1. **As part of our proposal for the evaluation of the GRCF, are we expected to include the CVs of the project team? If yes, should these be included within the main proposal or can they be included as an annex? Is there a particular format you would like for CVs?**

CV’s for team members can be included as an annex, in a format of your choosing and is considered outside of the 20 page limit. Please keep these brief and relevant to this ITT.

1. **Does the completed Table A (Schedule of charges) need to be within the 20 page limit for the proposal or can it be additional?**The completed Schedule of Charges should be included in the 20 page limit.
2. **Can we add columns to Table A (Schedule of charges) for additional Posts if necessary?  (the schedule currently includes three Posts, but we may want to have more roles with different rates in the team and wanted to check if this is acceptable)**

Yes, you can add additional columns.
3. **Regarding the payment schedule (section 6.3), are you open to any negotiation on the proposed schedule?  We were wondering if, for example, you would entertain an additional milestone(s) between March 2021 and September 2022.**

We have some flexibility on the number of interim deliverables, including adding additional milestones (and payments) if needed. We would expect to agree this as part of contract negotiation with the successful supplier.

1. **How many applications does the Fund expect to receive over the delivery? How many projects does the Fund expect to be successful?**

We expect the Fund to be heavily over-subscribed. We do not know at this stage how many projects will be successful, or the split across programme themes.

1. **Do you have any feel for the project split across the programme themes?**

As the applications are currently open, at this stage we don’t yet know how this split will look. We will share this data with the successful supplier on appointment.

1. **Can NHLF detail the nature and amount of support they intent to provide small and larger grantees?**Grantees will have access to support from The Fund’s staff and from our website, <https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/help-resources/get-advice>

All grantees will have a named case officer, who will be the point of contact for routine email queries, progress reporting and processing of payment requests. The level of support for small grantees is normally light-touch and reactive, with only one formal progress report required at mid-point of project. Larger grantees will be expected to submit progress reports every quarter, and this may be followed up on occasion with a meeting by the case officer, including occasional site visits (Covid-19 restrictions permitting).

1. **Would you expect us to include carbon costs in the true cost delivery of projects?**

We expect to work with the supplier to identify the priority metrics for the evaluation. Given the environmental objectives of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund and the wider net zero ambitions, carbon costs or savings may be of interest were relevant. We would expect the evaluator to utilise government best practice, such as HMT Green Book and the supporting guidance.

1. **The spec says (section 4.8) ‘In the early stages of the contract, NLHF will supply the successful contractor with core data on the projects that have applied to the Green Recovery Challenge Fund’ – whist we note that participation in the evaluation is a condition of the grant funding, will the Fund continue to pass on data from the projects to the contractor or will the contractor have to obtain this data?  If the latter, are the project leads required to commit to providing regular data for the evaluation?**

Yes, the Fund anticipates collecting and collating monitoring and output data from projects on an ongoing basis. We also aim to collect some outcome data with projects, where it is possible to measure this in the short term (e.g. for jobs created).

Our guidance to applicants sets out the example outputs and outcomes for each theme and some of the standards we are asking projects to meet, in areas such as habitat and species data.

The intervals at which projects will need to supply monitoring data will be determined with projects as part of their funding agreement. Larger projects are expected to report on their progress quarterly, for example, and that is likely to include a mixture of qualitative and quantitative information, which the Fund intends to collate at a programme level.

Potential suppliers should note, that the Heritage Fund’s programme level quantitative data will need to operate to a minimum viable standard that is user-friendly and achievable by as many projects as possible. The Heritage Fund can share this monitoring data on a regular basis with the evaluation supplier. Potential suppliers may wish to factor in additional data collection for (i) richer evidence on outcomes that are hard to track, are relevant to a smaller number of projects or require a particular research technique (e.g. ‘engaging with nature’ theme) or (ii) where independent and objective feedback on the programme or partners is sought.

1. **We have some concerns regarding the ambitious scope of requirements and the budget, we were therefore interested to know if you would accept a proposal that whilst meeting the overall objectives and requirements for the evaluation contract it prioritises the core activities that can be delivered with the scope and depth of some other tasks constrained to ensure the work is deliverable overall within the available budget?**

Our overall requirement is set out in the objectives for the project and in addition we are looking for an evaluation that adheres to the Magenta Book guidance. This means it would cover the process, outcomes and value for money of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund.

We appreciate that there are likely to be trade-offs in the amount of work that can be delivered in each of those areas for the budget available. The methodology in the ITT is for illustration and we welcome alternative proposals from suppliers to meet the overall requirements.

1. **Regarding Strand 7 - recommendations for post-programme research – this is referred to as an ‘optional phrase’.  We would like to check our assumption that this doesn’t mean that providing recommendations for future research is optional (this would be required), it is the implementation of any future research that would be optional and beyond the scope of this contract.  Is that correct?**

Yes, this is correct, we require recommendations for research beyond 2022 as part of the evaluation, but the delivery of those services is outside the scope of this contract.