



## **National Parks Reimagined Citizen Conversations ITT – Clarification Questions and Answers**

**Q: The ITT refers to including “a proposal for the number of citizens to involve, with a clear rationale for why this is the right approach” (para 12). Can you clarify whether this is the number of citizens that should be involved in the development phase or is it for both the development phase and the delivery phase?**

A: This refers specifically to the delivery phase because this is the phase when we anticipate involvement of a wide range of participants in the research. The work in the development phase should help inform the proposal for the number of citizens to involve in the delivery phase. Tenderers may want to speak to stakeholder organisations in a particular area as part of the development phase to help develop their ideas for the delivery phase, including proposed number of participants, for example to get a better understanding of the range of different voices to include. But we’re not anticipating that contractors would involve individual citizens at the development stage.

**Q: Is there any learning or information available from the New Perspectives project, for example, in terms of the best approaches to use when reaching out to young people?**

A: There is a full evaluation from the New Perspectives project which we can share with successful tenderer(s). Some of the learnings from that have already been used to inform the development of elements of the National Parks Reimagined project. For example, we’ll not only be running leadership courses but creating pathways for young people to further develop their skills in ways that are of particular interest to them, such as contributing to our advocacy work or taking part in apprenticeship programs or reciprocal mentorship. There is more information on New Perspectives on our website: [New Perspectives 2024-2026 - Campaign for National Parks](#)

**Q: Please could you clarify the relationship between this commission and the ongoing work that Tirweddau Cymru Landscapes Wales (TCLW) are doing on the shaping the future of Wales's Designated Landscapes. How do you see those two projects interacting?**

A: TCLW is a partnership of the National Park Authorities (NPAs) and other Designated Landscape bodies in Wales. Campaign for National Parks is independent of the NPAs but we work closely with TCLW. They are a partner in this research and will provide important support for the Citizen Conversations in Wales. They are also represented on the advisory group for the whole National Parks Reimagined project. We have provided evidence to the research TCLW are currently

undertaking on the future of governance in Wales's Designated Landscapes but we are not involved in the development of the final report on this.

**Q: Are universities able to submit bids?**

A: Yes, we welcome submissions from any organisation with the appropriate expertise as long as they are able to meet the requirements we've set out in the ITT, such as having appropriate EDI and safeguarding policies and being able to comply with data protection requirements.

**Q: If one organisation applies on behalf of a multi-institution team, does it matter how we divide up the funding between the different institutions?**

A: As we've set out in the ITT, where bids are submitted as a partnership or consortium, one organisation should act as the lead contractor, and all submissions need to include details of the key personnel who will be working on the project and their day rates and the allocation of days between team members. We will need to know how funding is to be divided between institutions as part of the submission.

**Q: Do you have any ideas of what you might do to take the work forward if you aren't successful in securing delivery phase funding from the National Lottery Heritage Fund?**

A: We're working very closely with The National Lottery Heritage Fund and have quarterly meetings with our grant manager. For this level of project they also provide a consultant who is supporting us in this development phase to ensure we're in the best possible position to secure the delivery phase funding from the Heritage Fund. So we're very hopeful that we will be successful but we have also got plans for securing alternative funding. We have packaged up the National Parks Reimagined project as a whole into three distinct strands of work which are appealing to different funders from which we have already been securing match funding through the development phase. That work will continue throughout the development phase. We have a fundraising plan that has mapped out what the opportunities are and have developed relationships with funders that have already shown interest in various elements of this project and our senior development officer is leading this work.

**Q: Do you have somebody in place already for evaluating the development phase work or are you doing it in-house and is that evaluation going to be kept completely separate from this research?**

We are just about to launch a brief for some external consultants to support us on the evaluation of the project for which they will build in all the elements and there will be some specific strands of the evaluation framework that will need to involve the successful tenderer for the Citizen Conversations. We've already done a lot of work around a theory of change for the whole project since we launched the development phase. We've got a draft framework in place and we're starting to monitor a lot of the activity that we are doing already which will be built into the work with the successful tenderer for the Citizen Conversations research.

**Q: Please can you say a little more about your thinking on the advisory group for the project, who you have on it, and if you've identified any risks around including people with very binary positions. I'm thinking particularly of the Dartmoor context where we've recently had lots of tensions between commoners and some NGOs.**

A: First to clarify, there are two different groups. There's an advisory group for the whole National Parks Reimagined Project which is now established. We're also intending that there would be a specific advisory group for each part of the delivery phase of the Citizen Conversations (i.e. one in Wales and one in England). As part of the development phase, successful tenderer(s) would need to develop proposals for who to include in these groups and then, assuming we proceed to the delivery phase, support their establishment and organisation. So we would work with successful tenderers to make sure we have the right people involved in these groups and to ensure that we are able to take account of specific local circumstances in England where we're proposing a more place-based approach and the exact composition is likely to be dependent on which particular National Park is chosen. Ensuring that we are including a wide range of views is also relevant for considering who is invited to give evidence and to participate in the conversations.

**Q: Please can you give us an idea of the level of participation you'd expect from stakeholder organisations during the development phase and whether you'd expect them to be paid for their time.**

A: The references to payments in the ITT relate to those participating in the deliberative research during the delivery phase where we want to make sure that no-one is excluded because they cannot afford to participate. The proposed activities during the development phase include identifying the stakeholders we would need to work with during the delivery phase and securing support from key stakeholders such as relevant NPAs, Defra, Welsh Government, Natural England and Natural Resources Wales. We would not expect people working for these kind of organisations to be paid for their time and input to this research. Tenderers may also want to propose the involvement of other stakeholders such as those representing the farming community or communities just outside the Park and where this would involve people in voluntary roles or working for very small organisations, it might be appropriate to pay for their time. Tenderers should include the costs of any such payments in their budget for the development phase.

**Q: There's been various research already in different National Parks with specific groups such as farmers and land managers, local communities, visitors and those who've never visited. Have you been considering whether this research should focus on any one of those particular groups e.g. those who haven't visited or land managers because it's so important to have them on board?**

A: We want what comes out of this to be something that's very definitely a shared mandate. It's about ensuring that as wide a range of voices as possible are being included in the conversation and it's not about saying there's already been a lot done with x group in a particular place so we shouldn't worry too much about them or that's a good place to do a lot of work with a particular group because there's already good contacts with that specific group. It's more about making sure for example, in England, that the range of perspectives from a particular national park are being included.

In terms of the place to be chosen we're inviting tenderers to suggest places that they have particular links with or think will be particularly good places to do the research. We have also set out in the ITT those National Parks where either we've got partners that have already agreed to support this project such as the National Park Authority or the National Park Society or there's other work going on as part of National Parks Reimagined where we felt it might be particularly useful to focus on those places. But choosing the particular place to work in will be something we'll do in conjunction with the individual tenderer once the contract starts. And in Wales we really want to make sure that the conversations include a range of views from a representative sample of citizens from across the whole of the country.

In addition to this research, we're creating a toolkit that can be rolled out to local community groups to get their ideas and thoughts. This wouldn't necessarily feed directly into the deliberative research piece but there might be a way that we communicate some of the findings from that into the research. We're also looking at some sort of app or digital polling system where we could get top line data which could potentially feed into some of this work.

**Q: If you appoint two separate organisations for England and Wales, have you done any thinking about how they'd interact and learn from each other?**

A: If we appoint two separate contractors, we would definitely expect them to be willing to work collaboratively in terms of sharing information that would help with comparing the different approaches and also with other contractors working on other aspects of National Parks Reimagined, such as the evaluation. We've made this expectation clear in the ITT. How this will work in practice is something we'll need to consider in more detail with successful tenderers once appointed. We're conscious that in making our decision about who to appoint there are pros and cons of having one or two separate organisations but we're very open to both options.

**Q: How would you manage the situation if you appoint two separate contractors with wildly different approaches?**

A: We are actually looking for approaches that are somewhat different as we are asking for something different in each of the two countries because we want something that's place-based in England compared to a whole country approach in Wales so inevitably they will be different. But both approaches will need to be delivered within a similar framework in terms of time scales, outputs etc so we don't anticipate it being difficult to find ways of comparing them effectively.

**Q: As I understand it National Parks Reimagined is creating a vision for 75 years' time but most of us won't be around in 75 years' time so would it be easier to get people to think about the changes needed if we reframe that with a more realistic timescale?**

A: Although we're asking people to consider very long-term outcomes, they will also need to think about the changes that need to happen much sooner than that so it's going to be impossible to talk to people about what they want to change in shorter timescales. For example, if they want to have resilient, healthy landscapes thriving with wildlife and places that everyone gets an opportunity to visit in 75 years' time what needs to happen now or in two years' time to make sure that that can happen. Maybe other previous deliberative research hasn't looked so far into the future but a lot of

it is about asking people to think about the changes they want in order to deliver a different future. If tenderers really think that the long time scale is not workable then we'd be interested in suggestions as to how to frame the work in a way that would make the discussions more useful.

We are also in a development phase so our framing and our narrative is still very much open to development and certainly in considering some of the audiences that we're engaging with how we talk about National Parks is changing already. The ambition for a reimagining is a long-term vision but we recognise there is great work happening right now that is exactly what is needed for the future of National Parks and part of the wider project is focussed on recognising and connecting to that work.

**Q: Please could you say a little more about your routes to policy impact across the NPAs and wider governance structures.**

A: Perhaps one key difference between us and many of the other organisations who might commission deliberative research is that we are looking to use the outputs to secure changes in policy and practice in other organisations rather than changing what we do ourselves. So it is important for us that this research is able to influence organisations, such as NPAs, Welsh Government and Defra. To do this effectively, will require consideration of how key people from those organisations are involved from the start of the process to ensure that they are more likely to be receptive to the recommendations that emerge later.