

## **IHBC Response to HLF's future direction and funding consultation**

Submitted at <http://surveys.comres.co.uk/wix/2/p1862857042.aspx> at 18.28 on 22nd March 2018

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF's role in future should be to inspire, lead and resource the UK's heritage to create positive and lasting change for people and communities?**

**Strongly disagree**

Whilst communities and those who value heritage are important the Heritage Lottery should put the heritage itself at the forefront of its work. The heritage should remain the focus of the HLF and that focus should be directed where the heritage matters most to the community not where the community needs support. A community focus can lead to funding of the wrong projects leaving behind those most valuable and most in need.

**Thinking about the different aspects of HLF's role, other than grant-giving, please select and rank up to 5 that you think are most important for HLF to do.**

1. Supporting the capacity and resilience of the heritage sector as a whole
2. Advocating for the value of heritage
3. Attracting other public or private financial support for heritage
4. Building strategic partnerships and collaborations
5. Sharing learning

### **PART 2: Strategic priorities for heritage and people, + measuring our impact**

#### **Supporting the full breadth of heritage**

**Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) has developed a distinctive approach to making a 'lasting difference for heritage and people' across the UK.**

**This overall vision and direction has been widely supported and endorsed by stakeholders and the public in many previous consultations. In particular, National Lottery players told us that they value the fact that HLF takes an inclusive approach, doesn't define heritage and supports the full breadth of heritage across the UK.**

**We have no plans to change this - but we want to hear from you what our priorities should be for different types of heritage and in different parts of the UK.**

**Taken from the Heritage Lottery Fund Tailored Review**

**TR5. In its next Strategic Funding Framework HLF should:**

- a. clarify its own strategic priorities, explain how those priorities are identified and illustrate how evaluation and research are used to inform these**
- b. articulate its strategy for reaching underrepresented groups and geographical 'Priority Development Areas'**

**c. outline how it responds to priorities in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England, within the UK-wide framework.**

**What do you think are the most important heritage needs or opportunities that investment from the National Lottery should address in the UK?**

We think it is vital to maintain the HLF's involvement in and contribution to historic area funding, the regeneration of historic areas through Townscape Heritage schemes and previously through Townscape Heritage Initiatives has been a long standing success and contributes to the wider heritage of communities in a way that once off projects can not always do.

The reduction or removal of funding for certain distinct types of heritage such as churches and parks reduces funding ultimately available to these often struggling community assets.

**And what do you think are the most important heritage needs or opportunities that investment from the National Lottery should address in your region or country?**

No applicable comments as IHBC is a UK wide body

**Should HLF give priority to heritage considered to be 'at risk'?**

Yes

**And how would you define heritage that is 'at risk'? Please give as much detail as possible in your answer.**

Heritage at Risk should be an important mainstay of the funding offered by HLF. The HLF could remain in its role contributing part of the package to prevent heritage at risk from being lost entirely. But funding should not be seen as an incentive for neglect and the reasons heritage at risk or indeed those responsible for it should be taken into account: funding the person or body who neglected the building originally may not be appropriate whilst a new owner intending to save the building may well deserve funding subject to the price paid. Funding of Building Preservation Trusts and other owners of the last resort is especially to be encouraged.

Assessing risk may be through Historic England's Heritage At Risk list, local authority lists, amenity societies nationally and locally and through volunteer based HAR projects such as those funded by HLF. But the presence on a recognised list does not ensure that all heritage at risk is covered and other heritage may come to light which is more at risk than previously considered. The HLF should maintain a flexible approach to assessing risk and should consider the risk on an individual basis as part of the assessment process.

**How should HLF take account of different priorities for heritage in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales within a UK-wide framework?**

Whilst priorities may differ between countries as between other the HLF should be consistent in the approach. It may be that the proportion of money available for different streams may differ but the fundamental intention of what it is possible to fund should remain consistent.

**Addressing under-representation in HLF's funding and making heritage more inclusive**

Since 2002 HLF has offered outreach support to groups in areas and communities who have benefited least from HLF funding. We intend to continue to prioritise for development support people who are under-represented in our funding so that they are given the help they need to develop applications.

Since 2013 we have reduced the number of Local Authority areas that have received less than 25% of average per capita funding from 61 to 56, indicating some success in achieving a more even spread of funding. We have also supported a wide range of community groups to make successful applications. We need to do more.

Taken from the Heritage Lottery Fund Tailored Review:

Building on learning to date, HLF should develop a cohesive strategy for engaging underrepresented groups with heritage, to ensure that National Lottery money benefits as wide and diverse an audience as possible. HLF should capitalise on the benefits of digital tools to achieve this aim of broadening access.

HLF should ensure that funded projects collect audience data to ensure it is fully aware of who is currently engaging with the projects it funds and to assess its progress in broadening and diversifying audience participation.

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF should address under-representation in our funding of geographical areas that have received least funding in the past?**

Tend to disagree

The HLF's approach to priority areas has already been seen to have rewarded less deserving projects with less specialist support. Areas sometimes do not have so many applications for good reasons; less heritage of note or insufficient knowledge. Building up specialist knowledge and expertise with HLF support in an area to arm it better for making an application is worthwhile but targeting areas just because they have not benefitted much previously is not.

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF should address under-representation in our funding of geographical areas that experience deprivation?**

Tend to agree

Where strong projects might be developed and significant heritage could benefit then assistance with building skills to apply for funding and subsequently manage the heritage could be helpful. This should be done where the heritage in question warrants it and not where HLF take up has previously been low.

**We are continuing to drive forward our progressive agenda of broadening the range and depth of people's engagement with heritage. Our current Strategic Framework has encouraged more people to volunteer, to learn and to develop skills. Guidance and mentoring have helped applicants to broaden audiences, make heritage more accessible and tackle a lack of workforce diversity. But there is still more to do to engage people who are under-represented in heritage, such as people from black, Asian or minority ethnic communities and disabled people.**

**We are committed to taking leadership to achieve higher levels of inclusion in heritage, which is key to a flourishing more equitable society. We know it is a priority for Lottery players that everybody, regardless of age, disability, ethnicity, sexuality, class or income should have**

**opportunities to get involved. Working in partnership with sectors outside heritage, e.g. youth organisations or disability or housing charities, is increasingly important in this context.**

**The social groups in the list below are ones that we focus on, in line with our policy directions and the public sector Equality Duty. Are there groups you think we ought to prioritise in our Strategic Funding Framework? Please select all that apply.**

HLF should not prioritise social groups in its next Strategic Funding Framework

**How could HLF respond to any specific barriers you know these groups face in applying for funding to support their community's heritage?**

Supporting under represented groups in the development, application and subsequent management of the heritage would appear to be worthwhile. Weighting funding towards such groups and as a result funding heritage which may not be so important overall is not.

A weighting of funding towards a reflection of funding the UK demographic may cause more funding to be concentrated in urban areas which do reflect this demographic and other areas may not benefit from funding as a result.

**How could HLF respond to any specific barriers you know these groups face accessing heritage opportunities?**

No specific suggestions

**How could HLF most effectively support all organisations to reach a wider range of beneficiaries?**

HLF should work at a strategic level to build relationships between the sector and groups which have historically been less engaged.

**How could HLF most effectively support organisations to collect better data on who is benefiting from heritage projects?**

No specific suggestions on how this is done but any collection of data should be simple for applicants to collect if necessary.

**Achieving quality and measuring our impact**

**In 2013 we introduced an outcomes framework which forms part of our assessment and decision making process, to help us make comparative judgements of projects, alongside our view of the applicant's business case, risk and value for money. This has worked well in supporting applicants to consider carefully the difference they want to make for heritage and people, and providing the basis for higher-quality project evaluations and evidence of impact. We will continue to require applicants to produce thorough proposals for evaluation and to budget realistically for this as part of their grant.**

**For our next Strategic Funding Framework we will make some changes to the current range of outcomes we expect our funding to achieve and will set some corporate objectives linked to those as the basis of measuring the overall impact of National Lottery investment in heritage.**

**Below is the list of outcomes we propose to cover in our new Strategic Funding Framework –these will be used to prioritise funding and measure impact.**

- 1. Heritage will be in better condition**
- 2. Heritage will be identified and better explained**
- 3. People will have developed skills**

4. People will have learnt about heritage
5. People will have greater well-being
6. A wider range of people will be involved in heritage
7. The funded organisation will be more resilient
8. The local area will be a better place to live, work or visit
9. The local economy will be boosted

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF should focus on these nine outcomes?**

Strongly disagree

**Why do you say that?**

These outcomes do not read as the main priorities of a body dedicated to support of the heritage. The heritage sector has limited funding opportunities and the HLF is a leader amongst these. The HLF should have strong heritage lead outcomes not repeat the priorities of other non heritage funders.

**We recognise that our funding has long delivered well-being benefits for individuals, evidenced in our evaluations, and now plan to reflect this more explicitly through 19 introducing an additional 'well-being' outcome. Well-being is gaining wider currency across the cultural sector, and there are established definitions and measures available. We want to recognise the personal well-being benefits which heritage projects achieve for those with lowest relative well-being**

**Do you have any comments on how people might gain greater well-being through heritage projects?**

Maintaining a focus on areas based heritage lead regeneration will ensure that historic areas of all types and for all communities maintain high quality of life and standard of health and well being.

**PART 3: Strategic interventions and partnerships**

**The shifting policy and operating environment for the UK's heritage continues to present significant challenges, but also opportunities.**

**We want to build on recent investments in resilience (Catalyst5 and Resilient Heritage6), and place-making (the Great Place Scheme7), and other interventions to maximise the wider impact and role of heritage in society. We want to see cultural and natural heritage at the centre of social and economic regeneration, and opportunities presented by developments in digital technology and new models of business and enterprise being seized.**

**Place-making**

**Heritage shapes how people identify with the places they live, work and play in. Yet a role for heritage is frequently missing in conversations and plans for how places can develop into the future, as shown in our 2016 research Networked Heritage8. In our next Strategic Funding Framework we are interested in developing new approaches to place-based funding that would offer an opportunity for communities of all kinds - from major urban centres to rural areas - to put heritage at the heart of their economic and social development, and to decide for themselves how to invest our funding to achieve their goals.**

**Our approach to place-based funding would cover all types of heritage, including those previously funded through programmes targeted at parks, townscapes, landscapes and places of worship and could include new areas of investment such as enabling the re-use of historic buildings for housing.**

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF should focus on putting heritage at the heart of placemaking across the UK?**

Strongly agree

**Who would be the most appropriate partners for HLF and what should their contribution be?**

Historic England especially with Heritage Action Zones

BEIS – As part of the placemaking element of the industrial strategy.

Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government through the NPPF

**Heritage and enterprise Launched in April 2013, Heritage Enterprise was a pioneering new funding programme designed to stimulate local economic growth by unlocking the commercial potential of unused heritage buildings and sites. Analysis of the schemes that HLF has already supported, allied with feedback from sector stakeholders, confirms that there is an appetite for HLF to do more to support the regeneration potential of underutilised heritage assets.**

**We could take a more commercial approach, encouraging projects more actively targeted towards the private sector. We might also consider whether projects could be funded through loans or a blend of loans and grants, depending on the planned end use of the building or site.**

**It could also be more closely focussed on heritage at risk and historic assets located in the most deprived areas where there is clear market failure and that demonstrate the potential for regeneration.**

**Collaboration with LEPs, Historic England and DCLG, for example, could enable HLF to achieve greater strategic impact with projects building on the Heritage Enterprise model. This might include projects that, for example, address the major challenge of industrial heritage at risk, or have the potential to address housing need.**

**Should HLF fund more commercially focused approaches to support projects with a focus on enterprise and skills?  Yes**

**Do you have any suggestions about how HLF can best work with other organisations to support the viable reuse of existing underutilised buildings?**

### **Resilience and capacity building**

**Since 2012 we have provided support to organisations working in heritage to rise to the challenges presented by reduced public funding. These have included capacity building programmes for income generation, governance and fundraising skills, early-stage funding to new organisations, transition funding for previous grant recipients to review business plans, governance and strategic direction, and interventions to build endowments and increase private giving to heritage.**

**We are committed to helping organisations to adapt to the current uncertain financial and operating context. We want to support organisations to build resilience and entrepreneurial approaches, develop new sources of income, increase private fundraising, build business and financial management skills, and to be ready to respond to opportunities presented by new sources of finance and digital innovations. When investing in the resilience of organisations, we will continue to prioritise protecting past National Lottery investment in heritage.**

**How can HLF best support heritage organisations across the UK to become more enterprising and financially sustainable? Please select and rank the top three ways in which you think HLF could do this, placing the numbers 1-3 in the corresponding box.**

1. Provide funding to individual organisations to achieve strategic organisational change
2. Provide small-scale funding to help organisations build their fundraising capacity and skills
3. Fund business support training and capacity building programmes, including in investment readiness

Provide early-stage funding to support new organisations and enterprises in setting their direction

Provide funding for testing new ideas, such as the viability of new commercial activity

Other, please specify

or

HLF should not support heritage organisations to become more enterprising and financially sustainable

### **Non-grant finance**

**We see opportunities to make National Lottery investment go further and building the capacity of the heritage sector by offering a proportion of our funding as repayable grants, loans, or other types of social investment (an investment requiring both a social and financial return) where appropriate - for example where organisations can generate income from their HLF project or need working capital. We will continue to provide help and support in investment readiness to enable more organisations to gain the financial and other skills needed to use repayable finance.**

**We could also use our investment to attract additional funding for heritage from others, for example, through an 'Impact Fund' model where HLF investment is augmented by funds from others, distributed as loans or equity investments. We expect to pilot some approaches to this in the near future.**

Taken from the Heritage Lottery Fund Tailored Review TR25

**HLF should explore whether alternative options to pure grant giving would support the sustainability of the sector. DCMS, DEFRA, DCLG and the devolved administrations should work with HLF as alternative fundraising mechanisms are developed, to support the take-up of new options where appropriate.**

**What is your organisation's experience of non-grant finance (e.g. loans, equity investments, crowdfunding)? Please choose the description that best reflects your current position.**

- We already use non-grant finance as part of our funding mix x
- We plan to take on non-grant finance in the near future
- We are in the early stages of exploring non-grant finance
- We have no experience of non-grant finance, but are interested in exploring it
- We have no experience of non-grant finance, and are not interested in exploring it
- We wanted to explore non-grant finance but were unable to identify ways of repaying
- We have explored non-grant finance but decided not to take it on

What, if anything, would make your organisation more likely to take up non-grant finance such as loans or equity investment? Please select all that apply.

- Increased knowledge or skills in financial management and business planning
- Increased knowledge or skills in impact measurement
- Having an income source that we could use to repay a loan
- Increased confidence among trustees about levels of risk
- Greater flexibility on what sorts of projects we can get funding for
- Access to funds designed for heritage and/or cultural organisations
- Preferable rates
- Other, please specify

Or

- We have no current need to use non-grant finance

Please answer if you work for an organisation.

What support, if any, would be most useful for your organisation in helping you to access non-grant finance? Please select and rank your top 3.

3. Capacity building support in financial management and business planning

Capacity building support in impact measurement

1. Capacity building support in income generation

Capacity building support for governance reviews

2. Greater flexibility in what sorts of projects HLF will fund

Providing funding for projects as part grant/part loan or equity investment

Attracting partners to invest in funds designed for heritage and/or cultural organisations

Other, please specify

Or:

None of these

Why do you say that?

Establishing a firm business foundation for organisations working with heritage will ensure long term management of the heritage and not risk loss of HLF funded investment in the years following any project.

Recent research by Nesta in partnership with Heritage Lottery Fund and Arts Council England demonstrated significant financial and non-financial benefits arising from a matched crowd-

**funding approach, whereby an institution such as HLF offered to match fund money raised by the 'crowd' for small and medium-sized projects (£4000-£40,000).**

**Should HLF provide match funding for organisations who use crowd-funding to win support for their heritage projects?**

Yes

No

Don't know

**Why do you say that?**

Matchfunding of any type if secure should be considered. The finding of funding to secure the package can be very difficult and if funding is available the it should be taken into account.

### **Digital**

**Digital technology can help organisations look after heritage and make it accessible to a wide range of people in many different ways from digitising historic photographs and 3D laser scanning of buildings to online access to remote sites, collecting biodiversity data and crowd-sourcing community stories. It can also help heritage organisations to thrive through improving their management, marketing, fundraising, communications and public offer.**

**HLF encourages the use of digital technology in any way that helps a project achieve our outcomes; we recognise that there is more we can do to support in this area. The Tailored Review recommends that HLF work strategically to support the sector to use digital technology effectively and to access funding for digital projects.**

**How could HLF better support organisations to use digital technology to...**

- A) Create and make available high quality digital content**
- B) Increase engagement with heritage**
- C) Diversify audiences for heritage**
- D) Make heritage more inclusive**
- E) Increase organisational efficiency and resilience.**
- F) Build the digital literacy of staff, volunteers, and trustees/governors**

**How could HLF help organisations ensure that their digital content is accessible to the public now and safeguarded for the future?**

**How could HLF support innovation in the use of digital technology by organisations that look after heritage and engage the public with it?**

### **International**

**HLF should support the projects and organisations it funds to promote themselves and the sector internationally, and to engage further with the GREAT Britain campaign and tourism campaigns led by the devolved nations.**

**Taken from the Heritage Lottery Fund Tailored Review**

**We are looking at what we can do to support the sector to take up new opportunities for growth and learning. More opportunities can be opened up by broadening the UK heritage sector's international engagement and global reach. In 2017, together with the British Council, we brought**

together heritage and tourism leaders and practitioners to discuss our potential role in supporting international engagement. We are interested the role we can play in supporting heritage organisations to promote themselves and the sector internationally, exchange knowledge and support tourism campaigns.

How could HLF support the heritage sector to engage internationally and deliver benefits for the UK? Please select all that apply.

- Support for UK heritage organisations to promote themselves internationally
- Support for knowledge exchange with organisations overseas
- Work strategically with partners to develop heritage-led inbound tourism
- Other, please specify

involving the public in our decision making

Should HLF involve the public in decision-making?

Yes

No

Don't know

Please answer if you think the HLF should involve the public in decision-making.

Why do you say that?

To ensure best value for its investment the HLF should continue to rely on specialist input as to the suitability of applications. The funding of heritage should not become a popularity competition. Limited public involvement such as that previously done through the Restoration series to raise awareness and input may be possible.

## **PART 4: Our Portfolio**

### **Our portfolio**

We are committed to improving our application processes and making it easier for people to apply for grants for all types of heritage. We want our next SFF to be flexible and enable us to respond quickly to new areas of need and opportunity as they emerge.

We expect to offer open funding opportunities for any type of heritage, with grants starting below £10,000, as well as:

- Strategic campaigns, which may be UK-wide or locally based, and will be time-limited, to attract applications for types of project missing from our portfolio
- Partnership initiatives, including non-grant finance, on issues such as place-making, as set out in part 3;
- Innovation funds, which could be small-scale partnership interventions to test ideas and drive progress in areas such as developing new business models.

This will reduce the number of separate grant programmes we offer, which will enable us to provide clearer routes to funding for applicants.

We will provide new guidance and resources to support applicants with projects focusing on specific types of heritage such as landscapes, places of worship, parks or townscapes, to ensure that the good practice achieved through our investment to date is embedded in the new open programme and our future approach to place-making.

**We may set specific requirements for certain types of project where our evaluations of previous strategic initiatives demonstrate clearly what works and produces the greatest impact. For example, we would expect future work-based skills training projects to be based on the learning from Skills for the Future<sup>9</sup>.**

**Each year we will review the need for strategic campaigns and will advertise new funding opportunities in advance so that applicants can plan with confidence.**

**HLF should better and more consistently embed learning from project and programme evaluations into the organization, using lessons about successes and failures to inform programme design, strengthen the advice given to applicants and ensure decision-making is focused on building a sustainable sector.**

**Taken from the Heritage Lottery Fund Tailored Review**

**The open grant programme**

**For funding up to £10,000 and from £10,000 up to £250,000 we plan to accept applications at any time, for any type of heritage project.**

**These will be single-round applications (as now) with decisions made on an application in around 8 weeks.**

**We propose to increase the upper ceiling for single-round applications from the current £100,000 to £250,000 which will enable a wider range of projects to benefit from a quicker decision and simpler application and monitoring processes.**

**For grants over £250,000 we will set out our priorities for support following this consultation, for example, priorities for heritage and people as identified in part 1. We expect to accept applications around four times a year, as we do now.**

**We will have proportionate requirements and processes for each of the grant levels under the open programmes:**

- Under £10,000**
- £10,000-£250,000**
- Over £250,000**

**Do you have any comments on our proposal for an open grant programme for all types of heritage project?**

An open grants programme could benefit organisations that are better able to make applications. Ensuring fair access to all would be important in this case.

Simpler application procedures and guidance will be the only way to encourage applications from underrepresented groups and areas.

Do you agree with the proposal that we increase the ceiling for single-round grants from

£100,000 to £250,000?

Yes

No

Don't know

**We currently have no upper limit on the value of our grants. In the current Strategic Framework since 2013 we have made 20 awards over £5m and up to £19.7m, and given the green light to 11 further projects to develop their proposals.**

**With a lower annual budget, should HLF set an upper limit on awards?**

Yes

No

**If you do think HLF should set an upper limit on awards, what should that limit be?**

**Why do you say that?**

Setting an upper limit would not be of any help and could hamper the development of the most important projects. These are always exceptional projects and ones for which the higher level of funding is vital.

**How should HLF strike a balance of offering larger and smaller awards?**

HLF should fund both larger and smaller projects.

**Strategic campaigns**

**We propose to introduce strategic campaigns which will be time-limited and could be delivered across the UK or within a single region or country. They will enable a shorter-term emphasis on specific opportunities such as encouraging more applications from certain groups or areas, or running alongside events or anniversaries. They may be offered at any level of grant.**

**Strategic campaigns will be focused on needs or opportunities we have identified. They could be based on particular areas of heritage, or aspects of people's engagement with it (e.g. skills, well-being), or a particular beneficiary group (e.g. young people), or cross-cutting needs (e.g. building resilience or digital capabilities across the sector).**

**We will also continue to make strategic interventions in partnership with others as opportunities arise, for example through solicitation of bids to meet strategic needs or programmes that will drive innovation and build capacity across the sector.**

**What needs or opportunities should HLF prioritize for strategic campaigns in the early years of the next Strategic Funding Framework?**

**For certain types of strategic campaign we could consider making grant offers at a fixed rate – for example, we would announce in advance that we want to make say 10 awards of £1m to address a specific strategic need or opportunity, and invite proposals.**

**Do you see benefits in HLF offering fixed rate grants for certain types of project through strategic campaigns?**

Yes

No

Don't know

It is important to judge each applicant on its own individual benefits and not accept projects in order to spend on a identified funding stream.

**Partnership funding**

**We want to maximise the value and benefits achieved through National Lottery investment in heritage while ensuring that the projects we support are financially viable and sustainable. We can provide support for organisations to develop their fundraising capacity and skills and expect to offer more resources to help organisations improve their governance, business and financial planning skills in future. There are a number of ways in which we could ensure that we**

are contributing financially to projects at the right level and realistically maximising the contributions from others.

We currently require partnership funding (in cash or in kind (e.g. through free use of a venue)) to be contributed by grantees at the following minimum rates:

- Up to £100K – no minimum contribution (in kind and volunteer contributions encouraged)
- Over £100K and up to £1m – 5% cash or in kind
- Over £1m – 10% cash or in kind

Should we make changes to this approach?

- Yes - require more partnership funding
- Yes - require less partnership funding
- No - retain the current approach

How should HLF achieve a balance between offering open funding opportunities and strategic interventions through campaigns, partnership programmes or innovation funds?

- HLF should prioritise investment in the open grant programme
- HLF should give equal weight to investment in open funding and strategic interventions
- HLF should prioritise investment in strategic interventions

Do you agree or disagree that all projects should embed environmental sustainability and that this should be part of our standard criteria for the assessment of applications? Disagree

Why do you say that?

This requirement could lead to damaging and inappropriate retrofit activities on historic buildings in a mistaken attempt to make an already sustainable building more so.

How should HLF ensure applicants follow best practice on environmental sustainability and address the potential negative impacts of climate change?

The HLF should be clear that certain sustainability measures which are damaging to the heritage are usually not appropriate as part of an application. The inherent sustainability of historic buildings should be emphasised as a starting point and suitable retrofit encouraged only where it is not at all detrimental to the building.

## IMPROVING THE EXPERIENCE FOR CUSTOMERS

Which of the following resources do you think would be most helpful to applicants preparing proposals and applications? Please rank the top three most helpful.

- 3 Application guidance documents and help notes
- Video guides to navigating the online application process
- 'Top tips' short videos from successful grantees
- 2 Digital peer to peer support through an online community
- Online toolkits and guidance on specialist topics
- Webinars on specialist topics

Self-assessment tools/or checklists to identify 'project readiness'

1 Tailored advice, such as a telephone helpline and/or chat facility

**Why did you give these rankings?**

The current application process is complicated and confusing for many. More on the spot one to one advice as the application is being developed would help applications progress quicker with less delay and frustration.

**Do you agree or disagree that HLF should introduce an Expression of Interest screening stage for larger grants?** Strongly agree

**Why do you say that?**

This will give potential applicants more of an idea of their chances of success and what to do to make that more likely.

**Making it easier to apply for a grant from HLF**

**We are interested in views on how we can best ensure that Lottery funding is used effectively and on how we can make it easier to apply for a grant from HLF.**

**Please answer if you have experience of applying for an HLF grant.**

**In your opinion was the work involved in preparing an application proportionate to the size of grant you applied for?**

Yes

No

Don't know

**Why do you say that?**

The application process is considered by many to be complex and confusing.

**How could HLF simplify its application processes to ensure they are as accessible as possible (for example by accepting applications by video or other online media, or using face-to-face, telephone or online interviews as part of the assessment process)?**

Simpler applications requiring much less paperwork and more help on developing the application

**How could HLF use digital technology to improve the customer experience for applicants and grantees?**

**How could HLF make its processes for managing your grant post-award more efficient?**

**PART 6: Final comments, review and submit**

**Are there any other comments you would like to make?**