Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund Wave 2.2 Application Form

**Guidance to Applicants:**

Please read the Competition Guidance Notes carefully before completing this form and provide sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the Eligibility Criteria and the Evaluation Criteria.

Applicants are encouraged to write self-contained responses, within the word count given to limit the size of the application. Responses that exceed the word count will be considered up to the word limit stated, with text exceeding the limit disregarded. Applicants are requested to maintain the structure of the application form. Applicants are asked not to include pictures or images in their written responses.

**Scoring of Responses:**

This application form contains three types of questions:

1. Questions that are assessed and weighted to contribute towards the application score (these questions will be flagged as ‘assessed and weighted’)
2. Binary questions that are not weighted and do not count towards the overall score. These will still be assessed and responses will either pass or not pass that individual question (these questions will be flagged as ‘assessed but not weighted’). Binary questions will form part of moderation and will be considered as part of the suitability review.
3. Questions that are for information only and will not be assessed (these questions will be flagged as ‘for information only’) – whilst not marked, this will help DESNZ understand necessary information on projects, and therefore enable facilitation of effective delivery.

Eligible proposals will be ranked based upon their total score. In general, applications with higher scores will qualify for funding ahead of those with lower scores, with funding provided to as many applications judged as suitable within the budget available. All applications will be moderated after assessment, and a portfolio review will be undertaken, including a suitability review of applications that score well overall but poorly on one or more individual question(s). For clarity, this suitability review includes both applications scoring poorly on a question weighted to contribute towards the application score, and applications not ‘passing’ a binary question. The outcome of the suitability review may result in a change in the eligible proposal ranking or a proposal no longer being regarded as eligible.

**Guidance to Consortia Applicants:**

Consortia Applicants should submit a single application to DESNZ, which is co-ordinated by the consortium lead. The consortium lead is responsible for ensuring that the information provided in this application form is correct, including the information provided on other consortia members. The supplied Grant Funding Agreement sets out full information on the responsibilities of the consortia lead.

The responses in the application form should focus on the consortium lead’s approach, with high level information about the approach taken by other consortium members. Where it is not appropriate for the consortium lead alone to draft the response submitted (e.g. they are not stock-holding or have a comparatively small project to other members), the responses in the application form should focus on the largest consortium member’s approach (in terms of number of homes being retrofitted). The responses should give a more detailed view of the largest consortium member project, while still giving high level information about the other consortium members. Where consortia choose to adopt a unified approach to a particular topic, this should be detailed in the response to DESNZ. Consortia applicants will be granted an extended word count allowance to convey these additional details in their response. Questions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 have specific guidance to consortia applicants, which differs to this approach and should be noted.

Within the supplementary tables provided, all consortia members will be required to provide individual data on the stock they are applying with, the retrofits proposed, and the modelled outcomes of those retrofits. When completing the supplementary tables to the application form, each consortia member should input their own data in individual tabs provided. The consortia lead is responsible for ensuring that the data summary correctly encompasses the data from each consortia member’s individual tab.

**Application Submission Details:**

Details of the submission process will be made available in November 2023 on the [SHDF Wave 2.2 webpage](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-housing-decarbonisation-fund-wave-2). Applications must be submitted by the Lead Applicant as defined in Section 2.1. All completed application forms and required attachments must be submitted by 23.59 on the bid submission deadline, in January 2024. Proposals received after the application deadline will not be considered.

**Declarations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Declarations |  |
| I have the express authority to fill out this application on behalf of the lead applicant and its project partners.  | [yes/ no] |
| The lead applicant acknowledges that, if successful, it will be expected to deliver the project as outlined in this proposal. | [yes/ no] |
| I have read the accompanying guidance document and other related documents for completing this proposal. | [yes/ no] |
| To the best of my knowledge, this proposal is legally compliant with any commercial agreements it uses. | [yes/ no] |
| The directors of the lead applicant do not have a financial interest in any suppliers they plan to use. | [yes/ no] |
| To the best of my knowledge, the proposed project is compliant with the UK Public Contract Regulations 2015. | [yes/ no] |
| I confirm that the VAT position on this application form has been signed off by a relevant financial officer. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant confirms that all homes/ upgrades included in this project are intended to fit wholly within the specifications outlined in the accompanying guidance document. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant will introduce controls designed to ensure that SHDF competition funding will not be blended with other government schemes such as ECO for the funding of the same individual measure. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant has consulted their Data Protection Officer and built-in plans to ensure deliverability of data sharing requirements with DESNZ, including the completion of a Data Protection Impact Assessment. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant will ensure that tenants, installers and delivery partners receive both DESNZ’s and their own project-specific Privacy Notice, outlining how their personal data will be processed within the project and wider programme, in line with the terms of GDPR. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant agrees to acknowledge DESNZ's funding in all communications regarding the project, with reference to any branding stipulated by DESNZ, and support collection of case studies, as well as dissemination of case studies subject to DESNZ approval. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant acknowledges that DESNZ will contact a sub-sample of tenants, installers and delivery teams as part of the independent evaluation of the SHDF and will incorporate this as part of their project Privacy Notice. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant agrees to collate and transfer data, including personal data, as described in the Data Sharing Agreement, necessary to manage benefits and deliver evaluation of the programme.  | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant agrees to the performance management requirements outlined in the guidance document. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant will ensure projects are carried out to strict safety standards and that all work conducted through the SHDF will be compliant with all specifications and requirements set out in PAS2035 and appropriate safety and construction standards, including Construction, Design and Management (CDM) regulations and any statutory requirements for Principal Designs to be appointed. | [yes/ no] |
| Please confirm the Lead Applicant understands and acknowledges the terms and conditions of the supplied Grant Funding Agreement. | [yes/ no] |
| Please confirm that the Lead Applicant understands that funding not spent in the required timeframe is not guaranteed and applicants may have to take on any costs themselves in such instances, as set out in the supplied Grant Funding Agreement. | [yes/ no] |
| The Lead Applicant confirms that energy bills will not increase for tenants owing to works carried out through SHDF Wave 2.2. | [yes/no] |
| The Lead Applicant confirms that no homes retrofitted through a previous wave of the SHDF will be retrofitted through Wave 2.2, even with different measures. | [yes/no] |
| The Lead Applicant confirms that the proposal is in alignment with the following statement:“Landlords who have been successful in receiving funding through Wave 2.1 of the SHDF, and have signed a Grant Funding Agreement with DESNZ, either directly or as part of a consortia, will not be eligible to apply for Wave 2.2 with their stock. Organisations that received Wave 2.1 funding may lead a consortia for Wave 2.2, providing they do not retrofit their own stock.” | [yes/no] |
| Please provide an explanation if you have answered “no” to any of the above statements. | **Answer:** |

**Subsidy control questions (for information only)**

* These questions are to help us understand how you fit into our obligations to control and report on subsidies.
* Your answers to these questions will not affect whether or not you are eligible for or receive funding.
* Please answer the questions for either single applicants or consortiums, depending on which applies to you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| For single applicants |  |
| I have the express authority to fill out this application on behalf of the lead organisation and its project partners.  | [yes/ no] |
| For consortium applicants |  |
| I have the express authority to fill out this application on behalf of the lead organisation and its project partners.  | [yes/ no] |

# Application Details

**Section A: Details of Lead Applicant**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All questions in section A are for information only. |  |
| Name of lead applicant and type of body:*Name of the lead, e.g. Local Authority, Combined Authority, registered provider of social housing, or registered charity. Please ensure that names are listed here as they appear in the gov.uk list of registered providers[[1]](#footnote-2) or register of charities[[2]](#footnote-3).* |  |
| Company number of lead applicant (if applicable):*If the lead applicant is a Housing Association, please include your company number and DUNS number:* |  |
| Charity number of lead applicant (if applicable):*If the lead applicant is a Charity, please include your registered charity number.* |  |
| Is this a consortium application? *A consortium is an application containing more than one social landlord.* | [yes/ no] |
| Is your application subject to UK Subsidy Control Requirements? *Please provide brief evidence to support this position. Further information can be found in section 2.3 of the competition guidance document.* |  |
| Are there private properties (private rental sector or owner occupier) included in your application as well as social homes? And if so, have you/will you seek a declaration from the relevant economic sector that they do not exceed the Small Amounts of Funding Exemption in respect of elements of the bid that related to non-social homes[[3]](#footnote-4)?*Please provide brief evidence to support this position.* |  |
| *[Individual applications only]* In any three-year consecutive fiscal period, will you/have you received state support of under £315,000?*If the answer is yes, please state the amount of state support given.* |  |
| *[Consortium applications only]* Name(s) and organisational type of consortium partners in application:*Consortium partners can be Local Authorities, Combined Authorities, Registered Providers of social housing, Arms-Length Management Organisations or Registered Charities. Please specify whether each organisation is a Local Authority, Combined Authority, Housing Association or other type of organisation and whether each organisation is a registered provider. (Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.1)* |  |
| *[Consortium applications only]* Contact details of consortium partners in application:*This question is only required for consortium applications. You should provide an email address for each consortium partner.*  |  |
| *[Consortium applications only]* In any three-year consecutive fiscal period, have/will the members of the consortium together receive/have received state support of under £315,000?*If the answer is yes, please provide the amount of state support, broken down into each consortium member.* |  |
| Lead applicant town/ city:*You should enter the town/ city in which the lead applicant is located. You will also be required to enter the postcodes of targeted properties in the supplementary tables provided.* |  |
| Lead Applicant Region:*Please select: North West, North East, Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands, West Midlands, East, London, South East, South West, Nationwide (if Nationwide, please also state the region with the highest stock holding).* |  |
| Name and role of the individual drafting this proposal:*This individual will be considered the main contact. DESNZ will contact this individual if we have any questions or updates on the status of the application. You may provide more than one contact name if helpful for resilience purposes.* |  |
| Email address of the individual drafting this proposal:*DESNZ will use this email address to provide confirmation and receipt of the submitted application form. DESNZ will use this email address as the primary source for any updates to the lead applicant on the status of their application. You may provide more than one email address if helpful for resilience purposes.* |  |
| Phone number of the individual drafting this proposal:*This is an optional field; this information is requested in case DESNZ are unable to reach the Applicant by email. You may provide more than one phone number if helpful for resilience purposes.* |  |
| Partner Organisations:*Please provide the names of any partner organisations contributing to this application, and their roles within your project’s delivery model.*  |  |
| Comms and Media Contact:*Please provide a designated PR and Comms contact for your organisation for media-related enquiries.* |  |

**Section B: Summary Information**

|  |
| --- |
| All questions in section B are for information only. |
| Public description of project:*If this application is successful, DESNZ may wish to publicise the results of the scheme which may involve engagement with the media. At the end of the application and assessment process, DESNZ may issue a press release or publish a notice on its website. Applicants should summarise their project goals and ensure the summary is suitable for public disclosure. Applicants could include information including:** *Project title*
* *Lead and consortia members*
* *Region*
* *Number of homes treated*
* *Project cost*

*DESNZ reserves the right to amend the description before publication if necessary but will consult the applicant about any changes.**Single bidder word limit – 100, consortia bid word limit – 150* |  |
| Total project costs: | Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| *[Consortium applications only]* Total project costs, split by consortia member:*This question is only required for consortium applications.**Please add additional organisation name/costs depending on the size of your consortium.* | Organisation Name:Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT:Organisation Name:Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| Total SHDF Wave 2.2 grant funding applied for: | Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| *[Consortium applications only]* Total SHDF Wave 2.2 grant funding applied for, split by consortia member:*Please add additional organisation name/costs depending on the size of your consortium.* | Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| Total co-funding contribution: | Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| *[Consortium applications only]* Total co-funding contribution, split by consortia member:*Please add additional organisation name/costs depending on the size of your consortium.* | Including non-recoverable VAT:Excluding VAT: |
| Blended Funding: Are you intending to use funding secured from another Government scheme alongside SHDF funding?*Funding must be secured by the point of application to SHDF.* | [yes/no]Scheme Name:Amount (£): |
| *[If the Lead Applicant or any consortia member is not a Registered Provider]:* The Lead Applicant confirms that properties included in this application fall under the definition of social housing[[4]](#footnote-5) (except for non-social housing included for the purposes of infill) and has provided evidence in Annex A. Evidence should include rent rates for the properties being considered for retrofit, with a market rate comparison. This is recommended to be attached as a spreadsheet. | [yes/no] |
| Please state whether the following annexes are included in your application:*On the table below, DESNZ has stated which bids each annex is mandatory for.**Annexes should be used to provide further information, such as screenshots of modelling or evidence of quotes, to further illustrate the written justification provided within this document. Applicants should not use the annex as a way of negating the word count.* *A guideline annex length has been provided in the table below for each annex. There is no upper limit on annex lengths, however DESNZ expects applicants to keep annexes as concise as possible and only include the information requested. DESNZ will take a proportionate approach to the assessment of annexes exceeding the guideline length, and annexes that exceed the guideline length provided may not be assessed in full.* *Consortia bidders should abide by the guidelines to consortia when supplying annexes: the responses in the application form should focus on the consortium lead’s approach, with high level information about the approach taken by other consortium members. Questions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 require annexes and have specific guidance to consortia applicants, which differs to this approach and should be noted.* |
| Annex A: Evidence that properties fall under social housing definition c*Guideline annex length: one spreadsheet tab per applicant who is not a registered provider.* | [yes/no] |
| Annex B: stock identification and steps taken to ensure data provided in table 1 is accurate. [mandatory annex for all applicants]*Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 3 pages, consortia – up to 5 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex C: modelling methodology used to identify the measures proposed in table 2, and the outputs of retrofits outlined in table 3 [mandatory annex for all applicants.]*Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 1 page, consortia – up to 2 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex D: evidence that bills will not increase as a result of works [mandatory annex in homes where low carbon heating is proposed.] *Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages*  | [yes/ no] |
| Annex E: justification where EPC F/G homes are not expected to meet EPC C [mandatory only if EPC F/G homes are not expected to meet EPC C]*Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex F: project plan [Mandatory] | [yes/ no] |
| Annex G: risk and issues register [Mandatory] | [yes/ no] |
| Annex H: project team capacity and capability [Mandatory]*Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex I: evidence to support your confidence in delivering this project [Mandatory]*Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 1 page, consortia – up to 2 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex J: proof of cost justification [Mandatory] *Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 4 pages, consortia – up to 6 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex K: proof of co funding [Mandatory] *Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 5 pages, consortia – up to 8 pages* | [yes/ no] |
| Annex L: evidence to support application if under 100 social homes below EPC C | [yes/ no] |

# 2. Strategic Fit

|  |
| --- |
| Worth 35% of the total marks |
| Minimum bid size |
| 2.0)*Assessed but not weighted* | **All Wave 2.2 proposals should include a minimum of 100 eligible social housing properties at EPC band D-G per bid. Applicants wishing to apply to Wave 2.2 with fewer than 100 eligible social housing properties at EPC band D-G should first look to submit a bid as part of a consortium, with this consortium bid meeting the minimum threshold. Recognising the shorter delivery window on Wave 2.2 compared to Wave 2.1, if neither of the above are possible despite every effort, then applicants may submit a bid with fewer than 100 homes with strong justification. It is expected that in such cases bids should be as close to 100 homes as possible.****If this bid contains fewer than 100 social homes below EPC C, please provide evidence for all of the following:*** **Why your organisation could not apply with 100 social homes below EPC C;** *(e.g., stock data outlining that this was not possible)*
* **Why your organisation could not join a consortium** *(e.g., evidence of engagement with the Social Housing Retrofit Accelerator on failed consortia matching)***; and**
* **Why your organisation could not apply with more homes, closer to the 100-home minimum** *(e.g., stock data outlining that this was not possible)***.**

Evidence of these should be provided in Annex L. The examples of evidence for each category are indicative of the type of evidence that will be expected. Other forms of evidence, as may be relevant under each category, will be considered on a case-by-case basis.  |
| Proposed works to social homes |
| 2.1.a) *Assessed and weighted* | **Please complete tables 1-3 in the accompanying document.** *Tables 1-3 will request information for homes starting below EPC C. This will include the starting characteristics of selected stock, the proposed measures to be installed, and the expected performances outcomes of the retrofit work. Questions 2.1.b – 2.6 will provide the opportunity to justify the retrofit approach proposed.* |
| 2.1.b)*Assessed and weighted* | **How have you identified the stock and made sure the data you have provided in table 1 is accurate? Evidence may be submitted as Annex B.***Applicants should explain the stock assessment process that was used to identify these homes as being suitable for this application. Please outline the approach that has been taken to provide accurate data, including any steps taken to mitigate against reliance on poor quality data.* *The starting point for this is expected to be SAP, RdSAP or PHPP. This must be evidenced in annex B (e.g. through EPC certificates of an appropriate sample of stock. Applicants are not required to provide evidence in annexes for all homes included in their bid but are expected to provide evidence for at least one home representative of each archetype included in the bid. All homes must still meet SHDF Wave 2.2 requirements). It is acceptable to use recent EPC certificates combined with stock analysis at the application stage of the proposal.* *For those applicants wishing to use modelling to demonstrate the starting condition of the stock, DESNZ expects a clear explanation of the modelling process that was used. Applicants may choose to supply a screenshot of any modelling carried out as annex B, to further illustrate the written justification. If a home is EPC C or above pre-retrofit according to a valid EPC, then it cannot be included in an application unless pre-application an EPC assessment is carried out showing that it is below EPC C, or if a retrofit assessment is carried out and as part of the retrofit assessment process the property is evidenced to be below EPC C. Acceptable evidence as part of the retrofit assessment process must be based on government approved SAP 2012 or SAP 10.2 software.**Any application containing void properties should outline the modelling used to choose an appropriate selection of voids that will be deliverable during the SHDF Wave 2.2 delivery window, alongside what evidence was used to provide accurate information in Table 1 for this selection of properties. See the published clarification questions for further detail about consideration of voids.**Detail should be provided on the proportion of stock in the bid covered by the methodology used to provide data on the starting condition of homes, and the proportion of stock in the bid where assumptions have been made on starting condition based on data from similar properties (i.e. gap data). An assessment should be made of how the proportion of gap data included impacts the overall quality and accuracy of bid data.* *The best answers will provide additional confidence on the real-world condition of properties, beyond just the use of SAP/RdSAP/PHPP and any stock modelling that may have been done.**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 3 pages, consortia – up to 5 pages* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.1.c)*Assessed and weighted* | **What modelling methodology have you used to identify the measures that you have proposed in table 2, and the outputs of those retrofits outlined in table 3? Evidence may be submitted as Annex C.***Examples of acceptable evidence can include the outputs from stock modelling and energy efficiency planning using a SAP, RdSAP or PHPP based modelling tool or calculator. We would also expect a description of the modelling process – including any headline parameters included in the modelling. You may also wish to provide further evidence on any additional modelling/work you have done to provide further certainty. Applicants are expected to include a screenshot of the modelling undertaken as annex C, to further illustrate the written justification. Applicants are not required to provide evidence in annexes for all homes included in their bid but are expected to provide evidence for at least one home representative of each archetype included in the bid. All homes must still meet SHDF Wave 2.2 requirements.**This does not replace the requirements for dwelling assessments under PAS2035. (Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.9 and 2.10).**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 1 page, consortia – up to 2 pages* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.2)*Assessed but not weighted* | **How you will ensure that bills will not increase as a result of the retrofit works, relative to what they would otherwise have been. Evidence of this modelling may be supplied as Annex D.** *Evidence of bill decrease should be based upon modelling via SAP, RdSAP or PHPP as an alternative. This does not replace the requirements for dwelling assessments under PAS2035.**Projects proposing low carbon heat installations are required to demonstrate that bills will not increase as a result of the retrofit works, on a detailed basis for all archetypes – this should include a screenshot in Annex D of the modelling undertaken which should highlight SAP score pre-retrofit, modelled SAP score post retrofit, and modelled bill difference between pre and post retrofit. (Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.9). Applicants are not required to provide evidence in annexes for all homes included in their bid but are expected to provide evidence for at least one home representative of each archetype included in the bid. All homes must still meet SHDF Wave 2.2 requirements.**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.3.a)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please confirm that all EPC Band D or E homes in your bid are expected to reach at least EPC Band C.** | [yes/ no] |
| 2.3.b)*Assessed but not weighted* | **If EPC Band F or G properties are not expected to be able to meet EPC Band C, please provide a clear justification as to why. Evidence of this justification may be supplied as Annex E.***Applicants must improve their social homes (through a fabric first approach suitable for the building type) to at least a minimum energy efficiency rating threshold of EPC Band C; except for those EPC Band F/G homes that cannot reach this level, which would need to reach EPC Band D and provide strong justification as to why they could not reach EPC Band C (evidence should be based upon modelling via SAP, RdSAP or PHPP as an alternative. Applicants should show starting SAP score and modelled end SAP score.) Applicants are expected to include a screenshot of evidence supporting their justification as annex E, eg EPC certificates, or modelling, to further illustrate the written justification. Applicants are not required to provide evidence in annexes for all homes included in their bid but are expected to provide evidence for at least one home representative of each archetype included in the bid. All homes must still meet SHDF Wave 2.2 requirements**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.4)*Assessed but not weighted* | **If alternative low carbon heating solutions to low temperature heat pumps (e.g. connection to low-carbon heat network, high temperature hydronic heat pumps, air to air heat pumps, solid biomass, high retention electric storage heaters), or hybrid heating, have been proposed, please provide a clear justification as to why.***If no alternative low carbon heating is proposed in this application, leave this box blank. Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.10.1**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.5) *Assessed but not weighted* | **If you have applied to utilise the solid wall cost cap on some or all homes in your retrofit, please provide a justification as to why.** *Please note the cost of cavity wall insulation on its own is not an acceptable justification. If only utilising the cavity wall cost cap, please leave this response blank.* *(Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.11)**Any home that is not classed as ‘cavity’ in the SAP wall type categorisation may use the solid wall cost cap if appropriate to do so. This includes brick, stone (granite, sandstone, or whinstone), timber, system build, or curtain walls.**Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit - 350* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.6)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please outline how the approach proposed is appropriate to your stock that you have applied with.** This could include: * *Why the measures proposed for the stock applied with are an appropriate fabric first and lowest regrets approach to your stock that you have applied with. You may choose to build on the response to Q2.1 about modelling, and include information about your understanding of your stock, including retrofits that have been previously carried out.*

*If no fabric measures have been applied with, please provide a clear justification as to why.** *Applicants are expected to propose cost effective measures appropriate for their chosen stock which align with the SHDF Wave 2.2 objectives and strategic approach.* Where Applicants plan to install measures which are typically less cost effective in making progress towards the SHDF Wave 2.2 objectives and strategic approach, the proposal should justify why they are a suitable, cost effective measure for the properties applied with. For example, installation of solar PV may be more appropriate where it is part of (rather than instead of) an appropriate fabric first approach, or installation of glazing may be more appropriate where replacing single glazing, or where alongside EWI if necessary to ensure PAS compliance, rather than where replacing existing effective double glazing to slightly improve the energy performance of the home. *Applications installing measures that are not making cost effective progress towards the SHDF’s strategic objectives are likely to receive a low score in the ‘Value for Money’ section of the assessment, particularly where these measures are accountable for a significant proportion of the spend. See guidance sections 2.10 and 2.11 for further information.*
* *How the 90kwh/m2/year level outlined in the guidance was considered as part of the retrofit - including justification on the end level of space heating demand, considering reasonableness of retrofit and cost effectiveness. Note, applications should not look to implement a retrofit that reaches 90kwh/m2/year without considering these factors at the forefront of retrofit design.*
* *How it is in alignment with your organisation's net zero strategy?*

*Single bidder word limit – 600, consortia bid word limit - 800* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.7)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Will any homes within your application go beyond the performance outcomes for SHDF Wave 2.2 (EPC Band C, with appropriate consideration of 90 kwh/m2/year)?**  | [yes/ no] |
| 2.8)*Assessed but not weighted* | **If you answered yes to question 2.7, please confirm that you will only use grant funding to fund a maximum of 50% of the eligible costs to reach EPC Band C, with appropriate consideration of 90kwh/m2/year, and that all other funding will need to come from co-funding. All eligible measures and costs should be included in the application form to SHDF Wave 2.2.***See section 2.11.2 of the competition guidance for further information.* | [yes/ no] |
| Proposed infill works*The focus of SHDF Wave 2.2 is on improving social homes currently below EPC C at scale. DESNZ recognises that in some instances, Applicants may wish to carry out works to a block comprising mostly social homes below EPC C, but some homes in the block may be non-social homes, or social homes at EPC C or above. These homes may be eligible for infill funding for whole-block measures, such as external wall insulation, however such instances need to be strongly justified.*  |
| 2.9)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Does your application contain any social homes starting at EPC Band C or above?** | [yes/ no] |
| 2.10)*Assessed but not weighted* | **If you answered yes to question 2.9, please complete table 4 and 5 (and proceed to respond to question 2.11). If you answered no to question 2.9, please skip to question 2.12.** |
| 2.11)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please justify the inclusion of any social homes at EPC Band C or above in this application, including why any proposed measures are vital for infill.***Funding is limited to situations in which social homes below EPC Band C would be adversely affected without it, for example cases where these social homes would not be able to meet EPC C with appropriate consideration of 90kwh/m2/year, bearing in mind reasonableness and cost effectiveness (see ‘Performance Outcomes’ section 2.9 of the competition guidance document), or where works must be undertaken on a whole block for planning or logistical reasons.* *Any proposed infill measure must be justified. Funding is available for insulation and associated ventilation. Applicants may include additional measures on an exceptional basis if a justification is given as to why a whole block approach is essential for the attainment of SHDF Wave 2.2 performance outcomes (see section 2.9) for the below EPC Band C homes. Any Applicant wishing to install a measure that is not an infill measure onto these homes must do so out of their own money, separately to their co-funding contribution.**Single bidder word limit – 300, consortia bid word limit - 400* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.12)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Does your application contain non-social homes?** | [yes/ no] |
| 2.13)*Assessed but not weighted* | **If you answered yes to question 2.12, please complete tables 6 and 7 (and then proceed to respond to questions 2.14 and 2.15). If you answered no to question 2.12, please skip to question 2.16.** |
| 2.14)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please justify the inclusion of non-social homes in your bid, including why any proposed measures are vital for infill.***Funding* *limited to situations in which social homes would be adversely affected without it, for example cases where social homes would not be able to meet EPC C with appropriate consideration of 90kwh/m2/year, bearing in mind reasonableness and cost effectiveness (see ‘Performance Outcomes’ section 2.9 of the competition guidance document), or where works must be undertaken on a whole block for planning or logistical reasons.* *Any proposed infill measure must be justified. Funding is* *available for insulation and associated ventilation. Applicants may include additional measures on an exceptional basis if a justification is given as to why a whole block approach is essential for the attainment of SHDF Wave 2.2 performance outcomes (see section 2.9 of the competition guidance document). Any Applicant wishing to install a measure that is not an infill measure onto these homes must do so out of their own money, separately to their co-funding contribution.**Single bidder word limit – 300, consortia bid word limit - 400* |
| **Answer:** |
| 2.15)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please explain what low-income eligibility criteria will be used to determine the proportion of funding that homes are eligible for. Applicants should describe the steps they have taken to provide accurate data.*** *The SHDF Wave 2.2 competition will fund 100% of costs of the infill measure for low-income owner occupier homes. These homes are considered as:*
	+ *Homes with an annual income of no more than £31,000 gross, before housing costs and where benefits are counted towards this figure*
	+ *We expect many* Applicants *to use receipt of means tested benefits as a proxy for low-income and would expect* Applicants *using non-means tested benefits to set out additional income verification. Other methods to verify eligibility may include using data such as existing processes on Council Tax reductions for those on lower incomes, residents on the social housing waiting list, or more innovative approaches such as advanced statistics and machine learning (e.g. Experian or CACI Paycheck), where Applicants* *can demonstrate these will target low-income households. Self-declarations will not be acceptable methods of verification.*

*Single bidder word limit – 250, Consortia bid word limit - 350* |
| **Answer:** |
| Additional information |
| 2.16)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please confirm that you will be using Trustmark registered (or an equivalent body) businesses in line with the installer eligibility requirements, to ensure appropriate installation of measures to appropriate standards and quality [PAS2035].** | [yes/ no] |
| 2.17)*For information only* | **Have you identified a PAS2035 retrofit coordinator? Please state your preferred route to market for procuring a retrofit coordinator: independent, contractor led, or in house.** | [yes/ no]Preferred route to market: |
| 2.18)*For information only* | **If applicable, please set out how your project will add social value, for example any plans to work with local colleges or provide apprenticeships to upskill the supply chain. Please note that SHDF Wave 2.2 grant funding may not be used beyond eligible costs set out in the Competition Guidance.** *Single bidder word limit – 300, Consortia bid word limit – 400* |
| **Answer:** |

# Delivery Assurance

|  |
| --- |
| Worth 35% of the total marks.  |
| 3.1)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please provide a project plan for your project and attach this as Annex F. As a minimum, DESNZ expects plans to include the following:*** *Key project stages broken down into specific tasks*
* *Details of project set up and project team establishment*
* *Details of all necessary procurement activity*
* *Details of tenant engagement activity before, during and after works have been completed*
* *The steps needed for project design and coordination, including PAS2035 risk assessments, planning permissions, and building surveys*
* *Details of installation*
* *Details of post-installation activities and handover*
* *The 9 DESNZ core milestones included in Table 9 of the application form should be integrated into the plan*

*Appendix A of the competition guidance document provides further guidance to applicants on how to structure plans, as well as an example.**Consortia bidders should provide a detailed consortia plan as per the guidance in Appendix A of the competition guidance. Additionally, each consortia member should submit a plan on a page. The annex containing all plans should be submitted as a single document.* |
| 3.2)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please provide a Risk and Issue Register for your project. The register must be completed in the supplementary template, titled “Annex G - SHDF Wave 2.2 Risk Register Template”, which can be downloaded from the SHDF Wave 2.2 webpage. All fields in the register should be completed to outline the risks and issues for the overall retrofit project and demonstrate mitigations you are putting in place to minimise the likelihood (in case of risks) and potential impact (both risks and issues). The Register should also include contingency plans should a risk materialise. Please attach the Risk and Issue Register as Annex G.** *Project Risk and Issue Registers should include, as a minimum, an assessment of the following risks:** *Tenants (both social and non-social) refuse works being carried out on their homes, including due to COVID-19*
* *Planning permission from the relevant department is not received in time*
* *Properties that are deemed eligible at application stage are found to be ineligible (EPC C or above)*
* *Leaseholders within mixed blocks refuse to finance works for infill homes*
* *Specific materials and supplies are not available in time (e.g., steel, heat pumps)*
* *Contracts, for retrofit coordinators or other necessary resources, are not in place in time to support delivery, due to delayed procurements, changing requirements, or lack of supply chain capacity*
* *There is variation between costs during delivery compared to those used at application stage*

*The list above provides a list of some of the most common risks. DESNZ expects Risk and Issue Registers to also include risks specific to each project.**Consortia bidders should aim to capture risks and issues for the whole project, but are encouraged to still include specific risks that apply only to specific consortium members, making clear where this is the case.*  |
| 3.3.a)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please provide the following to evidence the capacity and capability of your project team. This should be attached as Annex H.*** *Organisational Design Map: This should comprise of a visual representation of the individuals forming your project team as well as the relationships between them. It should also show the contractors/suppliers (potentially) involved in the project, consortia members (if applicable) and who in your team will engage with DESNZ/any DESNZ appointed third parties.*
* *Profiles and mini-CVs for key personnel. This must include:*
	+ *A named Project Sponsor*
	+ *Project Manager*
	+ *Reporting lead*
	+ *Retrofit co-ordinator/assessor*
	+ *Quantity surveyor*

*Consortia bidders should include details on the project or governance team for the consortia, which should include a clear overview of how the consortia works, and the roles within it including the senior responsible officer for each consortia member. A short overview of the project teams for individual consortia member projects should be included.**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 2 pages, consortia – up to 3 pages* |
| 3.3.b)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please confirm that the project team as outlined in question 3.3.a will be sufficiently resourced, including specifically for providing regular monthly data and reporting to DESNZ.** | [yes/no] |
| 3.4)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please give an overview of how you will manage your project to deliver to time, cost, and quality.** *Your answer should include any Project Management methodologies, systems, and practices you plan to use. Your answer should also include any additional information you wish to provide relating to the documents and plans you have provided for question 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Your answer should reference but not be limited to the following: project planning, governance and controls, data and reporting, and risk and issue management (including fraud risk management and reporting). The internal governance process for handling cost variances within your project should be outlined here, but details on specific approaches taken to addressing cost variances should be covered in your answer to question 3.5.**Single bidder word limit – 600, consortia bid word limit – 800* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.5)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please give an overview of how you plan to approach any cost variations to those levels applied with throughout the life cycle of your project. Your answer should include:*** **How you will approach any changes to costs that occur after bid stage. This may include:**
1. **Any potential/plans for using organisational contingency funding. Please note, costs applied with as part of the SHDF application should be realistic costs for delivery of the project in the current environment. By contingency funding in this question, DESNZ means applicant funding available in addition to these realistic levels included elsewhere in this application form.**
2. **If there are unexpected cost increases beyond those levels applied with, and insufficient availability of any contingency funding to cover such cost increases, how applicants would consider the suitability of the measure mix and number of homes to be retrofitted, while still bearing in mind the key SHDF principles of delivering a fabric first approach to EPC C at scale. How any decreases in costs from those applied with would be approached, including any considerations on delivery of additional homes.**
3. **Any provisions that you have in existing contracts or mechanisms that you will include in contracts that will be procured to address cost variation including those driven by inflation.**

*In response to this question, you may wish to cross reference the rate of inflation you have included in your costings, as detailed in question 4.2.* *Single bidder word limit – 250, consortia bid word limit – 350* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.6)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please provide a statement detailing your confidence in delivering this project. Where possible, this should be done through the provision of evidence of successful delivery of at least one past construction and or/ energy efficiency project of a similar size, scale, and complexity. Further information may be included as Annex I.***Applicants should provide a clear narrative, supported by evidence as to their confidence in delivering this project. Applicants may include evidence such as case studies, references from past projects, or screenshots of monitoring as annex I to further illustrate the written justification provided.**Evidence can include the following:** *An overview of the project and its objectives, and robust evidence of delivery performance including but not limited to: KPIs and milestones achieved; measures completed in line with original project baseline; Budget/VFM, and benefits achieved. Where applicants have participated in relevant DESNZ and DLUHC grant schemes should use these schemes as their primary evidence base but may include other additional examples.*
* *Narrative on past delivery challenges with a clear demonstration of how these issues were addressed and will be mitigated against during the delivery of the SHDF project, specifically referencing how lessons have been learned by the organisation.*
* *Use of case studies; references from past projects; monitoring or/and final reports.*

*Where an applicant is unable to answer this question with an example, they should outline the processes that have been put in place to ensure they are equipped to deliver this project, and may cross reference to other responses given within this application form.**DESNZ reserves the right to utilise applicant performance evidence sourced internally from the delivery teams managing the DESNZ/other department schemes including but not limited to: monitoring or/and final reports; performance statement from Project Director; report by Scheme Administrator; 3rd party Technical Consultants reports. If an applicant’s past performance would impact DESNZ’s confidence in their ability to deliver the project, the narrative on past delivery challenges or references to the appropriate mitigations in the Risk and Issues register should give DESNZ the confidence that any such failure or issue will not recur if that applicant were to be awarded grant funding.**Single bidder word limit – 500, consortia bid word limit – 700**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 1 page, consortia – up to 2 pages* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.7)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please describe in detail your commercial and procurement strategy to support the delivery of the project including already established supply chains and how you will support supply chain development. Please complete table 8 as part of this question.***Applicants should include commercial and procurement strategies considering all contracts (or planned contracts) that will be placed using grant funding, and/or details of any amendments to existing contracts to deliver the project. This should include timelines, market engagement strategies, contract route, contract management and performance plans, pricing model, evaluation/award criteria and other information. Applicants should describe how they will support the delivery of HM Government policies with a focus on Social Value, supporting SMEs, Prompt Payment, Modern Slavery and Carbon Reduction Plans.* *If new procurements are required and these are not known at the time of application, applicants should provide an indication of planned contracts to be placed to deliver the grant funding (e.g by value, type). Details not known at the time of application should be itemised in the risk register, along with planned actions and milestone dates for resolution in the project plan.* *If existing procurements are amended or extended, applicants should consider any procurement risks of increasing volumes of work and values through existing contracts or frameworks, especially where subject to project change requests.**Single bidder word limit – 600, consortia bid word limit – 800* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.8)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please provide a comprehensive and proactive plan detailing your approach to considering the needs of tenants and overall tenant engagement.** *DESNZ expects applicants to detail all tenant interaction relevant to the SHDF, including engagement/planning carried out prior to application submission.**Applicants should detail the methods and materials to be used for tenant engagement. Applicants should describe how they will secure buy in from tenants on both the proposed retrofit approach to the home and entry to the home to undertake any necessary surveys and to carry out works. DESNZ expects tenant engagement to go beyond leafleting and cold calling, which DESNZ does not consider to be sufficient methods of tenant engagement when implemented in isolation. Tenants should have access to a communications platform where they can have questions answered and concerns resolved with the Landlord.**Applicants should also demonstrate that individual vulnerabilities and tenant concerns have been considered with explicit reference to protected characteristics listed under the Equality Act 2010. Applicants should demonstrate that they have considered tenant comfort, wellbeing and satisfaction both during and post works, and provide a follow up plan including how you will educate tenants around new measures and technologies after works have been completed.**Learnings from the SHDF Demonstrator scheme are that poor tenant engagement is a particular blocker to successful delivery.**Single bidder word limit – 500, consortia bid word limit – 700* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.9)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please provide a baseline estimate for total volume of properties per month against milestones. Please include your plan for both volume and cost, including any contingency you have accounted for.***Applicants should insert numbers to Table 9 where applicable to indicate how many properties will complete each milestone per month. This should be as total volume.* |
| 3.10)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please provide a baseline estimate for how much money, including co-funding, will be spent per milestone per month.***Applicants should complete Table 10 outlining how much money, including co-funding, will be spent per month. The information supplied should be inserted in numerical £ value.*  |
| 3.11)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Will a partial upfront payment at the start of the delivery window be needed to quickly mobilise the project and ensure on-time delivery?***Please note that upfront payment is not guaranteed and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.* If yes, please outline why.*Single bidder word limit – 200, consortia bid word limit – 300* |
| **Answer:** |
| 3.12)*Assessed but not weighted* | ***[Consortium applications only]* Please outline why you have brought this consortium together. You should include the strategic purpose of this consortium and what you are aiming to achieve as a consortium.** *Consortia bid word limit – 350* |
|  | **Answer:** |
| 3.13)*Assessed but not weighted* | ***[Consortium applications only]* Will you arrange for legally binding agreements between your consortium members, as per the competition guidance and requirements of the Grant Offer Letter?**  | [yes/ no] |
| 3.14)*Assessed but not weighted* | ***[Consortium applications only]* Have you conducted appropriate due diligence on the organisations and projects within your consortium, as per the competition guidance?** | [yes/ no] |
| 3.15)*Assessed but not weighted* | ***[Consortium applications only]* How do you plan to manage the delivery of the project across consortium members?** *Please refer to governance arrangements, data reporting and data sharing agreements, ways of working and any flexible approaches to project outcomes you will apply. Please also discuss the differing supply chains and contractors used across the projects within the consortium.**Consortia bid word limit – 400* |
| **Answer:** |
| 3.16.a)*For information only* | **To effectively manage public spend, DESNZ will commission an independent evaluation of SHDF Wave 2.2. Do you have plans to evaluate the progress and impact of your project independently of/ in addition to the DESNZ- commissioned evaluation?** | [yes/ no] |
| 3.16.b)*For information only* | **If yes, please give a brief overview of how you will evaluate your project, including:*** *the research aims*
* *the research timeframe*
* *if you plan to carry out primary data collection, the type of data collection (survey, interviews etc.), and with whom.*

*If you intend to commission your evaluation to a third-party (such as a University or Research Institution), please refer to this in your response.**Please note that there is no requirement for grant award recipients to conduct independent monitoring or evaluation of their projects beyond compliance with the requirements set out under Declarations below and in Section 6.2 of the Competition Guidance.* *For further information on DESNZ’ monitoring and evaluation requirements, please see Section 7.2 in the Competition Guidance.**Single bidder word limit – 300, consortia bid word limit – 400* |
|  | **Answer:** |

# Value for Money

|  |
| --- |
| Worth 30% of the total marks |
| 4.1)*Assessed and weighted* | **DESNZ will carry out a value for money assessment based on the mix of measures proposed, which will be scored.** *Please ensure the information entered into table 2 is correct. Applicants are expected to propose cost effective measures appropriate for their chosen stock which align with the SHDF Wave 2.2 objectives and strategic approach. Applications installing measures that are not making cost effective progress towards the SHDF’s strategic objectives are likely to receive a low score in the ‘Value for Money’ section of the assessment, particularly where these measures are accountable for a significant proportion of the spend.*  |
| 4.2)*Assessed and weighted* | **Please complete tables 11, 12, 13 and 14 to provide a detailed cost breakdown of the project, then fully justify the cost breakdown provided below. Evidence may be supplied as Annex J.***Please outline why the proposal represents good value for money.* *Applicants are not expected to maximise the available grant funding for retrofit works for every home (as outlined in Section 2.11.2) and should request grant funding based on the costs required to upgrade homes to SHDF performance outcomes.**Applicants must justify their proposed capital costs for retrofit works and associated A&A. Some factors that may affect costs are: spread of dwellings, cost of materials, cost of installers, how effective existing contracts were or new procurements will be at achieving value for money, supply chain infrastructures, archetypes treated/inclusion of hard-to-treat properties and level of funding required to meet SHDF performance outcomes.* *Poorly evidenced costs at bid stage are a clear challenge to effective delivery. Applicants should justify why the cost breakdown provided is an accurate reflection of actual costs that will be seen in delivery. As a minimum, bidders should engage with the supply chain, and outline this engagement in the response, along with how it has given confidence to the costs provided. Bidders should also factor in any estimates of inflation, outlining the level incorporated into the bid. Applicants should justify these estimates. The rate at which inflation is factored in will be left at the discretion of the bidder but must be supported by evidence which may include, but is not limited to, recent experience on construction projects, or recent price changes seen in the market.**To supplement this, applicants may also wish to consider additional information as appropriate, eg consultations with Accounting Officers, further cost research, etc.**Applicants are expected to provide evidence of cost research, eg quotes from suppliers, as annex J.**DESNZ will carry out a value for money assessment of bids, including a cost benchmarking exercise (i.e., comparing equivalent costs against costs seen in other bids) – with the aim of ensuring that bids represent good value for money but also are evidence based. Bids with poor cost justification will receive a low value for money score. The value for money assessment, including cost benchmarking, will be considered at portfolio review stage, to supplement the written response to this question – with the suitability of bids exhibiting relatively very high costs (i.e. potentially not exhibiting value for money) or very low costs (i.e. potentially not exhibiting evidence based/realistic costs) in particular likely to be considered.* *Administration and ancillary (A&A) costs are expected to be as low as possible. Grant funding on A&A must be less than 15% of total grant funding - the expectation is that A&A spend should make up less than 15% of total costs. There is not scope to increase this proportion of grant funding used on A&A; however, in exceptional circumstances there may be scope for landlords to use slightly more than 15% of overall project costs for A&A purposes through spending slightly greater than 15% of the co-funding contribution on A&A. Applicants should justify the level of A&A costs requested.* *Single bidder word limit – 650, consortia bid word limit – 850**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 4 pages, consortia – up to 6 pages* |
| **Answer:** |
| 4.3)*Assessed but not weighted* | **Please complete table 15 with the amount of co funding you will input, then confirm the source of funds for co funding. (Further information can be found in the guidance, section 2.11). Supporting evidence of secured co-funding, and of any blended funding to be utilised, should be provided as Annex K***Applicants are requested to state their overall co-funding contribution, which must be a minimum of 50% of eligible project costs. Applicant should also outline any blended funding to be utilised (see guidance section 2.12).**Applicants should outline the source of funds for co-funding and are expected to provide evidence of secured co-funding such as board sign off, minutes from meetings or letters of commitment, as annex K. Applicants are required to provide evidence that co-funding has been signed off at CFO level. The co-funding value shown in evidence should match the value input to table 15 of the application form.* *Single bidder word limit – 200, consortia bid word limit – 300**Guideline annex length: single bidder – up to 5 pages, consortia – up to 8 pages* |
|  | **Answer:** |
|  |  |

**Approval**

|  |
| --- |
| Individual within lead applicant responsible for leading this project: |
| Name  |  |
| Title and role |  |
| Email |  |
| Phone number |  |
| Signature |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Individual within lead applicant that approved this proposal for submission: |
| Name  |  |
| Title and role |  |
| Email |  |
| Phone number |  |
| Signature |  |

1. [*https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/registered-providers-of-social-housing/list-of-registered-providers-14-april-2022-accessible-version*](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/registered-providers-of-social-housing/list-of-registered-providers-14-april-2022-accessible-version) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [*https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search*](https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See section 2.5 of the competition guidance document for further information. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. as defined by the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 (sections 68-70) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)