approach particular innovative suppliers with a view to

... you’re pitching to the market to say ‘these are our problems’, rather than this is the solution we particularly want... When you’re doing outcomes-based procurement you’ve actually got much greater scope for social procurement to occur.

... there are people in government thinking - OK show me your runs on the board and show me your best ideas, and then we’ll talk price.”
testing an approach amongst a small pool before developing the full tender, and for the first time suppliers can approach an agency directly with a concept. This offers opportunities for developing and fine-tuning innovative approaches to social procurement, and for building long ranging and robust capacity on the supply side.

Industry-based agreements are also being developed to support the implementation of the policy. For example, an agreement with the Master Builders Association (MBA) on Aboriginal Employment and Enterprise Development commits the parties to working towards the following outcomes: increased sustainable employment opportunities for Aboriginal people, including within businesses servicing the Construction Industry; increased employment opportunities for Aboriginal people in management (including senior management) level positions; increased retention rates of Aboriginal employees; increased engagement with and development of Aboriginal enterprises; increased organisational awareness of Aboriginal culture; increased Aboriginal education and training pathways that position the Construction Industry as a career of choice; and improved monitoring and auditing of NSW Government contracts that require Aboriginal employment.

The identification and verification of for-social-benefit suppliers can sometimes be a road block to the implementation of social procurement strategies. The focus of the APIC policy raises the profile of this issue with regards to Aboriginal-owned businesses. The Action Plan that forms part of the agreement with the MBA notes that this is a critical issue for implementation. NSW Government has determined that incorporating the verification of reputable third party organisations, such as membership of Supply Nation or an Indigenous Chamber of Commerce, is a practical approach and streamlines procedures for Aboriginal-owned businesses also. As the effects of the policy ripple outwards, opportunities for these organisations to continue to build their capacity and refine their models will unfold.

NSW central procurement staff have been involved in the evolution of the previous policies, and capabilities have developed alongside this so no major changes to internal roles are needed. Capability matrices govern role descriptions and performance indicators, providing assurance that the right people are in the right jobs. However, evidence is emerging that within some agencies and at the project delivery level role profiles are becoming more complex. At this level, traditional contracting models relied on staff who could do high volume contracting using a routine and compliance based approach. Now there is more emphasis on communication skills and experience working with communities to source local suppliers. Agencies going down this pathway are providing exemplars for other agencies, in how to build internal capacity around delivering outcomes-based contracts as the new policy comes into effect.

“Social procurement makes my job more interesting.”

Interviewee: Don Jones, Director Procurement & Construction Reform, NSW Procurement, Office of Finance & Services
The South Australian Department for Communities & Social Inclusion (DCSI) includes Housing SA, Disability SA, Multicultural SA, Youth Justice, Office for Women, Office for Youth, Office for Volunteers, Disability and Domiciliary Care Services, and a range of other services and programs designed to support vulnerable people and help build resilient communities.

Its strategic plan and a Sustainable Procurement Policy (SSP) are key governance documents its procurement unit seeks to implement. Whilst the SSP has a strong focus on minimising and managing environmental impacts it also includes guidance around engaging suppliers. The requirement to ensure suppliers “consider relevant government employment policy objectives that relate to particular community sectors, including apprentice training, opportunities for disabled or injured workers returning to work, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people etc …” acts on its broader mission and has been a driver in catalysing and refining its social procurement strategies.

These policies and processes have been in place for several years, but more recently it was identified that there was room for improvement in implementation. Due to the nature of DCSI’s business it was recognised that many opportunities to deliver social value outcomes, in line with its core objectives, could be achieved by taking a more proactive approach to facilitating social procurement through its agencies and programs.

As a result, DCSI increasingly engages directly with Aboriginal-owned Business Enterprises (ABEs) and Australian Disability Enterprises (ADEs), and with for-profit suppliers who engage them in their supply chains. The policy changes mean DCSI now assesses the corporate social responsibility status of potential suppliers when they tender, formalises their agreed social commitment as a condition of the contract, and then monitors it through ongoing reporting.

CLEAR ENDORSEMENT

Every procurement process (purchase contracts and grants) valued over $110,000 comes through DCSI’s centralised procurement unit, giving the team the opportunity to systematically work through with the contracting business unit where additional social value could be generated. With a team of only 20 there was some internal positioning that needed
to occur before the unit could take on this hands-on but also more strategic role in the procurement process. Routine and lower value purchasing was transferred to the business units over time. This reduced double-handling, improved each business unit’s knowledge of their own supplier markets, and freed up the time of the central procurement unit to take a more proactive role in the strategic process.

With a clear vision for how its role could be repositioned and strong senior management support for its implementation, the procurement unit had the clear endorsement it needed to really focus in on the opportunities available. The existing strong relationships with business unit-level staff initially helped raise awareness of social responsibility opportunities across the breadth of the department’s business. They also continue to inform the development of the more complex procurement and grants processes the unit now handles, with business unit staff providing subject matter expertise as required by the specific contract. There is also strong management support for an iterative approach to implementation and consequently there is a focus on learning from each contract process, sharing that knowledge within the team, mentoring newer team members, and taking the time needed to identify more and different ways to generate social outcomes.

“... learning as you go along, all the information and skills are developing as you take each step forward”

Part of DCSI’s vision for a strategic procurement unit was to ensure adequate support was available for contract management, and a team dedicated to this end of the process has been created as a result. The executive committee that approves and oversees the delivery of acquisition plans and purchase recommendations for large projects takes a particular interest in the outcomes highlighted in contract management reports. The regularity of reporting differentiates the DCSI approach from many other government departments, where reports are often generated only if something goes off track and at the end of a contract. The executive level interest in ongoing contract management ensures the involvement of all those required to provide input and gives a clear focus for the regular contract management meetings with suppliers, improving their effectiveness.

“...setting up the policies was really important, getting buy in from senior management ... but it's not as simple as just rolling them out”

TO MANDATE OR NOT TO MANDATE

Most reporting obligations around procurement are established by the SA State Procurement Board, including through the State-level Sustainable Procurement Guideline. At this stage, there are no mandated reporting obligations around social procurement at this level. The reporting DCSI does is at the departmental level and as a result of social procurement being integrated into its procurement framework. State Governments use procurement as a lever to drive many different types of outcomes and adding to those that have mandated reporting requirements could make for particularly unwieldy and inefficient processes. DCSI’s preference is that reporting on social procurement remain flexible, so that each department can identify the particular objectives within the State’s strategic plan that make sense for it to focus on, according to the nature of its business. Time and energy can then be spent on contracts where there are opportunities to deliver social
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outcomes, instead of creating congested channels through trying to force policy objectives onto contracts that are not well matched.

At the contract level, the use of weightings in tender specifications is a mandating tool that can be used to drive a focus on social value outcomes. DCSI uses weightings for socially responsible activity in some cases but not all, and when they are used also varies the percentages according to the nature of the contract. This approach can be used to send clear signals to the market and also ensures that weightings aren’t ‘wasted’ where there is low potential and that higher weightings can be applied where useful and innovative responses are likely (see the examples described below). Where weightings aren’t used, social value can be generated through other methods – such as requiring a Disability Action Plan from successful tenderers. In these cases DCSI’s procurement team often works with the chosen supplier to guide the development of the plan, and reports it is seeing evidence of improvements in quality over time.

MATCHING THE SOCIAL PROCUREMENT METHOD TO THE TENDER OPPORTUNITY

In determining where social procurement opportunities lie, the emphasis is often on those contracts where the opportunity to deliver social value outcomes is fairly evident. An example of this is DCSI’s linen and laundry services contract for its Domiciliary Care and Disability units, where an Australian Disability Enterprise was deliberately sought as the supplier. Stationery contracts, however, are often cited as the type of purchasing where it is more efficient to just focus on the traditional value for money considerations (such as price and quality). DCSI’s contract with Staples Office Supplies provides an example of how, with some creative thinking and smart suppliers, social value outcomes can be generated through even the most routine procurement contracts. In its negotiations DCSI made it clear it was seeking a social value outcome, and asked suppliers to suggest what they could offer. The tender went out through the SA Government approved panel of commercial stationery suppliers. Staples won the contract with the inclusion of an annual ‘grant’ back to DCSI to spend across its full catalogue, on socially responsible projects within the department. Each year all the business units are offered the opportunity to put forward proposals to access the fund. Examples of how the fund has been used to date include:

- Youth Justice – a project to support residents of DCSI Youth Training Centres during their transition into the community. Staples provided 300 backpacks filled with some day-to-day needs (eg. toiletries and basic food supplies) for young people being released from training centres. The Department of Transport also contributed, donating bus tickets, and Staples staff did the packing at no extra cost.
- Domiciliary Care – a project to support people (predominantly over 65 years) to remain living safely and independently in their own homes. Protective kits (with eg. gloves, disinfectants, face masks, shoe covers etc) were provided by Staples are being trialled by staff working with clients, carers and families living in challenging domestic environments involving hoarding, high levels of squalor and self-neglect.

This shows how a mixture of both direct and indirect forms of social procurement (see p.3) can be applied, to meet different objectives and to match the opportunities available.
FIT-FOR-PURPOSE SYSTEMS

Systems that support development and implementation are critical to realising the full strategic potential of social procurement. Time and again we hear that these either don’t exist or that existing systems don’t have the capacity to record and report on the types of data needed to effectively manage contracts with social procurement components. DCSI’s journey in this regard is ongoing, as most will be, and provides some useful insights. Importantly, a dedicated position has responsibility for developing new and integrating existing system capabilities. DCSI advises that this dedicated focus has been an important contributing factor to its progress with implementing social procurement strategies overall.

DCSI’s experience has been that developing systems in this area, even relatively simple databases, has been a lot more complicated than originally anticipated. It was only after building up its tacit knowledge over a few years - of what specifically would be useful on a day-to-day basis and for monitoring and reporting purposes - that it had the experience needed to properly tackle the development of fit-for-purpose systems. Patience around this reflects the iterative approach discussed earlier.

When new tenders are initiated they are set up in an electronic document management system and can be linked to other existing or previous projects. This acts as a flag to the staff involved throughout the process, letting them know that another team member suggests a particular project may be helpful in designing this procurement or grant strategy. Whilst so far ‘corporate memory’ is still relied on to identify relevant projects the system can be searched using broad terms, improving access to existing materials for newer staff and across the team. Over the past 12 months a new electronic tracking system for contracts and grants over a certain value has also been implemented. This value has now been lowered to $22,000, meaning that a larger volume of activity will now be tracked. The reporting elements of the new system are currently being tested, and the team is keenly anticipating the improvements these will deliver around contract management, including reporting on social value outcomes.

“Having a good document management system is amazing. We’ve found it so useful.”

THE QUESTION OF COST

There is a common perception that specifying social value outcomes in contracts will result in a higher contract price. Whilst this can be true in some cases, DCSI’s experience is that its social procurement contracts are delivering better value for money, in the broader sense that this is now understood (beyond just price) and taking into account whole of life costs. The procurement unit’s experience means it is now proficient at negotiating with suppliers for the inclusion of additional or higher value social outcomes, even where the contract price is considered suitable - meaning that the ‘best and final offer’ can include much better value for money overall. DCSI’s executive committee has a strong focus on the financial aspects of acquisition planning and contract management, and its endorsement of the value for money outcomes being achieved has been consistent and strong to date. As the social value outcomes are aligned with the State’s strategic plan, DCSI can also clearly demonstrate the value generated for SA communities and for the government.

“It doesn’t really appear to be costing us more. In fact, for example [on our stationery contract] … we got excellent social outcomes, but we also got a really good price.”

ONGOING DEVELOPMENT

DCSI has previously won some awards - through EcoBuy and The Chartered Institute of Purchasing & Supply Australasia (CIPSA) - for its procurement activities, and it advises that the SA State Procurement Board is interested in its approach, as are other SA Government departments. DCSI is committed to continuing to resource the refinement of its methods and systems, and to building capacity in its supplier market, offering strong leadership in the public sector around the implementation of social procurement strategies.

Interviewee: Caroline Lock, Manager Procurement & Grants and Sandra Clarke, Procurement Financial Analyst, SA Department for Communities & Social Inclusion
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WA SUPPLY POLICY EXEMPTION – Creating employment opportunities for people with a disability

In 2009, in recognition of the potential for government procurement to improve the employment prospects of people with a disability, the WA Government Supply Policy was amended to include an exemption from minimum requirements to allow agencies to contract directly with an Australian Disability Enterprise (ADE), without following a competitive quote or open tender processes. The announcement was appropriately made on 3 December, International Day of People with Disability. However, despite Ministerial support and advocacy across the Cabinet, over the next three years there was very little uptake of the exemption clause and therefore the potential of this direct social procurement strategy (see p.3) was not being realised.

In 2012, in a first attempt to collaborate strategically, the seven ADE’s in WA made a joint submission for a WA Social Innovation Grant. Western Australian Disability Enterprise (WADE) was awarded two years funding for a project manager, whose role is to facilitate the members’ collaboration around government contracting, ‘broker’ negotiations with government agencies, and assist them with tendering. The Department of Finance’s Client Procurement Services team restructured one of its positions to focus on ADE procurement and to ‘match’ the WADE role. This internal position raises awareness of the opportunities available through the exemption clause, assists agencies interpret these into their own context, and ‘brokers’ negotiations with WADE members. Subsequently, the incoming WA Government committed to the continuation of the internal dedicated position and, through the Disability Services Commission, awarded WADE an additional four years funding for its project manager.

“It couldn’t have been done without a dedicated position ... a go-to person, a coordinating person. What I call the marriage broking role ... you need that to get traction, to actually put the rubber on the road”.

An early focus was to generate quality promotional materials that showcased the range of services the seven WADE members’ could jointly offer. This promotional material has been invaluable in helping agencies understand where their business needs might intersect with the service offerings.
The two matching ‘broker’ roles work closely together, and since their establishment the uptake of the ADE exemption clause has increased significantly. Seventy three contracts, with a value of over $21 million, across 27 agencies and supporting 2100 employees with a disability have now awarded. The ADE’s haven’t been successful with every contract they’ve tendered for but, in addition to those awarded under the exemption clause, a number of open tenders have also been won and as WAde members become more experienced with government contracting an increase in these is evident.

**PROACTIVELY IDENTIFYING AND SECURING OPPORTUNITIES**

The internal role initially focused on understanding the core business of each agency and what types of contracts each lets, to identify where potential matches may lie. Whilst all agencies are required to produce a forward procurement plan, it was often more useful to focus on creating a list of contracts coming up for re-tender over the coming twelve months. Agencies purchase regularly, but they don’t purchase different goods or services very often, so the strongest opportunities for ADEs lie in the renewal of existing contracts.

A critical issue in social procurement is ensuring there is enough lead time to act on the opportunity. For Client Procurement Services, the ability to do this is dependent on its relationships. Its central team includes staff members based within each agency and these positions have been critical in helping to form relationships with the relevant contract managers, and for monitoring the re-tender list for opportunities coming up. As well as openings that result from a scheduled re-tender, opportunities can present where a contract manager isn’t particularly happy with the incumbent supplier (or in one case where the supplier went into liquidation) and so are open to considering other possibilities. In these cases, the added benefit of avoiding a full tender process and going to direct negotiation with a potential supplier, through accessing the ADE exemption, can also be attractive.

“... getting in early enough is really important . . . identifying contracts that are going to expire six to twelve months in advance and at least starting a conversation with the right person...”

Client Procurement Services advises that having a position dedicated to identifying specific contract opportunities, and then fostering the relevant internal relationships, has been central to the more recent uptake of the ADE exemption. Through these relationships it has been possible to expose contract managers to the operational capacity and integrity of ADE service offerings, thereby building trust. This has included activities like site tours for procurement staff, and in some cases has involved conducting trial contracts. This involves offering a short term opportunity (eg. three months) as a way to test out delivery capacity, allow relationships to be formed, and build understanding around the potential of social procurement strategies. Once an ADE wins a contract, with quality service delivery and social outcomes performance over time, there is strong potential it could retain the business into the longer term. The list of contracts let to ADEs also shows that once confidence is built and the benefits of social procurement witnessed, agencies then often start to seek out further opportunities within their portfolios. It is these types of ‘repeat business’ that will sustain the ADEs and generate sustainable jobs for people with disabilities.

Of course, social outcomes are often generated as a by-product of contracting activity, but increasingly the public...
sector is seeking a more strategic orientation. For WA, where the economic climate is currently shifting, value for money is beginning to be considered more broadly and effective allocation of expenditure is likely to become closely scrutinised. As outcomes-based procurement increases in the public sector generally, being clear about the social outcomes that could be generated by a specific contract and then systematically integrating these into the contracting process will become key capabilities for procurement staff.

“... social procurement is about defining things up front, before you buy something ... our push is to say spend more time in planning…”

DEMONSTRATING OUTCOMES
Even with a social outcome that sounds relatively straightforward - like ‘employment for people with a disability’ – there a multitude of complexities to navigate in determining how achievement could best be demonstrated. For example, to raise just a few issues: do you include additional hours for people who already have a job, or only new ‘jobs’ created, and how many hours of work constitutes ‘employment’, or do you use increased income as a measure; and what about the perhaps more intangible benefits like improved mental health; and should flow on benefits, like more respite for families and carers (and potentially their increased economic participation in other areas as a result), be captured and if so how.

Reflecting the complexity of these issues, approaches to monitoring and reporting on social outcomes are being progressed around the world, with some receiving greater profile than others. Client Procurement Services suggests that public sector social procurement initiatives could perhaps learn from colleagues in a range of Community Services oriented departments, where outcomes-based contracting has been evolving for some time. Aligning approaches with other departments within the same government would make sense also.

These broader issues notwithstanding, Client Procurement Services continues to work on how it approaches these issues within the ADE initiative. Currently, contract management includes regular reporting by suppliers against the outcomes negotiated through the tendering process – although the extent of this varies depending on the contracting agency, as information collected needs to have some benefit for their purposes also. An approach that makes the overall numbers and value of contracts meaningful, in terms of the actual outcomes generated, is the longer term goal. In the shorter term, there are opportunities to look at how data already collected (eg. training people have completed, hours worked, sick days, employee postcode data, etc) could be re-purposed and this is being explored with WADE members. There is also a strong interest in gathering more stories about the impact on people’s lives as these have proven to be powerful tools for engaging people, including elected representatives.

There are ADE’s all over Australia, and collaboration would ensure developments on this critical issue are moving in directions the sector considers relevant and appropriate. The benefits of being able to demonstrate to government that broader returns on investment are being achieved would be felt across the sector. And this would have a cyclic effect, as governments would respond to the availability of this evidence and continue to fine tune their approaches to social procurement accordingly.

YOUR SUCCESS IS MY SUCCESS
The approach taken by WADE members in their collaboration, and by the WA Government in supporting their growth and stability, revolves around raising the profile and performance of the group as a whole. The small number of ADEs in WA has certainly helped in this regard, but the ability of all involved to act not just in their own organisational interests to achieve progress as a whole is an important factor in the success of the initiative. This has been particularly promising where opportunities have arisen in areas where members have overlaps in the services they offer. In one case, for a very large contract that was a good fit for several members, they were
able to commence discussions on putting forward a joint offer to demonstrate a broader capacity overall, strengthening the bid for all of them. In another example, a more established member stepped aside from a small contract so one of the newer enterprises could generate a track record around a particular service area. In another area, where one of the members is at an early stage of establishing a new service, a member offered to take a lead contractor role; providing a sub-contract opportunity that would see them gain experience and exposure. Whilst this tender was unsuccessful, these types of negotiations are building trust, fine tuning how the members work together, and improving their offer in the market.

PARTNERING WITH COMMERCIAL SUPPLIERS

A recent example points to what could become an interesting area of development. A commercial supplier took a subcontractor role for a grounds maintenance contract, with the ADE acting as the principal. Through this arrangement the contracting agency was able to access the exemption clause, thereby avoiding the requirement to go to open tender. The commercial supplier brought greater capacity to the partnership, including large mowing equipment and the like, and is delivering the majority of the work. The ADE handles all the trimmings and other ‘fiddly’ tasks, gaining access to a contract it couldn’t have handled on its own, whilst also gaining experience as a lead contractor.

The exemption clause does not include any threshold rules around portion of contract performed by an ADE, but the ADE is commercially liable for the delivery of the contract, so entering into a partnership of this type is a significant decision for them to make. There is an expectation amongst contracting agencies that work for people with a disability will be generated through contracts where the exemption clause has been used. The two ‘broker’ roles therefore advise ADEs to ensure they are completely transparent with the contracting agency about arrangements with for-profit partners. Of course, it is understood that people without disabilities will also be involved in delivering the contract, but it is important that all parties are clear about what portion of the work will be undertaken by people with a disability. It’s important for the initiative as a whole, and for the reputation of all the WADE members, that developments in this area are handled with integrity.

*... be careful when doing commercial type contracts (with for-profit lead or subcontractors). Be upfront with the client agency as to what it will deliver for people with a disability specifically...*

JUST THE BEGINNING

The WA Supply Policy also includes an exemption for procuring from a registered Aboriginal Business, where the contract value does not exceed $250,000 (although this cap can be raised, through delegated approval processes) and the experience with the ADE exemption is now informing Client Procurement Services’ approach to implementing this. With the ADEs capacity to tender and to deliver on contracts improving all the time, the ADE dedicated role is now expanding into working with registered Aboriginal Businesses also, and over time the focus could grow to include other types of for-social-benefit suppliers.

The WA Government initiative has provided an important capacity building platform that is strengthening the tendering and service delivery capabilities of WADE members. They are now expanding their efforts and beginning to turn their attention to Local Government and the private sector. The WADE project manager is working closely with them to identify appropriate contract opportunities and develop strategic relationships in these sectors.

Interviewee: Alex Taylor, Director Client Procurement Services and Bindy Syminton, Senior Procurement Manager ADE Procurement, WA Department of Finance Government Procurement
The following examples complement the more in-depth case studies developed as part of this project. They provide snapshots of different ways that government entities are utilising both direct and indirect social procurement (see p.3) strategies to support the implementation of local economic development policies and programs. Through harnessing and targeting their purchasing power they are engaging residents and supporting local small enterprise growth and stability, fostering the economic capacity of a local area so as to improve quality of life for local residents.

MYUMA–TMR ALLIANCE

The QLD Department of Transport & Main Roads (DTMR) developed a framework for Indigenous development and job readiness which led to an alliance with Myuma Pty Ltd, a not-for-profit Aboriginal training organisation. Employing a direct social procurement strategy, since 2000 DTMR has worked with Myuma to deliver a number of road construction and other alliance projects.

Myuma conducts a diverse range of business and training operations on behalf of the Indjalandji–Dhidhru People. These include civil and general construction, and the provision of plant and labour hire services to the mining and construction industries. Myuma also delivers a biannual 13-week work-readiness training course which provides trainees with certification in civil construction. DTMR supports this prevocational training with an infrastructure works program to provide on the job training.

The innovative and long running Myuma model is based on a guarantee of work to local Aboriginal trading organisations, including the provision of services and as an alliance partner in construction projects. DTMR established a stable growth pathway through offering guaranteed work. Myuma has now been awarded a Category RI/R2 contractor pre-qualification under the national pre-qualification system for civil (road and bridge) construction projects.
ATHERTON GARDENS PUBLIC TENANT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

In the Melbourne suburbs of Fitzroy and Collingwood two high-rise public housing estates have for many years faced a range of complex social issues, including high rates of long-term unemployment. In 2002 the Victorian Department of Human Services (DHS) decided to implement an indirect social procurement strategy, in an attempt to tackle these complex issues in a more strategic and sustainable way. A Public Tenant Employment Clause was included in the cleaning contracts let for the two estates, requiring that 35 per cent of the labour force engaged be made up of unemployed public housing tenants. The Clause was subsequently extended to the estates’ maintenance contracts and then across all public housing in Victoria (with a reduced required percentage).

In 2004 DHS introduced social procurement into its daytime security contract at Collingwood and Fitzroy, this time using a direct social procurement strategy that saw it procuring from a social enterprise. Previous efforts to improve safety and security on the estates had met with minimal success, despite the significant resources invested. The opportunity to generate employment on the estates, whilst also providing a tailored service response was identified. A joint venture between DHS’ Neighbourhood Renewal Program and the Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) was developed and through this the Community Contact Service (CCS) was established. The CCS is a social enterprise run by the BSL that provides concierge services at the base of seven high rise housing estates in Collingwood and Fitzroy.

The CCS has grown substantially and now provides approximately 20 jobs each year for public housing tenants, with 80 per cent of these transitioning to mainstream employment after 12 months. After an initial period of development and refinement the incubated model was transferred to open tender in the competitive market, with the BSL successfully retaining the contracts.

BALLARAT INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION PROGRAM (BIPP)

To support business development and innovation, and as an implementation element of its Economic Strategy 2010-2014, the City of Ballarat developed the Ballarat Industry Participation Program (BIPP). The BIPP is designed to increase the local economic impact of major Council expenditure in the Ballarat region.

The City of Ballarat Procurement Policy12 specifies that tenders for contracts with a value over $250,000 are required to include a ‘BIPP Statement’ and a ‘Statement of Local Content’.

After the Weighted Evaluation Score for each tender has been determined by the evaluation panel, the BIPP Statement for the highest performing tender is opened and evaluated. If it is considered unsatisfactory, tenders with a price within five percent of the first selected submission then re-enter the process.

The Council delivers programs to increase the awareness of regional businesses about the relevant procurement opportunities, and to highlight opportunities for smaller suppliers to work with big business. The TenderWrite Program was also introduced and is delivered annually to assist local suppliers understand the tender process, investigate consortiums and improve tender development and writing skills.
Through this indirect social procurement strategy, The City of Ballarat estimated that by 2011 it had already generated more than 340 jobs and injected more than $38 million into local businesses\textsuperscript{13}, and Council expenditure to local businesses has increased to over 80 per cent of its overall spend\textsuperscript{14}.

“For Local Government social procurement builds on initiatives already undertaken by the sector in enhancing sustainable and strategic procurement practice, enabling procurement to effectively contribute to building stronger communities.”

In addition to the BIPP, the City of Ballarat Procurement Policy also includes support for instances of direct social procurement. This inclusion recognises social procurement as a key strategy through which wider social benefits may be generated, providing a mechanism for linking and integrating social and economic agendas. The policy specifically states that the City of Ballarat would seek Ministerial Exemption\textsuperscript{15} in instances where the required works provide value for money to Council and would be advantageous to any of the following: employment of disadvantaged groups; employment of Apprentices; employment of recognised Youth Traineeships; Employment of youth labour; benefits to the local community.

SA WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT POLICY (WPGCPP)

The South Australian WPGCPP\textsuperscript{16} came into effect in 2010 and applies to all building and civil government construction contracts valued over $150,000. Its overarching objective is to drive increased employment and up-skilling of specific ‘target groups’ in SA - Aboriginal people, trainees and apprentices, and local people with barriers to employment. It does this through including labour hours quotas in government building and civil construction contracts, providing an example of indirect social procurement.

SA government agencies and contractors are required to work together to ensure that 15 per cent of labour hours on specified contracts for building and civil works is undertaken by these ‘target groups’. The Implementation Guidelines\textsuperscript{17} for the policy provide further detail about the targets and quotas, including the prescribed formulas for how they are to be calculated.

The SA Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST) supports the implementation of the skills and workforce development aspects of the policy, and has responsibility for facilitating connections between industry, current and potential employees, and relevant skills and employment programs. This role includes providing contractors with information and advice on how to maximise employment opportunities for local people living near to contract sites, helping to remove barriers that may impede the practical implementation of the policy.
CITY OF GOLD COAST LOCAL COMPETITIVE INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS STRATEGY

In its Procurement Policy & Standards\(^\text{18}\), the City of Gold Coast includes a number of requisites that must be applied to all procurement activities. These requisites include ‘competitive local business and industry’. Providing an example of indirect social procurement, weightings for tender evaluation are specified. Council supports the development of local competitive business and industry through:

- the issue and receipt of quotations to Gold Coast businesses or businesses with a branch office on the Gold Coast, in the first instance, for contracts less than $200,000
- specifically including in its evaluation criteria for tenders (and quotations where practicable), a 15 per cent weighting to be apportioned on a sliding scale to local (15-9 points), regional (4 points), intrastate (2 points), interstate (1 point) and overseas (0 points) suppliers
- providing a 15 per cent pricing advantage to Gold Coast businesses or businesses with a branch office on the Gold Coast directly employing a minimum of 10 FTEs, for tenders leading to contracts with an annual value less than $1,000,000 (per separable portion)
- including in its evaluation criteria for tenders a two per cent weighting related to the Gold Coast Business Excellence Awards.

City of Gold Coast also recognises the wide range of potential benefits that direct social procurement strategies can offer, including: developing and attracting social enterprises; encouraging local businesses to include social or community objectives into daily business practices; promoting employment opportunities and inclusive and accessible work environments for young people or older persons who are unemployed, people from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) backgrounds and people with disabilities; building the skills, knowledge and ability of not-for-profit community groups to enable them to access funding and expand services.

“The ‘snapshot’ case studies provided here are drawn from publicly available materials.”

---

“Council intends to use a portion of its annual procurement spend to engage suppliers that provide a direct benefit to the disadvantaged communities of the Gold Coast, including offering tender opportunities directly to social enterprises and social benefit suppliers. Council intends to work with social groups and suppliers to expand opportunities and identify suitable procurement spend categories for social procurement initiatives.”
ENDNOTES

1 Social procurement is also one of the pillars of sustainable procurement. Sustainable procurement aims to integrate environmental, social and economic considerations.


3 Social purchasing - which involves buying products or services that fall below tender thresholds - is part of the social procurement spectrum - see: Newman, C. & Burkett, I. (October 2012). Social procurement in NSW: A guide to achieving social value through public sector procurement. Sydney, NSW. NSW Social Procurement Action Group. Social purchasing is not the focus here, this document is focused on tender and contract based procurement and commissioning.


5 Available at: https://www.procurepoint.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/apic_policy_1_may_2015.pdf

6 Category 3 projects are exempt from the publishing requirements until 1 July 2016 but “as a matter of good practice, contractors and agencies are encouraged to submit participation plans for publication up until this time” (APIC policy, 2015).

7 See: https://www.procurepoint.nsw.gov.au


9 SA Department for Communities & Social Inclusion, Sustainable Procurement Policy 2012

10 For example, where the assessment is that the targeted supplier market isn’t sufficiently developed to make any meaningful offer against social outcome specifications.

11 The Aboriginal traditional owners of the Camooweal region in north-west Queensland.


16 Available at: http://www.dpti.sa.gov.au/wpgcp
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