

## REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR DECISION – DD1439

### Title: Mayor's Regeneration Fund - Evaluation

#### Executive Summary:

The purpose of this Decision is to release funds of up to £125,000 for the procurement of an organisation to deliver a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the Mayor's Regeneration Fund (MRF). This work will assess whether the aims and objectives of the MRF were met, the impact and value for money of the MRF and individual projects, and what were the strengths and weaknesses of implementation. The final report should be completed by autumn 2016 and will be used by both internal and external stakeholders to inform future policymaking and funding rounds.

#### Decision:

That the Executive Director approves expenditure of up to £125,000 revenue funding from the Mayor's Regeneration Fund (MRF) Programme budget for the completion of the evaluation for the MRF programme.

#### 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:** Fiona Fletcher-Smith

**Position:** Executive Director-Development,  
Enterprise & Environment

**Signature:**



**Date:**

10.12.2015

## **PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE**

### **Decision required – supporting report**

#### **1. Introduction and background**

- 1.1 From Saturday 6th of August through Tuesday 9th of August 2011, unprecedented levels of public disorder took place in a range of locations across London. Following over 1,600 arrests and estimated damages of over £100m, the impact on London's communities, society and economy are undoubted. Following these disturbances, the Mayor announced a fund of £70m to invest in the long term regeneration of some of the worst affected boroughs (MD895).
- 1.2 Of this funding, £50m has been provided by the Mayor of London via the GLA. In addition, £20m has been provided to the GLA from the Department for Communities and Local Government and was ring fenced for investment in Tottenham and Croydon.
- 1.3 Bids were invited from boroughs, and these proposals were assessed by the GLA with regard to deliverability and economic impact, and a number were prioritised for funding. A requirement of 30% match funding was applied to all applications for funding.
- 1.4 The main aim of the Mayor's Regeneration Fund (MRF) was stated as: "investing in people's futures with grant agreements awarded on the strength of job, training and apprenticeship opportunities for local people as well as high street renewal".
- 1.5 Given the considerable amount of funds being spent on the MRF and the ongoing importance of regeneration to London, the GLA is committed to learning from this programme. To achieve this, the GLA is planning an evaluation of the MRF to be published in the autumn of 2016 to mark the fifth anniversary of the disturbances, and are looking to commission some of the evaluation work within this specification. If required, this work could include an additional interim evaluation published before the end of the current Mayoral term.
- 1.6 In January 2014 Regeneris completed two pieces of work for the Regeneration Unit. One was a guide to the self-evaluation process which was issued to delivery partners, and the second was an interim evaluation of MRF, which included an initial process evaluation of the delivery of MRF and a data audit and assessment of the existing MRF projects and recommendations on data gaps which could be filled. Both pieces of work would be issued to whoever undertakes the final evaluation.
- 1.7 The GLA wishes to undertake a competitive procurement exercise in line with the Authority's Code of Conduct to appoint an organisation to conduct an evaluation of the Mayor's Regeneration Fund. The Procurement Strategy is to utilise the existing framework 'GLA 80405: GLA Economics, Research and Evaluation Framework' and 'Lot 2: Appraisal and Evaluation'. It is estimated that this evaluation will not exceed £125,000, and the funding will come from the MRF Programme Support Budget.
- 1.8 A steering group will be set up to score the proposals and analyse the interim and final reports. Members of the steering group will include representatives from GLA Economics, a representative from the Regeneration Area teams and a representative from the Regeneration Programme team.

## **2. Objectives and expected outcomes**

- 2.1 The purpose of the evaluation is to expand the evidence base for regeneration activities and establish lessons learned which can both help improve future policymaking within the GLA and Regeneration funding rounds. Consequently, the audience of the evaluation will consist of both internal and external stakeholders.
- 2.2 The focus of the evaluation is an assessment of whether the MRF programme and its constituent projects achieved their aims. Where delivery is ongoing, the aim will be to understand whether the specific projects are on track.
- 2.3 The main output from the work we are seeking to commission in this specification will be a final, public facing report including the key themes and research questions outlines above. The recommended report structure for the evaluation is:
- Executive summary
  - Introduction
  - Overview of programme
  - Profile of funding and expenditure
  - Performance against aims and objectives
  - Effectiveness of the delivery process
  - Impact of the programme
  - Value for money assessment
  - Strategic added value
  - Key lessons learnt and recommendations
  - Conclusions
- 2.4 Additional budget has been secured to include a follow-up evaluation 12 months on (autumn 2017). This second report will be in the same format, but focus solely on an analysis of projects still in delivery at the time of the original evaluation being published, as well as a longitudinal analysis of those projects featured in the original report. One drawback of our previous evaluation commissions is that the timing means that many of the schemes have only recently finished delivery, and consequently the evaluation could not fully analyse long term benefits and impacts.

## **3. Equality comments**

- 3.1 GLA specifications will require that organisations that issue tender submissions enclose their Equalities Policies for scrutiny.

## **4. Other considerations**

- 4.1 The Mayor's Regeneration Fund, while not mentioned in the Strategic Plan directly, as it originated as a response to unforeseen exceptional incidents of August 2011, does link closely to a number of the Mayor's priority themes, particularly improving Londoner's quality of life; investing in young Londoners; and making London safer. Furthermore, policy 4.12 of the London Plan, Improving Opportunities For All, aims to "improve employment opportunities for Londoners" and "support local employment, skills development and training" and objective 4 of the Economic Development Strategy "to give all Londoners the opportunity to take part in London's economic success, access sustainable employment and progress in their careers" mirror the main aims of the Mayor's Regeneration Fund.

- 4.2 The evaluation will support the Strategic Plan deliverable to “provide first class intelligence and analytical services to ensure evidence is used effectively in support of investment, policy-making decisions and strategy development”. Furthermore, the Greater London Authority’s Business Plan 2015-17 refers to the ongoing aim of the Regeneration Unit to use their collective body of work to “develop a robust body of evidence describing how regeneration can drive growth”.
- 4.3 Consultation has been held with the Director and Assistant Director of Regeneration. The evaluation itself will support impact assessment of the projects that constitute the MRF Programme
- 4.4 The independent nature of the evaluation could potentially result in findings which may be negative and could have reputational implications. However, this is an acceptable risk given that the lack of an independent evaluation of a large regeneration programme carries a greater reputational risk to the organisation. Furthermore, it is worth noting the negative repercussions of not conducting an evaluation, and being unable to assess which strategies have had the biggest impact, and where things need to be done differently in future to inform future programmes. The learning captured through the evaluation helps inform future work and evidence resulting impact.
- 4.5 There is a risk that due to particular elements of the Mayor’s Regeneration Fund programme still being ongoing, the evaluation may not fully identify the full economic benefits of the various interventions. To mitigate this, the GLA Regeneration Unit will work closely with the winning bidder and the relevant projects and stakeholders to ensure the most up-to-date and relevant information is being captured and communicated in a sufficient manner that is conducive to the aims of the evaluation. We have also made the decision to include a follow evaluation in 12 months to mitigate against this even further.

## **5. Financial comments**

- 5.1 The estimated cost of the proposed consultancy contract is £125,000 and will be funded from the 2015-16 Mayor’s Regeneration Fund ‘General’ budget for which the current allocation stands at £983,000.
- 5.2 The procurement and completion of the evaluation is expected to last 12 months and will span into the 2016/17 financial year. Consequently, officers will seek to carry forward the budget provision required to fund the completion of the work into 2016-17. It should be noted that all budget carry forwards are subject to the Authority’s closing of accounts process

## **6. Legal comments**

- 6.1 The report above indicates that:
- 6.1.1 the decision requested of the Director (in accordance with the GLA’s Contracts and Funding Code) falls 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 economic development and wealth creation, or social development in Greater London; and
- 6.1.2 in formulating the proposals in respect of which a decision is sought officers have complied with the Authority’s related statutory duties to:
- pay due regard to the principle that there should be equality of opportunity for all people (further details on equalities are set out in section 3 above) and to the duty under section 149 of the 2010 Act to 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 share a protected characteristic and those who do not<sup>1</sup>;

- 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; and
- consult with appropriate bodies.

6.2 Officers have indicated in paragraph 1.7 of this report that the services required will be 'called off' from an existing GLA framework in accordance with relevant procurement law and the GLA's Contracts and Funding Code.

Officers must ensure that appropriate 'call-off' documentation is put in place and executed by the successful bidder(s) and the GLA before the commencement of the services.

## 7. Planned delivery approach and next steps

Activity	Timeline
Procurement of contract [for externally delivered projects]	w/c 23/11/2015
Announcement [if applicable]	N/A
Delivery Start Date [for project proposals]	w/c 30/11/2015
Final evaluation start and finish (self/external) [delete as applicable]:	w/c 01/08/2017
Delivery End Date [for project proposals]	w/c 05/09/2017
Project Closure: [for project proposals]	w/c 12/09/2017

### Appendices and supporting papers:

Appendix 1 MRF Evaluation Specification

---

<sup>1</sup> The protected characteristics and groups are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, gender, religion or belief, sexual orientation and marriage/ civil partnership status.

**Public access to information**

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI Act) 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 approval or on the defer date.

**Part 1 Deferral:****Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? Yes**

If YES, for what reason:

Appendices contain the MRF Evaluation specification, which is about to be issued as part of the invitation to tender. Publication should be deferred until after procurement has taken place and successful bidder has been announced.

Until what date: 01/01/2016

**Part 2 Confidentiality:** Only the facts or advice considered to be exempt from disclosure under the FOI Act should be 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:**

Matthew Kleebauer has drafted this report in accordance with GLA procedures and confirms that:

✓

**Assistant Director/Head of Service:**

Debbie Jackson 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.

✓

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES:**

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

Signature

*M. D. Kleebauer*

Date

8.12.15