**Clarification Questions -** Evaluation of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Parks and Public Open Space Future Parks Accelerator project.

Posted – 03/08/2020

*We will welcome bids from consultants wanting to undertake only the work outlined in this tender, or from consultants or partnerships bidding for more than contract. Both will be considered equally on their individual merits according to the relevant evaluation process.*

1. when did work actually start on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Parks and Public Open Space Future Parks Accelerator project and has any thought been given to Theory of Change or evaluation metrics and baselines up to now (for example in any bids submitted to National Lottery Heritage Fund)?

The Project was awarded funding in 2019, however, permission to start was granted in September 2019 and initial work commenced in 2020.

The following were submitted as evaluation metrics and theory of change to the NLHF as an appendix.

However, please note that since then we have reviewed our project milestones, and so will need to review evaluation metrics and baselines as part of the initial stage of this consultancy work to develop the proposed project evaluation framework and methodology in consultation with the Project team and other stakeholders. Hence we do not expect potential consultants to be limited to the information provided below.

Original submission:

“As part of the Co-design phase of the project we will set the baseline, which will identify the current position for parks and green spaces in Cambridgeshire. The baseline will be 'a reading' which helps us to understand the number of parks and green spaces, their funding, ownership and management, standards/quality, use, community involvement, health benefits, commerciality etc. As we move forward with the project, we will measure, continually and at milestones, both the impact and effects of our project at that point, but also the likely affect our project will have once implemented at scale.

Once complete we will report against a set of KPIs and objectives which will be agreed early in the project.

We hope that using analysis tools such as Greenkeeper and with support and experience from NT, we will be able to both analyse and understand data and the value of our proposed solutions. We also hope that the FPA structure will promote the sharing of our learning with and between other FPA projects. We will also seek to interface with MHCLG and the Parks Action Group, with academic institutions (including IWUN, Exeter University and others) to ensure we share best practice.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Potential Outputs**  *What does this work stream need to deliver/create?* | **Scope**  *What is (or might be) included? What definitely isn’t?* |
| A network of better managed parks and greenspaces |  |
| A comprehensive record/map of the number and area of parks and green spaces across the county. |  |
| A comprehensive record/map of the number and area of parks and green spaces across the county. |  |
| A countywide integrated approach to managing our parks and green spaces portfolio |  |
| A programme volunteering recruitment and development across  Cambridgeshire's parks (or help to improve existing), to provide opportunities for people to be more active, to build new connections with others and to learn new skills. |  |
| A Forum for Friends Groups/Volunteer groups to share good practice knowledge |  |
| Improved health and wellbeing of our local communities through their interaction with parks and green spaces and the organisations managing them day-to-day. |  |
| A regional Forum for Parks and Green space managers/staff to share good practice and knowledge |  |

1. In S3.1 you outline the requirement to work with the consultants working on mapping and evaluation, while on page 13 (2nd paragraph Appendix 1) you talk about consultancy contracts for mapping and valuation – can you confirm whether the other consultancy contract is mapping and valuation and that a typing error has slipped into S3.1, or is S3.1 correct.

The reference in S3.1 was a typo and should have been mapping and valuation, not evaluation. We have a consultant working on mapping and open space standards, and this work commenced in March 2020. We are also working with VIVID Economics on natural capital assessments.

1. S1.3 - The brief indicate a requirement for analysis of baseline information for the project as researched during the development stage of the project – has this baseline data been collected yet or is this required as part of the development stage. If the later, what is the timeline for the development stage as we can see that sign-off of the evaluation methodology is due by November – so do we assume baseline data is collected after sign off in November?

Some data are currently being collected but due to delays this November date will indeed need to be rescheduled, and some baseline data will be collected after November.

1. S1.3 – Can you clarify what the “workshop sessions and events throughout the lifetime of the programme” are likely to be? The brief indicates we should provide observation at these, so suggests these are events being organised by partners. How many are there likely to be, when and where?

The Some workshops have already taken place, however a number are yet to run. These will be based within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, but due to C-19, more recently they have been run on Zoom Conference calling platform.

Examples of workshops and events that have already taken place include:

* Two Funding and Operating Models workshops to discuss priority issues
* Visioning workshop on messaging
* A peer review Parks Challenge week run by the National Trust

Other meetings that will be held include:

* Stakeholder engagement events (various; schedule to be agreed)
* Funding and operating model (various; schedule to be agreed)
* Executive Board meetings (approx. every quarter)
* Project Team meetings

The number and type of meetings to observe is not fixed and will depend on the need to collect data and measure impact. We will take advice from our consultant on the best approach.

1. S2.2. A deliverable by November 2020 is a detailed project evaluation methodology (both quantitative and qualitative) ensuring compatibility with ongoing work streams. Are you able to share what the workstreams are now?

Please see the following work streams list

* Collective leadership and shared ambition for our Parks and Public Open Space
* Plan for Open Space Management
* Model for Delivery
* Evaluation

This is included in Appendix 1 of the tender document.

1. S3.1. the ITT mentions it is essential the successful tenderer works with our consultants leading on other work streams such as funding models and the mapping elements as this piece of work will be delivering our vision. You have explained that approximate timelines for the other consultant work as part of this project areas will be confirmed at inception meeting. How many days of activity are you expecting as we are unable to effectively cost without this information – i.e. is it 1 day or 10 days?

The evaluation consultant will need to understand the work that is being undertaken by these other consultants, their aims and objectives and how it will determine the measures of success and impact, and what data could be useful. These work of these consultants may also generate data and evidence. We will take advice from our consultant on the most robust approach.

1. Same question as above for S4.4. The tenderer must allow time to work with a small working group of FPA officers to ensure these standards are professionally sound and based on the local conditions and political influence. How much time should we assume?

We expect potential consultants to propose an approach on this based on previous experience of working on similar projects.

1. Table 3. The High level milestone plan shows a number of bullet pints with \*\* or \*, but there doesn’t appear to be an explanation of what these refer to? E.g. “Working alongside the LNP to identify two case study new developments. Identify the features that are needed in new open space provision or the investment in existing open space to ensure sustainable funding and management opportunities are maximised.\*\*” Can you clarify what information is missing?

We apologise for this oversight. The missing information is:

\*To be reviewed once the COVID-19 impacts have been assessed, and if an extension is granted.

\*\* If an extension is granted.

1. Where we are required to provide three examples, is the word count of 500 words per example or in total?

This should be in total. However, we have amended this so that skills, experience etc. can be provided separately on one side of an A4 page.

1. A general point we’d like to note is that 500 words is rather low to ‘effectively’ cover all aspects you have asked for in the Appendix B, Section 2 questions. For example, Q1 requires:

* project proposal/approach to the project
* an outline timetable
* breakdown of key tasks and methodology
* consultancy background, experience and the expertise you/your team would bring to this project
* details of any consultants that would be working on this project and their relevant experience.
* Confirmation that we can meet the timelines

We have amended this so that skills, experience etc. can be provided separately on one side of an A4 page.

1. Can you confirm that the budget is exclusive of VAT?

The budget is exclusive of VAT.