Measures and Indicators to Support the National Lottery Heritage Fund’s work on Place

**Organisation** **The National Heritage Memorial Fund**

**Department** Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement Measures and Indicators to Support the National Lottery Heritage Fund’s work on Place**

**Brief description of supply** Research

**Estimated value of tender, £20k  
inclusive of VAT**

**Estimated duration** 2 months

**Name of the Fund Contact** Faruk Barabhuiya

**Timetable** Deadline for clarification questions: 13 April 5pm

Response deadline: 22 April 5pm

Clarification & Negotiation meetings: 29 April

Confirmation of contract: 2 May

Completion of contract: 30 June

# 1. Overview

* 1. The National Lottery Heritage Fund, formerly the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), is an operating name for the Trustees of the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF). In 1994 the NHMF was given authority under the National Lottery Act to distribute money raised by the National Lottery to support projects involving the national, regional and local heritage of the United Kingdom. In January 2019 we launched our current Strategic Funding Framework: ‘Inspiring, leading and resourcing the UK’s heritage’. See The [Funds website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024) for more details.
  2. The Fund invests in the full breadth of the UK’s heritage and, through our funding, we aim to make a lasting difference for heritage and people. We do not as an organisation value any kind of heritage, tangible or intangible, over another and remain strategically committed to this principle. This is reflected in the outcomes for heritage, people and communities which underpin our grant-making.
  3. In addition to being a cross cutting theme of the current Strategic Funding Framework, place[[1]](#footnote-2) and the impact of heritage on places has risen in importance since the pandemic. Recent research conducted for the Heritage Fund showed that we can do more to encourage place-based working[[2]](#footnote-3).
  4. We currently define our place approach as awareness of the needs and opportunities for cultural and natural heritage and communities across a geographic area, as well as the role played by stakeholders in that area. This approach highlights the benefit partnership working brings when working across an area. We also know that place-based working can also mean that we need to set different objectives across our engagement and investment activities.
  5. The Heritage Fund currently seeks to deliver place-based outcomes through:
* Devolved decision-making, which enables locally-based staff, with local expertise, to assess applications and make awards
* Our Strategic Funding Framework outcomes of “the local area will be a better place to live in, work or visit” and “the local economy will be boosted”;
* The promotion of area-based schemes through our good practice guidance
* Targeted encouragement of applications from 13 prioritised Areas of Focus;
* Place-based funding partnerships with other distributors such as the Towns Fund, Future Parks Accelerator, Great Places, Landscape Partnerships and Townscape Heritage and,
* Internal tools and resources which provide staff with up-to-date data and insight into geographical areas.
  1. Recent work to further improve our evidence in this area includes:
* [Heritage Index](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/news/rsa-heritage-index-reveals-uks-heritage-hotspots) developed with the RSA. The Heritage Index looks at local heritage assets and how they are used, enjoyed and shared, to reflect the state of heritage in the UK. It considers factors including listed buildings, levels of public participation and funding streams.
* [Heritage and Place research](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/insight/research/impact-our-funding-place) conducted by Wavehill in partnership with DC Research. This research considered how well the Heritage Fund has delivered its strategic objective of demonstrating how [heritage helps people and places to thrive](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/our-work/thriving-places). It also offered options for improving the way our funding could support places across the UK.
  1. Further information on our place approach can be found on our [website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/our-work/thriving-places).
  2. We would like to develop our place-based work further by developing a set of metrics for places across the UK which summarise the relevant data about the need, opportunity and potential for investment in a local area.
  3. The outputs from the project will allow our organisation to consider options for how our future place-based strategy could work in practice and be evidence-based in nature. This could potentially inform the Heritage Fund’s strategic proposition for 2022/23, standalone initiatives or wider interventions with partners such as the National Trust or National Government (Department for Levelling Up, Homes and Community).
  4. Should the organisation decide to adopt the measures as a tool for grant funding decision making, there would need to be a significant follow-on stage of work to develop an analytical product with full rigour and quality assurance. The focus for this initial piece of work is to scope the potential datasets which help us understand places and their relevance to our strategic goals.

1. **Aims and Objectives**
   1. The focus of this piece of work is to develop a long list of potential specific indicators, followed by a number of practical shortlists of measures, which would allow the Heritage Fund to offer a summary of the relevant data for an area to decision makers and staff at all levels of the organisation.
   2. The project should be based on Fund data and publicly available datasets from other sources and tell us about the needs, opportunities and potential for investment in heritage and communities in areas across the UK.
   3. The questions for the project to address are:
2. Which potential metrics would enable the Heritage Fund to measure the three factors of need, opportunity and potential in relation to heritage and communities?
3. Which data sources and indicators are available to enable measurement of the metrics?
4. How many of these meet key principles for use by the Heritage Fund (see 3.1 below)?
5. Can these be combined into a single overarching set of measures by local authority area? If so, how broad is the range of possible approaches?

# Method

* 1. Although our aims and objectives are different to the Government’s Levelling Up Fund, we have reviewed the principles that underpinned the analytical approach followed by Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and agreed within the Heritage Fund that they should also guide this project[[3]](#footnote-4). Namely:
* Any metrics used should be chosen in support of the Heritage Fund’s strategic goals, as outlined in the Strategic Funding Framework.
* That any data used should be publicly available, ensuring that if the method is used for decision making in future that the approach is transparent.
* That any comparison of need between places in different nations should be made using a consistent set of *UK*-wide metrics only, or, if UK-wide metrics are not readily available, country measures which are considered to be broadly comparable.
* That, in line with the Heritage Fund’s delivery geographies, the method should cover the following institutions:
  + - District councils, metropolitan and London boroughs and unitary authorities in England;
    - Unitary authorities in Scotland and Wales;
    - Local councils in Northern Ireland
  1. We would welcome suggestions for amendments and additions to these, based on suppliers’ own expertise and research.

# Process

* 1. We anticipate three stages to this piece of work:

Stage 1: Sharing of organisational strategic factors and principles for the index

This will be done as part of the kick off meeting for the project. It is currently being consulted on internally and the content of this ITT reflects the current factors and principles for the project.

Stage 2: Horizon scan of suitable measures

Undertake a scan of the publicly available indicators and metrics relevant to each factor listed in the previous section. Scanning open data to identify areas of need, for example, might involve looking at the different types of measures of ‘heritage at risk’ and how these can be aggregated at a local authority level.

The outputs from this stage would be:

* + A long list of potential indicators against each factor, the data source and extent to which the project principles are met in that case.
  + Facilitated discussion with relevant Fund staff about the extent of coverage of open data against the Fund’s aims and outcomes in order to develop a short-list.

Stage 3: Shortlist measures and design potential methods

Using the agreed short-list, the appointed supplier will then need to propose various methods for how these measures could be consolidated across the UK with the shortlisted data.

The supplier will not be expected to run detailed analysis of areas at this stage, except for some indicative analysis that might give an early view of the likely differences between approaches that consolidate data sources.

Relevant Fund staff would need to review the potential methods at this stage and give advice on the work prior to the final stages of the analysis.

The outputs for this stage would be:

* Proposal for possible methods that could be used to consolidate data across the UK with the shortlisted indicators.
* Indicative analysis to show the possible differences in outcomes between potential method options.
* Facilitated discussion to review potential methods to provide input for any amendments.

Stage 4: Amendments following June board meeting

Following consideration by the board of trustees at their June meeting there may be the need for further amendments before the outputs from this project are finalised.

1. **Internal responsibilities and liaison**
   1. Your main contact for the project will be Insight Manager Faruk Barabhuiya who will introduce the supplier’s team to the relevant stakeholders; facilitate access to The Fund’s teams and support with any arising issues. Other key people include:

* Lucy Emerson – Policy Manager overseeing place-based work at the Fund
* Tom Walters – Head of Research, Data & Insight
* Amanda Feather– Head of Built Heritage and Regeneration Policy UK
* Heads of Engagement, area Directors and Heads of Investment who are involved in our place working group.
  1. A project steering group will be established through which key discussion and decisions will be made. This will be made of key people from various teams and departments.

1. **Outputs**

The following outputs will be required:

* Project Initiation Document
* A long list of potential indicators against each factor, the data source and extent to which the project principles are met in that case.
* Write up of a facilitated discussion with relevant Fund staff about the extent of coverage of open data against the Fund’s aims and objectives.
* Proposal for possible methods that could be used to consolidate data about areas across the UK with the shortlisted indicators.
* Indicative analysis to show the differences in outcomes between potential method options.
  1. All reports must adhere to The Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended). We also expect reports to follow a layout agreed with The Fund in advance of submission of any reports.
  2. We expect all our evaluations and research projects to generate evidence about the inclusivity of our funding and our performance in addressing inequality. Bidders must be committed to this principle and ensure evidence gathering addresses this requirement.
  3. The initial findings will be confidential to The Fund. The Fund may prepare or commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution, based on the results.
  4. All reports to include appendices as agreed between The Fund 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.
  5. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of UK and European Data Protection Laws and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
  6. The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences, including our Board, our Senior Management Team, Grantees, policy makers and other external 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.
  7. 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.

1. **Timetable for Delivery**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeline** |
| Deadline for clarification questions | 13 April 5pm |
| Deadline for bids | 22 April 5pm |
| Interviews | 29 April |
| Inform successful bidder | 2 May |
| Set up meeting | Week of 2 May |
| Stage 2 outputs | To be discussed |
| Stage 3 outputs | 3 June |
| Stage 3 output amendments | 30 June |

# Contract management

We expect the research to begin 2 May 2022 and be completed by 30 June 2022.

The anticipated budget is £20,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the trustees of The National Heritage Memorial Fund.

The payment schedule will be:

* 50% upon signing of the contract
* 50% on successful completion of the work

The contract will be based on The Fund’s standard terms and conditions.

The research will be managed on a day-to-day basis for The Fund by Faruk Barabhuiya.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should be a maximum of 5 pages and include:
* a method for undertaking the study;
* details of staff allocated to the project, together with experience of the contractor and staff members in carrying out similar projects. The project manager / lead contact should be identified; CVs, along with any other relevant information can be provided in appendices
* the allocation of days between members of the team;
* the daily charging rate of individual staff involved;
* a timescale for carrying out the project;
* an overall cost for the work.
  1. Bids will be scored out of 100%.

**70% 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 The Fund against the following Quality Questions:-

| Selection Criteria | Weighting |
| --- | --- |
| Demonstrated a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and main concerns of the research | 20% |
| Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief | 20% |
| Demonstrated a record of collaboratively producing indexes and metrics to support decision-making in the charity sector through workshops with stakeholders. | 20% |
| Demonstrated an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to the Heritage and Culture sector. | 15% |
| Demonstrated the bidder has the capacity and resources to carry out the research within the timescale, or if working in partnership, each organisation has the capacity to fulfil its role and the role of each partner is clear | 15% |
| Demonstrated a clear and realistic project plan, showing phases of the work, tasks for each phase and roles and responsibilities for each member of the team. | 10% |

## 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 Fund 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 Fund confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the Fund’s requirements. |
| 4 | Very good | Response is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the Fund a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Fund’s requirements in some respects. |
| 5 | Excellent | Response is very comprehensive and supported by a very high standard of evidence. Gives the Fund a very high level of confidence the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Fund’s requirements in most respects. |

**30% 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 30%

* 30 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.
* For example, if the lowest price is £100 and the second lowest price is £108 then the lowest priced bidder gets 30% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 27.6% and so on. (8/100 x 30 = 2.4 marks; 30-2.4 = 27.6 marks)
* 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/National Lottery Heritage 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 you 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 Fund reserves the right to clarify quality and prices and to reject tenders that demonstrate an abnormally low quality response. The Fund 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 reserves the right to reject abnormally low scoring tenders. The Fund reserves the right not to appoint and to achieve the outcomes of the research/evaluation through other methods.
  2. We are inviting submissions from a single organisation or a consortium to deliver all areas of this evaluation work. We anticipate two possible scenarios:  
       
     The Fund appoints a single organisation, who has the capacity and skillset to deliver all aspects of this work; or  
       
     A consortium is appointed, who together bring the required skills and resources to deliver all aspects of this work. We are open to proposals from consortia of organisations or individual consultants, where the appropriate measures in place to ensure clear lines of management and communication. Payment arrangements will be via a single organisation and these details should be included in the tender return.
  3. The procurement timetable will be:
* Deadline for clarification questions\*: 13 April 5pm
* Tender return deadline: 22 April 5pm
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on week commencing: [29 April]
* The Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 2nd May
* \*The Fund will upload response to clarification on Contracts Finder.  Please note that we will make the anonymised questions, and our responses to them, available to everyone on the Fund 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 both The Fund’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 clarification questions should be sent by 13 April to the following email address: Faruk.barabhuiya@heritagefund.org.uk
  2. Your tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of 22 April 2022 5pm to the following contact: Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk

The National Lottery Heritage Fund

Mezzanine Floor

International House

1 St Katharine’s Way

London E1W 1UN

* 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 **reports**, and all other documents that may be published online including the **tender submission** consultants should ensure that:

* The size of the font is at least 12pt;
* 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](ttps://www.heritagefund.org.uk/search?keys=Logos).

**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.

1. ‘Place’ can mean many things, and definitions vary depending on where you are or who you ask. But examples include a local community, a natural landscape or an entire city.  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. ‘The impact of our funding on place’ research report, DC Research and Wavehill for the National Lottery Heritage Fund: [The impact of our funding on place | The National Lottery Heritage Fund](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/insight/research/impact-our-funding-place) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Adapted from ‘Levelling Up Fund: Prioritisation of places methodology note’, June 2021, [Levelling Up Fund: Prioritisation of places methodology note - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/levelling-up-fund-additional-documents/levelling-up-fund-prioritisation-of-places-methodology-note) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)