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# Overview

* 1. This Invitation to Tender for evaluation services has been issued by the National Lottery Heritage Fund. The Heritage Fund is the delivery body for the Government’s Green Recovery Challenge Fund, which is being supported by the following partner organisations.

### The Partners

* 1. **The National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF)**, formerly the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), 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). 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.
	2. **DEFRA** is the UK government department responsible for safeguarding our natural environment, supporting our world-leading food and farming industry, and sustaining a thriving rural economy. Our broad remit means we play a major role in people’s day-to-day life, from the food we eat, and the air we breathe, to the water we drink.

*The GRCF stakeholders*

* 1. **Natural England** are the government’s adviser for the natural environment in England, helping to protect England’s nature and landscapes for people to enjoy and for the services they provide. Natural England is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs.
	2. **Environment Agency** works to create better places for people and wildlife, and support sustainable development. EA is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs.
	3. **The Forestry Commission** increases the value of woodlands to society and the environment. The Forestry Commission is the government department responsible for protecting, expanding and promoting the sustainable management of woodlands.
	4. **The Marine Management Organisation (MMO)** licenses, regulates and plans marine activities in the seas around England so that they’re carried out in a sustainable way. MMO is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by DEFRA.
	5. **The Joint Nature Conservation Committee** is the public body that advises the UK Government and devolved administrations on UK-wide and international nature conservation. We are led by a Joint Committee, which brings together members from the nature conservation bodies for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and independent members appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs under an independent Chair.

### The Green Recovery Challenge Fund

* 1. On the 30th June 2020 DEFRA announced a new fund of up to £40 million for nature recovery and conservation projects. The Green Recovery Challenge Fund brings forward public investment to help charities and environmental organisations start work on projects across England that will restore nature and tackle climate change.
	2. The new funding will be spent over two financial years, until March 2022, with the aim of kickstarting a pipeline of nature projects. Section 3 provides further information on the main themes of the fund.

### Fund timelines

* 1. Full guidance on the Green Recovery Challenge Fund can be found on the National Lottery Heritage Fund’s website.
	2. Applications to the fund open during the week commencing the 14th September 2020 and decisions are due to be announced by mid-late November. Projects are expected to start by December and must be delivered by the end of the financial year 2021/2022.

# Aims and Objectives of the Evaluation

* 1. DEFRA and NLHF’s approach to evaluation seeks to collect evidence on the process, outcomes and value for money of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund (GRCF). Applied at a project-level, this approach will enable projects to achieve maximum impact, while at a programme level it will support ongoing progress reporting, evaluate impact, as well as generating lessons learnt for future investment.
	2. The GRCF monitoring and evaluation approach has the following four elements:
1. Project level monitoring, including tracking delivery against milestones and KPIs and progress reporting.
2. Project evaluation throughout the lifetime of the work, culminating in grantees documenting their own evidence and lessons learnt, or choosing to commission their own independent research into their impact.
3. Programme monitoring to track the activity and outputs that the fund has supported
4. Programme evaluation to research the combined impact of the funding, assess its cost-effectiveness and value for money and collate lessons learnt for the partners, grantees and the environmental sector.
	1. This Invitation to Tender relates primarily to the final element as outlined in paragraph 2.2 (4) above – the evaluation of the overall outcomes and impact of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund. While grantees and NLHF will lead on elements 1-3 (at the project and programme level), the contractor will be required to support the design of programme monitoring, through their work on an output and outcomes framework (see paragraph 4.4), where we intend to agree a Theory of Change that can be applied at all levels of the GRCF.
	2. The objectives of this evaluation are to:
* Ensure effective evaluation of the programme and capture and disseminate learning to inform future DEFRA funds.
* Support effective outcome and impact reporting to grantees, DEFRA and National Lottery Heritage Fund.
	1. The high-level questions we are seeking to understand through the evaluation are:
* Has the Green Recovery Challenge Fund delivered as originally designed and intended (including in relation to an agreed outcomes framework)?
* What are the lessons learnt for future funds?
* Has value for money been demonstrated,in terms delivery of environmental and/or economic objectives for the programme.
	1. In meeting these objectives, we will apply best practice grant delivery requirements under Government Grants Functional Standards. We also require that this evaluation meets HM Treasury [Magenta](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book) and [Green Book](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-governent) guidance.
	2. We require that potential suppliers set out in the proposal a methodology to achieve the aims and objectives of the study.

# Output and Outcomes Framework

* 1. The Green Recovery Challenge Fund (GRCF) is designed to contribute to long-term goals for environmental improvement as set out in the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan (25YEP). Those overarching goals of the 25YEP include thriving plants and wildlife, enhancing beauty, heritage and engagement with the natural environment and mitigating and adapting to climate change.
	2. Our guidance explains how all projects within this fund are expected to contribute to at least one of the following ey themes:
* Nature conservation and restoration – improvements to the physical state of the natural environment, including making it richer in plants and wildlife.
* Nature based solutions – improvements to the physical state of the natural environment that help people and nature adapt to the effects of climate change and natural disasters.
* Connecting people with nature – a wider range of people benefit from the natural environment, including feeling more connected to the place where they live.
	1. Alongside these, projects will be expected to contribute to the following economic benefits:
* Job creation and/or retention – relating to the direct employment created or sustained in order to deliver the projects and any jobs created indirectly through the supply chain, or as a result of (for example) increased visitor numbers to project sites.
* eNGO capacity and resilience – which could include financial resilience of grantee organisations, but may also cover changes in assets, skills and capabilities or strategy and plans.
	1. Annex A of this document provides a high-level indication of how these outcomes link to the 25YEP.
	2. The partners recognise, however, the challenges of attributing changes in environmental outcomes (such as air and water quality, the health of species and the risk of harm from environmental hazards) to relatively short-term projects. The partners have therefore developed some indicative outcomes and outputs to inform the types of benefit that projects may deliver.
	3. Example outcomes and outputs are provided in paragraph 3.8, and we intend to work with the evaluator to finalise this as part of the Theory of Change. Our proposed approach to measurement does not seek to try and measure long-term impacts directly, but instead adopts the following, pragmatic approach:
	4. For individual applicants, the funding application process asks that they explain how their project will contribute to the fund outcomes. They can do this in a number of different ways:
* Those that will deliver physical enhancements (e.g. tree planting, re-wetting, natural flood management etc.), could choose to use the Conservation Evidence database[[1]](#footnote-2),Woodland Wildlife Toolkit[[2]](#footnote-3) or Climate Change Adaptation Manual[[3]](#footnote-4) to assess whether projects will be consistent with existing evidence around what works.
* Proposals that aim to connect people with nature, a methodology for capturing quantitative data (e.g. the Nature Connection Index[[4]](#footnote-5)), could be used in the proposal.
	1. To inform the overall GRCF outcomes framework and evaluation design, the contractor will be provided with relevant information from applicants about how projects intend to measure and evidence their outcomes.
	2. At the programme level, our focus is on collecting good quality output data, as well as measuring short-term outcomes where possible and the progress towards longer term impact, where this can be identified. Where possible, we aim to pair good quality output data and evidence of the fidelity of implementation of projects with existing research on the benefits of conservation and environmental improvements. This will allow the partners to develop an understanding of the outcomes that could be achieved in future through the implementation of evidence-based activities by short-term GRCF projects.
	3. The table below outlines some output measures taken from a draft GRCF outcomes framework. These have been provided to applicants as an example of the type of monitoring information we may require them to collect during delivery of their project. As outlined, a final version of the framework will be used to guide the overall evaluation approach.
1. **Nature Conservation and Restoration**

**Example Project Outcomes**

Heritage will be in a better condition, as a result of (for example):

* New or restored wildlife-rich/priority habitats
* Existing wildlife habitats protected and enhanced
* Wildlife habitats expanded or more connected
* Actions to support species (particularly pollinators and other native species)

**Example Outputs - expected measurable activities by March 2022**

* Area of land/water prepared or planted to support new habitat or species
* Area of woodland brought into active management to improve condition
* Area of natural habitats now joined up to create wildlife corridors
* Area and number of wildlife ponds
* Measures implemented as part of river or waterways restoration plan and fish passageways
1. **Nature-Based Solutions (to climate change)**

**Example Project Outcomes**

Heritage will be in a better condition, as a result of (for example):

* Habitat restored or created for enhanced carbon sequestration and storage or improved resilience to climate risks
* Nature and land use change supporting better resource management, reduce carbon emissions or improve quality e.g. water, air
* Nature-based solutions to support climate change adaptation, including flood mitigation or coastal erosion management
* Increased investment in Natural Capital to deliver solutions
* Use of green infrastructure to support enhanced river or urban cooling
* Improvement in soil health

**Example Outputs - expected measurable activities by March 2022**

* Area of land undergoing or prepared (wetter, seeded, water clean) for peat restoration
* Area of land undergoing or set aside and secured for tree planting
* Number, area and/or density of trees planted
* Land management assessed for carbon budget and actions implemented to reduce emissions
* Measures implemented to improve soil health
* Volume of natural water storage secured or area of land managed for water quality
* Area of catchment roughened for water slowing
* Area of land and habitats identified, prepared or undergoing changes to increase resilience to climate change risks, following assessment of local vulnerabilities
1. **Connecting People with Nature**

**Example Project Outcomes**

People with have greater wellbeing or a wider range of people will be involved in natural heritage as a result of, for example:

* Engaging or empowering community to support nature-based objectives
* Access to nature improved
* People connecting with nature to increase understanding and/or improve wellbeing
* Improving or increasing nature where people live

**Example Outputs - expected measurable activities by March 2022**

* Relative position along the community engagement standards scale (outreach/consult/involve/collaborate/shared leadership)
* Opportunities for volunteering for nature or citizen science, such as species monitoring
* Increase in numbers and diversity of people engaging with nature or visiting natural features
* Length of footpath or area of open access land now accessible
* Area of new nature identified/ prepared or introduced within 200m of residential area
* Number of features supporting wildlife in schools, parks and residential areas
1. **Helping to sustain and build capacity in the environmental NGO sector**

**Example Project Outcomes**

* People gain or retain employment in the environment sector
* Skills developed or retained within the organisation
* Additional income for local businesses
* Greater local involvement in your organisation
* Improved governance or partnership arrangements
* Increased financial resilience

**Example outputs –expected measurable activities by March 2022.**

* Number of jobs created or retained
* Skills, expertise or qualifications gained
* Number of businesses supported
* Increase in visitor or volunteer numbers
* Development of relationships to secure income streams
* Improved evidence base to support ongoing activities
	1. Alongside this contract, the National Lottery Heritage Fund will initiate work with grantees to design monitoring processes and systems to collect basic quantitative activity and output data, such as the area of land that is subject to funded projects, the types of features implemented, species supported and trees planted. This data will be provided at regular intervals to the successful contractor and they will be required to support the work by finalising a common set of measures of outputs and outcomes.
	2. Potential suppliers should outline how their methodology could support measurement of more complex indicators at a programme level, particularly those which could be challenging for individual projects to track, such as those relating to levels of engagement with nature.

# Outline Method and Research Requirements

* 1. The partners have identified the following strands of research that *could* be applied to meet the aims and objectives of the evaluation. This should be used by suppliers as an indication of the type of analysis we believe might be appropriate to generate robust evidence about the outcomes and impact of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund.
	2. We actively welcome alternative approaches that meet the brief and suppliers are not obliged to follow the strands outlined below.

### Strand 1: Process evaluation

* 1. The partners require that the evaluation examines the process of delivering the GRCF, from the perspective of applicants, grantees/project leads and stakeholders. We are particularly interested in understanding which elements of delivery have worked well and which were challenging and why this was the case.
	2. We are also asking that the process evaluation explores the context for the GRCF, in terms of the situation for eNGOs at the time of its launch and the effects of the coronavirus pandemic on their operations. Similarly, we would like to understand the how eNGOs decided which projects to put forward for GRCF support and how they found the application and project initiation stages. Suppliers might also choose to propose some research with unsuccessful applicants to GRCF to understand their experience of the process.
	3. A variety of methods could be suitable for the process evaluation, which could include in-depth case studies, focus groups, surveys. We anticipate that the findings from the process evaluation will inform recommendations from the supplier about the things that could be improved by DEFRA or NLHF, either at the interim stage of this programme, or for future funds.

### Strand 2: Outcomes framework, theory of change and KPIs

* 1. A draft outcomes framework has been designed by DEFRA, Natural England and the stakeholder organisations, and used to inform the examples in section 3.8, The successful supplier will need to work with DEFRA to finalise the framework and with grantees to finalise and agree programme level outcomes and KPIs. Potential suppliers are expected to outline how they would convene grantees to discuss and develop the outcomes framework, including through the use of theory of change, or similar methods for defining outcomes and their connections to activities and inputs.
	2. The finalised outcomes framework will support reporting and measurement at both a project and programme level, with KPIs that are relevant to a wide range of projects. It should also facilitate data collection by eNGOs, complementing existing measurement wherever possible. Potential suppliers should note that NLHF will develop the processes and systems for output and milestone data, based on the finalised framework and that individual projects will be responsible for their own evaluations against the framework.

### Strand 3: Profile of the portfolio

* 1. In the early stages of the contract, NLHF will supply the successful contractor with core data on the projects that have applied to the Green Recovery Challenge Fund. This will include the details of the application and proposed project, the organisation bidding, any matched funding and structured and unstructured data about the objectives and intended outcomes of the interventions..
	2. The partners require the successful contractor to use a range of data to provide a rich profile of the overall portfolio of funded projects. Potential suppliers should outline how they propose to:
* Analyse the profile by geography and statutory/environmental status (SSSI, AONB, National Parks, World Heritage Site)
* Aggregate the available baseline data generated by individual projects on the pre-existing condition of the environment, habitat and landscape in the areas where projects are taking place and any historic trends. Projects will be advised to use the UK Habitat Classification to conduct their baseline[[5]](#footnote-6) and suppliers will be required to aggregate this data and advise Defra and NLHF on it’s robustness.
* Design and document data models that would allow the partners to continue to profile the condition of the areas that have Green Recovery Challenge Fund projects in future, including beyond the life of this evaluation.
	1. The partners are particularly interested in understanding how open data sources can support the analysis needed for this strand. This includes spatial datasets that can be used as reference data when matched to the funded projects, but also any open data on environmental and natural outcomes, such as:
* Natural England’s People and Nature Survey[[6]](#footnote-7)
* The National Biodiversity Networks datasets and resources[[7]](#footnote-8)
* Relevant data from the UK Habitat Classification
	1. In relation to measurement of biodiversity, all funded projects will be required to comply with the data standards of the National Biodiversity Network (i.e. the Darwin Core format)[[8]](#footnote-9). They must also make observational data available to the public on an open license capture resolution.

### Strand 4: Outcomes and impact

* 1. The partners require that potential suppliers propose a method that seeks to measure the outcomes and impact of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund projects and the contribution the funding has made to those outcomes. Since the funding is not being delivered through a randomised-control trial, we invite potential suppliers to recommend methods that could be used to analyse the outcomes of the funding.
	2. The data modelling conducted in strand three should be used to support this phase of the work, as well as quantitative research and the monitoring data from projects.
	3. The partners understand that there are major challenges in designing robust non (or quasi)-experimental methods, especially when outcomes are subject to such a wide range of influences. Our aim is to ensure that this evaluation uses all reasonable effort to explore appropriate methods. At a basic level, suppliers should explain the analysis they propose to conduct of the change in key outcome measures between the programme initiation (November 2020) and the end of funding for projects (in March 2022). Looking beyond comparisons of outcome measures, we also invite potential suppliers to indicate how they will assess the suitability of quasi-experimental methods for isolating causal effects and the analysis they will conduct should these methods prove feasible.
	4. Potential suppliers may choose to propose quantitative research into funded and/or rejected projects as part of this strand of work. The Fund and the partners will support this by providing communications and guidance with sampling if required.
	5. Participation in the evaluation by grantees is a condition of the grant funding. We are keen, however, to ensure that the workload for projects is kept manageable and that the independent evaluation complements the ongoing monitoring returns of each project.

### Strand 5: Value for money assessment

* 1. The partners require that the evaluation contractor conducts a value for money assessment of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund. This assessment will rely on the evidence collected through the other strands of the evaluation and relevant secondary literature.
	2. In line with Green Book guidance, the partners are seeking to understand:
* A view of the true costs of delivering the projects.
* Natural, economic, social and wellbeing benefits that have been delivered by the funding.
* The distributional, employment and indirect economic impact of the funding.
* Any unintended consequences, both positive and negative.
* The degree to which the findings are likely to be applicable to other green/environmental schemes.
	1. We are also interested in evidence of the economic benefits to the environmental NGO’s in terms of skills creation/retention, capacity and overall workforce. The analysis should identify where match funding has added value to the Government funding provided by the scheme.
	2. The successful contractor will be required to write up the value for money analysis for dissemination to DEFRA economists, HM Treasury and the wider eNGO Sector (see section 5 – outputs). Suppliers should factor in consultation with DEFRA economists on to ensure that the evaluation provides evidence to inform future investment cases.
	3. Suppliers should propose the methods they think will best support a value for money assessment, within the constraints of the GRCF programme.

### Strand 6: Synthesis of evidence, recommendations and lessons learned

* 1. Potential suppliers are invited to propose appropriate methods for triangulating the evidence from the different strands to provide an overview of the effectiveness of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund in meeting its intended outcomes and impact. This includes reporting on the lessons learnt for the partners, stakeholders and the wider sector in using relatively short term funding to deliver environmental and economic outcomes.

### Strand 7: Recommendations for post-programme research [optional phase]

* 1. Acknowledging the inherently long-term nature of many environmental outcomes, the successful contractor will be required to provide the partners with proposals for future research into the effects of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund after the funding has ended. This should take the form of the recommended timelines for following up with projects, the types of methods that could be appropriate and how the models and approaches designed through this evaluation could be refreshed and updated.
	2. These recommendations should be provided to the partners before the end of 2021, to inform research planning for the 2021-22 financial year.

# Outputs

* 1. The following outputs will be required:
* Project Initiation Document, including evaluation design, plan and methodology, timelines and dependencies.
* Regular progress reports delivered through slide pack presentations to the DEFRA steering group.
* Impact and economic appraisal methodology statement, for consultation with partner economists.
* Interim reports – anticipated to be provided on approximately 6 monthly basis.
* A final report and accompanying slide deck.
* Documentation of data modelling and handover of datasets.
	1. The reports issued by the contractor should make recommendations for future funding rounds both under the GRCF and under the Nature Recovery Network Fund and Nature for Climate Fund, at both the interim and final report stages, and work with the partners to incorporate these into lessons learnt. These reports should identify where Value for Money has been best achieved against KPI’s and identify good/bad practice.
	2. The evaluation will also be used to inform strategy and policy development. We will expect the consultants to identify learnings and feed these back throughout the evaluation so that we can act on to make any changes to our support.
	3. The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences, including the DEFRA project board or relevant steering groups for the fund, 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.
	4. A project plan with specific deliverables\* and timetable will be agreed with the successful consultant. However, the National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund) expects the following deliverables in accordance with the following timetable as a minimum:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable/Key Milestones\*** | **Due date** |
| Project Initiation Document, including evaluation plan and methodology, timelines and dependencies. | Within a month of project initiation. |
| Inception Meeting to agree plans, including reporting structures, learning events and a communication and dissemination strategy | Within a month of project initiation. |
| Short interim reports outlining findings and analysis completed during the previous period.  | At around 6 monthly intervals, but as a minimum:March 2021,September 2021 & March 2022 |
| A final report with structure agreed with the Fund, and accompanying slide deck.  | September 2022 |

* 1. The above represents our minimum requirements.
	2. \* The Fund reserves the right to amend this timetable where required.
	3. All reports must adhere to The Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended). We also expect reports to follow the layout advised in our evaluation guidance.
	4. The initial findings should be provided to The Fund and its partners. The partner organisations are committed to the publication of research findings and we may commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution.
	5. 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.
	6. 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.
	7. 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.
	8. We expect the successful bidder to focus on improving, rather than just proving, including a mechanism for feeding back evidence that demonstrates the difference being made and enables changes to be made, based on learning, enabling the programme to maximises its impact.
	9. Bidders should be committed to adapt to the evolving nature of the programme.
	10. 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 research/evaluation to begin week commencing 9th November 2020 and be completed by 30th September 2022. The final report shall be submitted to the Fund by 15th September 2022.
	2. The anticipated budget is up to £200,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
	3. The payment schedule will be split into three payments; 25% on signing of contract, 25% on the interim report in March 2021 and 50% on submission of final report in September 2022.
	4. The contract will be based on The Fund’s standard terms and conditions.
	5. The research will be managed on a day to day basis for The Fund by Hilary Leavy.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should be a maximum of 20 pages and include:
* a detailed 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 and the potential supplier should specifically highlight their experience in natural environment/natural sciences and connecting to nature (social science) research.
* 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. Your Bid 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 evaluation, particularly outlining how you will address each of the three themes (nature conservation and restoration, nature based solutions and connecting people with nature). | 20% |
| Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief and adhere to the Magenta and Green Book principles | 25% |
| Demonstrated an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to nature conservation and restoration, particularly in response to biodiversity loss and climate change.  | 25% |
| Demonstrated the suitability of the team, assigned roles and responsibilities and their experience in natural and social science research and a suitable approach to performance and risk management | 20% |
| Demonstrated well considered plans for feeding back learning and dissemination of evaluation findings | 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. The procurement timetable will be:
* Deadline for clarification questions: Monday 28th September 2020
* Tender return deadline: Midday, Wednesday 14th October 2020
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on week commencing: 26th October, by video call
* The Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 2nd November 2020
* \*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 tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of midday, 14th October 2020 to the following contact:

Ruth Dench

The National Lottery Heritage Fund

Mezzanine Floor

International House

1 St Katharine’s Way

London E1W 1UN

Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk

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

# Annex A: High Level Outcome Mapping Against 25-Year Environment Plan and Heritage Fund Strategic Framework Outcomes

| **Theme/outcome** | **Relevant 25YEP Goal / targets** | **Relevant National Lottery Heritage Fund Outcomes** | **25 YEP indicators** | **Project-level definition** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 – Nature Conservation and Restoration** | **Targets:** - Create or restore 500,000 hectares of wildlife-rich habitat outside the protected site network, focusing on priority habitats- Restore 75% of our one million hectares of terrestrial and freshwater protected sites to favourable condition) | 2. Heritage will be in a better condition  8. Local area will be a better place to live, work or visit    | D1 Quantity, quality and connectivity of habitats D2 Extent and condition of protected sites D6 Abundance and distribution of priority species in England any more required  | If your project is a success, there will be improvements to the physical state of the natural environment, which will be richer in plants and wildlife. |
| **2 – Nature Based Solutions** | **Targets:** - increase woodland in England to 12% cover by 2060 (incl. planting 180,000 hectares by 2042)- planting 11 million trees by 2022- flood strategy- water strategy- reduce net emissions of greenhouse gases by 100% relative to 1990 levels by 2050 |  2. Heritage will be in better condition  6. People will have greater wellbeing   | D3 Ha of woodland planted G3 Enhancement of green / blue infrastructure Carbon sequestered p.a.  | If your project is a success, there will be improvements made to the physical state of the natural environment to help people adapt to the effects of change and natural disasters. |
| **3 connecting people with nature** | **“We will conserve and enhance the beauty of our natural environment, and make sure it can be enjoyed, used by and cared for by everyone.”** | 1. Wider range of people will be involved in heritage3. Heritage will be identified and better explained 5. People will have learned about heritage, leading to change in ideas and actions 6. People will have greater wellbeing  | G4 Engagement with the natural environmentG5 People engaged in social action for the environment G6 Environmental attitudes and behaviours G7 Health and wellbeing benefits | If your project is a success, a wider range of people will benefit from engagement with the natural environment. They may also feel more connected to the place where they live.” |

# Annex B: 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.

1. <https://www.conservationevidence.com/content/page/81> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [https://woodlandwildlifetoolkit.sylva.org.uk/assess](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwoodlandwildlifetoolkit.sylva.org.uk%2Fassess&data=02%7C01%7Ckaty.thompson%40defra.gov.uk%7C16c2cc916a2d409aee4e08d84b1f548f%7C770a245002274c6290c74e38537f1102%7C1%7C0%7C637341945234005554&sdata=Va6DBJKTpeRBgEQM51PyhkHFsejlf3i1r4ZRGF%2F4RYE%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5679197848862720 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment: developing a method to measure nature connection across the English population (adults and children), Natural England Commissioned Report NECR233, 2017 http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5337609808642048 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. See the UK Habitat Classification website: <https://ecountability.co.uk/ukhabworkinggroup-ukhab/> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. See ‘Overview of the People and Nature Survey’: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/people-and-nature-survey-for-england> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See: <https://nbn.org.uk/> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See: <https://nbn.org.uk/news/data-upload-templates-guidance-now-available/> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)