**Youth Engagement Specialist Partners EOI**

**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). No. 3 Last update 16th June 2023**

**No. 1 - 12th June 23**

**Q1. Project components. Can you apply for parts of the EoI specification? Do you have a set idea as to how this will be broken up? Should an offer fit neatly into one of the bullet points for example? Or if there were ways to do a part of a part or to augment certain aspects, is there also scope for that?**

We wouldn’t expect a partner to cover all areas, we are looking for partners to deliver to their strengths. We do not have a set idea at the moment as it will depend on the EOIs submitted as we need to ensure coverage throughout Cornwall and Isles of Scilly which meets the specification. The EoI process allows for discussion with selected partners if we have imbalances in volumes, geographical coverage or specialisms.

**Q2a. Participant numbers and Value for Money. Can you advise what the total participant number for the call is please? I assume some of the outputs and outcomes will come from multiple interventions with a single participant?**

**Q2b. Can we come back to the numbers again please as the impact on budgeting is profound - adding all 3 output headlines together is 800 so approx. £2500/output whereas if 350 it’s more like £5,700. ESF was always lower than this so quite a key.**

The overall project specification does not have a total number of participants and neither do we have a number in mind for the specialist partner element at this stage. It is possible for a single beneficiary to meet multiple output and outcome categories. In your EOI you will need to make assumptions on overlaps to calculate and specify the number of outputs and outcomes. you expect to achieve. Similar previous ESF projects provide an indication of a participant unit cost, but this could vary as some projects may be more outcome rich for example.

Please note as per the guidance in the EoI template outputs and outcomes section, the project overall targets in the specification are for the total £2m UKSPF Youth Engagement contract. The specialist provision component which is the subject of the EoI is expected to make a substantial contribution to these targets but is not expected to deliver the total target numbers specified.

 **ALL THE TARGETS.**

Furthermore, the guidance in the EoI template advises that we are not seeking a contribution to ALL the interventions for each specialist provider. Enter numerical values against those interventions which are relevant to your proposal. These could be particularly high in some areas to compensate for no or low numbers in another area.

**Q3. No. Of Partners. How many organisations are you looking to partner with?**

The EOI states contracts of between £50k to £250k. We would envisage that we would need anything between 7 and 14 partners, but this will depend on the EOIs submitted.

**Q4. Partnerships. Can two organisations partner together as one project applicant?**

As stated in the specification CSW is not seeking EoIs from specialist providers bidding on behalf of others (e.g., consortium or partnerships. Partners could cross reference other partner proposals but would need to stand on its own if one was selected and one wasn’t for example.

**Q5. Spot Purchase. Can partners spot purchase from external service providers?**

The project itself will have a specific central pot for Spot Purchasing to support participants. You would need to describe it in your delivery model and include in your participant costs budget and providing it does not exceed procurement thresholds and is not a way of creating sub-contracting layers because as stated above we are not looking for EOIs from specialist providers bidding on behalf of others then it should be acceptable

**Q6. Role of CSW and Cornwall Education Partnership. In addition to project management, is it possible to outline the elements that CSW/ EBP plan to cover so providers can ensure their submissions are complementary?**

CSW and Education Business Partnerships will be covering all the elements of the overall specification not delivered by specialist partners. We are not prepared to go into the specifics as Youth Engagement is an open call.

**Q7. Sharing of contacts. Can we learn who is on this call and can we collaborate together?**

Organisations attending the briefing agreed that contact email addresses could be shared and these will be published on Contracts Finder.

**Q8. Partner Geographies. Might be worth also asking those on this call what geography they'd intend to work in as part of the sharing contacts.**

As per the response to Q7, email addresses are shared on Contracts Finder. On further consideration, partners are welcome to share their intended geographies with each other should they wish, but as this is an open and competitive EOI process, we will not be seeking this information from the organisations on Contracts Finder other than by them completing the EOI.

**Q9. Cashflow. Is it possible for the project to apply to CC for cashflow support to ensure that small businesses and VCSE’s can actually be included effectively.**

**We appreciate this concern and understand that there may be mechanisms to support cashflow from Cornwall Council at the project level or at individual partner level. We will investigate with Cornwall Council and provide further information.**

**Q10. Payment Model. Do you yet know what the payment model will be for this and what cash flow mechanisms (if any) could be put in place for smaller organisations?**

Similar to the existing ESF 15% FRIC model. Payment will be based on defrayed expenditure including: staff costs + 15% of staff costs as a contribution to indirect costs + all other eligible costs. As per ESF, costs are claimed quarterly in arrears. Please see Good Growth additional guidance: [EXAMPLE SPF Progress and Claim Form TEMPLATE.xls (ciosgoodgrowth.com).](https://ciosgoodgrowth.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/EXAMPLE-V3-SPF-Progress-and-Claim-Form-TEMPLATE.pdf)

Re cashflow, please see the response to Q9.

**Q11. Intervention Rate. Will there be an intervention rate on claims as it is with ESF?**

Whilst the Specification targets leverage of additional funds, there will be no intervention rate for delivery partners who will be reimbursed at 100%.

**Q12. Young Person Input. Is this project a Young Person Co-design?**

We have used various sources of feedback from Young People and other evidence to inform the solution, but it is not a Young Person co-design in the purest sense. However, we are looking to build a forum for the Young Persons voice within the project to inform continuous improvement.

**Q13. Where should the EoI response be submitted to as the instructions said via ‘the portal’?**

To clarify all questions, policies and related documents, and the EoI response form, should be submitted via **procurement@cswgroup.co.uk****.**

**No. 2 - 14th June 2023**

**Q14. The notice on Contracts Finder specifies a contract value range of £50,000 to £250,000, is this an absolute?**

No, this is an indication of what we are looking for to obtain the necessary delivery coverage.

**Q15. The EoI states that paying the Real Living Wage by 1 Jan 24 is a pass / fail criteria, is this an absolute?**

The full application to Good Growth states “Do all of your staff earn the [Real Living Wage](https://www.livingwage.org.uk/what-real-living-wage), or do you commit to paying the Real Living Wage by the end of your project?” so this is the absolute requirement. We deliberately brought forward the date to 1 Jan 24 so that the Real Living Wage would be in place for contract delivery and we were not compromised as applicant. At this stage I am not sure what the consequences are for the applicant and the delivery partner if the Real Living Wage is not in place for a partner by the end of the project. If you can commit to the Real Living Wage by the end of the contract we would not reject at this stage but please proceed with caution if you decide to commit.

**Q16. Under other direct costs there is an option to claim ‘facilities’, can you please confirm what can be claimed under this category?**

Please see Good Growth guidance on eligible and ineligible costs.

 [EXAMPLE SPF Progress and Claim Form TEMPLATE.xls (ciosgoodgrowth.com)](https://ciosgoodgrowth.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/EXAMPLE-V3-SPF-Progress-and-Claim-Form-TEMPLATE.pdf)

Facilities are not specifically detailed but from other UKSPF guidance we have determined it incudes accommodation costs such as rent or rates, that can be directly attributed to the project. For example, if a building is used solely for the purposes of the project then the rent and rates for that building can be included in the project budget. Apportioned costs are not eligible. Also, as an example, room hire for delivery of training.

**Q17. Under E34 – Courses including basic skills (digital, English, maths (via Multiply) and ESOL), can you confirm what (via Multiply) means, does this mean that we have to have a separate multiply contract to fund the learner under this stream and if we are funding them under Multiply why would be also be claiming them under this project? Or is it proposing that we are able to fund anyone on maths training through this intervention if we do not currently hold a Multiply or AEB contract?**

We cannot use the UKSPF funding to fund actual basic skills qualifications where there is eligibility for mainstream funding (including maths via Multiply for people aged 19 years or older). Depending on the specific target, basic skills can still be claimed under this project if the Young Person has been supported to access the qualification from external mainstream funding or project funding and also can be claimed as having basic skills following support where they achieve a qualification

**No. 3 - 16th June 2023**

**Q18. Deadlines. Are the respective deadlines on 16 and 21 June 23 5pm or midnight?**

They are midnight for both deadlines.

**Q19. Spot Purchasing. Further to Q5 we are planning to purchase an industry taster day from a third party to benefit our participants. Would this be acceptable?**

The arrangement you describe would be fine. What we are trying to avoid is another level of sub-contracting for a substantial element of the project where they should be a partner in their own right.