

**1. Does Ageing Better expect to engage the public in the co-design of these materials alongside Local Authorities?**

The primary targets for the co-design process are people working in local authorities, whom the guidance will be geared towards. However, if bidders feel there is a case to be made for public engagement, they are welcome to include that in response to Section 2 (Methodology and approach).

**2. Does Ageing Better have a sense of who within the local authorities would be best to engage and include in our research and co-design? We're thinking primarily about roles and departments that might use this guidance more actively.**

This will largely depend on the kinds of local authorities that are identified as our key audiences for resources in the first phase of this work (January-March 2025), as the powers and structures vary between different tiers and geographies. We do have knowledge and understanding of the different roles in different tiers of government that we are reaching, but as noted in the example research questions on pages 6-7, phase one should draw out those roles and departments with influence we don't currently know about. We also expect bidders to bring their own expertise on levers and structures for change.

**3. Does Ageing better expect that the contractor to engage with LAs across the whole of the UK or just a specific region, i.e. England**

Across the whole of the UK, at least initially. However, we note there are different policy contexts in each of the 4 nations, so if through the process we needed to prioritise England would be the focus (because Centre for Ageing Better's funding is England based)

**4. If the work uncovers a need for more developed resources (i.e. short videos, websites, training), is there budget to support this beyond that specified in the tender?**

We have a reasonable budget for design work for written materials in addition to the contract value. Any additional or novel formats for resources which would require a budget beyond that for graphic design could be considered.

**5. We understand that you have valuable connections with local authorities and networks that could contribute to the project's success. To what extent can you support the recruitment process for this project? If we aim to engage local authorities outside the UK Network of Age-friendly Communities, how would you be able to assist with recruitment efforts?**

We can and would expect to lead contact with people directly in our existing networks, both in the UK Network of Age-friendly Communities and through other Ageing Better projects within our Homes and Work action areas among others. We also have outreach opportunities through partners at LGA, CCN and NALC, to reach others, e.g. through newsletters. We would also expect the delivery partner to be proactive in recruitment and in proposing an approach that makes best use of these contacts. Please explain how you would do this in Section 2 (Methodology and approach).

**6. Is there any intention to work with older people within the target audience?**

As per Question 1, as members of the public are not the target audience, we don't expect this project to involve older people who are not staff in local authorities in the co-design process. This approach may change as part of the process of phase one. If bidders feel there is a case to be made for public engagement, they are welcome to include that in response to Section 2 (Methodology and approach).

**7. You mentioned that some local authorities are more engaged than others. What is your previous experience working with those who are not "warm audiences" of Ageing Better? When reaching out to less "warm audiences", have you encountered any specific barriers to involvement that we should be aware of?**

Engaging local authorities in this kind of co-design process is a new approach we are taking, but we have reasonable expectations that local authorities will be willing to engage, and we have had experience of individuals/ communities who want to engage with us but who aren't able to develop full UK Network membership. Barriers we have encountered in the past include time and resources, so we expect the successful bidder to be aware of this as a risk and explain how they would mitigate it in Section 3 (Project management and risk management). Another potential barrier could be the fact that 'ageing' does not fall under any specific remit in local authorities so it may be a challenge to identify who to

engage, but our experience is that people who understand its relevance to the community tend to self-select.

**8. What types of data or insights will you be able to share about the local authorities in the UK Network of Age-friendly Communities? For example, will you be able to share their engagement levels, their progress within the four-stage WHO cycle or which authorities are doing better than others?**

We do not have a formal ranking system but through our relationships we have a good view on this data and share it with the successful bidder. Data we do track includes when the community joined the UK Network, the lead organisation/ department, their initial governance set up and their engagement levels with our learning activities.

**9. We understand that ‘necessary event and travel costs’ will be covered by Ageing Better in addition to the contract value. Could you clarify what this includes? For example, would expenses related to in-person co-design workshops—such as participant travel costs, remuneration, and catering—be covered? Is there a preliminary budget allocated for these ‘necessary event and travel costs’? Do you envision the co-design sessions being primarily online or in-person?**

Travel, catering and venue hire would be covered by expenses, but not remuneration for professionals. We do not have any preference on if the workshops should be in person or online, but would anticipate that any initial engagement or engagement with ‘colder audiences’ that would require a lot of travel would happen online. Bidders should include preliminary budgets for this if they intend to deliver sessions in person.

**10. Could you share more details about the Age-Friendly Handbook? For instance, who developed it, what process was used in its creation, and how were older adults involved?**

The Age-friendly Handbook has been written by the Ageing Better Localities team who will be the team managing this contract. It has been created in partnership with professionals in local government, academia, policy experts, and VCSE organisations with experience and expertise in ageing and older people. The content was informed by existing age-friendly guides and checklists, and interviews with the creators of those resources. The guide has

also been informed by a review of conversations with Ageing Better's Experts by Experience Network, a group of people aged 50 and over with lived experience of the issues Ageing Better seeks to address. You can view an early draft version of this handbook from October 2024 [here](#).

**11. Do you have an existing framework or criteria that will be used to evaluate the success of this project in achieving its aims?**

We do not have a specific evaluation criterion for this project, as it will depend on the approach outlined by the successful bidder. We can agree this early in the project and expect it to be aligned with the impact framework for Ageing Better's Age-friendly Movement impact framework and to include engagement with tools and resources, feedback on quality and relevance, and evidence of increased understanding and application of age-friendly principles by local authorities.

**12. Are you envisioning the development of universally applicable, 'off-the-shelf' tools and resources suitable for all local authorities across England, or will these tools need to be tailored to address the unique contexts and needs of each authority type?**

We expect these tools to be tailored to specific types of local authorities. They will follow the launch of the handbook and self-assessment tool which are suitable for all local authorities.

**13. How open are you to considering alternative types of tools or resources beyond those initially suggested?**

We are open to suggestions for any formats of tools or resources that emerge through this co-design process, within our budget limitations for design and dissemination. As per question 4, we are also open to more budget and resource-intensive formats if there is a case made for the effectiveness of these.

**14. Is there interest in having designated team members from the Centre for Aging Better shadow or collaborate closely with our team?**

We expect regular close collaboration between members of the Ageing Better Localities team and the project team. There will be a dedicated team member working on this

project, and forms of working arrangements can be agreed between the team and the successful bidder.

**15. We would like to ask whether the following minor amendments can be made to the contract:**

- a. We note that the Contractor's liability under these terms is currently unlimited, which is an uninsurable position. Considering the low-risk consultancy services being provided, would you be willing to limit the Contractor's liability to a commensurate amount, such as 125% of the Contract Fee?**
- b. Would you also be willing to remove clause 10.1.3 so that the Contractor is only responsible for direct loss or damage sustained through the Contract?**

We would be happy to make these amends.

- c. At Clause 22, Intellectual Property, would you be willing to include wording to enable the Contractor to use knowledge generated in our business? We would appreciate a non-exclusive, non-assignable, non-sublicensable, royalty free license to use the Foreground Intellectual Property in our business.**

We would not be able to grant this permission.

**16. We would like to propose that the Centre for Ageing Better would be the data controller, and that the Contractor would be the data processor for this contract - given that the Contractor will be collecting, analysing, storing and sharing data only on behalf of the Centre for Ageing Better.**

We are happy to accept this proposal.

**17. Please could you provide the Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure document - we do not seem to be able to access this from Annex 5 of the Form of Agreement.**

You can also view the Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure [here](#).

**18. Please could you confirm whether Centre for Ageing Better have any expected numbers for the engagement methods and audiences for this project, e.g. numbers of interviews?**

We do not have expected numbers for engagement as this will depend on the types of engagement (surveys, interviews, focus groups, workshops and other methods of collaboration as set out in 2.4 of the invitation to tender). We would anticipate a breadth of engagement which will enable an appropriately designed product. For example, if we produced an 'age-friendly towns' checklist, it is important that this is informed by engaging with several towns rather than just one. Please indicate in Section 2 (Methodology and approach) how many people you would expect to engage in each phase of research and production.

**19. On page 11 you describe the price weighting for scoring bids. Is the total price assessed before VAT (if applicable) is added, or do you assess on total cost?**

Prices will be assessed on total cost.

**20. Do you expect any graphic design to be included in the development of the tools / resources, or will that be done internally?**

Please specify whether your quote includes design of tools and resources in the Schedule of Rates. As per questions 4 and 13, we have a reasonable budget for graphic design and can outsource this ourselves or arrange it in-house if necessary.

**21. We have noticed that 2.11 Terms and Conditions, in the Invitation to Tender for Age-friendly Local Authority Guidance, refers to Section 14 of the Supplier Questionnaire, but we could not find it. Please could you provide a copy? If successful we would like to request some minor amendments to the terms and conditions which we will set out in Section 14 of the Supplier Questionnaire as part of our proposal.**

The reference to a supplier questionnaire in the ITT is an error. Please write any requests for amendments to the terms and conditions in Appendix 1: Conditions of contract on page 20.

**22. Please could you also clarify how Appendix 1: Conditions of the Contract should be filled out? We noticed in the ITT guidance this Appendix refers to the acceptance of the Conditions of Purchase.**

As above, you do not need to write anything in this section but if you have any questions or requests for changes to our standard conditions of contract – linked again [here](#) – please write them here.

**23. How much support can you give to making contact with local authorities versus the consultants doing this? Knowing who to approach at local authorities, setting up conversations/meetings etc. can take time so it would be good to know who should anticipate doing this.**

As per question 5, we can lead on approaching the local authorities we already have contact with, and do further outreach through other networks, and would expect the successful bidder to be proactive in recruiting more contacts where there are gaps. We would also like the successful bidder to support this communication by providing wording, managing responses and agendas etc. Bidders should reflect this in their project management approach and timelines in Section 3 of the return.

**24. What kind of appetite is there amongst local authorities to engage with this project, give their time. co-design etc. Is it part of our role to persuade local authorities to engage in this co-design work?**

We anticipate a range of willingness to engage in different levels of co-design from communities - some may just want to complete surveys, but we anticipate others being enthusiastic to be more involved. We would expect the successful bidder to encourage local authorities to engage through making the process easy and clear, but we wouldn't anticipate encouraging staff at local authorities to do what they are unwilling or unable to. We would expect the successful bidder to manage the risk associated with levels of engagement and be prepared to modify engagement activities to respond to feedback.

**25. Your document states: 2-4 tools or resources (for example a charter, checklist, policy guide or template) developed in partnership with the target local authority audiences and Ageing Better through all stages of drafting, testing, refining and publishing. We anticipate this might look like an “age-friendly**

***towns charter” or “creating an age-friendly district guide”. These will be clear and universally relevant to authorities across England.***

These two suggestions are along the lines of the resources we expect to be produced.

**26. What do you mean by publishing? Are these electronic resources e.g. PDFs? Or do you anticipate some of the budget will be used in physical comms e.g. professionally printed leaflets?**

We expect the primary means of publication would be online – if we do decide to print resources, we would cover printing costs ourselves.