



Triennial Review of The Big Lottery Fund

Call for Evidence

This document is available
in large print, audio and
braille on request. Please call
+44 (0)800 000 4999 or email
BLFTriennialReview@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

Cabinet Office
25 Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BQ

Publication date: November 2013

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (not including logos)
free of charge in any format or medium, under the
terms of the Open Government Licence.

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication
should be sent to us at
BLFTriennialReview@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/
or write to the Information Policy Team,
The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU,
or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Contents

Section 1	Welcome and Introduction	Page 4
Section 2	About you	Page 5
Section 3	About the Big Lottery Fund	Page 7
Section 4	Your views on the functions and form of the Big Lottery Fund	Page 9
Section 5	The Customer's view of the Big Lottery Fund	Page 13
Section 6	Your views on the effectiveness of the Big Lottery Fund	Page 17
Section 7	Your views on how well the Big Lottery Fund is managed as an organisation	Page 18
Section 8	In conclusion	Page 20

Please note: Comments boxes are expandable and page numbers may therefore change as you complete this questionnaire.

Section 1: Welcome and Introduction

Thank you for your interest in this call for evidence.

The Triennial Review of the Big Lottery Fund (the Fund) is being conducted as part of the requirement for all Government Departments to review their Non Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs) at least once every three years. The review team is independent of the Big Lottery Fund and of its sponsors within the Cabinet Office, and will ensure the confidentiality of responses. More information about the Public Bodies Reform policy is available on <https://www.gov.uk/public-bodies-reform>

How the review will work

As for all Triennial Reviews, the review team will examine whether there is a continuing need for the functions performed by the Big Lottery Fund, and whether the organisation should continue to operate in its current form. If it is determined that there is a continuing need for the organisation in its current form, the review will assess whether the Fund's control and governance arrangements continue to meet the recognised principles of good corporate governance. The structure, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Fund will also be considered as part of the review.

Your involvement in the review

In order to make a full assessment, the review will take into account the views of people who have an involvement with, or interest in, the Fund. This questionnaire is therefore designed to obtain your views on the functions, form, effectiveness and efficiency of the Big Lottery Fund as a grant-making organisation.

- Except where there is an alternative guidance note, all questions are either single answer multiple choice or ask you for free text comment.
- Where you do not have a view on a particular question, please select the 'don't know' or 'not applicable' option where provided, or leave the question blank.
- Comments fields are provided for most questions, to enable you to expand on your multiple choice answers if you wish to do so, but these are entirely optional. Please type your answers in the box, which will expand to accommodate what you type.
- Please do make reference to other funders by way of comparison, when providing responses to the questions.

The quickest and easiest way to respond to this call for evidence is to go online to complete and submit the same questionnaire on: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/BLFReview2013>. Alternatively, please complete and email this questionnaire to: BLFTriennialReview@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk. If you are not able to return the questionnaire by email, please post it to the Big Lottery Fund Triennial Review Team, Room 405, 70 Whitehall, London SW1A 2AS.

The closing date for submitting responses is 6 January 2014.

If you have any queries about this document, please direct these to the review team on this address: BLFTriennialReview@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

Section 2: About you

This information will help us to understand the varying views and experiences of the Big Lottery Fund across different groups of people and organisations with an interest in the Fund and what it does. You do not need to give us your name if you would prefer not to do so, but please do complete the other questions on this page.

1. Please indicate which of the following apply to you:

NOTE: You can select more than one of these options, as relevant

- I am in receipt, or have previously been in receipt, of Big Lottery Fund funding
- I have applied for Big Lottery Fund funding before, but was unsuccessful
- I work for the Big Lottery Fund
- I am involved in a project which is funded by the Big Lottery Fund
- I work for another grant-making organisation
- I represent a voluntary, community, or social enterprise organisation
- I represent an umbrella or infrastructure organisation
- I work for a Government Department or Devolved Administration
- I am an interested member of the public
- I would prefer not to say
- Other

Please specify your "other" answer here:

2. What is your name? (optional)

Nick Chase

3. What is the name of your organisation? (optional)

Action with Communities in Rural England

4. If you work in a project or organisation that is funded by the Big Lottery Fund, please tell us how much funding you have received and, where relevant, under which funding project/s or programme/s:

BASIS – £1.5m over five years, Supporting Change - £300,000 and Village SOS programme management (partner with Plunkett)

5. Please tell us where you work or are based?

- England
- Scotland
- Wales
- Northern Ireland
- In more than one country in the UK
- UK-wide

Section 3: About the Big Lottery Fund

The Big Lottery Fund (the Fund) exists as an executive Non Departmental Public Body (NDPB) under the National Lottery etc Act 1993 (as amended). The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport has responsibility for the National Lottery including the system of distribution of Lottery funds, and all pan-Lottery matters. Policy and sponsorship responsibilities specifically for the Big Lottery Fund transferred to the Minister for the Cabinet Office on 13 April 2011, having previously been the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport.

The Big Lottery Fund is responsible for distributing 40% of money raised for good causes from the National Lottery. The Fund must distribute this money to health, education, environment, and to charitable causes. The other 60% of the money raised for good causes by the National Lottery is distributed equally between sport, arts, and heritage by other distributors.

The Big Lottery Fund is a UK wide organisation. The Minister for the Cabinet Office issues policy directions for England and the UK. The relevant Devolved Administrations issue policy directions for Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland.

The functions of the Big Lottery Fund include:

1. Distributing 40% of all funds raised for good causes (about 11 pence in every pound spent on a Lottery ticket) by the National Lottery, in order to bring real improvements to communities and the lives of people most in need. Funding is delivered through programmes tailored specifically to the needs of the communities in England, Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland, as well as some programmes covering the whole of the UK;
2. Distributing non-Lottery funding on behalf of public bodies (such as the Department for Education and the Office for Civil Society). The National Lottery Act 2006 gives the Fund the power to distribute funds on behalf of, or alongside, other organisations;
3. Distributing money, previously held in dormant bank and building society accounts, which has been transferred to the Reclaim Fund Ltd for reinvestment in the community, in accordance with the Dormant Bank and Building Society Accounts Act 2008. Funds are distributed in accordance with the Act and with policy directions issued by the Minister for the Cabinet Office and the Devolved Administrations.

The Fund is required by statute to take into account the principle that National Lottery and dormant accounts funds should be used to fund projects for which funds would be unlikely to be made available by the UK government or Devolved Administrations. This is known as the additionality principle.

Sources of further information

The MISSION AND VALUES of the Big Lottery Fund are outlined at:

<http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/about-big/our-approach/mission-and-values>

Information on the Fund's STRATEGIC DIRECTION can be found in the following documents:

- Corporate Plan

<http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/about-big/our-approach/corporate-documents>

- Big Thinking – Strategic Framework to 2015

http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/-/media/Files/Corporate%20documents/Fresh%20thinking/bt_strategic_framework.pdf

- Fresh Thinking - the next chapter

<http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/about-big/our-approach/fresh-thinking>

POLICY DIRECTIONS can be found at:

<http://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/about-big/publications/corporate-documents>

Section 4: Your views on the functions and form of the Big Lottery Fund

Whatever your involvement or interest is in the Big Lottery Fund, this section asks your views on what the Fund does. As mentioned on the previous page, in summary the three functions of the Fund are to:

1. Distribute funds raised for good causes by the National Lottery, to bring real improvements to communities and the lives of people most in need.
2. Distribute non-Lottery funding on behalf of other public bodies and organisations.
3. Distribute money, previously held in dormant bank and building society accounts, which has been transferred to the Reclaim Fund Ltd for reinvestment in the community.

6. In your view, do these three functions accurately describe what the Big Lottery Fund does?

- Yes
- No (please explain in the comment box below)
- Don't know

Please comment (optional):

7. If yes, do you think these functions are still needed?

- Yes - all
- Yes - some
- No
- Don't know

Please explain your yes/no answer (optional):

8. Do you think the Big Lottery Fund performs any additional functions?

- Yes (please explain in the comment box below)
- No
- Don't know

Please comment (optional): Monitoring of grants programmes to gather data and inform the design and delivery of future programmes

9. If yes, do you think these additional functions are still needed?

- Yes - all
- Yes - some
- No
- Don't know

Please explain your yes/no answer (optional): Monitoring and analysis is essential to ensure the impact and effectiveness of the BIG Lottery funding programmes. ACRE has previously requested that the design of programmes should be formally assessed to ensure equity between rural and urban areas.

The next few questions ask your views on the overall impact of the Big Lottery Fund as a grant-making body.

10. Overall, how effective do you think the Big Lottery Fund is as a grant-making body?

NOTE: You are encouraged to make reference to the Fund's strategic direction and policy directions listed in Section 3

- Very effective
- Effective
- Ineffective
- Don't know

Please explain your answer (optional): The processes in terms of monitoring requires review – micromanagement is not helpful or required – this was evident in the recent Village SOS contract we were involved with which suffered from frequent changes imposed by BIG.

11. How successful do you think the Fund is in its mission to “bring improvements to communities and the lives of people most in need”?

- Very Successful
- Successful
- Unsuccessful
- Don't know

Please explain your answer (optional):

12. What is your understanding and view of the types of projects funded by the Big Lottery Fund, and of how the Fund allocates its funding between different types of projects?

Enter your comments here: There has been an emphasis on more grass root projects and significantly less support for infrastructure projects. This appears to be driven by the localism agenda of this Government. Grassroots community projects cannot operate in a vacuum, there is a need for appropriate infrastructure to support groups and the Big Lottery has a role in supporting and funding this. The Reaching Communities Community Buildings Programme is an example of where the allocation of funding and attempts to manage down the number of applications resulted in rural communities being disadvantaged. Although IMD data was used to identify eligible communities the Super Output Level data combined with the use of postcodes meant many Counties had no rural areas eligible for funding. ACRE was ignored despite offering to assist in developing a more equitable geographical allocation process free of charge. The approach adopted clearly disadvantaged rural communities.

13. Do you think the Fund strikes the right balance between awarding small grants and funding larger, more strategic programmes?

- Yes
- No (please explain in comment box below)
- Don't know

Please comment (optional): Given the impact of the recession on VCS organisations it was somewhat short-sighted for the Lottery to refocus their attention on smaller grants directly to community groups. This appears to be a consequence of the coalition's focus on localism and the influence that Minister's have on the type of funding approach the Lottery takes. With the Office of Civil Society withdrawing a considerable amount of funding immediately the coalition came into power, the Lottery was in an excellent place to consult and 'fill the gap', even if this was only in the short term, to mitigate the effects of the recession on support organisations across the UK.

The Awards for All programme continues to provide an easily accessible source of small grants for rural communities. ACRE receives comments about the ease of use of this fund as compared with the application processes for larger programmes that small communities struggle with. Funding for support bodies is decreasing and consequently small communities and groups aspiring to apply for larger amounts can struggle to access appropriate support from organisations that understand their community. The current coalition Government's funding to communities will cease in 2015 and there is no investment currently in organisations that will have to deal with the queries and requests for support to utilise the localism tools such as Neighbourhood Planning etc.

14. Overall, what do you think is the impact of the grants made by the Fund?

Enter your comments here: Currently – a positive impact in the short term. The legacy of withdrawal of infrastructure support is already impacting on communities with them unable to find 'free' support and being told – by Government – that if you value support you should pay for it. This is not sustainable and could seriously impact on communities trying to help themselves post 2015. The recent EFRA select committee report highlighted the need for support organisations to enable communities to help themselves but they need investment to continue to provide this invaluable function.

15. What do you think would be the impact if the Big Lottery Fund ceased to exist as an organisation in its current form?

Enter your comments here: There would be a need to set up some other mechanism for allocating funding; for example, lottery money could be allocated by existing infrastructure bodies e.g. as in the case of the grants from the European Social Fund. There could be a small investment allocation steering group to agree the theme for fund distribution e.g. rural, health, children, enterprise, poverty etc with the funding streams managed by the existing infrastructure bodies. This could represent excellent value for money and sustain existing organisations that fulfil a wide variety of functions.

The Big Lottery Fund is a **Non Departmental Public Body (NDPB)**. This means that it makes its own funding decisions within a remit set by Ministers, who are ultimately accountable to Parliament and to the public for what the Fund does.

This section asks your views on how well the Big Lottery Fund is structured as an NDPB to fulfil its functions, and how efficient and effective it is as an organisation.

16. The following characteristics are all features of NDPBs. Which of these do you think are ESSENTIAL for the Big Lottery Fund to operate?

NOTE: You can choose more than one of these options

- Having a national and regional scope
- Having operational autonomy and independence from Ministers but working within a strategic framework set by Ministers
- Being accountable to Ministers against this strategic framework, with Ministers ultimately accountable to Parliament and the public
- Being headed by a Board of directors and managed day to day by a Chief Executive Officer
- Being accountable for their own budget and publishing their own annual report and accounts
- None of the above
- Don't know

Please comment (optional): The Big Lottery Fund should not be accountable to Ministers as they come and go with their own agendas and 'flavours' of the month. It should be accountable to the public and should have representation from them in that respect. When the government changes it is apparent that Lottery programmes are influenced by the new government policies and priorities.

17. Do you think an NDPB is the most efficient model for the Fund, or would it be more efficient as another model (for example, if it were moved outside of Government, run by a Government Department, merged with another organisation, or delivered by another organisation)?

- NDPB

- Another model (please explain in comment box below)
- Don't know

Please comment (optional): We think there could be value in the Big Lottery being a more independent charitable grant making trust. It should be run by a fully independent Board; with full transparency and accountability to the public; acting as a steering group to direct funding via existing bodies.

18. Do you think that what the Fund does needs to be, and be seen to be, politically impartial?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please explain your yes/no answer (optional): Essential

19. Do you think that the work performed by the Big Lottery Fund:

DOES contribute to Government policy?

- Yes No Don't know

SHOULD contribute to Government policy?

- Yes No Don't know

Please explain your yes/no answers (optional): Current grant funding follows government priorities but this is not government money and should be used independently of whichever party is in power.

Section 5: The Customer's view of the Big Lottery Fund

This section asks grant applicants for their views on the way in which the Big Lottery Fund grants funding to good causes.

We would like to hear your views, whether you were successful or unsuccessful in your application, and whether you are a long-standing customer of the Fund or at an early stage of your first application.

If this set of questions is not relevant to you, please skip them and go straight to Question 30

20. Which Lottery distributors, or other funders, have you or your organisation applied to for funding in the past, whether or not you were successful?

NOTE: Please answer for EACH Lottery distributor listed, to help us understand how the Fund fits into the overall landscape of grant applications - where relevant, you can tick both "yes" options for one distributor. Your answers will NOT be shared with the Big Lottery Fund.

If you or your organisation DON'T apply for grant funding, OR you don't know where your organisation applies for funding, please only tick the "Not Applicable" button for either the "Not Relevant" or the "Don't Know" option and move on to the next question.

	YES - for current/future projects	YES - for previous project/s	NO - but currently working on 1st application to them	NO - have never applied to them	Don't know	Not applicable
The Big Lottery Fund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heritage Lottery Fund	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts Council England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts Council of Wales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Arts Council of Northern Ireland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Creative Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<u>YES</u> - for current/future projects	<u>YES</u> - for previous project/s	<u>NO</u> - but currently working on 1st application to them	<u>NO</u> - have never applied to them	Don't know	Not applicable
British Film Institute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sport England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sport Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sport Council for Wales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sport Council for Northern Ireland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
UK Sport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant - I/we do not apply for grants						<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Don't know						<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Other funders or grant-making bodies not listed above (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us which other funders or grant-making bodies you or your organisation have applied to for funding:

Enter your comments here: Government Departments, Princes Countryside Fund

21. Please tell us more about when and why you have chosen the Big Lottery Fund over other potential funders, and/or vice versa (optional)

Enter your comments here: Other funding sources have been severely curtailed over the last five years with the resulting impact that less resources are available to communities.

22. In general, how has your experience with the Big Lottery Fund compared with other Lottery distributors or funders? (optional)

Enter your comments here: The process is overly bureaucratic. The time and effort involved in preparing applications disadvantages smaller organisations who do not have the resources needed to dedicate staff to write and research applications. This means that funding is more likely to go to larger organisations that fund these posts than to front line delivery organisations.

23. When you applied to the Big Lottery Fund for a grant, how much time, attention and support did Fund staff give you through the application process?

- More than I really needed/wanted - I could have done just as well with less input from Fund staff.
- More than I expected, but I needed/appreciated the extra help.
- Just the right amount of help.
- A bit less than I needed/wanted - I would have appreciated more support from Fund staff.
- A lot less help than I needed/wanted, which had a negative impact on my application.
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer, comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: There is considerable 'micro-management' of the process from start to finish.

24. In your experience, is the Big Lottery Fund application process PROPORTIONATE to the grant type and amount being sought?

- Yes
- No (please explain in the comments box below)
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer, comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: Far too much bureaucracy involved

25. If you were successful with at least one funding application to the Big Lottery Fund, what's your experience of HOW LONG the application process takes, from submission through to receiving the grant funding?

- It's very quick
- It's about right for the type and amount of grant
- It's unpredictable or varies depending on type and size of grant
- It's very slow and takes far too long
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer, comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: Project specification changed twice after grant awarded resulting in considerable amount of rework.

26. Whatever your answer to the above question, how did the time it took to receive your funding compare with how long the Fund had advised you it would take?

- About the same as I had been told to expect
- Shorter than the Fund originally told me it would take
- Longer than the Fund had originally told me to expect
- My expectations on the time it would take to get the funding weren't managed at all by the Fund
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer (optional) Has rarely arrived on time

27. If you have ever been unsuccessful in an application for Big Lottery Fund funding, did you feel that you were provided with an adequate explanation and useful feedback?

- Yes
- No (please explain in the comments box below)
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer, comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: very limited feedback offered

28. In your experience, has the amount of grant management, monitoring and evaluation requested by the Fund been:

- Insufficient
- Sufficient
- Excessive
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please explain your answer, comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: The cost of monitoring seems unduly high. In addition to the staff cost at the lottery, there is the impact on the receiving organisations. Most organisations factor in minimum costs for overheads, the lottery seems to have no such staffing restraints. There is a mismatch between what is expected from lottery staff and what can be delivered without expecting staff to work excessive hours.

29. How satisfied are you with your interactions with the Fund?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied

- Dissatisfied
- Don't know
- Not applicable

Please comment, including how the Fund could increase customer satisfaction, and comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here:

Section 6: Your views on the effectiveness of the Big Lottery Fund

Here we ask for your views on how well the Fund works with its customers, stakeholders and partners.

30. How well do you think the Fund works with the voluntary and community sector?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Inadequately
- Don't know

Please comment, including how the Fund could improve the way it works with the sector, and comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: Lack of understanding and reluctance to fund infrastructure bodies such as ours who bridge the gap between the bureaucracy of the large funders and the reality of small front line delivery organisations.

31. How well do you think the Fund works with other partners?

Partners can include:

- Other Lottery distributors
- Other funders
- Local Authorities
- Umbrella bodies
- The private sector
- Departments of the UK Government (including Devolved Administrations)

- Very well
- Adequately
- Inadequately
- Don't know

Please comment, including how the Fund could improve the way it works with partners, and comparing the Fund to other grant-making bodies where relevant (optional)

Enter your comments here: Our member Rural Community Councils have built up

relationships with local officers particularly with regard to applications and information relating to village halls and similar community buildings. ACRE understands that this helped BIG Lottery to understand the problems with eligibility for the Reaching Communities Community Buildings Programme and the development of the exceptions policy. However, there could be better connections made with all sections of the Voluntary and Community Sector

32. We welcome your suggestions here on anything else the Big Lottery Fund might consider doing, towards its mission of bringing real improvements to communities and to the lives of people most in need.

Enter your comments here:

Section 7: Your views on how well the Big Lottery Fund is managed as an organisation

This section asks your views on how the Big Lottery Fund is led and managed, and on some areas of the Fund's corporate culture - these aspects are likely to have an impact on how customers and stakeholders experience their interactions with the Fund.

33. Do you feel that there is sufficient and strong leadership within the Big Lottery Fund organisation?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please comment (optional):

34. Do you feel that there is an appropriate level of skills, experience, independence and knowledge within the Fund?

- Yes - all of these
- No (please explain in the comment box below)
- Don't know

Please comment (optional): More diversity of background experience would assist the senior management team. ACRE has noted:

- a high turnover of staff within the BIG Lottery resulting in no continuity of service
- a reliance on preferred partners for delivering programmes
- that expertise and knowledge of rural issues and keeping up to date with changes in legislation needs to be addressed and improved (see example below)

A significant number of village halls applied to BIG Lottery for funding for renewable energy projects with the clear intentions of applying for the Feed in Tariff (FiT). BIG Lottery did not advise hall committees that they would not be eligible for the FiT if they received a grant from BIG. Consequently the projects affected have had to repay their grant.

35. Do you feel that the Fund is:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Open	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparent	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accountable	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Responsive **Yes** **No** **Don't know**

Please explain your yes/no answers (optional): Very slow to see what is happening externally

36. The Big Lottery Fund’s organisational values are: Being supportive and helpful, Making best use of Lottery money, and Using knowledge and evidence.

In your experience, do the staff and senior management of the Fund promote these values in their professional conduct?

- Always
- Usually
- Sometimes
- Never
- Don't know

There appears to be huge staff churn with projects getting a number of ‘managers’ over the course of the project. BIG Lottery does not always use the knowledge and expertise offered by external bodies. ACRE contacted BIG Lottery on a number of occasions with regard to the issue related in Q 34.

37. In your view, how well does the Big Lottery Fund understand what impact its grants make?

- Very well
- Adequately
- Inadequately
- Don't know

Please comment (optional):

Section 8: In conclusion

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer this questionnaire. Your answers will be included in the evidence used by the review team to assess the Big Lottery Fund, against the criteria used for all Triennial Reviews.

The review team is independent of the Big Lottery Fund and of its sponsors in the Cabinet Office, and will ensure confidentiality of all responses received.

38. Finally, please make here any other comments about the Big Lottery Fund, which you think are relevant for the review team to take into account.

BIG appear to be committed to favouring social investment models so that communities can become more sustainable and reinvest in themselves. However, whilst this approach has its value it is not always appropriate. Sometimes a small grant that enables a volunteer led organisation to keep going or a service to be maintained is vital to a rural community. It is particularly worrying that the proposed principles appear to focus on front line groups that espouse income generation, growth and enterprise above those groups whose longer term viability is secured through ingenuity, in-kind volunteering and widespread community support. If BIG wishes to have a focus on social enterprise, it should not, in doing so, lose sight of the needs of the vast army of community activists who will be excluded by reductions in funding.

How to send us your response

Please email your completed questionnaire to the review team:
BLFTriennialReview@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk.

Alternatively, if you are not able to return the questionnaire by email, please post it to the Big Lottery Fund Triennial Review Team, Room 405, 70 Whitehall, London SW1A 2AS.

Thank you.