Regeris Consulting Limited

**REDACTED**

Attn. **REDACTED**

Email: **REDACTED**

 Monday 09th July 2018

 Procurement ref: CCFI18A09

Dear **REDACTED**

**Award of contract for the Provision of National Impact Evaluation of the**

**European Regional Development Fund 2014-20 for England**

Further to your submission of a Tender/Proposal for the above Procurement, on behalf of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (the “Authority”), I am writing to advise that the procurement is now complete.

I am pleased to inform you that your company ranked first in our evaluation with an overall score of 93.22% and therefore we would like to award the contract to you.

The attached appendix provides detailed feedback on your submitted proposal.

The call-off contract shall commence on the 16th day of July 2018 and will operate for:

A period of one year until the 15th day of July 2019 with an expressed option to extend this by up-to two years on a +1+1 basis. This option to extend the contract is at the sole discretion of the Authority.

The total contract value shall be £1,869,353.63 (excluding VAT).

This procurement activity was a further competition under Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) RM6018 Research Marketplace and the DPS Terms and Conditions shall apply. A copy of the contract is provided with this Award Letter and includes those DPS terms and conditions.

Please print and sign a copy and forward to the Procurement Lead electronically via the e-Sourcing Suites’ messaging service. They in turn will manage its ratification and return a copy for your records.

Please ensure that the signed copy of the contract is submitted via the e-sourcing suite by 17:00 hours on Thursday 12th July 2018.

Should you have any queries regarding this or any other matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

**REDACTED**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/nXe8xka1Wnwa9PFPHUh7ZChMbFOC5UX_ImqF9j9l30W4-i-0Bkq2bVBut6rxhUl_e9CZeemR9gysyMv4OFekp3vVpWzI1ohkWrufkqMbAo7kP7Cmv6xUr4H_ltPl9Af7OWT0UcGO | **REDACTED**Crown Commercial Service**REDACTED****Customer Service Centre:** 0345 410 2222**Direct dial:** **REDACTED**[www.crowncommercial.gov.uk](http://www.crowncommercial.gov.uk)  | follow us on [Twitter](https://twitter.com/gov_procurement) | connect with us on [LinkedIn](http://www.linkedin.com/company/government-procurement-service?trk=cp_followed_logo_government-procurement-service) |
|  |  https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/P-uXZH0LjTsM0eiOd4ZlUXz00ED2OTck27Ysw1TPX1x1jM1nGhC_14tJMabltqXQjMJETcksZkiKXCDRafKPc4hrhk5GYtmFPIxoPMOmUKv0PmCZmeZ-5e4ovQt2VrvbOogMmgV0 |

|  |
| --- |
| Signed for and on behalf of Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Order Number: | CCFI18A09 |
| From: | Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government ("Authority") |
| To: | Regeneris Consulting Limited ("Supplier") |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Effective Date:  | 16th July 2018 |
| Expiry Date:   | End date of Initial Period; 15th July 2019, with an expressed option to extend this contract by up-to two years at the sole discretion of the Authority. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Services required:   | Set out in:Annex A – Authority’s Project Scope.Annex B – Supplier’s Response.Both of which form part of this document. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key Individuals: | On behalf of the Authority:**REDACTED**On behalf Regeneris Consulting Limited:**REDACTED** |
| Guarantor(s) | Not Applicable |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT): | £1,869,353.63 |
| Insurance Requirements | Employers Liability Insurance of at least five million poundsProfessional Liability Insurance of at least two million poundsNeither Party excludes or limits it liability for:* death or personal injury caused by its negligence, or that of its employees, agents or Sub-Contractors (as applicable);
* bribery or Fraud by it or its employees;
* statutory obligations stated within the Consumer Rights Act 2015;
* any liability in respect of a breach of duty or obligation under the Financial Services & Markets Act 2000 (as amended from time to time); or
* any liability to the extent it cannot be excluded or limited by Law.

The Supplier does not exclude or limit its liability in respect of the indemnity in Clauses 28 (Staff Transfer) and clause 33 (IPR) and in each case whether before or after the making of a demand pursuant to the indemnity therein. |
| Authority’s billing address for invoicing: | The Authority’s billing address shall be as follows:Hemal Peiris, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local GovernmentSouth-West Quadrant Floor 4, Fry Building 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Alternative and/or additional provisions (including Schedule 6 (Additional clauses)): | Not applicable |

**FORMATION OF CONTRACT**

**BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Authority to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.**

**The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.**

**The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Authority acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt****.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **For and on behalf of the Supplier:**  | **For and on behalf of the Authority:** |
| Name and Job Title: **REDACTED** | Name and Job Title: **REDACTED** |
| Signature: **REDACTED** | Signature: **REDACTED** |
| Date: 09/08/2018 | Date:10/08/2018 |

**Annex A**

**Authority’s Project Specification**

# PURPOSE

## Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is the Managing Authority (MA) department for the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) programme in England. The Authority is responsible for preparing and delivering the £2.8bn England 2014-20 Operational Programme (OP) setting out the national investment strategy for ERDF.

## MHCLG shall be referred to as the Authority throughout this document.

## The Authority wishes to commission the evaluation of the England ERDF 14-20 OP. This shall consider three areas:

## the process of implementation and delivery of the projects and programmes funded through the ERDF programme;

## where possible, the outcomes and impacts that can be established from programme investment.

## the value for money of the programme.

## The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an opportunity to assess the impact of ERDF-financed local growth interventions and the effectiveness of a range of delivery approaches. This will provide important information and analysis to inform future local growth policy and delivery in England.

## The Authority is responsible for demonstrating that the ERDF programme has delivered the outputs and results anticipated.

## The Supplier shall provide a National Impact Evaluation on the success of nine (9) Policy Priorities (Priority Axes (PAs) that have been funded via the ERDF. The PAs are as follows.

**Main priority axes (85% of total)**

**PA 1**: Promoting research and innovation (22% of funding)

**PA 3**: Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs (43%)

**PA 4:** Supporting the shift towards a low carbon economy in all sectors (20%)

**Priority axes with smaller allocations (15% of total)**

**PA 2**: Enhancing access to, and use and quality of, ICT (3%)

**PA 5**: Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management (2.5%)

**PA 6**: Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency (2.5%)

**PA 7**: Sustainable transport In Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly (2%)

**PA 8**: Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination (1%)

**PA 9:** Technical Assistance (4%)

## The National Impact Evaluation must include but not be limited to methods identified within the Appendix B Statement of Requirements. I.e. Project design; collection and aggregation of baseline data and summary assessments; identification of counterfactuals; communication of findings to the indicated audiences).

# BACKGROUND TO THE PROGRAMME

## **The England ESI Funds Growth Programme**

## The 2014-2020 European Structural and Investment Funds (ESI Funds), which include the ERDF, are the European Union’s (EU’s) main instrument for delivering EU Cohesion Policy and the objectives of smart, sustainable, inclusive growth set out in its EU 2020 Strategy.

## The ESI Funds play an important role in supporting economic growth in the UK. They have been organised in England in line with the Government’s model of local economic development across 38 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), through an ESI Funds Growth Programme for England. The design and delivery arrangements reflect the Government’s commitment to decentralisation and increased local accountability, as well as economic rebalancing. The devolved administrations have their own arrangements for the management and evaluation of the ESI Funds in their respective territories.

## The England European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) programmes have been aligned with the socio-economic part of the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) programme to create the England ESI Funds Growth Programme. These three EU Funds have been aligned and notionally allocated to LEP areas through local ESI Funds Strategies, to maximise the synergies between them and domestic funds, and their use as an integrated funding package to support local growth.

## The ESI Funds Growth Programme combines the policies that support the key drivers of growth. Funding priorities are innovation, research and development, support for SMEs, low carbon, skills, employment and social inclusion.

## A single multi-fund Programme Monitoring Committee – The Growth Programme Board – has been set up to oversee and advise departments on the combined use of the Funds and their alignment with domestic growth policies and funding. Sub-committees that bring together key economic stakeholders are in place in each LEP area, to support this EU growth funding model at a local level and delivery through ESI Funds Strategies. Local stakeholders provide an important role in advising MA departments on calls for funding applications and investment decisions that are made by departments, in support of OP objectives and targets and local economic priorities.

## Programme arrangements across the Funds have also been harmonised where possible to support improved and simplified delivery, for instance through a single payment and management information IT system for ERDF and ESF.

## **England ERDF Programme 2014-20**

## The 2014-2020 ERDF programme has been designed in line with this model. A single programme for England has been established to support the economic priorities of England’s 38 LEP areas. The package of a single England ERDF programme and policy framework that is notionally allocated and delivered through 38 LEP area ESI Funds Strategies, has been established to ensure a strategically coherent, highly localised approach to economic development. This supports the Government’s commitment to decentralisation and locally-led growth.

## The England ERDF Programme has also been designed to be strategically flexible and administratively more straightforward. The replacement of previous regional ERDF programmes with a single England ERDF programme allows spending to occur on the basis of need and strategic opportunity across LEP areas, within the three EU categories of region that make up the programme. ERDF rules and procedures, such as output definitions and eligibility criteria, have been similarly harmonised across the country, reducing administrative complexity and increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of programme arrangements.

## **England ERDF Programme Focus**

## It is anticipated that the Programme will distribute approximately £2.8 billion[[1]](#footnote-1) ERDF (£5.1 billion including match) to around 1,750 projects supporting over 150,000 enterprises, with an average ERDF contribution of £1.5m.The Programme covers a wide spectrum of projects, from small interventions that support programme delivery though PA9 technical assistance, to very large financial instrument projects worth up £140m ERDF. The majority of projects and 85% of ERDF will be invested in priority axes 1, 3 and 4 (see paragraph 1.6).

## The Authority proposes that the majority of the central evaluation budget and focus should be committed to the process and impact evaluations of the 3 PAs with lighter touch evaluation of the PAs with smaller financial allocations.

## **Ex-ante Evaluation**

## The EU’s European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds Common Provision Regulations (Regulation 1303/2013) require an OP and ex-ante evaluation to be submitted at the same time. The OP was published in May 2015 and set out the socio-economic circumstances in which ERDF was being introduced and, investment priorities, indicators, targets and partnership and management arrangements for the programme in England. An ex-ante evaluation was undertaken in line with EU regulations to provide an independent assessment of the quality, effectiveness and design of the OP in relation to EU cohesion policy and the England context. The ex-ante evaluation provided important independent evaluation of the programme and basis for its approval by the European Commission (EC). The [ex-ante evaluation](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705329/ERDF_2014_2020_Exante_Evaluation.pdf) was conducted by the contractor Regeneris Consulting in 2014 on behalf of the department.

## EU 2014-2020 regulations for the ERDF 2014-2020 programme establish the performance framework which requires the programme to set out financial and non-financial targets. Failure to meet these targets during and at the end of the programming period can result in reduced financial resources through non-payment of a performance reserve that is linked to the achievement of agreed targets and to financial penalties being applied[[2]](#footnote-2).

## The ex-ante evaluation assessed the effectiveness of monitoring arrangements for the ERDF programme for the performance framework.

## **The Programme Evaluation Plan**

## The Authority is required to produce and submit an Evaluation Plan for the Programme. The plan submitted to the European Commission sets out three key elements:

1. The ERDF indicators as a measure of performance and for monitoring the ERDF spend and implementation;
2. A central process and impact evaluation which will enable us to attribute any results identified to the programme that can be established (referred to as the national evaluation) and;
3. Project-level summative assessments, conducted by projects according to a format provided by the Authority which will feed into the central process evaluation and help inform and validate the indicators.

## High level examples of questions for the national evaluation to cover, as set out in the evaluation plan, include:

* Did the Operational Programme achieve its stated Specific Objectives?
* Is there a difference in outcomes on each of the ERDF policy priorities and interventions before and after implementation of the ERDF programme?
* Which aspects of the programme (from process evaluation) seem to have led to an observed outcome?
* Where sufficient levels of data are available, did any changes in outcomes vary across different individuals, partners, sections of society (sub-groups), LEP area level and if so, how did they compare with what was anticipated?
* Did any outcomes occur which were not originally intended, and if so, what and how significant were they?

## **Background to the requirement**

## Following a [scoping study](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705330/Scoping_National_Evaluation_of_the_2014_2020_ERDF_Programme.pdf) to provide options and recommendations for effectively evaluating the ERDF programme of interventions, the Authority’s analysts have drafted the following evaluation design to meet the EU requirement to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the programme. The proposed design takes on board learning from various other evaluations of local growth programmes, such as the Regional Growth Fund evaluation and the evaluation scoping report of the Local Growth Fund. In addition, it is consistent with advice from the ‘What Works Centres on Local Economic Growth and Wellbeing’ (as an additional measure of impact) as well as the EU and HMG's standards and protocols on impact evaluation, [Quality in Policy Impact Evaluation](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/190984/Magenta_Book_quality_in_policy_impact_evaluation__QPIE_.pdf) and the [Magenta Book](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book).

## Understanding how public investment in economic growth and private spending levered in can deliver a range of objectives, is vital to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of spending and future growth policy. The proposed approach reflects this goal, which is supported by EU regulations and guidance on suitable methods. It is also supported by the findings and recommendations from lessons learned from a variety of previous local growth evaluations and an external [scoping study](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705330/Scoping_National_Evaluation_of_the_2014_2020_ERDF_Programme.pdf) commissioned by the Authority for this ERDF evaluation.

## The nature of the ERDF programme regulations and the Programme’s design and implementation in England have had a number of important implications for the design of the National Evaluation:

* **Programme Duration**. The 2014-20 programme is implemented over 10 years (and potentially longer for certain projects such as financial instruments) during which economic circumstances and policy can change.
* **Spread of Resources**. As noted earlier, the Programme’s resources are heavily concentrated in three policy priorities which will generate the majority of the business beneficiaries and also a significant proportion of the overall economic impact. Nevertheless, these resources will be spread across more than 1,500 projects in total.
* **Eligibility of All Areas**. The fact that ERDF resources are allocated across England as a whole means that the scope to use areas within England which do not have access to these resources as a control area is not feasible, except in PAs which are isolated to specific LEP areas.
* **Time Lags in Impacts**. There can be a considerable time lag in the occurrence of economic, social and environmental impacts, especially for certain types of activities such as research and innovation.
* **Limitations on Counterfactual Impact Evaluation**. The manner in which the interventions are delivered and beneficiaries are selected limits the approaches which can be adopted for counterfactual impact evaluation, especially where the programme is investing in supporting investments rather than directly in beneficiaries. The enhancements to administrative datasets will assist more effective counterfactual impact evaluation (CIE) approaches in some instances only, and most definitely not in all.
* **Wider Economic Impacts**. The ERDF programme has the potential to generate a diverse range and potentially complex mix of positive and negative wider impacts affecting factor and product markets. The current performance of the UK economy and the limited labour market capacity in many parts of England, will have implications for the potential overall impact of the investments (e.g. labour substitution may be an issue).

## There is also a regulatory requirement to assess the application of horizontal principles applied in the programme: the promotion of equal opportunities and non‑discrimination and sustainable development, which will be embedded into the assessment and delivery of all programme activities.

## In addition, the Programme includes specific tools and approaches designed to respond to different territorial needs. It will also be important these are assessed where possible for effectiveness and efficiency, particularly to understand how investments under different PAs have combined to have a greater impact on the territories’ growth. This includes impact for:

* Categories of region (the less developed, transition and more developed regions);
* Sustainable Urban Development;
* Community Led Local Development;
* Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs); and
* at the LEP area level.

## ERDF is a major contributor to the Government’s local growth plans and the evaluation will demonstrate how the programme has maximised the use of this funding and the Authority’s return on the investment. The evaluation also needs to inform the EU’s synthesis report outlining the main conclusions of the ex-post evaluations from all member states. The proposal does not include the ex-ante evaluation that will be required for the next programming period.

# DEFINITIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expression or Acronym | Definition |
| **MHCLG** | means the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government |
| **ERDF** | means the European Regional Development Fund |
| **EU** | means the European Union |
| **MA** | means the Managing Authority |
| **LEP** | means the Local Enterprise Partnership |
| **CIE** | means the Counterfactual Impact Evaluation |
| **BEIS** | means the Department for Business, Enterprise, Innovation & Skills |
| **CCS** | means the Crown Commercial Service |
| **DEFRA** | means the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs |
| **EIR** | means the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 |
| **ESF** | means the European Social Fund |
| **ESIF** | means the European Structural and Investment Funds |
| **EU** | means the European Union |
| **FoIA** | means the Freedom of Information Act 2000 |
| **GDT** | means the Growth Delivery TeamThe local growth delivery teams are responsible for managing delivery of ERDF in their respective areas. This work includes developing calls for projects, assessing applications, approving Grant Funding Agreements and monitoring projects that are receiving funding.In this ITT, the term GDT includes the GLA which is an intermediate body. |
| **GFA** | means the Grant Funding Agreement |
| **GLA** | means the Greater London Authority |
| **GSR** | means the Government Social Research |
| **IDBR** | means the Inter-Departmental Business Register |
| **ITIs** | means the Integrated Territorial Investments |
| **ITT** | means the Invitation to Tender |
| **NAO** | means the National Audit Office |
| **OGD** | means the Other Government Department |
| **OP** | means the Operational Programme  |
| **PA** | means the Priority Axis  |
| **SME** | means the Small and Medium sized Enterprises |

# SCOPE

## The proposal for the evaluation of the England ERDF 2014-2020 OP aims to understand the following:

1. the process of implementation and delivery of the projects and programmes funded through the ERDF programme;
2. where possible, the outcomes and impacts that can be established from programme investment; and
3. the value for money of the programme.

## There are nine policy priorities[[3]](#footnote-3) financed by the ERDF. Three PAs, focus on research and innovation (22%), small and medium enterprise competitiveness (43%) and low carbon economy (20%). These constitute 85% of the funding. Six PAs have smaller allocations, which make up the remaining 15% of the ERDF funding in England.

## In view of the above, the evaluation methods need to be proportionate. There is the potential to dedicate a lot of effort and resource trying to “shoehorn” interventions into Counterfactual Impact Evaluation (CIE) methods which are not appropriate or sufficiently robust to be part of the National Evaluation. The proposed design therefore focuses on trying to implement CIE in the areas of greatest spend, with large enough scale programme of activity, where counterfactual can be identified in the three PAs with the largest financial resources. In the PAs with smaller financial resources greater reliance is put on the monitoring data, local project evaluations and qualitative assessment of impact, with the national evaluators playing a quality assurance role on the data to ensure validity and reliability for inclusion in the National Evaluation analysis and reporting.

## Table 1 below provides an at a glance overview of the sources of economic impact evidence for the national evaluation by intervention type.

## **Table 1: Summary of the Sources of Impact Evaluation Evidence by Intervention Type**



# THE REQUIREMENT

## Evaluation is an objective process of understanding how a policy, strategy or other intervention was implemented, what effects it had, for whom and under what circumstances. The ERDF 2014-2020 evaluation will do this through the utilisation of:

1. a process evaluation the effectiveness of decision making/ governance arrangements,
2. qualitative, theory-based or counterfactual impact evaluation[[4]](#footnote-4) and;
3. economic evaluation.

## The Authority requires the Supplier to conduct an evaluation that will assist the Authority in demonstrating how the OP is delivering on its priorities and objectives, establish accountability and provide defensible evidence to independent scrutiny from the European Commission.

## The Supplier’s evaluation will also contribute valuable knowledge to the local economic growth policy evidence base, feeding into future policy development and occupying a crucial role in the policy cycle of any future domestic local growth funding.

## In order to ensure clarity on what the programme aims to achieve, the means by which this will be achieved and the impacts it expects to see as a result, the following logic model has been developed. The logic model is a key tool in evaluation to help inform the design (i.e. explain the approach that the Authority wishes to evaluate) and definition of the data that needs to be collected. It helps the Authority to understand what the actual practice and experience of the programme was following implementation (rather than what was expected or intended, which forms part of appraisal).

## **Figure 1: Logic model ERDF**



Note: Results as set out above are equivalent to both ‘outcomes’ and some ‘outputs’, but not ‘impact’ in traditional data terms for evaluation.

## In order to understand both the delivery and impacts of the ERDF 2014-2020 programme, it is proposed that the national evaluation covers both a process and impact evaluation. The advantage of this approach is that if impacts are identified, the Authority can better relate them to delivery mechanisms and where impacts are not necessarily seen, a logical assessment can be made of whether it is the policy, strategy or operational programme that has failed to deliver, or whether its implementation has failed.

## Due to the nature and scale of the ERDF programme, it is proposed that the focus of evaluation be by intervention type, where projects that are similar can be aggregated for evaluation purposes. This design outlines each of the different intervention types covered by the programme, after considering the [logic model](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-european-regional-development-fund-2014-to-2020) (for each intervention type, including the rationale for the interventions and the desired beneficiary outcomes and local economic impacts). Allowing for the scale of intervention and the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts, the assessment outlines the feasible evaluation methods for as robust impact evidence as possible. This includes the use of counterfactual impact evaluation (CIE) methods, secondary published surveys, specific commissioned beneficiary surveys, the project level summative assessments and specific project case studies. The requirement could also include the piloting of CIE methods for selected projects where the use of CIE methods for an intervention type as a whole might not be suitable as part of the National Evaluation.

## **Objectives**

## The approach taken in relation to the ERDF National Evaluation by intervention type is illustrated in Figure 1 below. Robust CIE methods are the gold standard in impact evaluations, these methods may not be proportionate to the investments made and the data collected. In these cases, lower thresholds of evaluative evidence will be collated but will still offer valuable insights. In addition, in all cases, process evaluation will be necessary and will include these lower thresholds of data.

|  |
| --- |
| Trade-off between Impact Evaluation Evidence Robustness and Quantity |
|  |
| A range of data sources will be drawn upon by the National Evaluation, with the requirements varying between the different strands, some is already collected by the MA and some will require additional data collection by the contractor. The key strands include:* programme expenditure and output information, including commitments and achievements, analysed at the overall programme level, PA and Investment Priority/Specific Objectives
* project level monitoring information including the commitment and achievement of spend and outputs, as well as information for beneficiaries
* project level summative assessments identifying delivery progress and the achievement of outcomes and impacts
* national administrative datasets (such as the IDBR[[5]](#footnote-5)) which may enable the matching of beneficiaries to reliable and independent sources of performance data for the beneficiaries, as well as the selection of comparison groups
* secondary published datasets (typically survey based) which may provide access to additional independent data for the beneficiaries
* specially commissioned beneficiary surveys, as well as consultations with a range of grant recipients and project delivery bodies, and relevant stakeholders (including LEPs and sector bodies)

**Process evaluation**Evaluation can take various forms such as process[[6]](#footnote-6), qualitative[[7]](#footnote-7) or CIE[[8]](#footnote-8). CIE is helpful when the Authority wants to understand the impact of a new policy, programme or project that is untested and where good quality monitoring data can be designed-in to inform the evaluation, through piloting or trials. The former types of evaluation might be more proportionate and appropriate for projects that are small in scale with small numbers of throughputs where a sound counterfactual group cannot be identified, but where the Authority can build on good quality monitoring data. In addition, impact evaluation should not be undertaken without process evaluation, precisely for the above reasons. **Summative Assessments**The project summative assessments will be a valuable source of evidence where done well, providing rich information on delivery approaches, theory of change assessments and robust CIE based assessments in some instances. To ensure that standards of evaluation are high the Authority has [published guidance](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-european-regional-development-fund-2014-to-2020) and provided training on undertaking summative assessments and the minimum quality of data and standards of evaluation acceptable. Specifically the Authority has:* reinforced the message contained in the [summative assessment guidance](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705888/ESIF-GN-1-033_ERDF_Summative_Assessment_Guidance_v1.pdf) on the need for an appropriate and high standard of project evaluation that is commensurate with the overall level of ERDF grant and match funding;
* strongly encouraged projects to adopt CIE where feasible and appropriate;
* ensured that the summative assessment tools provided as part of the summative assessment process are implemented by the projects including the evaluation plan and reporting formats, as these will help to ensure consistency of standards and outputs.

The contractor will have a role in the quality assurance of these assessments to ensure they are fit for the purposes of the national evaluation.**The role of beneficiary surveys in impact evaluations**Beneficiary surveys can be useful in providing quantitative and qualitative information in a consistent format even though it is self-reported evidence of outcomes. Such surveys can bring insight on how the manner in which, the support received or access to other investments, brought about changes in beneficiary behaviour and potentially performance. The analysis above has identified the role for survey design of both beneficiaries (potentially using surveys prior to support or immediately after, as well as follow-up surveys 8-12 months later) and non-beneficiary comparison groups in a number of instances to enhance CIE approaches. Given the recommendations on CIE approaches to follow, the main areas in which large scale surveys are likely to be required are: * Established SMEs receiving general business advice and guidance, business finance and more specialist types of research and innovation related support
* Entrepreneurs that establish as business post start-up support, as well as those that do not

Surveys will also be a useful source of evidence for other intervention types (including occupiers in new or refurbished property, beneficiaries of energy efficiency treatments including social housing tenants, businesses taking up broadband, businesses benefiting from environmental improvements and researchers in new research facilities) as well as additional sources of funding, these will be the responsibility of the grant recipients to implement as part of their summative assessments. Each of the intervention types identified through the scoping study is now presented in turn below with our proposals on the nature and scale of evaluation, based on what is feasible and provides best value for money for the Department. This includes consideration of process evaluation methods, inclusive of project summative assessments and impact evaluation feasibility. |

## **1. Research and Innovation Infrastructure and Facilities**

## The mix of intervention types covered in this group in the ERDF Operational Programme include: R&I infrastructure & facilities (SO1.1); and R&I knowledge exchange and collaboration (SO1.2 and SO1.3). There is the potential for some investment to be targeted at research and innovation infrastructure through Priority Axis 4 as well (low carbon economy), but this will be less significant in terms of the scale of resource and its expected impact.

## Some of the investment will be capital in nature, including new research and innovation facilities, equipment and infrastructure, often located in higher education and research institutes. These capital projects may also include revenue elements focused on more intensive knowledge exchange and collaborations. The types of beneficiaries include university researchers and SMEs who utilise the facilities. These interventions have the potential to improve the research capacity, knowledge exchange and hence attractiveness of local economies as centre of research excellence and business locations. More general revenue focused innovation support for SMEs is covered in intervention category 3.

## **Evaluation approach**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommended adopting number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 1 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments. In addition, there will be further monitoring requirements as set out below, as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* It will be necessary for a wider range of data to be collected by grant recipients including (i) information on the type of facilities, equipment and other facilities accessed, the intensity of other support and the timing or receipt, (ii) contact details for beneficiaries including a variety of related data, (iii) beneficiary selection processes and contact derails for unsuccessful applicants (where appropriate).
* Case studies will be extracted where they have been collated as part of summative assessments to illustrate the implementation, delivery and qualitative impacts of a range of projects.

## **Impact evaluation**

## A range of counterfactual impact evaluation methods have been considered as outlined below;

* Identification of any beneficiary businesses which may be present in the LSBS, UKIS and/or BERD datasets, via data-linking from the IDBR. An analytical assessment should then be made as to whether there are enough of these businesses, and they are sufficiently representative of all beneficiaries, to enable a reliable matched-control group analysis for the anticipated effect size. However, the small sample size of these datasets is likely to mean an insufficient number of beneficiaries are identifiable to make the analysis worthwhile. In this case, an analysis of confidence interval of the sample would be expected to help inform discussions between MHCLG and the contractors.
* A matched-control group approach focused explicitly on the ultimate impact from changes in innovation behaviour on business performance in terms of employment growth. This can be done in the IDBR without the need to link to other datasets with small sample sizes, so is more viable as an approach. However, it should be noted that any effect on business performance from innovation takes a long time to transpire, and is not a straightforward one.
* A survey-based approach in which either later accessors of new/improved facilities or infrastructure, or those applying for/on a waiting list to access the new facilities, act as a control for those already using the facilities. A comparison between the two groups on important measures such as R&D investment, number of researchers, or level of innovation, is then made.
* A survey-based approach which compares performance of the beneficiary businesses both before and after receipt of support, as well as benchmarking against national innovation surveys such as the LSBS (the whole survey dataset is then used as a comparator, and, where such a comparison is possible for more than one time-point, a Difference-in-Differences estimation employed). The large number of SMEs which receive support means there is merit in the national evaluation undertaking its own specific surveys, rather than accessing this information through the summative assessments.

##  Of these approaches, only the first and second (matched-control group analyses) would meet the minimum SMS level 3 robustness criteria. From the other options, the closest to this minimum standard is the third listed, in which later accessors of a new facility/infrastructure, or those on a waiting list to access the new facilities, control for earlier accessors. However, feasibility of the approach will need to be considered before being taking forward.

## Where a comparison group can be established such as by comparison against an existing government survey - but not one representing a matched control group - a counterfactual-type approach can still be taken by employing Difference-in-Difference estimation. Where such an approach is used, consideration should be given to whether the two groups are genuinely comparable.

##  **In summary, the Authority recommends adopting a number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates each other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types**. There is an important place for a beneficiary survey to supplement this evidence, as well as project case studies and summative evidence. Steps will need to be taken to enhance project monitoring information gathered by grant recipients.

## **2. Business Advice, Guidance and Finance for Start-ups**

## The intervention covers two main investment strands:

* Business start-up advice, guidance and mentoring (including a spatial focus on deprived communities) (SO3.1)
* Start-up and early stage finance (SO3.1).

##  The interventions are likely to be focused on potential entrepreneurs, new businesses and micro business beneficiaries. The projects may have been targeted spatially, in particular where activity is focused on communities with low levels of entrepreneurialism. Whilst early stage finance can be placed in a number of the groupings, it is included here due to the relatively young age of many of the businesses which receive support and hence the evaluation issues raised around the counterfactual (that is, the absence of many from the IBDR, subject to ONS’s planned enhancements to this dataset).

## **Evaluation approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommended adopting a number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 2 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments. In addition, there will be further monitoring requirements as set out below, as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* In terms of the recommended additional monitoring information, it will be necessary for a wider range of data to be collected by grant recipients, including the type, timing and intensity of support provided. It will also be necessary for grant recipients to provide details of the selection and scoring procedures used and details of unsuccessful applicants.
* Case studies will be extracted where they have been collated as part of summative assessments to illustrate the implementation, delivery and qualitative impacts of a range of projects.

## **Impact evaluation**

## Counterfactual Impact Evaluation for this intervention type is rendered difficult by the newness of the businesses supported and the fact that, in some cases, support is given to potential entrepreneurs who have yet to start a business. Several approaches are suggested, with the feasibility of each dependent on the approach taken by delivery organisations to identify businesses/individuals to support. This will need to be investigated further by the national evaluators. However, the options are set out below.

* Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD) for instances in which a clear scoring mechanism has been used to select individuals/businesses to receive support. However, it is currently unknown whether many delivery organisations have used the type of selection procedure needed for such an approach to be feasible. The current expectation is that this may be feasible for some projects providing repayable finance to micro or small businesses.
* Where RDD is not possible because of the absence of a clear scoring mechanism, yet an application procedure has nevertheless been used to select individuals/businesses to receive support, a survey approach should be used to survey both those benefiting from support and those applying for but not being granted support. This removes the self-selection bias associated with seeking support, although many other differences between the supported and unsupported businesses may remain, since matching is not used to eliminate them, meaning this approach has quite a low level of robustness.
* It will be necessary to undertake an initial review to determine the means by which those delivering support have identified and selected individuals to receive it. The purpose of the review is to understand whether this selection mechanism in any way allows for a quasi-experimental analysis, or at least a comparison between individuals applying for and receiving support and those applying for but not receiving support.
* The adoption of a survey of beneficiaries could also be utilised where the details of unsuccessful applicants are not available. The evidence collected through the survey and possibility for more in-depth case studies could be used in a simplified form of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. This approach would monitor the number of planning and preparation activities undertaken by potential entrepreneurs before-and-after the provision of advice. Alongside this, data should be collected on the proportion of these potential entrepreneurs who actually go on to start a business. This figure might then be compared against the existing literature and available data on this subject, such as, potentially, data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor dataset. Potentially, where such a comparison can take place at more than one point in time, a Difference-in-Difference analysis can be used to establish a counterfactual, with the caveat that such an approach does not eliminate sources of bias to the same extent that a matched-control group approach would do.
* While the newness of businesses provided support under this intervention, or the fact that some have not even yet been started (e.g. potential entrepreneurs), means they will not be present in administrative datasets, rendering quasi-experimental CIE approaches impossible at the National Evaluation level, individual projects may have selected those to receive support in such a way as to make quasi-experimental CIE possible at the project level. In this case, the Summative Assessments of individual projects can be drawn on for an assessment of impact as part of the National Evaluation.

## It is important to monitor the firm deformation rate within a locality as part of this intervention type, since increased firm formation is highly correlated with increased firm deformation. There is therefore the possibility for an overall net aggregate decrease in the population density of businesses in the locality as a result of measures to increase start-up.

## **In summary, we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates each other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types**. There is an important place for a beneficiary survey to supplement this evidence, as well as project case studies and summative evidence. Steps will need to be taken to enhance project monitoring information gathered by grant recipients.

## **3. Business Support and Finance for Established SMEs**

## The intervention category covers a range of business support and finance which will typically be provided direct to SMEs and funded across a variety of specific objectives in Priority Axes 1, 2 and especially 3, please the [operational programme](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-european-regional-development-fund-operational-programme-2014-to-2020) for referencing:

* General growth focused advice and guidance for established SMEs (SO3.3)
* Innovation focused advice and guidance for established SMEs (SO3.2)
* R&I focused business advice and guidance (SO1.2 and SO1.3)
* Business advice focussed on use of digital technologies (SO2.2)
* Business advice and grants to encourage low carbon innovation (SO4.5 and SO6.2)
* Early stage business finance (SO1.2/SO1.3)
* Business growth finance (SO3.2/SO3.3).

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 3 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments. In addition, there will be further monitoring requirements as set out below, as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* In previous evaluations, such as that of the [2007-2013 ERDF](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-european-regional-development-fund-2014-to-2020), identification of beneficiary businesses in administrative datasets has been hampered by poor record keeping. These interventions will have a very high volume of beneficiaries and it is essential that consistent and high quality beneficiary data is collected:
* Full details of the businesses to enable their identification in the IDBR (as well as other characteristics), as well as surveying
* Information on the type, intensity and timing of the support
* It is also desirable that projects provide information on their application and selection process for support, as well as the details of the unsuccessful applicants.
* Due to cost constraints, detailed case studies which trace through the process by which business support and finance for established SMEs has resulted in positive benefits will not be commissioned. As there is the potential for counterfactual impact evaluation in this intervention area, case studies will be extracted where they have been collated as part of summative assessments to illustrate the implementation, delivery and qualitative impacts of a range of projects.

## **Impact evaluation**

## The recommended approach for evaluating ERDF business advice and finance schemes is to target an SMS level 3 evaluation through the use of Propensity Score Matching. This approach is the most robust achievable in the case of this strand of the ERDF because randomisation of treatment, as required by an RCT, has not occurred, so SMS level 5 is unachievable; furthermore, we are not aware of any quasi-random aspect to this intervention type that might allow for the achievement of SMS level 4. The [scoping study](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705330/Scoping_National_Evaluation_of_the_2014_2020_ERDF_Programme.pdf) contractors were confident that a PSM approach, in which businesses receiving advice are accurately matched with those not receiving support from the ERDF, can provide for a robust attribution of any beneficial effect from the support provided through this ERDF intervention type.

##  However, as noted, highly-accurate matching can actually be detrimental to isolating the 'true' impact of business support under circumstances of displacement, with the potential to overstate or understate impact. Therefore, the recommendation is to primarily rely on PSM but to supplement this, where possible, with other approaches, including Regression Discontinuity Design for schemes in which there is a specific scoring mechanism for allocating support, and with beneficiary surveys conducted in such a way that non-beneficiaries are also surveyed as a control. Furthermore, the use of productivity-decomposition analysis should be investigated specifically as a way to examine the problem of displacement.

##  The recommended approach is therefore one in which PSM constitutes the main thrust of the evaluation, the results of which are then triangulated and verified using other CIE techniques. The options for this intervention type are therefore listed below. A matched-control group analysis using PSM implemented using the IDBR as a spine that is linked to by other datasets, where relevant, and where the provided support relates to specific forms of advice pertaining to, for example, innovation or finance, in which case linking to the LSBS in particular may be useful.

##  While this is an intervention type that is highly amenable to CIE carried out on administrative datasets, beneficiary surveys also have an important role in its evaluation, as a means to process trace the mechanism by which business advice and finance impacts business performance, as this will differ from case-to-case. This can provide timely input into the evaluation, since the ultimate effect from advice/finance on the business’ performance may take a long time to become evident; new business plans, made in response to advice or associated with an investment, take a long time to implement. Furthermore, beneficiary surveys allow for a tailoring of questions to provide information on issues not easily examined through secondary administrative datasets, such as spill-over effects and displacement.

## Summative assessments can be drawn on to supplement any information resulting from beneficiary surveys for the same purpose. Summary assessment can provide specific information on how particular instances or examples of advice and finance were employed by individual businesses, and to what effect. This provides causal detail with which to complement a CIE statistical analysis, which may provide an estimation of impact if there is one, but perhaps says little about the reasons for impact, or lack of impact.

## **In summary, by combining evidence from different sources, such as analysis of administrative datasets, alongside summative assessment evidence with regards to how advice/finance was actually used by business, it will be possible to say something about the spatial pattern of impacts and to derive possible reasons for variations in effect**. Different localities will have approached and implemented the provision of advice and finance in different ways. By disaggregating the analysis geographically it is possible to get a handle on which types of approach have worked best.

* In addition to the core analysis outlined above, there are a number of options:
* The use of RDD where there is a suitable scoring process for selecting beneficiaries, in conjunction with a survey of the unsuccessful applicants
* A survey of beneficiaries shortly after completion of receipt of support, in addition to the main follow up survey 8-12 months after support
* Working alongside the project evaluators in undertaking a pilot case study of a small number of the larger or more impactful projects such as business finance projects in order to test approaches (possibly RDD)
* If judged to be feasible as part of the initial scoping, exploring the potential use of productivity-decomposition analysis should be investigated specifically as a way of testing the assessments of displacement.

## **4a. Business Related Infrastructure – Broadband**

## The interventions in this category include investments in broadband infrastructure under Specific Objective 2.1 of Priority Axis 2. The interventions will indirectly benefit SMEs and potentially larger businesses. There is also likely to be indirect benefits to households and public sector organisations, although these are not eligible in terms of ERDF grant.

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, both counterfactual and non-counterfactual, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with regards to overall impact of different types.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 4a will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new implementation off broadband has benefits for business. Where a detailed case study has been conducted as part of Summative Assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not sufficiently representative of the different interventions that fall under this type, or are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## While the assessment is complicated by the need for different types of approach for established businesses and those that are new to the area, the main conclusions are:

* Although it will add to the cost of the evaluation, a survey of businesses is unavoidable for all options. This is because a survey is the only robust method for measuring business take-up (an outcome indicator) and identifying the specific businesses which have subscribed to broadband.
* Counterfactual approaches to assessing the impact of broadband on the performance of established businesses should be viable. This could be done using administrative datasets, which would be the most robust approach, but could also be done as part of the business survey.
* It will be more challenging to carry out counterfactual approaches for assessing impacts on the number of businesses in an area and the jobs that they support. While possible in theory, we believe it would be very difficult for an evaluation to establish a suitable control area, or to conduct an Instrumental Variable approach which identified and controlled for the wide range of dependent variables which could affect economic outcomes. Therefore a before and after survey based method, which asks businesses about the role broadband played in their location decisions, is likely to be the most pragmatic approach.
* Given the expected requirement for beneficiary surveys to be carried out as part of the summative assessment and the typical size of these projects (which are all fairly large), we believe it is most appropriate for the responsibility for carrying out the counterfactual impact assessment to be with the project evaluators rather than the national evaluation. The national evaluation will have a key quality assurance role to play in ensuring that these are all carried out in a consistent and robust way.

## In summary, CIE methods could be used to assess the impact on established SMEs but not the impact that broadband has on the overall number of businesses in the area. This will offer robust evidence of impact. We recommend that this approach is adopted. Ideally, this would use administrative datasets to minimise the risk of bias or inaccuracies. If this is not possible, then the business survey should also be used to ask businesses to report their business performance before and after the broadband intervention. Theory of change approaches should be used to assess the impact broadband has had on attracting new businesses to the area or encouraging more businesses to be set up in the are**a**. We recommend that the business survey evidence is considered alongside business datasets showing how the number of new businesses has changed.

## **4b. Business Related Infrastructure – Land and Property**

## The interventions in this category include investments in a range of place based business related infrastructure, including site remediation, associated site infrastructure and development of premises for SMEs (including incubation, managed workspace and grow-on space). The specific objectives and associated eligible activities are:

* Employment land remediation (SO6.1)
* Incubation, commercial and industrial floorspace (SO3.2/SO3.3).

## The interventions will indirectly benefit SME occupiers and potentially larger businesses, with benefits including additional wealth and employment creation in local economies, including the potential for this to be located in priority spatial areas or sectors, and the growth of local businesses and the attraction of inward investors, wider benefits can include the enhanced economic competitiveness of local economies, the establishment of new investment locations and improved land values and rents for commercial and industrial property.

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with on the process and delivery of the intervention.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 4b will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments. In addition, there will be further monitoring requirements as set out below, as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* In order to implement the proposed approach, there will be a need to ensure a standard approach to the collection of monitoring information concerning the (i) the type of development activity and floorspace, (ii) occupancy data, (iii) details of the occupiers, their origin and selected performance information (more detailed is provided above). There may be practical restrictions on the collection and provision of beneficiary information, especially where the grant recipient is not the site or property developer.
* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new business related infrastructure has resulted in benefits. A sufficient number of case studies need to be conducted to ensure that they are representative of the different types of intervention that fall under this type. Comparison and contrast between case studies should be undertaken to establish the causal effects stemming from varying types of infrastructure investment and support. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of Summative Assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not sufficiently representative of the different interventions that fall under this type, or are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## This is a particularly challenging intervention for which to undertake robust impact evaluation. This is due to the large number and diverse mix of investments, the complexity of the local economic and property markets contexts in which they are implemented, the limitations of the local economic and property market data, and the long time period over which delivery occurs and impacts emerge. Considering each of the approaches the main conclusions are:

* There is limited scope for the viable use of robust counterfactual approaches of these interventions as part of the national evaluation. Whilst there may be scope to test a mix of approaches as part of the national evaluation, the uncertainty as to their value points to only doing this on the basis of case study pilot.
* If an in-depth case study is to be undertaken to test possible counterfactual approaches, we suggest that this is focused on one of the larger investments namely the North West Evergreen II or similar fund. This has the advantage of being focused in a geographical area for which the availability of property market and economic data is generally very good. The grant recipient is also well placed to gather the type of monitoring data which will be necessary.
* Whilst there may be some merit in undertaking developer and occupier surveys across all or a sample of property projects, this risks unnecessary duplication of effort where the benefits of a national approach may not be justified in practice. The alternative approach is for the national evaluators to work with grant recipients to develop suitable research tools which can help to secure greater consistency of data.
* The summative assessment will provide useful evidence, which may be enhanced if the suggestion to use common survey approaches and tool is adopted.

## **In summary, whilst there is a need for a mixed methods approach enabling triangulation of the evidence, the scope for robust counterfactual impact assessment of these interventions at a national level is limited**. There is not a strong case for beneficiaries surveys as part of a national evaluation (unlike for business support interventions), instead with the emphasis on raising the standards of surveys undertaken by grant recipients.

## **5: Transport**

## The interventions in this category include transport interventions in Cornwall, the only Less Developed region in England (and all contained within Priority Axis 7). These include investments in the road and rail networks and interventions which promote greater accessibility and encourage more sustainable forms of travel. There are no direct beneficiaries but a range of potential indirect beneficiaries including businesses, residents and visitors. The specific objectives and the associated eligible activities are:

* Investments in the TEN-T road and rail network (SO7.1)
* Encouraging modal shift and improving accessibility of employment sites (SO7.2).

## **Evaluation Approach**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base on the process and delivery of the intervention.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 5 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new transport infrastructure has resulted in benefits. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of Summative Assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## The main conclusions are as follows:

* Evaluation methods for transport investments are in need of more development. The guidance on evaluating impacts is limited and there are no well-established CIE methods.
* Recent research has identified some CIE methods which offer potential. These are based around accessibility modelling, in which a pre and post investment matrix of journey times is used to assess the extent to which the transport investment explains variation in small area economic performance. This approach can be applied to investments on rail, road and multi-modal hubs and therefore could be applied for all of the different types of transport interventions which could be funded under this Priority Axis.
* Although these methods offer potential, it is still a novel and thus far untested approach to evaluating the impact of transport investments. It would also require the collection of a very large volume of monitoring data on journey times to populate the pre and post investment matrix. This would therefore be resource intensive, and further work would be required to determine whether the approach is feasible and whether the cost is proportionate to the scale of investment.

## **In summary, while CIE methods can be explored further, given the focus of the priority just on Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly and the small number of large projects being funded, it is most practical to implement and test these approaches as part of the summative assessments**. The [summative assessment guidance](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705888/ESIF-GN-1-033_ERDF_Summative_Assessment_Guidance_v1.pdf) has encouraged these projects to consider the feasibility of adopting CIE methods. The national evaluation will rely on the projects assessment and the national evaluators will have a role to play in providing advice and guidance ensuring the quality of the assessments.

## **6: Other Infrastructure**

## The interventions within this category include infrastructure to tackle flood and coastal flood risk management and green and blue infrastructure to preserve and protect the environment. The specific objectives and the associated eligible activities are:

* Enabling and protecting economic development potential through investment in flood and coastal flooding management, where there is a demonstrable market failure (SO5.1)
* Investment in green and blue infrastructure and actions supporting provision of ecosystem services on which businesses/communities depend to increase local natural capital and support sustainable economic growth (SO6.1).

## These schemes are characterised by having primarily indirect beneficiaries, which include domestic and business land and property owners and tenants, as well as wider users of the space.

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with on the process and delivery of the intervention.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 6 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments, additional monitoring requirements as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* As noted above, if the methods are adopted as part of the national evaluation, it will require a range of additional information to be collected on a consistent basis for the different types of projects including (i) geospatial data for the site or treatment area, (ii) full details of the types of treatments and (iii) information on number and type of properties in the treatment areas or an impact area if this is larger.
* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which these infrastructure investments have resulted in benefits. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of Summative Assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## It is challenging to implement robust counterfactual impact methods for this intervention, due to a variety of factors including the modest size of some treatments, the potential diffuse impact on local economies or the long time period over which impacts emerge, the shortcomings in the data sets, and the challenges of identifying suitable comparators. The proposed approach for the national evaluation therefore needs to draw on a number of sources of evidence.

## Considering each of the approaches the main conclusions are:

* There is limited scope for the viable use of robust counterfactual approaches of these interventions as part of the national evaluation. There may be a case for piloting a case study for major floor defence treatments in conjunction with the Environment Agency.
* There is merit in undertaking time series analysis (before and after) of the relevant and reliable economic and property data for the treatment and associated defined impact areas. This would need to be supplemented by tailored occupier and property owner surveys. Whilst achievable, this would be a very resource intensive approach which may not be justified by the benefit provided by the evaluation evidence collected, given the relatively modest level of programme resources being devoted to this area.

## **In summary, the summative assessment will provide useful evidence accepting the challenges of evaluating these interventions set out above.**

## **7. Low Carbon Generation**

## The interventions within this category include investment to enable the development of small scale renewable energy schemes. The specific objective is to ‘increase the number of small scale renewable energy schemes in England’ (SO4.1). Whilst SO4.1 also includes support to build capability and capacity for supply chains in renewable energy the sector, the focus on advice and guidance support to SMEs means this strand of activity is considered under business support to SMEs above.

## Direct beneficiaries could include SMEs, public sector organisations and social landlords. It is also possible that these organisation types could also benefit indirectly, if they are allowing renewable scheme developers to deploy renewable capacity on their land or premises (and receiving a rent for this).

## **Evaluation Approaches**

##  For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence from each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base with on the process and delivery of the intervention.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 7 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments, additional monitoring requirements as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* As noted above, there is a fairly limited requirement any enhancements to the monitoring information collected. Where relevant, all organisations should capture monitoring data on actual energy output (both electricity and heat) in addition to additional capacity. Whist there could be some merit in requiring grant recipients and delivery bodies to capture data to enable the measurement of actual real world net reduction in energy use and hence emissions (where appropriate), it is not appropriate or desirable to insist upon it in this instance.
* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new transport infrastructure has resulted in benefits. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of Summative Assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## Whilst there is merit in the national evaluators investigating this intervention type in more detail when more information is available on the types of projects which are being funded, it is unlikely that standard CIE methods will be viable as part of the national evaluation. **In summary, the focus should be on using the combination of programme monitoring data and summative assessments as the main source of impact evidence, with the possibility of selective using pilots of CIE approaches or in-depth project case studies for particularly interesting or impactful projects**. As with a number of other areas, there may be merit in the national evaluators running workshops or providing good practice guidance on impact evaluation for these types of projects to the grant recipients in order to raise standards.

## **8: Resource and Energy Efficiency**

## The interventions within this category include energy efficiency measures and to a lesser extent resource efficiency, with a range of direct beneficiaries including SMEs, public sector organisations, and social landlords and their tenants. The specific objectives and the associated eligible activities are:

* Energy efficiency advice and financial support to SMEs (SO4.2)
* Energy efficiency advice and investment support to social housing and public sectors (SO4.3).

## The main impact sought is carbon abatement (more sustainable use of resources and reduced waste), although these measures can also improve energy security, reduced energy costs and reduce fuel poverty in the longer term for SMEs and tenants (both social and SMEs).

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type we recommend adopting a number of evaluation approaches, in order to examine the extent to which the evidence each corroborates the other, thereby building a strong evidence base on delivery and outcomes.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 8 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments, additional monitoring requirements as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* The implementation of the approach described above as part of the national evaluation will require projects to record and supply a core set of information including the full name and address of the beneficiaries, as well as the nature of the support provided, a measure of its intensity or value and the timing of the assistance. Where the support consists of direct financial support towards the costs of energy efficiency measures monitoring data would need to be provided on the address and characteristics of the treatment property, details of tenants, and expected and actual change in energy use. Where only advice is provided rather than direct financial support, then projects should record the details of the properties / businesses which are the focus of the guidance.
* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new transport infrastructure has resulted in benefits. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of summative assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## Whilst the assessment is complicated by the need for different types of approach across the different mixes of activity and beneficiary, the main conclusions are:

* There is limited scope for the viable use of robust counterfactual approaches of these interventions as part of the national evaluation, possibly with the exception of the portfolio analysis for interventions with social landlords (although this will need to be tested further as part of the national evaluation). If this is achievable it could gain a SMS score of 3.
* There is merit in piloting a number of counterfactual impact approaches for projects focused on the provision of financial support for energy efficiency to SMEs and social landlords – this is likely to focus on 2-3 projects only given the available resources
* There is need for enhanced project monitoring arrangements, especially relating to the nature of energy efficiency treatments and changes in energy use
* The potential limitations of the project summative assessment evidence and hence the limited value of this information to inform the national evaluation.

## **In summary, there is scope to use before and post implementation beneficiary surveys covering SMEs, social landlords and tenants to help address shortcomings in other counterfactual impact methods.** This would need to be implemented with monitoring of energy/resource use. Whilst resource intensive, this approach could achieve an SMS score of 2 if well implemented.

## **9. Community Led Local Development**

|  |
| --- |
| Priority Axis 8 seeks to build capacity with communities as a foundation for economic growth in deprived areas, focusing predominantly on the bottom 20% of areas according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (30% in Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly). The Managing Authority has chosen to deliver this entirely through Community Led Local Development (CLLD), a spatial approach to economic development targeted upon the most deprived communities. CLLD adopts a different approach to management and delivery to most other parts of the ERDF programme. There is strong emphasis on a highly targeted spatial approach, local management and delivery of the strategy involving local partners and communities, and a willingness to adopt innovative approaches.  |

## The intended beneficiary outcomes revolve around: improved start-up, survival and subsequent growth of businesses; improved enterprise readiness for potential entrepreneurs; and improved access to employment amongst residents of the target areas.

## **Evaluation Approaches**

## For the evaluation of this intervention type it is recommended to focus attention on the monitoring data, summative assessments and case studies.

## **Process evaluation**

## The process evaluation of intervention category 9 will include review of the monitoring data collected as part of administrative datasets for the project summative assessments as well as detailed case studies of projects in this intervention type.

* Detailed case studies which trace through the process by which new community led development has resulted in benefits. Where these case studies have been conducted as part of summative assessments they need not be duplicated. However, the National Evaluation may need to supplement with additional research where these are not of the requisite quality.

## **Impact evaluation**

## Given the localised nature of CLLD and the modest scale of the investment, the scope for and merit of undertaking impact evaluation as part of the National Evaluation is very limited.

## Whilst the recommended approach is for evaluation activity to be restricted to summative assessments of each CLLD strategy and plan, it is recognised that there will be little scope for LAGs and their local partners to undertake counterfactual impact approaches. The available resources they will have for summative assessment will be modest, whilst the action plans will often include multiple projects which are small in size on average (e.g. 10 projects with an average value of less than £300,000).

## Whilst the summative assessments need to measure outcomes and impacts locally (in so far as this is possible even in a simple way), they also need to consider the added value which the CLLD approach has provided Including the impact of animation and the benefits of engaging local people and developing local relationships. This is a key aspect of CLLD and it is important for the assessment to capture these potential qualitative benefits. It is apparent from the applications that whilst the CLLD areas all follow the same basic approach there is a lot of variety and some are embracing the ‘spirit’ of CLLD more than other.

## **Strategic Benefits**

## As noted above, effective impact evaluation for the intervention types (and drawing on these to inform conclusions at the level of the priority axes) will require the adoption of a mix of methods including CIE, primary research and surveys, project level evaluation case studies and pilots, plus the analysis of qualitative evidence from the summative assessments.

## The resource devoted to evaluating the impact will need to vary greatly across the intervention types, reflecting a mix of factors including the overall scale of ERDF grant they are likely to receive, the types of impacts they are expected to achieve and the ease of assessing the impacts in a rigorous way as part of the national evaluation.

## In terms of the use of CIE methods as part of the overall approach to impact evaluation, there is an important word of warning here. There is the potential to dedicate a lot of effort and resource trying to shoehorn interventions into CIE methods which are not appropriate or sufficiently robust as part of the National Evaluation. A lot of money and effort could be spent for little or no added value. This would reduce the budget available for the impact evaluation of other areas in which these approaches are more appropriate, can provide more useful findings and cover a higher proportion of programme expenditure.

## Table 3 summarises the potential to undertake CIE as part of the National Evaluation. If the potential is limited, the scope to undertake CIE through the summative assessments is considered. In addition, where CIE is not feasible, qualitative evaluation is proposed as a key method to fill gaps in knowledge. Even though any impacts identified will not be attributable, they will still provide valuable insight, in the absence of anything else. The main source of this qualitative information will be the project summative assessments, drawing on desk based reviews and detailed case studies. The manner in which this evidence can be used in conjunction with CIE evidence at a national or project level, or in its own right, is discussed later in the section.

**Table 3: Evaluation method by intervention**

****

## **Economic evaluation**

## Given the nature of the programme, strength of the expected evaluation evidence and various other measurement and definitional challenges, the economic evaluation is likely to be focused on a limited number of cost-effectiveness measures related primarily to job creation and increase on turnover. These estimates should ideally be based on net additional economic impacts, but if the available evidence on economic effects such as displacement and substitution is limited or lacks robustness the focus may need to be on gross beneficiary outcomes.

## These estimates should be based on both gross cost to the public sector and gross project costs, allowing for programme management and delivery costs. The availability of comparable unit costs for other interventions to inform judgements on value for money will need to be investigated further by the national evaluators.

## **Overview of Progress to Date**

## The table below sets out the for each priority axis the allocation, level of commitment to date and the value of applications currently being considered. It should be noted that there will be attrition to the applications value as they go through the assessment and appraisal process.

| **Priority Axis** | **Allocations****(£m)** | **Commitments** | **Applications** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value (£m)** | **No. Projects** | **Value (£m)** | **No.** |
| **1** | 618.75 | 258.35 | 132 | 229.52 | 121 |
| **2** | 86.46 | 55.55 | 22 | 25.37 | 12 |
| **3** | 1,231 | 383.97 | 187 | 416.41 | 233 |
| **4** | 583.48 | 142.35 | 57 | 296.88 | 131 |
| **5** | 67.6 | 8.77 | 5 | 72.6 | 30 |
| **6** | 70.55 | 18.32 | 14 | 47.72 | 37 |
| **7** | 45.18 | 25.3 | 3 | 7.24 | 4 |
| **8** | 29.91 | 25.96 | 41 | 2.57 | 2 |

# KEY MILESTONES

## There is a need to provide evaluation evidence at the appropriate times in the life of the programme to inform key programme management decisions (such as the rebalancing of resources across priorities), to disseminate performance information and lessons to stakeholders, as well as to provide evidence about the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery models and types of interventions to inform the future evolution of local growth policy in England. This needs to be balanced against the most appropriate timing of evaluation activity, given the progress of the programme, the delivery of investment activity and the build-up of impacts. The initial discussions point to key outputs from the evaluation being required in:

* Summer/Autumn 2018 – this will be an opportunity to review the progress of the ERDF programme and the nature of the investment to date and future pipeline, to inform any further adjustments to the programme strategy and implementation, as well as to allow the national evaluators and MHCLG to refine the evaluation plan. Outputs will inform the Department’s work on the development of future growth policy and programmes on an ongoing basis.
* Summer/Autumn 2019 - the output will be an interim evaluation report which will have a strong focus on process issues, but also presenting the emerging evidence of impacts (although this may rely more heavily on primary survey evidence rather than counterfactual impact evidence given the timing of the output). It will also inform the second enhanced annual implementation report to the European Commission. Outputs will inform the Department’s work on the development of future growth policy and programmes on an ongoing basis.
* 2020/21 - by which time significant impacts should be observable and hence be more suited to CIE methods. This will inform the main summary of programme impact required by the European Commission by the end of 2022. Outputs will inform the Department’s work on the development of future growth policy and programmes on an ongoing basis.

## The Supplier should note the following project milestones that the Authority will measure the quality of delivery against:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Description** | **Timeframe** |
| 1 | Project inception meeting | Within week 1 of Contract Award  |
| 2 | Presentations on evaluation progress to the Evaluation Sub Committee | Quarterly |
| 3 | Progress update emails on the evaluation  | Every 2 weeks |
| 4 | Regular project update meetings with the lead analyst and policy | Every 4-8 weeks |
| 5 | Report on relevance, consistency and appropriateness of programme | Summer/Autumn 2018 |
| 6 | Phase 1: Interim report | April 2019 |
| 7 | Phase 2: Interim report | April 2020 |
| 8 | Phase 3: Final Impact evaluation report | April 2021 |

## Research contractors will have regular catch up meetings with the project manager during the project and should provide fortnightly written updates. These will be agreed with the contractor once the contract has been signed, but will be expected to will include (as a minimum) updates on:

* Designing the methodology and testing the research tools;
* Administering baseline measurement, and quality of data;
* Any issues/challenges in the process evaluation fieldwork and emerging findings regarding variation in delivery;
* Administering interim measurement, and quality of data;
* Administering follow-up measurement, and quality of data;
* Any issues/challenges arising during the analysis of the data;
* Write up and formatting of the final report

# AUTHORITY’S RESPONSIBILITIES

## The proposed approach to the review of delivery progress reflects the regulatory requirements, guidance on suitable methods and consultations with the ERDF policy and evaluation team. The approach is straightforward, using tried and tested analytical techniques and mostly quality assured programme monitoring data. It is worth nothing that the initial assessment programmed for Summer/Autumn 2018 has the potential to build on work already being completed by MHCLG and hence it will be fairly light touch at that stage. Nevertheless it is an important task which will inform the national evaluators’ knowledge of the programme and the refinement of the evaluation methods and plan.

## A steering group for the analytical programme will be established to include representatives from MHCLG’s ERDF Policy Team. The steering group would also invite participation from MHCLG’s Analysis, Research and Coordination team to ensure synergy with wider analysis within the Department and from MHCLG’s Local Growth and Places to align with related policy. Also, HMT, BEIS, DWP and Defra would be involved due to their interest in interim and final outputs.

# REPORTING

## The Supplier will report to MHCLG, Managing Authority for ERDF in England through the Lead Analyst and Policy Official. The Managing Authority is required to regularly report to various groups and committees both within HMG and the European Commission. Emerging outputs and findings from the research will be shared with groups as appropriate on delivery with all necessary caveats regarding the limitations of analysis and interpretation applied. Final reports for publication will only be accepted after incorporation of independent academic peer review comments as part of our departmental quality assurance process.

## A core principle of the Government Social Research (GSR) profession is that there will be prompt release of all government research and analysis, with publication normally within a maximum of 12 weeks from agreeing the final draft. The ERDF National Evaluation reports will follow this format as standard.

## The other major audience for Programme monitoring and evaluation information will be the **European Commission** (EC). The main monitoring tool for the EC is the **Annual Implementation Report** (AIR). The EC requires Member States to submit AIRs for each Operational Programme. The first AIR was completed in 2016 and covered 2014 and 2015 (art. 111(1) CPR regulation). The second AIR covering 2017 will be submitted to the EC in May 2018.

## To supplement our evaluation, the EC intends to collect evidence from evaluations covering the same policy fields across Member States: where a sufficient number of good quality evaluations cover the same fields, it will carry out meta-analyses and to the extent possible build a repository of evidence for policy making. The results of these analyses will be disseminated widely. Evaluation evidence will be shared and compared across the UK in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Where possible, common approaches will be developed and agreed to support UK-level evaluation of ERDF and ESF.

# CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

## The Supplier will be expected to continually improve the way in which the required Services are to be delivered throughout the Contract duration.

## The Supplier should present new ways of working to the Authority during quarterly Contract review meetings.

## Changes to the way in which the Services are to be delivered must be brought to the Authority’s attention and agreed prior to any changes being implemented.

# SUSTAINABILITY

## In delivering the national impact evaluation of ERDF, the Supplier should consider the longer-term sustainability of requirements beyond EU exit, the development of future growth policies and programmes and the capacity of GDTs to deliver. The Supplier should also provide a smooth transition of appropriate measure during and towards the end of the Contract period to the monitoring and evaluation arrangements for future growth policies and programmes.

# QUALITY

## The Evaluation should give due regard to the guidance provided by the European Commission on Evaluation for the 2014-20 Programming Period[[9]](#footnote-9), in particular, the “Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation”[[10]](#footnote-10)

## The Supplier should take into account learning and good practice from the What Works Centre for Local Growth and the NAO, the Green Book[[11]](#footnote-11) and Magenta Book[[12]](#footnote-12) techniques[[13]](#footnote-13).

## There is a requirement to obtain evaluation evidence to Level 3 on the Maryland Scale as a minimum where possible.

## The Government Social Research (GSR) Publication Protocol requires that social research outputs must be published within three months of receiving the final report. All publications must continue to meet the six month FOI deadline.

## All reporting and guidance produced must be of publishable standard. Reports and guidance are expected to have been proof read by the supplier before submission to MHCLG. Reports should conform to standards set out in the MHCLG provided Microsoft Word template, *copy attached.* This guide is intended as a guide to layout and you are not expected to typeset. The Successful Supplier should also refer to The Government Digital Service style guide which covers style points for all content published on the Gov.uk website[[14]](#footnote-14). Reports should be in a Word file compatible with Office 2010. Quantitative data submitted electronically should be in MS Excel or a compatible format.

# STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE

## The Authority requires the Supplier to provide a sufficient level of resource throughout the duration of the ERDF National Impact Evaluation Contract in order to consistently deliver a quality service to all Parties.

## The Supplier’s staff assigned to the ERDF National Impact Evaluation Contract shall have the relevant qualifications and experience to deliver the Contract.

# SERVICE LEVELS AND PERFORMANCE

## The Authority will measure the quality of the Supplier’s delivery by:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| KPI/SLA | Service Area | KPI/SLA description |
| #1 | Impact Evaluation Design | As outlined in the tender document and agreed by the supplier |
| #2 | Delivery of quality outputs | Milestone dates in Section 7  |
| #3 | Risk management | A risk matrix will be regularly monitored to ensure delivery of the evaluation to time, cost and quality |
| #4 | Project management | Regular, clear and concise progress updates to the project manager and policy throughout the length of the contract |
| #5 | Engagement Plan | Advance papers to be delivered to timescales agreed  |

## We will be reviewing the contract at the end of each financial year to ensure the national impact evaluation remains on course for delivery, is relevant, will meet our commitments to the EU and share learning for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UK SPF).

## In the event of poor performance through the failure to deliver KPIs to time and of appropriate quality, the Authority shall meet with the Appointed Provider to understand the root causes of the issue. The Appointed Provider shall formulate a Performance Improvement Plan to rectify these issues and meet the requirements in this statement.

## The Authority may, without prejudice to any other rights and remedies under this Contract, withhold or reduce payments in the event of unsatisfactory performance.

## If poor performance continues, following formal written warnings, early termination of the Contract will also be considered.

### The Authority will monitor the work of the Supplier throughout the Evaluation Project through regular contact between the Supplier and The Authority’s day-to-day contact.

### The Authority will manage poor performance by the Supplier as set out in section 14 and in line with the terms and conditions of the resultant contract.

# CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

## The Supplier may conduct evaluations or provide services for other ERDF projects or partners of the Authority However, the Supplier must ensure that the supply of those services does not compromise their independence in evaluating ERDF or affect their capacity to deliver this contract. The Supplier shall be required to notify the Authority in writing should any potential or actual conflict of interest arise in accordance with the provisions of these tender documents.

# INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR)

## The IPR for Interim Papers, Outputs, Guidance, Templates and training materials rests with the Authority, for the purposes of informing the National Evaluation, and also to contribute to the body of evidence/good practice for other evaluations of a related nature across Government and among other interested parties.

##

# ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

## When required, papers to the Evaluation Policy Group, Growth Programme Board and its Evaluation National sub-committee should be provided by the Supplier 10 working days in advance of their meetings.

## Meetings of the Evaluation Policy Group occur on an ad hoc basis so can be scheduled as required.

## Meetings of the Growth Programme Board occur on a quarterly basis. The Evaluation National Sub-committee holds meetings in line with the availability of products and proposals for discussion. There may be scope for sub-committee meetings to be scheduled in line with the Supplier’s needs.

## The ERDF 2014 -2020 ERDF Ex-Ante Evaluation is available [here](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705329/ERDF_2014_2020_Exante_Evaluation.pdf).

## The ERDF 2014-2020 Scoping Study is available [here](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705330/Scoping_National_Evaluation_of_the_2014_2020_ERDF_Programme.pdf).

## The ERDF 2014-2020 Summative Assessment guidance is available [here](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705888/ESIF-GN-1-033_ERDF_Summative_Assessment_Guidance_v1.pdf), with appendices [here](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-european-regional-development-fund-2014-to-2020).

# LOCATION

The Services will be carried out at the Supplier’s location, with meetings held at the Authority’s premises as required.

**Annex B**

**Supplier Proposal**

The following information provided is details of Regeneris Consulting Limited’s proposal. Regeris Consulting Limited proposal describes the services that Regeneris Consulting Limited shall provide under this contractual agreement:

**REDACTED**

**ANNEX C – Part 1**

**Call Off Contract Charges**

The below table sets out the maximum charges for the entire contract term.

**REDACTED**

Rate CARD

The below table reflects the above pricing table and specifies the rates that the Authority will be charged for each of roles specified below.

**REDACTED**

**ANNEX C – Part 2**

**Payment Terms**

The Authority shall pay Regeneris Consulting Limited within thirty [30] working days of submission of a valid invoice.

Payment can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables.

The Authority’s project manager will agree an invoice schedule based on the milestones in as specified within section [“Key Milestones”] of Annex A of this contract and confirm the payment process with the RS Consulting Limited upon award of the contract.

Before payment can be processed, invoices must be submitted that include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.

Payments will be made via a purchase order, which must be detailed on any submitted invoices before payment will be made.

Regeneris Consulting Limited must ensure that all invoices are sent to the following office address:

Hemal Peiris,

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

 South-West Quadrant, Floor 4, Fry Building

 2 Marsham Street

 London

SW1P 4DF

Call Off Contract Charges are included with Annex C – Part 1 Call Off Contract Charges.

1. The programme is valued in Euros (€3.6bn), with the sterling value based on a FOREX rate of £1=€0.78. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Common Provision Regulation, Title II, Section III, Article 142, 1(f) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Referred to in the Programme as Priority Axes (PAs). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For more information please see European Commission Guidance Document on Evaluation, Terms of Reference for Impact Evaluations Guidance on Quality Management of External Evaluations Plans, February 2015, [**http://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/evaluation\_plan\_guidance\_en.pdf**](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/evaluation_plan_guidance_en.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Inter-Departmental Business Register [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Process evaluation is a method of assessing how a program is being implemented. Process evaluation focuses on the program's operations, implementation, and service delivery, whereas impact evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of the program. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Qualitative evaluation focuses on narrative causal statements elicited directly from intended project beneficiaries. Evidence of attribution is sought through respondents’ own accounts of causal mechanisms linking X to Y alongside Z rather than by relying on statistical inference. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Counterfactual impact evaluation tries to attribute the impact of a programme directly to it, by considering what would have happened in the absence of the programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. http://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/en/policy/evaluations/guidance/#1 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. http://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd\_2014\_en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Green Book: appraisal and evaluation in central government, HMT, 2015

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-governent> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Guidance on Evaluating the Impact of Interventions on Business, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), 2011 <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/212318/11-1085-guidance-evaluating-interventions-on-business.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The Government Digital Service (GDS) style guide, <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/style-guide> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)