

Young Futures Hub Data Support Commission – Frequently Asked Questions

Take up

Q1. To confirm, is the LA 'call-off' support included or excluded in the £240,000 contract value?

The full contract value of £240,000 covers the entire commission, including the call-off element. Bidders' proposed approach to structuring call-off support within this total value forms part of their proposal.

Q2. Given the call-off nature of the contract, is there a maximum percentage or cap on the budget that can be allocated to central fixed costs (project management, development of shareable tools, set-up) versus LA day rates?

We understand that there is a mobilisation cost to assist with set up, onboarding of LAs, document reviews and related initial set up. We expect a genuine set-up cost to provide the oversight, delivery team, expertise and infrastructure needed to start the programme strongly and onboard as many LAs as possible in the early phase. As a result we expect a fixed upper limit cap of 20%. Bidders should set out their fixed costs clearly and show how their cost structure would flex depending on actual LA take-up.

Q3. As the number of days required will range from 10 (one LA) to 320 (all 32), would you expect the proposal to be priced as a fixed cost + a price per LA, up to a maximum of £240,000?

We anticipate bidders setting out activities and costings for the mobilisation phase, alongside a cost per LA day of support.

Q4. For a non-profit CIC, can you confirm if this is treated as a grant (outside the scope of VAT) or a procured service contract?

This is a grant. Any VAT must fall completely within the £240k limit of this tender.

Q5. Do you have an early sense of the likely level of take-up across the up to 32 Local Authorities, and when areas will need to opt in?

We anticipate having a clearer indicative of take up once the national programme is launched. Areas should commence opting in from October through to mid or late November.

Q6. Are the central fixed costs associated with mobilisation, oversight and development of the shared tools/resources expected to be payable irrespective of the eventual number of areas opting in?

Yes, we expect bidders to layout their full cost recovery. There is a 20% cap for core costs.

Q7. Do the up to 32 areas include the eight early adopter sites?

We expect the focus to remain on the current areas not including the eight early adopter sites. However, we may consider the eight early adopter sites if total take up is less than first agreed.

Information Security

Q8. Will the appointed partner act as a data processor on behalf of the LAs/DCMS, or a data controller? Are there specific minimum security accreditations required to win this bid?

We have not prescribed a single controller/processor model or a mandatory accreditation list, as this will depend on each bidder's proposed way of working with LA, police, health and social care data. We expect bidders to set out:

- their track record of working with sensitive public-sector data of this kind;
- the standards, certifications and data protocols they use to demonstrate this alignment; and
- how they would work with each Local Authority to agree the right governance model (including clarifying controller/processor status where relevant) securely and diligently.

This should be read alongside the Data Protection and Information Governance section of the ITT, which sets out our baseline expectations (UK GDPR compliance, DPIAs, use of aggregated/de-identified data wherever possible, and agreed retention/deletion arrangements).

Working with Local Authorities

Q9. Can virtual problem-solving clinics and training sessions be delivered to cohorts of multiple LAs simultaneously and billed proportionally, rather than strictly 1-to-1?

This is for bidders to propose. We would welcome an approach that demonstrates strong value for money, and bidders should clearly set out how they would balance shared/cohort delivery against each LA's individual needs. We anticipate in person activity to be part of the offer.

Q10. Should travel costs for delivering workshops to LAs be included in the budget, or billed separately?

Travel costs should be met from the bidder's allocated programme budget, not billed separately in addition to the £240,000.

Q11. Do you have information on the data and reporting technology currently used by LAs — is it consistent, or a range of different tools?

We do not hold this centrally and expect this to vary across areas. Bidders should draw on their track record of mobilising data tools in similar contexts and set out feasible, evidenced examples of how they have supported other areas to do this.

Q12. Do you have pre-existing information on the datasets LAs already have access to?

No — establishing the profile of data each LA can access is itself part of the scope of this project. Bidders should propose the most feasible and timely way of establishing this as part of their delivery approach.

Q13. Can you provide guidance on the most important youth violence outcomes being targeted, and any critical success metrics for the project?

The core focus is enabling LAs to have enriched, high-quality local data to inform their decision-making — giving them a clearer understanding of youth violence, vulnerability, and where and to whom violence is happening. Metrics are based on LAs signed up and include:

- A report for LA area based on Appendix 1 data sets in the tender document [Data-Support-Commission_YFHs.pdf](#)
 - LAs agree data-sharing arrangements
 - LAs are supported to use the data
 - Tool creation for Young Futures Hubs (design and commissioning)
 - Clear tangible ways the data enables local sites to better understand and respond to racial disproportionality
- can be found in

An overarching output is that LAs have quality data to respond effectively to available evidence.

Working with Local Authorities

Q14. When do you expect the appointed partner to have a reasonably firm picture of the participating areas?

We are working towards having a final take up number between 1-2 weeks post signing the agreement with the appointed partner, we envisage plans that show how they seek to maximise participating areas. However, applicants should demonstrate associated costs due to the call off nature of this tender.

Q15. We can see that around seven days per area are expected during planning/co-design, with a further 2-3 days potentially used afterwards. Do you have an indicative final deadline for this later support and any final outputs?

Likely by end of Jan, early Feb 2027 (this is indicative at this stage and depends on mobilisation of the national programme and DCMS timelines).

Q16. For the ten-day allocation per area, should we assume that any cross-area clinics or training sit within those allocations, or would you envisage these being part of the central offer?

The maximum allocation is 10 days, we expect bidders to share a feasible and high-quality approach to deliver this and should include key components that will help meet overarching goals of this tender successfully.

Scope and ways of working

Q17. We wanted to check our interpretation of “assess” in Appendix 1. Is the expectation that the partner assesses the availability, accessibility and quality of the identified datasets and, where they can be accessed within the timeframe, also undertakes analysis to generate insights for the area reports/profiles?

Yes this is the expectation, LAs will be at different stages and this must be considered.

Q18. Would YEF/DCMS expect to introduce the appointed partner to named leads in each participating area?

Yes YEF will seek to make introductions, working with DCMS or potentially a 3rd party partner.

Q19. Do you have a particular call-off mechanism in mind for agreeing the support with individual areas, for example, a short scope/agreement for each LA, or would you be happy for bidders to propose a proportionate approach?

We welcome bidders to propose a proportionate approach (short scope agreement with LAs) and share methodology within their application. We encourage this activity to strengthen take up and buy in from participating areas.

Q20. Do you have any expectations around central programme reporting and liaison with YEF, for example, the likely frequency of catch-ups and whether you envisage a final cross-area synthesis in addition to the reusable tools/resources?

Yes. Due to the timeline of the support, we envisage a weekly catch up and a final cross area synthesis including a full summary slide deck.

Information governance and outputs

Q21. Do you have an anticipated information governance model for the work, for example, whether the appointed partner would generally act as a processor for participating LAs, or should bidders propose an approach recognising that arrangements may vary between areas?

Bidders should propose the approach as the lead experts we are partnering with.

Q22. Similarly, do you have an expectation about which parties would enter into any necessary data sharing agreements?

Bidders should have a track record that encapsulates working with LA partners and the required level of data sharing agreements to meet permissible data standards.

Q23. Are the individual area reports/profiles primarily intended for the participating areas themselves, or would YEF and/or DCMS also expect to receive them?

The area reports/profiles should be for participating areas and made accessible to YEF who may in turn share this with DCMS.

Relationship with the DCMS evaluation

Q24. Do you have an indicative timetable for appointment of the DCMS evaluation partner? We'd like to make sure our proposed approach builds in appropriate coordination and avoids duplication from the outset.

We are working with DCMS to negotiate timings and alignment. The appointed partner will adjoin plans to avoid duplicative activity.

Q25. Finally, would involvement in bidding for, or delivering, the DCMS evaluation create any eligibility or conflict-of-interest considerations in relation to this commission, or vice versa?

No. We expect this work to align with current plans.

Questions post 5th Oct to Queries deadline 8th Oct

Q26. Engagement with Local Authorities: The specification describes an optional, call-off offer for Young Futures Local Authorities. Will YEF introduce the offer to Local Authorities and secure their opt-in, do you expect the appointed partner to approach Local Authorities directly, or would you envisage the partner supporting YEF to secure opt-in (for example, through joint communications or presenting the offer at onboarding)?

Yes. YEF will seek to make introductions to secure opt in and work with the data partner to undertake joint communications. Due to the scale of the programme, YEF will also seek ways to get support from DCMS and the appointed national partner. YEF has premiered the data offer as part of a closed onboarding session hosted by DCMS for all new Young Futures Hubs areas.

Q27. Contract duration: The specification sets out support running from Autumn 2026 to early 2027, with 2-3 days per Local Authority potentially used after design decisions are made. Could you confirm the anticipated end date of the contract?

See question 15.

Q28. VAT: We anticipate this work being structured as a contract for services, and therefore in scope for VAT. Could you confirm that the £240k budget is inclusive of VAT?

See Question 4. The work will be commissioned as a Grant Agreement and any VAT incurred must be accounted for in the £240k budget.

Q29. As the award is described as a grant, may a UK private limited consultancy company be the lead recipient, or must the lead have a particular charitable/non-profit status? May such a company participate as a paid consortium specialist/subcontractor?

The lead body must be officially recognised/registered in the UK and meet the right legal requirements as a legal entity (Charity, company, CIC etc).

Q30. What ownership and licensing provisions will apply to newly commissioned reports, tools and resources?

Newly commissioned reports, tools and resources, IPR and materials created using the grant fund will be owned by YEF, who will seek to make them publicly accessible as open outputs of this offer (supporting national scale up). The relevant licensing arrangements will support their open access and use. YEF will grant a license back to the Grantee for the IPR and materials use.

Q31. Can partners retain their pre-existing methods and materials, with an agreed licence for their use in the commissioned outputs?

Yes. Partners will retain ownership of their pre-existing methods, materials and intellectual property. Where these are used to develop commissioned outputs, the parties will agree an appropriate licence to enable their inclusion in the outputs and support their public access and use. The newly commissioned outputs will be owned by YEF and made publicly accessible, while partners will retain ownership of their underlying methods and materials.

Update to previous questions

Q2. Given the call-off nature of the contract, is there a maximum percentage or cap on the budget that can be allocated to central fixed costs (project management, development of shareable tools, set-up) versus LA day rates?



We understand that there is a mobilisation cost to assist with set up, onboarding of LAs, document reviews and related initial set up. We expect a genuine set-up cost to provide the oversight, delivery team, expertise and infrastructure needed to start the programme strongly and onboard as many LAs as possible in the early phase. As a result we expect a fixed upper limit cap of 20%. Bidders should set out their fixed costs clearly and show how their cost structure would flex depending on actual LA take-up.

Given the open-call nature of this offer, bidders should recommend the approach that will deliver the highest-quality offer for participating areas, even if this means working with fewer than the full 32 areas. We recognise the time pressures and anticipate variation in uptake. Bidders should explain their proposed approach and be prepared to discuss it further at interview.