



Lancashire  
Enterprise Partnership

# GROWTH DEAL MONITORING & EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

March 2016



## 1. Introduction

## 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Requirements

- Government
- Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Board, Growth Deal Management Board and LEP Performance Committee
- Lancashire County Council (acting as Accountable Body)

## 3. Development of the Monitoring Framework

- Development activity and methodology
- Agreed Approach
- Implementation Arrangements

## 4. Development of the Evaluation Framework

- Development activity and methodology
- Agreed Approach
- Implementation Arrangements

## 5. Glossary

### Appendices

Appendix A	Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Form)
Appendix B	Core and Supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions

The Lancashire Growth Deal aims to realise the growth potential of the whole of Lancashire, building on key local economic assets including the universities and colleges, the Lancashire Advanced Engineering and Manufacturing Enterprise Zone, the Preston, South Ribble and Lancashire City Deal and high value business clusters in Central and East Lancashire, and the development of a renewal strategy for Blackpool.

The Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP) secured one of the country's most significant Growth Deals with over £250m competitively secured from the Government's Local Growth Fund (LGF). The Growth Deal programme has an investment value of over £500m, with the capacity to generate nearly 8,000 jobs and create over 3,300 new homes.

Monitoring and evaluation of the Growth Deal programme and the projects that sit within it is required by Government and the LEP in order to understand what has been spent and what has been delivered, to provide information for reporting back to Ministers and the public, and for influencing future policy. It is in this requirement for transparency that the LEP agreed the need for a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. The LEP and its Performance Committee will use the monitoring process to manage performance to ensure that the planned delivery is achieved.

Monitoring (at programme and project level) enables all relevant parties to track momentum towards the achievement of milestones and progress towards the creation of outputs.

The approach to monitoring encompasses consideration of a core set of metrics covering the activities, outputs and outcomes associated with the main typologies of intervention.

The purpose of evaluation is to allow more accurate judgements to be made of the effectiveness of projects and the programme as a whole and to understand and learn "what works" in different areas and why. Evaluation commences towards the completion of the projects, whereas monitoring is ongoing throughout their implementation.

The LEP is committed to ensuring that monitoring and evaluation add real value to its Growth Deal programme and that project sponsors are fully engaged in the process. As such, the monitoring and evaluation information collected will be used to further inform the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and future investment proposals and to identify opportunities to achieve enhanced outcomes and impacts.

The control and management of the Growth Deal projects is the responsibility of the Growth Deal Management Board (GDMB). It is the responsibility of the Board to:

- I. Oversee the implementation of the Growth Deal Programme and make recommendations to the LEP Board.



- II. Oversee the operation of a Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group and will approve all monitoring reports for submission to the LEP Board and Government (HMG).
- III. Use an Implementation Plan to track progress against the planned milestones, including key financial and output information, milestones and risks.
- IV. Ensure that the LEP's arrangements for Monitoring & Evaluation will be implemented in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework.

This GDMB oversees the work of Lancashire County Council, the accountable body for the LEP, who will ensure that the LEP's arrangements for monitoring and evaluation of the Growth Deal is implemented, in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework. The GDMB also oversees the work undertaken by the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Sub Group. The M&E Sub Group has numerous responsibilities which include:

- I. Implement the delivery of the Monitoring & Evaluation Framework;
- II. Monitor the progress of the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation consultant commissioned in accordance with the delivery of the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation Framework and the consultant contract;
- III. Update the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework according to operational need, and annually as a minimum;
- IV. Provide quarterly monitoring reports to the GDMB in respect of the activities being carried out in pursuance of the Monitoring & Evaluation Framework;
- V. Support the GDMB in ensuring that any conditions attached to Local Growth Fund funding agreements are discharged appropriately;
- VI. Approve project material changes where compliant with the parameters of the Growth Deal Change Notice Procedure;
- VII. Advise the GDMB of any issues arising if project sponsors are unable to comply with the Growth Funding principles agreed by the LEP Board;
- VIII. Advise, provide context and recommendations to the GDMB in respect to any proposed material changes to funding profiles, including redirecting significant resources in year and between projects; and
- IX. Advise the GDMB of any proposed material changes to project funding in the event of non-delivery, and/or the withdrawal of grant offer.

The LEP and Government recognise that this Monitoring & Evaluation Framework needs to be a "living" document that needs to be revised periodically with flexibility built-in to ensure it remains fit-for-purpose throughout the Growth Deal period. The progress and success of the monitoring and evaluation framework is reviewed annually by the Growth Deal Management Board and periodically by the Growth Deal Performance Committee.



### Information Dissemination

The LEP's Assurance Framework sets out a clear commitment by the LEP to publish Agendas and reports on the LEP website. This MEF will be published on the LEP website along with key evaluation and monitoring findings reported to the LEP Board over the course of the Growth Deal Programme.

## 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting Requirements

There are three distinct audiences/parties who require monitoring and evaluation information:

### **(a) Government**

Government have specified that on a quarterly basis, for the lifetime of the Growth Deal programme, a suite of specified monitoring information must be submitted on retrospective basis.

This monitoring information incorporates detail about individual project spend, draw down of growth deal monies and realisation of agreed project outputs and metrics. The electronic mechanism for providing this information (LOGASNET) is maintained and managed by Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

### **(b) Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board**

The LEP Board and two sub-committees of the Board (Growth Deal Management Board and LEP Performance Committee) require regular monitoring and evaluation information.

The mechanism for provision of this information is via formal reports tabled, as required, at the scheduled meetings of each forum. This enables an appropriate level of scrutiny and also affords the opportunity to take remedial action should it be required.

### **(c) Accountable Body**

In order to effectively discharge their responsibilities in relation to the programme management of Lancashire Growth Deal, the Accountable Body requires monitoring information on a pre-determined frequency in support of claims for funding from individual projects. This is determined during the development of the formal Growth Fund Agreements/Memorandums of Understanding for individual projects.

This ensures that the Accountable Body is satisfied that funding is being released appropriately against agreed project milestones. It also provides the mechanism for the Accountable Body to track the achievement of agreed project outputs and outcomes.

The mechanism for collecting project monitoring information is the "Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Report)". This is provided as an appendix to this document (Appendix A)

The core and supplementary monitoring metrics for projects and their definitions can be found at appendix B.

### 3. Development of the Monitoring Framework

#### **Development activity and methodology**

In September 2014, the LEP asked Growth Deal project sponsors to review the expenditure and output information included in the SEP (following an initial consultation exercise to inform this plan) and to identify any additional outputs appropriate to their project from those highlighted in the August 2014 BIS report/presentation on Monitoring and Evaluating Growth Deals.

A list of monitoring metrics was forwarded to all project sponsors who were asked to identify which were relevant to their project. Projects were therefore ideally placed to respond to the publication on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014 by Cabinet Office of a comprehensive draft list of core and supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions.

This second consultation exercise culminated in the submission to Government of a completed monitoring matrix in October 2014. A parallel exercise was also undertaken with the Further Education Skills Capital projects and a monitoring matrix, containing details of all projects, was submitted to Government in October 2014.

A third consultation exercise was then undertaken with all project sponsors being asked to forecast targets against each of the metrics they had identified as being relevant to their project, profiled over the project lifetime. This exercise was completed in November 2014. The same process is being applied to projects in the Growth Deal extension, which was announced in February 2015.

Government officials have expressed that they were comfortable with the monitoring matrix submitted and were satisfied with the progress that had been made.

#### **Agreed Approach**

##### Monitoring Framework

Following the meeting with Government officials, the LEP reviewed the metrics which project sponsors had identified as being relevant to their individual projects. This was completed in the context of those originally included within the SEP and existing good practice. Discrepancies and ambiguities were worked-through with project sponsors.

All projects agreed to report on a pre-determined frequency on the top 3 metrics. These are "Expenditure", "Funding breakdown" and "In-kind resources provided." The remaining metrics are split into "Core Metrics" and "Project Specific Outputs and Outcomes"

#### **Implementation arrangements**



It was agreed that Lancashire County Council, as the accountable body, should be responsible for the collection and collation of all monitoring data from Growth Deal projects. Lancashire County Council is responsible for ensuring that outputs and milestones are met according to agreed timescales; that projects spend according to the agreed framework and can evidence both progress and spend. This evidence can be used to satisfy all parties that projects are progressing as per the agreed business case and that the accountable body is acting in a transparent and neutral way.

All ongoing monitoring of projects was agreed to be undertaken by the accountable body at the agreed timescales set out in each project's Growth Funding Agreement. It was agreed that monitoring should comprise routine checks of project outputs, milestones, risks and issues, along with the required financial validation to support payment.

### Monitoring Frequency

As data owners, project sponsors are responsible for collecting and submitting their monitoring data to the accountable body (Lancashire County Council) in accordance with pre-agreed timescales. The accountable body then analyses and collates data for submission to the Growth Deal Management Board, the LEP Board and to Government.

All project sponsors are required to identify a named monitoring lead and have agreed to ensure the LEP is kept informed of personnel changes.

The LEP, via its Performance Committee may choose to undertake periodic auditing of the monitoring and evaluation information provided by project sponsors to ensure accuracy and consistency.



## 4. Development of the Evaluation Framework

### Development activity and methodology

#### Introduction

Lancaster University was asked by the LEP to work alongside Lancashire's wider higher education institutions in developing the principles for an evaluation framework to sit alongside and compliment the monitoring plan for the county's Growth Deal.

As a result Lancaster University provided advice and guidance on the development of an Evaluation Plan and the development and management of a formative evaluation process of the whole Evaluation Plan.

#### Review of Evaluation Options

All project sponsors were invited to an Evaluation Workshop arranged on behalf of the LEP by Lancaster University. This event, held in January 2015, provided an opportunity to bring together project sponsors to share ideas about evaluation options at an early stage in the Growth Deal programme.

The programme for the workshop included sessions on mapping the growth deal projects' Inputs, Outputs and Outcomes, the use of Logic Models to create Project and Programme Evaluation Frameworks; and the use of Evaluation Tools to deliver and demonstrate success. Following the Evaluation Workshop, all projects submitted completed Logic Model Templates to Lancaster University and these will form a core part of project management and implementation arrangements.

It was recognised at this Workshop that there would be particular merit in undertaking more detailed formative evaluation on a number of selected projects. The purpose of this, and benefit to the Growth Deal programme, would be to;

- Identify exemplar projects to help promote the activities and achievements of the Growth Deal;
- Support the management of risk, especially of large scale and complex projects;
- Support the transfer of knowledge and learning between projects clusters, for example skills;
- Generate innovation within sector;
- Provide knowledge and expertise for the use of new and emerging projects.



## Determination of Evaluation Options

The LEP agreed that all projects within the Growth Deal should be subject to evaluation, with a selection of projects (as yet to be decided) that should be evaluated in more detail. These will be chosen to represent the breadth of activity being supported through the Growth Deal as well as its wide geographical spread. Along with the individual projects, the LEP also agreed that a full evaluation of the Growth Deal Programme should be undertaken, therefore allowing for both project and programme level evaluation.

### **Agreed Approach**

The evaluation approach is threefold:

All Projects: For all projects a general evaluation will be required.

Exemplar Projects: for 6 specific projects (to be chosen as exemplar or high risk projects) a more detailed evaluation and assessment will be undertaken.

Programme: an overall evaluation is to be undertaken of the entire Growth Deal programme.

### **Implementation arrangements**

The LEP agreed that the implementation activity for evaluation should be undertaken by an external body. An initial allocation of £100,000 was set aside from within the LEP's existing core funding budget to ensure that these consultancy costs of evaluation can be met in the first years of the Growth Deal Programme. It should be noted that additional resources are likely to be required over the life-time of the Growth Deal Programme.

Government have not confirmed future core funding allocations for LEPs, however once there is further clarity on this position the LEP will make further investment decisions on the resources available for monitoring and evaluation.

In accordance with the requirements set out by the LEP, a tender exercise was undertaken by the accountable body in order to procure a consultant to complete the evaluation of the projects and Growth Deal programme. The winning applicant will commence the evaluation process (working with the accountable body) in April 2016.



## 5. Glossary

BIS:	Department of Business, Innovation and Skills
DCLG:	Department for Communities and Local Government
GDMB:	Growth Deal Management Board
HMG:	Her Majesty's Government
LCC:	Lancashire County Council
LEP:	Lancashire Enterprise Partnership
LGF:	Local Growth Fund
M&E SG:	Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group
MEF:	Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
SEP:	Strategic Economic Plan

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Form)

### Lancashire Growth Deal Claim PART B (PROGRESS REPORT)

1. Project Name:		
2. Project Reference:		
4. Reporting Period (From – To):		
5. Financial Claims	Amount claimed to date	
	Amount claimed in this reporting period	
	Indication of claim for the next period	

**6. Milestones**

Milestone Description	Target Contract Date	Planned Date	Achieved Date

**7. Progress**

Please refer to the Project Plan and confirm what activity has been delivered. Describe what activity will be undertaken in the next & future periods and detail plans to mitigate any delay to the programme/planned activity

<b>This period</b>	
<b>Next period</b>	
<b>Future periods</b>	

## 8. Risks, Issues and Changes

### 8a. KEY RISKS

Please provide your **RISK REGISTER** with this claim – and detail below the current **key** risks for the project. (Indicate impact, probability and how the risk can be mitigated)

### 8b. EMERGING ISSUES

Please use this section to note any obstacles, issues or interruptions to the progress of your project, particularly in relation to assumptions and inputs as noted in your Logic Model.

### 8c. CHANGES REQUIRED

Detail any significant changes to the project and the effect upon project deliverables, programme and budget. e.g. relevant dates (detailed in section 6), spend, activity, funding, outputs, results. *(Note: these may or may not constitute "Material Alterations" requiring the consent of the Council under clause 5.*

9. Outputs and Results

							CURRENT YEAR									
Metrics, Outputs & Outcomes	2016/17 Target	2017/18 Target	2018/19 Target	2019/20 Target	2020/21 Target	TOTAL	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual	Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Q3 Target	Q3 Actual	Q4 Target	Q4 Actual	2016/17 Actual	2016/17 Variance
CORE						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
PROJECT SPECIFIC	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
ADDITIONAL MONITORING	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0

**9. Signature**

**Project Manager**

Signed:..... Date : .....

Print Name:.....

Position: .....

Completed forms should be submitted to [growthdeal@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:growthdeal@lancashire.gov.uk)



**Appendix B – Core and supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions**

1. CORE METRICS - to be collected for all projects and programmes					
Inputs	Unit	Frequency	Definition	Data source	Issues / further information
Expenditure	£, by source	Q	Expenditure defrayed directly on the intervention, broken down into LGF funds, other public sector funds and private funds.  Where expenditure takes the form of grant support to applicants (e.g. skills capital, some business support), the amount of grant paid to successful applicants should be reported (not the amount approved).	LEP MI	
Funding breakdown	£, by source	Q	Non LGF Funding delivered - including public, private and third sector match funding, broken down by source. This should not include in-kind contributions	LEP MI	
In-kind resources provided	qualitative	Q	Land, buildings or other assets provided to resource the intervention	LEP MI	
<b>Outcomes</b>					
Jobs connected to the intervention	FTEs	A	Permanent paid full time equivalent jobs that are directly connected to the intervention, measured by FTE at predetermined "impact sites". This includes: - Employment on occupied commercial premises (in the case of site development)	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work. Employment is counted gross - no account of deadweight or displacement at the monitoring stage.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment in supported enterprises (in the case of business or innovation support)</li> <li>- Employment in FE space directly improved or constructed by the intervention</li> </ul> <p>"Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of Growth Deals projects (e.g. transport, skills capital) - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting. Excludes jobs created solely to deliver the intervention, e.g. construction jobs.</p>		
Commercial floorspace constructed	sq m, by class	A	<p>For both direct employment sites and "impact" sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace completed. "Impact" sites are defined as for jobs created above. Floor areas should be measured in accordance with the RICS Code of measuring practice (6th edition) 2007. A building should be classified as completed once it is on the non-domestic rating list.</p>	Scheme sponsor	<p>Need to define and agree "impact" sites in advance - can we articulate some criteria relating to planning or access? Need to demonstrate the credibility of that outcomes can be attributed (on balance) to the project. Likely to require primary survey work. Does not take account of refurbished floorspace.</p>
Housing unit starts	#	A	<p>For both direct housing sites and "impact" sites, the number of housing units completed. "Impact" sites are</p>	Scheme sponsor	<p>Same issues as defining commercial floorspace above around</p>

			defined as for jobs created above.		establishing impact sites. Should we break this up into class of housing? E.g. affordable housing?
Housing units completed	#	A	For both direct housing sites and "impact" sites, the number of housing units completed. "Impact" sites are defined as for jobs created above.	Scheme sponsor	Same issues as defining commercial floorspace above around establishing impact sites.  Should we break this up into class of housing? E.g. affordable housing?

## 2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention

Activity/Output Characteristics					
Transport					
Total length of resurfaced roads	Km	Q	Length of road for which maintenance works have been completed	Scheme sponsor MI	
Total length of newly built roads	Km	Q	Length of road for which works have been completed and now open for public use	Scheme sponsor MI	
Total length of new cycle ways	Km	Q	Length of cycle way for which works have been completed and now open for public use	Scheme sponsor MI	
Type of infrastructure delivered	drop down list	B/A	Identify what has been constructed as a result of the project - utilise units where appropriate e.g. length of cycle path	Scheme sponsor MI	Limit to how long of a list will be provided so interventions will have scope to supplement with other types
Type of service	drop down list	B/A	Identify the nature of service	Scheme sponsor	

improvement delivered			improvement as a result of the intervention e.g. improved bus service	MI	
-----------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	----	--

Land, Property and Flood Protection					
Area of site reclaimed, (re)developed or assembled	Ha	Q	Area of land directly improved by the project that is now suitable for commercial development where previously it was unattractive to commercial developers. Reclaimed: making the land fit for use by removing physical constraints to development or improving the land for hard end use; providing services to open it up for development, e.g. provision of utilities or service roads	Scheme sponsor MI	
Utilities installed	drop down list and km	Q	Identify what has been constructed as a result of the project. Drop down list: water pipe; gas pipe, electric cables, internet cable. And km of cabling/piping	Scheme sponsor MI	
Area of land experiencing a reduction in flooding likelihood (ha)	Ha	Q	Area of land with a reduced likelihood of flooding as a result of the project	Scheme sponsor MI	

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband					
Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	#, by type of support	Q	Number of SMEs receiving support (inc. advice and training) with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase	Scheme sponsor MI	

			turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). Value of the support should be a minimum of £1,000, calculated at Gross Grant Equivalent (see ERDF guidance) or a minimum of 2 days of consulting advice.		
Number of new enterprises supported	#	Q	As above, but businesses that have been trading for less than three years.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of potential entrepreneurs assisted to be enterprise ready	#	Q	Number of individuals receiving non-financial support (i.e. advice or training) with the intention of commencement of trading	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of enterprises receiving grant support	#	Q	Number of SMEs receiving grant funding support with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). To be counted where the support is at least £1,000.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of enterprises receiving financial support other than grants	#	Q	Number of SMEs receiving funding support in the form of equity or repayable loan instruments with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). Counted where amount of support is at least £1,000.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Additional businesses with broadband access of at least 30mbps	#	Q	For broadband interventions only: number of additional commercial premises that, as a result of intervention, now have the option to access broadband of at least 30mbps (average), where this was not previously the case	Scheme sponsor MI	

Skills Capital					
New build training/learning floorspace	sq m	Q	The amount of "new build" training/learning floorspace constructed. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports (standard reports submitted to SFA on project completion) and/or project implementation reports submitted by colleges/providers	
Refurbished training/learning facilities	sq m (where FE colleges are involved, by estate grading)	Q	The amount of new training/learning floorspace refurbished to improve building condition and/or fitness for purpose. For FE colleges, this should be by estate grading. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports and/or project implementation reports submitted by colleges/providers	Unlike FE Colleges, there is no formal building condition benchmarking system for private providers – however the overall amount of floorspace refurbished will be sufficient for private providers.
Floorspace rationalised	sq m	Q	The amount of overall floorspace reduced following completion of the project through, for example, demolition or disposal. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports and/or project implementation reports submitted by	

				colleges/providers	
--	--	--	--	--------------------	--

Outcomes					
Transport					
Follow on investment at site	£, by source	A	For "impact" sites, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site over and above that directly associated with the Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions. "Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of the Growth Deals transport project - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting.	Scheme sponsor	Need to define and agree "impact" sites in advance - defined by LEPs so as to maintain the credibility that outcomes can be attributed (on balance) to the project Likely to require primary survey work. Deliberately constructed as a gross measure, no correction for deadweight or displacement to be applied at this stage.
Commercial floorspace occupied	sq m, by class	A	For "impact" sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace completed that is currently occupied by commercial tenants. "Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of the Growth Deals transport project - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting.	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work Impacts are gross - no account of displacement. This outcome is a further link of the chain proceeding from follow-on investment rather than a completely separate outcome
Commercial rental	£/sq m per month,	A	The market rate for leasing	Scheme sponsor	

values	by class		commercial floorspace at the "impact" site		
--------	----------	--	--------------------------------------------	--	--

Land, Property and Flood Protection					
Follow on investment at site	£, by source	A	For the project site, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site over and above that directly associated with the initial Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions.	Scheme sponsor	As for equivalent transport metric above
Commercial floorspace refurbished	sq m, by class	A	For project sites, the area and class of refurbished commercial floorspace. Floor areas should be measured in accordance with the RICS Code of measuring practice (6th edition) 2007.	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work
Commercial floorspace occupied	sq m, by class	A	For project sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace constructed/refurbished that is currently occupied by commercial tenants.	Scheme sponsor	As for equivalent transport metric above
Commercial rental values	£/sq m per month, by class	A	The market rate for leasing commercial floorspace at the project sites	Scheme sponsor	

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband					
Financial return on access to finance schemes	%	A	The financial return to the scheme associated with revolving/repayable access to finance interventions - measured as a % return on initial investment.	Scheme sponsor MI	



Skills Capital					
Follow on investment at site, including revenue funding	£, by source	A	For the project site, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site (including revenue funding, for example for training courses) over and above that for the Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions.	College/SFA data	
Post code for new build sites	qualitative	A	Post code for new build sites, for matching with SFA database	Scheme sponsor MI  This information can potentially be used by the SFA to draw out metrics on learners and qualifications at the site level, to be shared with LEPS.	

### 3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes (see below)

Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes involving more than £5m public funding and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention

Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak	# vehicles	B/A	Average daily traffic by direction; AM, Inter- and PM peak hour traffic flows	Automatic Traffic Counters; Manual	Data collection location depends on the
--------------------------------------------	------------	-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

periods			by direction	Classified Counts	potential impact of transport schemes. Peak/inter-peak is defined based on local traffic flows. This applies to most transport interventions.
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	hr/mile	B/A	Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes	Trafficmaster data; Automatic Number Plate Recognition	Traffic congestion statistics reported across whole intervention area and on key corridors targeted for investment
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Minutes	B/A	Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes	Journey time surveys	Data collection location depends on the potential impact of transport schemes.
Day-to-day travel time variability	Minutes	B/A	Standard deviation of AM and PM peak hour journey time	Journey time surveys; Trafficmaster data	This applies to highway/public transport intervention on key corridors targeted for investment
Average annual CO2 emissions	tonnes	B/A	Average annual CO2 emissions	Use the Local Authority Carbon Tool based on distance travelled, vehicle speed and vehicle mix	Report across whole intervention area
Accident rate	# by severity	B/A	Number of accidents and accident rate	STATS 19	Report on key

			by severity and class of road	Accident data	roads/junctions/area targeted for improvement. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on accidents.
Casualty rate	# by severity	B/A	Number of casualties and casualty rate by severity and class of road user	STATS 19 Accident data	Report on key roads/junctions/area targeted for improvement. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on accidents.
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	NO <sub>x</sub> (tonnes); PM10 (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	B/A	NO <sub>x</sub> emissions in tonnes per year; PM10 concentrations per year	Air quality monitoring survey	Affected network is defined as the existing route, the new route, or an improved route on which traffic flow changes are considered to be significant. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on air quality.
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	LA <sub>10, 18hr</sub> (dB)	B/A	Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	Automatic Traffic Counters (18 hour Annual Average Weekday Traffic,	This depends on the scale of the proposed project, the site and local circumstances,

				composition of traffic - % Heavy Goods Vehicles, average traffic speeds); Noise monitoring survey	and the location of sensitive receptors. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on noise.
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	#	B/A	Annual average daily passenger boardings; AM, inter- and PM peak hour passenger boardings	Bus/rail ticketing data; Manual counts at stops/stations	The data collection method/location depends on the bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	Minutes	B/A	AM and PM peak bus/light rail travel time	Bus journey time surveys or Automatic Vehicle Location data; Rail journey timetable	The data collection method/location depends on the bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Mode share (%)	%	B/A	AM and PM peak proportion of trips for different travel modes	Automatic Traffic Counters; Manual Classified Counts	Need to define study area / specific site. This metric applies to bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	#	B/A	Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes	Manual counts; Video cameras	This applies to sustainable transport initiatives for walking.
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	#	B/A	Cycle journeys on new/existing routes	Manual cycle counts; Automatic cycling counters; Video cameras	This applies to sustainable transport initiatives for cycling.
Households with access to specific sites	#	B/A	Households with access to specific sites within 20/40 minutes using	Accessibility statistics	The specific sites targeted for transport

by mode within threshold times (#)			public transport/walking, car and cycle	published by DfT; Produce bespoke accessibility measures and travel time calculations using off-the-shelf software	schemes.
------------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband - to be collected where more robust evaluation is planned and where these metrics are relevant to the intervention					
Detail of successful and unsuccessful applicants		On-going	Administrative database covering company name, address, post code and CRN - company reference number. Named contact, telephone number and email address (and consent for being contacted). This should be captured for both successful and unsuccessful applicants.	Scheme sponsor MI	Required for robust long term evaluation
Beneficiary characteristics (business age, size, sector)		On-going	Collected at the point of initial contact - Age: year of business registration / founding year - Size: turnover and employment - Sector: to SIC (2007) one digit level (or higher)	Scheme sponsor MI	
Other support provided to applicant firm	£, by scheme	On-going	Other types of support received by successful applicants; covering the scheme, timing, type and value (£) of support received	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of entrepreneurial readiness assists progressing to trading	#	A	The number of potential entrepreneurs assisted that have subsequently progressed to full trading	Scheme sponsor	Will require a bespoke survey of beneficiaries - could do on a sample basis.

Number of enterprises assisted to cooperate with research entities/institutions	#	A	The number of treated SMEs working jointly with research entities after assistance has been given. Should be counted up to 3 years following support. Knowledge transfer is about transferring good ideas, research results and skills between the knowledge base and business to enable innovative new products and services to be developed	Scheme sponsor	
Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	#	A	The number of treated SMEs that successfully introduce a new-to-market product after assistance has been given. Product should be available for commercial purchase. Should be counted up to 3 years following support.	Scheme sponsor	
Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the firm products	#	A	The number of treated SMEs that introduce a new-to-firm product after assistance has been given. Product to be available for commercial purchase Should be counted up to 3 years following support.	Scheme sponsor	

