

Future Parks Accelerator Programme Evaluation

**Organisations The National Lottery Heritage Fund and National Trust**

**Department** Business Innovation & Insight

**Title of procurement Future Parks Accelerator programme evaluation**

**Brief description of supply** Evaluation Service

**Estimated value of tender** £100,000 including expenses, venue hire, VAT

**Estimated duration** May 2019 to June 2022

**Name of HLF Contact** Dr Asimina Vergou

 Evaluation Manager

 Asimina.vergou@hlf.org.uk

**Timetable** Response deadline:

 11.00 am on 29 April 2019

 Clarification questions deadline:

 15 April 2019

Clarification meetings:

 13 May 2019

Confirmation of contract:

Week commencing 13th May 2019

Inception meeting:

20 May 2019

Completion of evaluation:

June 2022

# Overview of the funding partnership and the programme

* 1. The [National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund)](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/) was set up in 1994 under the National Lottery Act and distributes money raised by the National Lottery to support projects involving the national, regional and local heritage of the United Kingdom. We operate under the auspices of the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF). Since January 2019 we have been operating under our current Strategic Framework: ‘[*Inspiring, leading and resourcing the UK’s heritage’*](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024).
	2. The Fund invests in the full breadth of the UK’s natural, cultural and intangible heritage. Through our funding, our vision is to create positive and lasting change for people and communities now and in the future. This is reflected in the six outcomes which underpin our grant-making.
	3. The [National Trust (NT)](https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/) was founded in 1895 on the simple and enduring idea that people need historic, beautiful and natural places that offer people perspective, escape, relaxation and a sense of identity. The natural world also gives people fresh air, clean water and clear seas. Over the last 120 years the NT has become one of the UK’s largest charities, caring for historic properties and areas of beautiful countryside. The NT welcomes everyone to explore: 780 miles of coastline, Over 248,000 hectares of land and Over 500 historic houses, castles, ancient monuments, gardens and parks and nature reserves.
	4. Looking after the places in NT’s care now and in the future is its first responsibility. But NT’s [‘Playing our part’](https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/documents/national-trust-playing-our-part.pdf) strategy to 2025 is also about how NT rises to the big challenges of the 21st century and how they works with others to find solutions. One of the four main areas that the NT strategy focuses is: *Helping look after the places where people live*, which has a strong focus on supporting parks and green spaces. Within this area the NT will:
* help find innovative new ways to manage local parks and heritage.
* explore and give support to local authorities, charities and communities in how to
* manage local heritage and green space.
* promote the importance of local heritage and green space, taking a leading role in Heritage Open Days celebrating why these places matter and how people can help look after them.
	1. The Future Parks Accelerator(FPA)is a UK-wide initiative to support local authorities and communities transform the way their urban green space estates are funded and managed. Need is urgent as most local authority budgets for green space management will be slashed to zero by 2020 as parks are a non-statutory services.
	2. The vision of the FPA is to create a critical mass of public parks and greenspaces in the UK on a path to sustainability and transformation to deliver even greater public benefits for the next generation
	3. The mission of FPA is to create a step-change in park management, funding and value through innovation, collation and dissemination of ‘best in class’ practices, adapting ‘what works’ from other sectors and blending for parks.
	4. The strategy of FPA is: to provide local authorities and communities with the necessary know-how and resources to enable them to transform their parks and greenspace estates
	5. FPA will support and encourage parks to move from a maintenance mind-set to one where they become a civic responsibility - an asset rather than a liability – and are funded from a diverse range of sources (graph 1, table 1).



Graph 1: Future Parks Accelerator programme vision

* 1. This is a new venture, led by a partnership between The Fund, the NT and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). The Fund have committed a grant investment of £5M, the NT has committed in-kind expertise and other resources to the value of £5M. Additionally, MHCLG have provided £1.2M to support the programme. Staff from both The Fund and NT have been seconded in to this new joint team to create an independent platform of funding, expert resources and shared learning.
	2. The FPA is the first joint venture between the NT and The Fund. It builds on three years of sustained innovation work in parks and green spaces, including The Fund’s own Rethinking Parks initiative, a recent Resilient Heritage grant to protect our past investment of £12.5M in parks in Newcastle, and learning from other place-based programmes like the Great Place Scheme. FPA is included in The Funds new strategic framework and in NT’s current strategy *‘*[*Playing Our Part’*](https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/documents/national-trust-playing-our-part.pdf).
	3. FPA is a new approach to investment for both The Fund and NT. It is not about capital investment in single sites, but about using grant investment combined with in-house expertise to support, encourage and advocate change in service delivery across whole places.
	4. FPA will work with a set of pioneering local authorities, to support them to work with local communities and other key partners, to create 25-year visions for how their urban parks and green spaces will need to be managed and funded to deliver better social and environmental benefits for the future.
	5. The FPA will support places to grow the contribution parks make to civic life whilst becoming financially sustainable. It will involve discovering how parks and green spaces could be better used, managed and funded to serve community needs and aspirations now and over the next generation.
	6. With grant funding and support from a team of experts, the places chosen to be FPA pioneers will work together to catalyse and share innovation, learn rapidly together and build their capacity to lead for ambitious change both in their place and to benefit the rest of the UK.
	7. FPA will encourage new partnerships whilst supporting the role of local authorities as vital owners, funders and co-managers of green spaces. It will promote an holistic approach, ensuring that all parks and green spaces in an area are protected and enhanced to deliver quality and fair access to green spaces for free for everyone.
	8. Our ultimate goal is to develop a toolkit and practical set of solutions that could be adopted by any public greenspace estate. It will also help to protect the significant legacy of Lottery players’ investment in public parks over the last 20 years.
	9. The programme will support grantees that will demonstrate *forward thinking* (innovation), *collaboration* (sharing learning and working as a cohort), *ambition* (sustainable economic and environmental footing for parks), and *inclusion* (active engagement from all sections of society).
	10. This £11.2M programme will run between May 2019 to May 2021 distributing funds between £250,000 - £1,500,000 to 5- 8 pathfinder projects. Grantees will be also expected to contribute at least 10% towards the cost of the project (partnership funding) to demonstrate their commitment. These two-year projects will need to contribute towards all of the following outcomes:
	+ Parks and green spaces will be better managed
	+ People will have developed skills
	+ People will have greater wellbeing
	+ A wider range of people will be involved in parks and green spaces
	+ The funded organisation will be more resilient
	+ Your local area will be a better place to live, work or visit
	1. Projects will be run in two distinct phases. A co-design phase during which they will create an ambitious vision of how their parks and green spaces will be managed and funded in the future. And a transition 2nd phase in which they will undertake the work to get ready to implement their vision.
	2. Projects have their own evaluation budget (up to 7% of their grant request) which they can use for conducting their project evaluation in-house, or commission an external evaluator to track progress against these outcomes. Many of the applicants have established collaborations with universities which they expect to be involved in this process.

# Evaluation aim and questions

* 1. We are now looking to appoint an evaluator/evaluation team that will help us evidence and understand the impact of FPA funding and maximise our contributions to the sustainable future of the parks sector.
	2. The aim of the evaluation is three-fold: to tell the story of FPA as a whole, drawing together lessons from each one of the grantees and the funding partners, develop grantees’ evaluation capacity and provide key learnings to influence policy, funding and practice in the parks sector.
	3. More specifically the evaluation will answer the following questions:

**Q1. How effectively did individual projects and the programme as a whole support a shift in grant recipients from a maintenance mind-set to one where they become a civic responsibility** (see graph 1 on page 3). How much progress was made in shifting perceptions towards these being an asset rather than a liability; and which could be funded from a diverse range of sources? In which areas did they recipients and the programme as a whole make most progress? In which areas were there the greatest barriers? To what extent can any success be attributed to the support of the fund vs other factors?

**Q2. Collectively and individually what have the projects achieved in growing public benefit outcomes (see list below), and how?** Where did the individual recipients focus their impact? What were the levels of impact in which areas across the programme? Have there been any unexpected outcomes from the grants - both positive and negative?

* **Parks and green spaces will be better managed:** improving the standards and quality in the management of parks and green spaces?
* **People will have developed skills:** developing skills which support long-term sustainability of parks and green spaces as well as skills and capabilities which benefit the local area more broadly?
* **People will have greater wellbeing:** contributed to improving wellbeing?
* **A wider range of people will be involved in parks and green spaces:** broadening the range of people who have been involved in parks and green spaces?
* **The funded organisation will be more resilient:** enabling individual organisations to have sustainable resources which allow them to become more resilient to change and able to plan and deliver for both the short and long-term. Where grantees are starting to deliver work (either during or beyond the period of their grant), to what extent is there evidence of them achieving resilience?
* **Your local area will be a better place to live, work or visit:** generating material or perceived improvements of the local area for those living, working or visiting, and how they support quality of life.

**Q3. How has the programme supported longer-term sustainability and work of grantees?** How do grantees experience the transition at the end of their grant and how could this experience be improved? What have grantees done in the period since the end of the grant and what has happened in relation to their sustainability? Which grantees have continued and developed the work they started during the grant, which have changed direction and which have discontinued the work? Why?

**Q4. What are the most significant learnings for wider policy and practice?** What can the government and other organisations learn about how to better support and enable parks to be maintained and thrive in the future? What can project managers and local authorities learn from the FPA about how parks can be managed in a more sustainable way in the future? What are the key practical set of solutions that could be adopted by any public greenspace estate? What areas of innovation look fruitful to further support or develop?

**Q5. What has been the impact of and for the programme funding partners?** To what extent and how is the collaboration of the funders adding value to the FPA programme? Which parts of the programme’s offer (e.g. funding, non-monetary support) and administration are most and least valuable for grantees and why?  What were the benefits of this partnership on the funding organisations (with a focus on organizational learning) and what were the challenges?

**Q6. How well did the process work for grantees and funders and where can it be improved?** What have been the main barriers and enablers that grantees have experienced during the period of the grant and since?  What worked well and what were the challenges in projects’ partnerships and have these influenced the success of the projects? What are the implications of the FPA evaluation findings for the way that the funding partners support grantees during the grant period and beyond?

# Methodology

A methodology for the work is open for consultants to propose. However, we anticipate that the work will include the following strands:

## Evaluative

* Design and implement an evaluation framework that captures change over the duration of the programme and one year after the end of the projects. This should include the projects outcomes and the programme’s overall aims.
* Co-creation of overall success measurements with The Fund, NT and the grantees. These measurements will be integrated in the overall evaluation framework and will be used for tracking change and progress throughout the programme and the year following the end of the projects.
* Benchmark the grantees against the co-created success measurements and by the end of the evaluation assess distance travelled.
* Conduct fieldwork for primary data collection
* Secondary data review and analysis e.g. from projects documentation such as evaluation reports and surveys, local area statistics etc.

## Supportive

* Assess grantees’ capacity on project evaluation and provide ongoing support which may entail evaluation training workshops, advice with commissioning evaluation, review of evaluation plans, evaluation methods, encouraging reflective practice within the projects and ensuring the programme and project evaluation processes complement each other in a seamless manner.

## Learning

* Map out with grantees, The Fund and NT, key stakeholders to influence with the evaluation findings and co-create dissemination plan.
* Organise two learning events annually to bring grantees together to exchange learning during delivery, reflect on evaluation findings and brainstorm solutions.
* Identify key learning emerging during the delivery of the projects especially around what projects are doing, or could do differently, common themes and innovations that work and ensure this is shared promptly in an engaging and effective way based on grantees preferences (e.g. using digital media, webinars, social media, email communications etc.).
* Identify any possible improvements to the support provided through the programme, and the way the funding partners work together, to make appropriate recommendations to ensure it remains responsive to the needs of the grantees.
* We recognise that for many grantees this grant is just a first step towards setting up a more financially sustainable model for managing their portfolio of parks and changing their mind-set. We are interested in finding out more about the journeys and experiences of our grantees beyond the period of their grant, to assess the sustainability of the different models emerging at the end of the two-year period and understanding what further support is needed for the grantees and to other pioneer local authorities who may embark on the same journey.

# Audiences, outputs and timetable

* 1. The evaluation outputs will need to be accessible, engaging and relevant for a variety of different target audiences. Central and local government, The Fund, NT, other funders, the FPA grantees and other stakeholders in the parks sector. The outputs will be made available on the funding partners websites and disseminated through various channels to maximise reach and influence.
	2. The main outputs of the evaluation are detailed below. We welcome bidders to suggest additional formats and methods for disseminating effectively the findings and learnings from the programme evaluation.
	3. A project plan with specific outputs, milestones\* and timetable will be agreed with the successful consultant/ies. However, the funding partners expect the following outputs and milestones in accordance with the following timetable as a minimum:

| **Deliverable/Key Milestones\*** | **Due date** |
| --- | --- |
| Inception meeting to agree plans, including reporting structures, and a communication and dissemination strategy. | Week commencing 20th May 2019 |
| Co-creation of programme measurements of success and dissemination plan | June 2019 |
| Two learning events annually during the programme duration with the aim of grantees’ networking, exchanging learning during delivery, reflect on evaluation findings and brainstorm solutions.  | TBC |
| End of grant giving report of 50 pp. max evidencing the impact of the programme and the partnership between the funders and recommendations for policy makers, funders, and other stakeholders in the parks sector. Structure to be agreed with the partner funders. | May 2021 |
| Final report of 20 pp. max on the sustainability of the FPA programme one year following the end of the projects and recommendations for various stakeholders in the parks sector. Structure to be agreed with the funding partners. | June 2022 |
| A set of evaluation data, to be stored in a readily accessible electronic format such as Excel | June 2022 |
| Regular contact/meetings for the evaluator to update the funding partners (including presentations to the FPA Board when appropriate), in relation to their work and emerging findings.  | To be agreed at the inception meeting |
| Regular updates and sharing of key learnings using appropriate and engaging media to ensure the key evaluation findings are used to enable ongoing programme improvements by both the grantees and the funding partners. | To be agreed at the inception meeting  |

The above represents our minimum requirements.

\* The Fund and NT reserves the right to amend this timetable where required.

* 1. All reports must adhere to The Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended).
	2. The initial findings will be confidential to the funding partners. The funding partners may prepare or commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution, based on the results.
	3. All reports to include appendices as agreed between the funding partners and the contractor. The contents and structure of the report to be agreed in advance of writing. All reports to be supplied in electronic format and hard copy if requested.
	4. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
	5. The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences including the FPA Board, grantees, policy makers and other stakeholders. The purpose of these presentations is to enable lessons to be learned and key policy and practice issues to be highlighted as the evaluation progresses.
	6. We expect all projects we fund to adhere to the Social Research Association (SRA) ethical guidelines. If your proposal raises particular ethical issues, you must indicate what they are and what your strategy for addressing them is.

# Contract management

* 1. We expect the evaluation to begin May 2019 and be completed by May 2022. The final report shall be submitted to The Fund and NT by end of May 2022.
	2. The anticipated budget is £100,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be led by the National Heritage Memorial Fund. In relation to the learning events each project will have their own budget for travel expenses. We expect the contractor to budget for venue hire, refreshments and facilitation. Value for money when choosing venues should be a consideration.
	3. Payments will be made in three instalments. The first payment will be made upon signing of the contract and inception meeting. The second payment will be made upon The Fund’s and NT’s receipt of an approved copy of the 2021 (end of grant) report. The third and final payment upon The Fund’s and NT’s receipt of an approved final copy of the final report in May 2022.
	4. The contract will be based on the Fund’s standard terms and conditions.
	5. The evaluation will be managed on a day to day basis for The Fund by Asimina Vergou.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should be maximum 15 pages. Submitting a proposal more than 15 pages will automatically result in the rejection of the proposal.
	2. Please include the following information within your proposal, clearly setting out responses following the numbering below: and include:
* A detailed description of how you would approach the work, methodology for evaluating the programme, ideas for how you will support the projects with their evaluation and ensure that learning is embedded throughout the programme at different levels.
* We expect the programme evaluation process to be highly developmental, iterative and formative, with learning constantly feeding back into the programme. Innovative methodologies and approaches will be welcomed.
* Details of staff allocated to the project, together with Knowledge and experience of the contractor and staff members in carrying out similar projects. The project manager / lead contact should be identified;
* A detailed budget for the three-year period including all costs, expenses and VAT, specifying the daily charging rate of individual staff involved; the allocation of days between members of the team, and the cost of particular activities.
* A timeline for the work, indicating when you would plan to deliver different activities. This should include key milestones in the project and deliverables against each of these.
* Details of how you will project manage the commission and quality assure your work.
* The partners recognise one individual or organisation may not feel equally able to deliver all strands of this evaluation and are therefore be happy to accept applications from a group of individuals or partner organisations. We will want one of these individuals or organisations to be identified as the lead contact.
* The contact details of two previous or current clients with direct knowledge or experience of your work relevant to this brief. Please specify how the referees know your work and if they can be contacted by us straightaway.
	1. Your Bid will be scored out of 100%.

**80% of the marks will be awarded to Quality**

Each question will be scored using the methodology in the table below.

Tender responses submitted will be assessed by HLF and BLF against the following Quality Questions which become 80% of the total score:

| **Demonstration/Quality questions** | **Weighting** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. To what extent does the tender response demonstrate

relevant experience working with organisations to support and develop their own skills on evaluation and learning based on evaluation findings?  | Weighing 5% |
| 1. Relevant experience delivering collaborative, iterative and progress-based evaluation processes and excellent facilitation skills (e.g. experience in delivering learning events) to support discussions of findings and recommendations with various stakeholders.
 | Weighting 20% |
| 1. To what extent is the proposed methodology (including data collection and analysis) robust and appropriate to fulfil the evaluation aim and answer the evaluation questions?
 | Weighting 20% |
| 1. To what extent does the tender response demonstrate the Bidder has experience and/or capacity of evaluating projects/programmes in most of the following areas: parks, innovation, community engagement, organisational resilience, wellbeing, financial sustainability, partnerships?
 | Weighting 15% |
| 1. To what extent does the tender response demonstrate the bidder’s experience in producing high quality, engaging and accessible and influential research/evaluation outputs for different audiences (funders, grantees, policymakers); and has the Bidder included ideas for impactful outputs to disseminate findings and learnings from the programme evaluation?
 | Weighting 15% |
| 1. To what extent does the tender response demonstrate a clear and realistic project plan, showing phases of the evaluation, tasks for each phase, and managing risk and quality?
 | Weighting20% |
| 1. How well has the Bidder structured an evaluation team, with clear roles and responsibilities for each member, in order to successfully manage the contract and deliver the required work to the budget and timetable required by the funding partners?
 | Weighting5% |

**Quality Questions scoring methodology**

| Score | Word descriptor | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | Poor | No response or partial response and poor evidence provided in support of it. Does not give the funding partners confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 1 | Weak | Response is supported by a weak standard of evidence in several areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 2 | Satisfactory | Response is supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence in most areas but a few areas lacking detail/evidence giving rise to some concerns about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 3 | Good | Response is comprehensive and supported by good standard of evidence. Gives the funding partners confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the funding partners requirements. |
| 4 | Very good | Response is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the funding partners a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the funding partners requirements in some respects.  |
| 5 | Excellent | Response is very comprehensive and supported by a very high standard of evidence. Gives the funding partners a very high level of confidence the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the funding partners requirements in most respects. |

**20% of marks will be awarded for Price.**

The evaluation of price will be carried out on the Schedule of charges you provide in response to **Table A**

# Price Criterion at 20%

* 1. 20 marks will be awarded to the lowest priced bid and the remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your fixed and total costs figure in your schedule of charges table will be used to score this question.
	2. For example, if the lowest price is £100 and the second lowest price is £108 then the lowest priced bidder gets 20% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 18.4% and so on. (8/100 x 20 = 1.6 marks; 20-1.6 = 18.4 marks)
	3. The scores for quality and price will be added together to obtain the overall score for each Bidder.

# Table A - Schedule of Charges

Please show in your tender submission, the number of staff and the amount of time that will be scheduled to work on the contract with the daily charging rate.

Please complete the table below providing a detailed breakdown of costs against each capitalised description, detailing a total and full ‘Firm Fixed Cost’ for each element of the service provision for the total contract period. Bidders may extend the tables to detail additional elements/costs if required.

VAT is chargeable on the services to be provided and this will be taken into account in the overall cost of this contract.

As part of our wider approach to corporate social responsibility the National Heritage Memorial Fund/The Fund prefers our business partners to have similar values to our own. We pay all of our staff the living wage (in London and the rest of the UK) and we would like our suppliers and contractors to do likewise. Please highlight in your proposal/tender/bid whether you do pay your staff the living wage.

Bidders shall complete the schedule below, estimating the number of days, travel and subsistence costs associated with their tender submission.

**TABLE A: (firm and fixed costs)**

| **Cost** | **Post 1 @cost per day****(No of days)***e.g. Project Manager/ Director**@ £2* | **Post 2 @cost per day****(No of days)***e.g. Senior Consultant/manager/researcher**@£1.5* | **Post 3 @cost per day****(No of days)***Junior* *Consultant/equivalent* *e.g. £1* | **Total days** | **Total fees** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inception meeting to agree plans and finalise requirements with the Fund | *Example 0.5* | *1* | *1.5* | *3* | *£4* |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |

| Cost Type | Value (£) |
| --- | --- |
| Sub - Total  |  |
| VAT |  |
| Total\* |  |

\* This must include all expenses as well as work costs; this figure will be used for the purposes of allocating your score for the price criterion and must cover the cost of meeting all our requirements set out in the ITT.

***Notes:* The funding partners reserve the right to clarify quality and prices and to reject tenders that demonstrate an abnormally low quality response. The Fund and NT also reserves the right to amend the timetable of work where required.**

*You should not submit additional assumptions with your pricing submission. If you submit assumptions, you will be asked to withdraw them. Failure to withdraw them will lead to your exclusion from further participation in this competition.*

# Procurement Process

* 1. The Fund and NT reserve the right to reject abnormally low scoring tenders. The Fund and NT reserve the right not to appoint and to achieve the outcomes of the research/evaluation through other methods.
	2. The procurement timetable will be:
* Deadline for clarification questions: 15 April 2019
* Tender return deadline: 11.00 am on 29 April 2019
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on: 13th May 2019
* The Fund and NT will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: Week commencing 13th May 2019
* Inception meeting: 20th May 2019

\*The Fund will upload response to clarification on [GOV.UK contracts finder](https://www.gov.uk/contracts-finder) and these will be signposted through our website, [here](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/transparency).  Please note that we will make the anonymised questions, and our responses to them, available to everyone on the Fund’s website.

\*\*We reserve the right to carry out clarifications if necessary; these may be carried out via email or by inviting bidders to attend a clarification meeting.  In order to ensure that The Fund, NT’s and Bidder’s resources are used appropriately, we will only invite up to three (the ultimate number will depend on the closeness of the scores) highest scoring bidders to attend a clarification meeting.  Scores will be moderated based on any clarifications provided during this meeting.  You are responsible for all your expenses when attending such meetings.

* 1. Your tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of 11.00 am on 29 April 2019 to the following contact:

Dr Asimina Vergou

Heritage Lottery Fund

Holbein Place

London

SW1W 8NL

asimina.vergou@hlf.org.uk

* 1. Please visit the [Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/) for further information about the organisation.

# Appendix: Accessibility and formatting guidance

The National Lottery Heritage Fund is committed to providing a website that is accessible to the widest possible audience. Our site is annually tested by accessibility auditors and we must meet a AA compliance level. Our accessibility testing encompasses not just site functionality and design but all of our content, including downloadable documents.

Reports and other documents created for the Fund (**including the tender submissions**) need to be clear, straightforward to use and ready to circulate internally, externally and online, as well as suitable for use by screen reading software. Best practice in accessibility is summarised below:

## Readability

In the final report, and all other documents that may be published online including the tender application consultants should ensure that:

* The size of the font is at least 11pt;
* There is a strong contrast between the background colour and the colour of the text. Black text on a white background provides the best contrast. This also applies to any shading used in tables and/or diagrams;
* Italics are only used when quoting book titles for citations and items on the reference list should be arranged alphabetically by author
* Colour formatting and use of photos should be of a resolution size that is easily printable and does not compromise the printability of the document.

For further guidance on ensuring readability of printed materials, please refer to the RNIB Clear Print guidelines. These can be found on the [RNIB website](http://www.rnib.org.uk/Pages/Home.aspx).

## Accessibility

Reports should adhere to the following guidelines:

## Formatting

Headings and content in your document should be clearly identified and consistently formatted to allow easy navigation for users. Heading Styles should be used to convey both the structure of the document and the relationship between sections and sub-sections of the content. Heading styles should follow on from each other i.e. Heading 1 then Heading 2.

## Spacing

Screen readers audibly represent spaces, tabs and paragraph breaks within copy, so it is best practice to avoid the repetitive use of manually inserted spaces. Instead, indenting and formatting should be used to create whitespace (e.g., use a page break to start a new page, as opposed to multiple paragraph breaks).

## Alternative text

Alt text is additional information for images and tables. This extra information is essential for both document accessibility (screen reading software reads the Alt text aloud) and for the web. Alt text should be concise and descriptive, and should not begin with ‘Image of’ or ‘Picture of’.

## Images

These should be formatted in-line with text, to support screen readers. Crediting pictures may be necessary, usually in response to a direct request from a third party.

## Tables

These should be for used for presenting data and not for layout or design. They should be simple and include a descriptive title. The header row should be identified and there shouldn’t be more than one title row in a table. There should be no merged or blank cells.

## Additional documents

Any additional information, separate to the report, for example proformas and transcripts which may be used as standalone documents must be fully referenced to the piece of work being submitting and therefore dated, formatted and numbered appropriately.

## Acknowledgement

All reports should acknowledge the Fund. Our logo can be found on the Fund's website.

## Further resources

Please refer to the WCAG 2.0 article on [PDF techniques](https://www.w3.org/TR/2014/NOTE-WCAG20-TECHS-20140408/pdf.html) for further information.

## Submitting your report to THE FUND

Please check the accessibility of your document using the Word accessibility checker before submitting: File – Info – Check for Issues – Check Accessibility.

Please submit your document as a Word file.

The Fund retains the right to amend documents in order to create accessible versions for publishing.