

## Queries and responses to the ARB Request for Proposals For Stakeholder Attitudes and Awareness Research

### 1. Stakeholder contact details held by/available from ARB

User and potential users of architects' services	No details held
Architects	We hold contact details for this group (phone/email – c40,000 records)
ARB 'consumers'	We hold contact details for this group (email – number of records not yet established)
School of Architecture	We hold contact details for this group (email - c60 records)
Students of Architecture	No details held (potential warm leads)
Built environment Professional bodies	We hold contact details and have warm leads for this group (email - c10-20 records)
Other regulators & enforcement bodies	We hold contact details and have warm leads for this group (email - c10-20 records)
Government	We hold contact details for this contact (phone/email - 1 record)
Insurance companies	No details held (one warm lead)

### 2. Do ARB intend to supply a list of registered architects to your chosen vendor, in order to assist in contacting this group?

Yes, we hold contact details (name/email/phone/address) for this audience.

### 3. Budget range

While we can understand your request, we took the decision not to quote our budget for this project and are not providing a range indication at this time.

### 4. Weighting for the evaluation criteria

The understanding of our requirements	20%
The ability to meet these requirements	30%
The ability to meet the timescales outlined or provide suitable alternatives	15%
The information provided on how the project will be managed and any risks	20%
Value for money	15%

### 5. Audience engagement expectations

In most cases we do not have a set number of interviews in mind but would, of course, expect the engagement to be sufficient to produce robust data for the envisaged research method. Where applicable, I have indicated either the maximum audience size or the expected rate of engagement.

User and potential users of architects' services  
Architects

There are 40,700 architects on the Register

ARB 'consumers'  
School of Architecture  
Students of Architecture  
Built environment Professional bodies  
Other regulators & enforcement bodies  
Government  
Insurance companies

There are 60 Schools of Architecture

We envisage approaching 10 organisations (from a larger potential group)  
We envisage approaching 10 organisations (from a larger potential group)  
There is 1 contact

We don't have a fixed idea of how many interviews should be conducted in each case.

## **6. Audience/stakeholder focus for this project**

All of the audiences are critical to this research though some have marginally more or less importance [to this project]. The below three groups give an indication of relative importance, from most to least.

User and potential users of architects' services  
Architects

Built environment Professional bodies  
Government  
School of Architecture  
Students of Architecture  
ARB 'consumers'

Insurance companies  
Other regulators & enforcement bodies

## **7. Is it possible for us to see a copy of your most recent e-newsletter to stakeholders?**

Our July Ebulletin can be found [here](#), this newsletter goes out five times a year after each Board meeting. In case it is of interest, our Twitter handle is [@ARBUK1997](#) and our recent New Releases can be found on our website [here](#).

## **8. Presentation expectations**

A presentation to our Board is not an absolute requirement but you're welcome to propose/cost this for consideration.

We are open to either option [face to face presentation meeting or delivery of the PowerPoint report].

Either approach [set of slides to be presented or something more detailed that could act as a report] is acceptable.

**9. Do you require the 'initial findings received on 21 January' to include initial findings from all stakeholder groups listed in the appendix?**

Initial findings need not include all audiences.

**10. For any online-hosted survey, would you prefer the contracting agency to host and administer the survey, would you prefer to facilitate this yourself, or are you open to either option based on the bidder's suggestions?**

We are open to either option.

**11. Do you need notification of intention to bid?**

No – we do not need notification of intention to bid.

**12. Any there any other requirements that will affect the tender not currently stated e.g. willingness to sign a standard set of terms, experience in the construction sector etc?**

All essential requirements should be covered within the Request for Proposal (RFP).

**13. How many agencies will you take to pitch – if indeed you intend to go to a pitch?**

Beyond the requested written proposal, we may shortlist for interview. The number of agencies on any such shortlist will depend on the proposals received.

**14. When you say nationally representative for the users and potential users section of research, is the intention here to be representative of the whole general public or of a subset of those likely to need architects' services? I ask because I would expect the proportion of the public to be familiar with the organisation to be pretty limited given that most people would have little experience in the past - I wonder if it might be more helpful to look at a group of people who would self define as potential or existing users of architect services?**

We would be interested in the views of both those with little experience or ARB or architects and those who would self-define as potential or existing users of architect services.

**15. You have listed robust quant research as the methodology for reaching architects - we would normally envisage an online survey as the most appropriate methodology. What proportion of the 40,000 do you currently hold email addresses for?**

We hold email addresses for 98.3% of the Register, which currently sits at 40,824 registrants.

**16. Would a consortium bid in which 2 independent research firms with complementary skillsets (e.g. qual and quant) come together to present a joint bid be considered or would it need to be led by one company with the other acting as subcontractor?**

A joint bid could be considered, subject to the arrangement satisfying our procurement procedures.

**17. Does the ARB have an existing segmentation of users and potential users or would this need to be determined in the research?**

This would need to be determined in the search.

**18. Architects: The ARB register contains details of individuals calling themselves architects or doing architectural work in the UK. Do you have an existing segmentation [of architects] or at least a framework that could be used for sample design?**

Firstly, to clarify, only the title architect and not the function is protected in the UK - therefore the Register only contains details of individuals qualified to call themselves architects. There is no segmentation to the Register, there is only one type of Register entry.

**19. Have [your stakeholders] opted into research from a GDPR perspective or would you expect them to be contacted under the 'Legitimate Interest' lawful processing criterion?**

In order to conduct this exercise we will be relying on the lawful basis of Legitimate Interests (Article 6(1)(f) GDPR). We will be carrying out a Legitimate Interests Assessment in respect of all groups to be contacted and we are confident that all will meet the legitimate interests test.

**20. Would ARB be prepared to contact Heads of School explaining the rationale for the research and asking them to participate?**

Yes

**21. Is it correct to assume you do not have contact details for students? While inviting Heads of School to participate, you could ask them to post an invitation to the University Architecture Students Association/Group members or administrator. Would you agree to this?**

We do not hold contact details for students, we would be amenable to asking Head of School to post an invitation to the University Architecture Students Association/Group members or administrator.

**22. Built environment professional bodies / Other regulators & enforcement bodies: Have you already identified the bodies to be contacted, or would a desk research element be required to do this?**

We have already identified the bodies to be contacted, though would consider any additional bodies an agency might wish to suggest.

**23. How critical is it to obtain measures of Unprompted Awareness for each stakeholder group?**

A measure of Unprompted Awareness would be most useful for users and potential users of architects services, and students. It is less relevant to the other stakeholder groups.

**24. Re. testing/exploring engagement strategies for effectiveness; is there an existing set of potential strategies to be evolved and refined through research or is the ARB open to new potential strategies being developed during/as part of the research process?**

There are existing strategies which could be evolved but ARB is also open to new potential strategies being developed during/as part of/as a result of the research.

**25. Users and potential users of architects' services:**

- a) **Are we correct in our understanding of this group in that they are 'end' users e.g. home-owners who may need an architect if considering an extension, re-building, new build..?**

This is a correct understanding of one type of user in this group.

- b) **We are assuming that professional users e.g. builders, developers would be covered in other stake-holder groups. Is this correct?**

No, we would expect this group to feature professional users as well.

**26. Are we looking to compare awareness of the ARB against that of consumer protection organisations in other (ie. not built environment related) categories?**

Not exclusively, but it could form part of the analysis. In brief – we are looking to understanding the unprompted/prompted awareness of ARB, and attitudes towards ARB and the duties it performs. Comparison of awareness levels with comparable consumer protection organisations could be of interest but would not be essential.

**27. Are we looking to talk only to Heads of Schools in this research or are there other key roles that would be relevant? Can the ARB provide contact details (including phone and email details) for these respondents?**

We believe Heads of Schools would be useful role holders to approach however we would be open to contacting other parties if this seemed appropriate. We hold contact details for Heads of Schools.

**28. Students of Architecture: We suspect the ARB may not have lists of contacts in this area. Is it realistic to look to the Schools of Architecture to support us in acquiring this sample?**

[Enquirer provided with the list shown in response one of this document]

**29. We are assuming that the nine different approaches used to include all kinds of stakeholder categories in the research do not overlap, ie every stakeholder only falls into one distinct category. Is this correct?**

Overlap is likely to be very minimal, though there could feasibly be some (for example, the ARB 'Consumers' group could feasibly include individuals from the other stakeholder groups)

**30. We also assume that you're looking to commission all nine approaches, so would provide a single costing, or would you like to receive the costing broken down into the different categories?**

In addition to providing total costs, we also ask that those submitting a proposal provide the following breakdown:

- Set up
- Fieldwork
- Reporting
- Presentation

Any further breakdown of costs is at your discretion.

**31. The lengths of the quantitative surveys would be determined during the set-up phase, but for the purpose of costing this, we would assume 15-20 mins length for the four surveys. Would this work for you?**

Our expectations for the format of the surveys are not fixed, therefore we have no objections at this stage to this approach.

**32. For the qualitative elements of the project we would also like to cost this on 30-45 mins lengths, although assume that the interview with the Sponsor Lead would take 90-120 minutes. Would these time frames be correct?**

Our expectations for the format of the interviews are not fixed, therefore we have no objections at this stage to this approach.

**33. Users/Potential users: Could you comment on the proportion of UK residents who used an architect in the past 12 months?**

We do not hold this data.

**34. Architects: Are you envisaging any quotas for this category? If so, what would these be?**

We have not envisaged any quotas for this category.

**35. Would the ARB be willing to write warm-up emails to [Schools of Architecture] individuals prior to the research?**

Yes.

**36. Students of Architecture: Do you want to set quotas here on degree/enrolment date/university/...?**

We have not envisaged any quotas for this category but would be open to proposals.

**37. Approximately what proportion of homeowners have used architects' services in the last year/last five years/ever?**

We do not hold this data.

**38. Would your appointed contractor be able to use your database of registered architects/ARB 'consumers' to generate a sample for research purposes, with email addresses provided?**

In order to conduct this exercise we will be relying on the lawful basis of Legitimate Interests (Article 6(1)(f) GDPR). We will be carrying out a Legitimate Interests Assessment in respect of all groups to be contacted and we are confident that all will meet the legitimate interests test.

Registered architects: We hold email addresses for 98.3% of the Register, which currently sits at 40,824 registrants.

ARB 'consumers': We hold contact details for this group (email) – number of records not yet established.

**39. Have you have done any previous post-service access engagement with [ARB 'consumers'] and if yes, do you know the response rate in either absolute numbers or as a percentage?**

There has been minimal post-service access engagement with members of this group. The group includes complainants (both members of the public and profession) who may value the opportunity to feedback on their experience.

**40. Users and potential users of architects' services: Can you advise whether the research should be confined to 'domestic' users i.e. home owners, or should include people who use architects in connection with their business (developers, commercial property owners, etc)?**

We would not necessarily expect research to be confined to domestic users, we envisaged it including all users of architects services.

**41. Built environment professional bodies & Other regulators & enforcement bodies: Can you tell us how many organisations you have listed and give us some examples from each category?**

We do not have a set list as such but envisage contacting 10-20 organisations for each of these groups. RIBA would be an example of a professional body, the General Dental Council would be an example of another regulator. For the purposes of producing a proposal we believe further examples from each category should be easily identifiable through your own online searches.

**42. We note the RFP refers only to a single government sponsor. Are there any other stakeholders in Central or Local Government that should be included? Would you prefer that local authorities were excluded, or do you see them within the 'Users and Potential Users' or the 'Other regulators & enforcement bodies' research elements?**

We have no preference for excluding local authorities and would see them as potentially falling within either/both of the two stakeholder groups noted in your question.

**43. Will the winning agency have access to any previous attitudes and awareness research?**

We expect to be able to share this information with the winning agency.

**44. Does the ARB have any draft engagement strategies that they wish to test? If, how many? Or are they looking for the to the research too generate novel strategies**

We are looking for the research to generate novel strategies.

**45. Please could you provide an example of who these might be and approximately how many consumers the ARB has?**

As examples, this group could include members of the public who have submitted a complaint to ARB, or individuals appointed to our Investigations Panel. The number of records for this group is not yet established.

**46. Contract award date – 29th October. Contract discussed – 10th December. FW commenced – 17th December. Is there any reason why there is such a large gap between award date and set-up / FW?**

We envisaged time being required for set up (e.g. discussions between us and the winning agency to finalise project design). The 17 December is latest point we envisaged the fieldwork starting but feasible could start sooner.

**47. Students of architecture – A survey is suggested. Is there a specific reason for this? Or are alternative suggestions for methods welcome?**

Alternative suggestions for methods are welcome.

**48. What does success look like to you?**

Please see sections 3, 6 and 7 of the Request for Proposals document.

**49. If you were being compared to another regulator across industries from ATOL to FCA and Ofgem, who would you be closest to and why? Are there regulators who you see as following best practice?**

We are arguably comparable to regulators who also maintain a professional register (for example, the General Medical Council, General Dental Council and Solicitors Regulation Authority to name a few). We believe examples of best practice can be found in most organisations.

**50. Could you please provide more description on who are 'ARB consumers' and how they engage with you?**

As examples this group could include members of the public who have submitted a complaint to ARB, or those appointed to our Investigations Panel.



**51. Do you have a CRM system for architects who are in touch with you including their names and emails? If so, what kind analytics would be available alongside their names and emails?**

We maintain a [Register of Architects](#), publically available information includes the architect's name and regular business address (available in all cases) as well as telephone number and email address (available in some cases). There is no segmentation to the Register, there is only one type of Register entry.

**52. Do members of the built environment directly engage with ARB? If yes, how? If no, would the goal be to research their attitudes of the sector as a whole?**

Those in the built environment may engage with ARB in a range of ways. Please see sections 3.2 and 3.3 for further information on the projects objectives and key stakeholders.

**53. We have noticed that in the initial time plan you have detailed in your brief fieldwork does not commence until [17 December 2018]. Could you let us know if there is a reason for this and if you would be open to changing it to earlier in the year so that it doesn't land over the Christmas period?**

We would be open to amending this deadline if the proposal could show there would be no detriment to doing so and the final project deadline would still be achieved.

**54. Will the ARB provide the winning provider with the sampling framework for each section or would this be up to the contractor to create?**

We envisage the contractor creating the sampling framework.

**55. Will a clean dataset be made available before or after the project initiation meeting?**

We envisage sharing the datasets we hold after the contract is awarded.

**56. On the qualitative research, what is the ARB's view on regional dispersion of architectural schools and similarly for students taking part in the study?**

We would prefer the research to be as representative as possible.

**57. Will the ARB support in identifying and securing dates with the sponsored Government lead in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government?**

Yes, we will organise this interview.

**58. Will the supplier be involved in the development of the survey research questions or has this work been done already?**

We would expect the supplier to lead on the development of the survey research questions.

**59. Will the supplier be able to advise with interview discussion guides?**

Yes

**60. Are you able to share the previous stakeholder research conducted by ARB?**

We expect to be able to share this information with the vendor who is awarded the contract.

**61. The project background mentions benchmarking ARB, are there any particular KPIs you want to use for this?**

While we have some established KPIs in place, we are hoping the project will provide/establish useful benchmarks for us to use going forward. An example of our existing KPIs can be found [here](#).

**62. Would you like us to cost for us presenting the findings to ARB?**

In addition to providing total costs, we also ask that those submitting a proposal provide the following breakdown:

- Set up
- Fieldwork
- Reporting
- Presentation

If your presentation costs could include presenting costs you are welcome to propose/cost this for consideration.

**63. For the Government group, is there just one person who is the Sponsor Lead who you would hope to interview, or several?**

There is just one person.

**64. Do you have any particular expectations for the numbers of people you would like to take part from each stakeholder category in the various surveys / interviews?**

We have no particular expectations, except for the Government group (one contact).

**65. Sharing of vendor enquiries and answers**

We intend to share a document summarising written queries received and responses given via Contract Finder. These should be available from 11 September.