

Heritage and Place - clarification questions and response

- 1. Does The Fund see a distinction between the outcome ‘heritage helps people and places to thrive’ and ‘place based funding’?**

We want the projects we fund to have a positive impact for both people and places. When we refer to “demonstrate how heritage helps people and places to thrive” this is a strategic objective reflected in The National Lottery Heritage Fund’s [Strategic Funding Framework 2019-2024](#) which we want to achieve through place-based approaches to National Lottery Grants for Heritage (our “open grants programme”) and strategic funding (eg campaigns, bid solicitation, Areas of Focus).

- 2. Can you confirm whether, and if so how, the Heritage Index is being used by The Fund in strategic planning and/or decision-making? Do you envisage it becoming one of The Fund’s Key Performance Indicators on Place?**

The Heritage Index is one of a number of datasets and sources of evidence used to inform our strategic planning. It isn’t used in isolation for these purposes.

We have no specific vision on whether it could be used as a Key Performance Indicator on Place. The research could help us to explore this.

- 3. Re. developing insights from the grant funding data into place-based funding in recent years (e.g. no of grants awarded/rejected on place based projects) – do you expect this to include both projects funded through open programmes and targeted programmes/initiatives?**

Yes, the data that will be analysed will be drawn from both our open grants programme and strategic funding initiatives. For the purpose of this project data dating back to 2008 is available for the contractor on The National Lottery Heritage Fund grants on the [open data](#) section of our website. Our data is also available on [360 giving](#) which also includes data by organisational type.

- 4. If open programmes – how will place based projects be identified from non-place based projects? Do you have a set of criteria for this already or will it be part of the research?**

We plan to identify place-based projects and applicants in the open programme as those which have been assessed as High, Medium or Low in terms of meeting either or both of the following outcomes in their application: [‘The local economy will be boosted’](#) and [‘the local area will be a better place to live, work or visit.’](#)

- 5. How many years do you envisage the data analysis and research review going back?**

We have not decided this and would let the consultants make proposals on this.

- 6. Can you clarify the place programmes and initiatives that are within the remit of the research? The following are referred to in 1.6: Great Place Scheme; Future Parks Accelerator; Areas of Focus; Landscape Partnerships; Townscape Heritage Initiative. Might projects funded through Parks for People and Heritage Enterprise also be included?**

The strategic funding programmes captured in **Appendix B** reflect our proposals for where the Fund's evaluations should be drawn upon to inform Strand 1 of the research. This is a non-exhaustive list – for example, the [Parks for People evaluation](#) may also be considered here.

- 7. Re. “the activity of the awarded place based projects”. This can be gathered from project application forms, progress reports and completion reports. Can you confirm which of these will be made available? This is likely to be a very large data set and we think there would be a need to adopt a sampling approach.**

We plan to give all the information from the application forms downloaded into one Excel spreadsheet. A subsample can be selected for review if appropriate to the approach. If it is felt to be needed we could provide PDF documents of a subsample of completion reports.

- 8. Re “Alignment with the strategic priorities of other national partners and funders”. Do you have strong view already on which partners and funders should be included?**

We would welcome the consultant to provide views on this but at present we were expecting other Arms Length Bodies to be included as well as government place agendas to be considered. This should encompass the place agendas of the Scottish Government, Welsh Government and Northern Ireland Executive as well as the UK Government.

- 9. Re. “Review a sub sample of place based funded projects to understand in more detail the types of activity funded to deliver our place based strategy through reviewing qualitative application form data”. Could interviews with project delivery teams feature here as well?**

The methodology is just a suggested approach and we are open to changes. Interviews with project delivery teams could be included here if the reasoning behind this is explained in the bid.

- 10. Re. “Use relevant external and internal research to conduct a review of place-based research”. Do you expect the external review to be limited to the UK?**

No, if there is relevant research from other countries it can be included provided it supports the aim of assessing the effectiveness and considerations for successful place-based funding, which could be adapted for funding place-based heritage projects.

- 11. Re. “Consult with a small group of key national stakeholders (approx. 10)”. Do you anticipate this will include other funders? Local authorities? Heritage bodies?**

We would work with the successful bidder to identify this list but at present we expect it would focus principally on national stakeholders which may include representative bodies for key sectors.

The Fund has undertaken extensive engagement with the heritage sector (and targeted engagement with local authorities) over the past 12 months and key evidence sources to be reviewed as part of this research are referenced at Annex B.

12. Re. “Engage with the Fund’s staff”. Can you indicate what level of engagement you anticipate – with regional teams; strategic development staff; senior management?

The purpose of this is to understand the current funding context at The Fund around place and to ensure the research is as relevant and useful as possible. It is likely to be with senior strategic and policy staff and could take the form of interviews.

13. Re. “Present on emerging findings to enable the co-creation of options to support The Fund to integrate place-based funding”. Does ‘co-creation’ imply this could involve follow-on work for the appointed consultants?

This is about ensuring that recommendations from the findings are developed collaboratively with The Fund once the analysis has been completed and emerging findings have been developed. This forms part of this heritage and place research commission.

14. Who is the target audience for the final report?

The research will be used to support The Fund’s strategic planning and policy development. Key audiences for the research include:

- The Fund’s staff, including our Executive Team as well as our Board of Trustees and Area/Country Committees
- Other ALBS, funders, heritage stakeholders, policy makers and interested parties.

15. Re. “The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences”. Over what timeframe to you expect these presentations to take place?

This has not been defined. In previous work this has involved interim findings being shared to relevant staff or the final findings and recommendations being presented to executive staff shortly after the report is complete.

16. With reference to the list of evaluations included in Appendix B – whilst we appreciate some of the work may be ongoing and may not be available at the moment, is it possible to provide access to any of the reports that do not have hyperlinks and may already be completed (e.g. Delivering the SFF Priorities for 2021-22 – findings (2020))?

Sorry, we are unable to share these at present.

17. Does The Fund have a definition of, or explanation of what it understands by, ‘place-based funding’ (paragraph 1.7, page 1)?

The Fund welcomes and invests in projects that adopt place-based approaches through National Lottery Grants for Heritage across all our priority outcomes. We do not have a single

definition of place-based approaches but our [local area guidance](#) sets out that this may include approaches to designing and delivering projects that: are collaborative, bringing in a range of local partners and participants; are embedded in local strategies; and aim to deliver changes and improvements to local places during and beyond the life of the project.

Beyond our open grants programme, The Fund has also adopted place-based approaches through our strategic funding, such as the Great Place Scheme. While these strategic initiatives will have their own distinct aims and outcomes, they share a focus on the local place.

For the purposes of the analysis in Strand 1, place-based funding is defined more discretely to encompass:

- Projects funded through the open grants programme which have selected that they will meet either or both of the following outcomes in their application: [‘The local economy will be boosted’](#) and [‘the local area will be a better place to live, work or visit.’](#)
- Strategic funding with a place focus (an indicative list of relevant strategic funding programmes is provided in Appendix B).

18. In terms of ‘place-based projects’ (Strand 1, page 3) – how are place-based projects defined by The Fund? Is there a specific list of programmes that are regarded as place based, or could some examples be provided?

For the purposes of the analysis in Strand 1, place-based projects encompass:

- Projects funded through the open grants programme which have selected that they will meet either or both of the following outcomes in their application: [‘The local economy will be boosted’](#) and [‘the local area will be a better place to live, work or visit.’](#)
- Strategic funding programmes with a place focus (an indicative list of relevant strategic funding programmes is provided in Appendix B).

19. We note the limit of 15 pages for proposals – would relevant annexes (e.g. staff CV) be acceptable in addition to the 15 pages?

Yes.

20. It would be helpful to understand in more detail the requirement 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’ – is this with respect to The Fund’s inclusion outcome as set out in the Strategic Funding Framework?

The Fund is committed to equality, diversity and inclusion and we would expect all research to support us in being an inclusive organisation and in delivering our mandatory inclusion outcome [‘A wider range of people will be involved in heritage’](#).

21. Can you provide any detail about the quantity of data we would have access to e.g. number of grants? This would be helpful to inform our resource planning.

For the purpose of this project data dating back to 2008 is available for the contractor on The National Lottery Heritage Fund grants on the [open data](#) section of our website. Our data is also available on [360 giving](#) which also includes data by organisational type. The data we will provide you with will be in this format but with extra fields for the place outcomes '[the local area will be a better place to live, work or visit](#)' and '[the local economy will be boosted](#)' and will include an assessment score of how strongly the applicant meets this outcome (High, Medium or Low). If relevant we will include the application data in excel fields alongside this. Bidders can propose how far back in time the data that is used as part of the research should go.