

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR DECISION – DD2742

Title: Good Growth Fund Final Evaluation

Executive Summary:

The Mayor's Good Growth Fund ('GGF') was a seven-year regeneration programme launched in June 2017 and delivered through the London Economic Action Partnership (LEAP) using funds initially received from Government as part of the Growth Deal and approved through MD2163. 79 capital projects were awarded £75m in funding to support growth and community development in London. The programme will complete final expenditure and delivery in 2025. An interim evaluation of the programme was completed under cover DD2222, evaluating only 29 completed projects.

This decision seeks to appoint consultants to undertake a final evaluation of the GGF to assess the impact of the entire programme, including a value-for-money assessment, how it met the GGF objectives, London and local scale impact and important lessons learnt for future programmes.

Decision:

That the Executive Director of Good Growth approves expenditure of £70,000 to deliver a final evaluation of the Mayor's Good Growth Fund. The funding will come from the Good Growth Fund revenue reserves.

AUTHORISING DIRECTOR

I have reviewed the request and am satisfied it is correct and consistent with the Mayor's plans and priorities.

It has my approval.

Name: Philip Graham

Position: Executive Director, Good Growth

Signature:



Date:

15/04/2025

PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE

Decision required – supporting report

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1. The Good Growth Fund was a seven-year regeneration programme launched in June 2017, funded predominantly through external funding provided to the London Economic Action Partnership (LEAP) and allocated and delivered through LEAP structures. Funding was originally received from government and approved under cover of MD2163 with subsequent decisions setting out the detail of the funding allocations and (in some instances) any additional funding added to the programme; including DD2182, DD2222, DD2278, DD2302, DD2352, DD2389, DD2455 and DD2544.
- 1.2. 79 capital projects were offered £75m in funding to support growth and community development in London. The programme packaged funding from multiple sources including the Local Growth Fund and European Social Fund to provide a flexible, strategic pot to support a diverse range of interventions and applicants. The fund was open to any public, private and third-sector organisation operating within the Greater London area.
- 1.3. The programme was scheduled to be completed by March 2021 and, whilst all funds had been contractually committed by this date, only circa £30m had been spent (with 29 out of 79 projects complete) by the time an interim evaluation was delivered in 2022. Full expenditure and completion of the programme was extended to 2025 to reflect delays caused in part by the COVID-19 pandemic. The interim evaluation was delivered under the cover of approval DD2222.
- 1.4. This decision proposes expenditure to procure consultants to deliver a final, retrospective, quantitative and qualitative impact evaluation of the Mayor's Good Growth Fund (GGF) regeneration programme, building on the foundations developed through the interim study.
- 1.5. Evaluation is critical to ensuring that the full benefits of the programme are identified and understood and the knowledge gained through it is captured for dissemination and to inform future projects. It also plays an important role in demonstrating the responsible use of public funding in accordance with Government Green Book guidance.
- 1.6. A key component of the interim work was the development of a value-for-money calculator model to assess the monetised impact of the programme. Appointed consultants will update the value-for-money model as part of a quantitative analysis to provide insights (and test pre-existing assumptions from the interim evaluation), based on a more complete but consistent dataset.
- 1.7. They will also conduct bespoke research, analysis, evaluation, and dissemination activities as part of a broad, final, qualitative programme evaluation. This will present insights in a way that tells a compelling and publicly engaging story about how this programme has delivered impact at both a London-wide and local scale; in ways that Londoners would recognise and value.
- 1.8. Consultants will be competitively procured in line with the Contracts and Funding Code.

2. Objectives and expected outcomes

- 2.1 The appointed consultants will address the following objectives:
 - to deliver a retrospective quantitative and qualitative impact evaluation of the Good Growth Fund regeneration programme. This will test:
 - the extent to which the aims and objectives of the GGF were met
 - the on-the-ground outputs and outcomes delivered as a result of the GGF

- the impact and value for money of the GGF as a programme and the link between investment and outcomes
- to use data, case studies and compelling visuals to describe how this programme has delivered impact at both a London-wide and local scale. This should reveal:
 - the stories and narratives surrounding the fund, its projects and beneficiaries
 - the extent to which the Good Growth by Design Programme has contributed to maximising the impact of projects
 - the way projects have supported delivery of Mayoral objectives and how funding deployed in this way can deliver against multiple GLA policy priorities beyond Planning and Regeneration
- to provide insight and lessons learnt to strengthen the case for funding of this nature, delivered in this way to support place-based development. This should include:
 - the strengths and weaknesses of the programme in delivering against its aims
 - recommendations to inform future funding programmes with similar aims. These should be focused around how outputs and outcomes can be maximised
- to knit together the elements above into a compelling narrative to explain how the fund has contributed to a fairer, greener and more prosperous London. This story should be engaging and presented to reach a broad audience including policy makers, decision makers and the public.

2.2 The following outcomes are expected:

- an updated quantitative analysis based on a value-for-money model which includes a larger dataset of completed projects. This will enable us to tell a robust, data driven story of the impact of the investment
- a qualitative analysis of the programme which will reveal the human stories of beneficiaries alongside key lessons learnt to help the GLA to develop future funding programmes that deliver maximum impact.

3. Equality comments

- 3.1. Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, as a public authority, the Mayor of London must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who have a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 3.2. The specification for this tender will be drafted with input and advice from relevant groups and stakeholders across the GLA to ensure that equalities considerations are incorporated into this evaluation work. Suppliers invited to tender will be required to set out how they would approach Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) issues in response to the brief. They will be required to comment on their own organisational approach to EDI and these elements will be scored to ensure that the appointed supplier is one that understand these issues and the importance of their continued consideration.
- 3.3. Furthermore, equality, diversity and inclusion advice will be sought when reviewing tender submissions for this piece of work and to help decide which consultant to appoint, to ensure that the most impactful piece of work as possible is produced.

- 3.4. The evaluation outputs will present a commentary on the extent to which the Good Growth Fund met its objectives with regards to delivering against the public sector equality duty as set out in the original approval. This states that; 'funding should accommodate and reflect the needs of the existing community and those that will live, work and visit an area. This includes the design for those with physical disabilities and mental health problems and older persons'.
- 3.5. One of the key evaluation outputs will be commentary reviewing and identifying ways in which the GLA can improve methods of engagement, communication and co-design methodology. For instance, this might include identifying ways to better ensure partners engage a diverse group of stakeholders to meet the challenge objectives and establishing practices to ensure that future challenges aimed at supporting beneficiaries from particular groups include representative stakeholders and partners with lived experience. The learnings and recommendations identified through the evaluation will be embedded into the design of future programmes.

4. Other considerations

- 4.1. There is a risk that consultants would not want to work with an existing 'value-for-money' model and so not tender for the work. Soft market testing has indicated that this risk was low or that suppliers would be able to tweak the existing model without compromising the consistency of the final dataset produced.
- 4.2. There is a risk that the budget would not enable a comprehensive final evaluation. Through soft market testing we are confident that this budget would enable a strong enough sample of insights, case studies and observations to assess the impact of the funding adequately. Close management of the appointed consultant team will ensure that the outputs are based on meaningful levels of research.
- 4.3. This work evaluates a programme that was established to deliver upon Mayoral objectives across a number of terms. By delivering this work we will assess how successfully funding has been deployed to deliver against Mayoral priorities and strategies including Good Growth and Economic Development.
- 4.4. It can be confirmed that no conflicts of interest were noted in the drafting and clearance of this decision.

5. Financial comments

- 5.1. This decision seeks to appoint consultants to undertake a final evaluation of the GGF to assess the impact of The Mayor's Good Growth Fund ('GGF').
- 5.2. The cost of this evaluation will be £70,000 and will be funded from the Good Growth Fund revenue reserves, for which there is a budget. This programme does not fall under a specific delivery plan as the programme was started in 2017 and is due to end in 2025, however it is consistent with the aims of the Helping Local Economies to Thrive mandate. This final evaluation will mark the completion of this programme.
- 5.3. It is important to note that the 2025/26 budget has yet to be approved and as such is subject to change.

6. Legal comments

- 6.1. The foregoing sections of this report indicate that the decisions sought concern the exercise of the GLA's general powers, falling within the GLA's statutory powers to do such things considered to further or which are facilitative of, conducive or incidental to the promotion of the improvement of the environment in Greater London and in formulating the proposals in respect of which a decision is sought, officers must comply with the GLA's related statutory duties to:

- pay due regard to the principle that there should be equality of opportunity for all people
- consider how the proposals will promote the improvement of health of persons, health inequalities between persons and to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development in the United Kingdom
- consult with appropriate bodies.

6.2. In taking any decisions sought, the Director must have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty - namely the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010 and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (race, disability, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion) and persons who do not (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010). To this end, the Director should have particular regard to section 4 (above) of this report.

6.3. If the Director makes the decision sought, officers must ensure the services required are procured (in liaison with TfL Procurement) in accordance with the GLA's Contracts and Funding Code; and a contract is put in place between and executed by the GLA and contractor before commencement of such services.

7. Planned delivery approach and next steps

Activity	Timeline
Procurement of contract	April 2025
Delivery Start Date: Consultant Inception Meeting	May 2025
Interim Draft Submission	July 2025
Final Draft Submission	September 2025
Project Closure	September 2025

Appendices and supporting papers:

None

Public access to information

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FoIA) and will be made available on the GLA website within one working day of approval.

If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision (for example, to complete a procurement process), it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary. **Note:** This form (Part 1) will either be published within one working day after it has been approved or on the defer date.

Part 1 - Deferral

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? NO

Part 2 – Sensitive information

Only the facts or advice that would be exempt from disclosure under FoIA should be included in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

Is there a part 2 form – NO

ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION:

Drafting officer to confirm the following (✓)

Drafting officer:

James Parkinson has drafted this report in accordance with GLA procedures and confirms the following:

✓

Assistant Director/Head of Service:

Louise Duggan has reviewed the documentation and is satisfied for it to be referred to the Sponsoring Director for approval.

✓

Financial and Legal advice:

The Finance and Legal teams have commented on this proposal, and this decision reflects their comments.

✓

Mayoral Delivery Board

A summary of this decision was reviewed by the Mayoral Delivery Board on 14 April 2025.

✓

CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER:

I confirm that financial and legal implications have been appropriately considered in the preparation of this report.

Signature:

Fay Hammond

Date:

14/04/2025