



Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

Executive Summary

Coast to Capital LEP monitors all projects in receipt of Local Growth Funds on a continual basis via quarterly claims, project board attendance, site visits/meetings and project audits. Monitoring of projects informs the LEP of current project status and risk and allows the team to evaluate successes and assist where challenges appear.

The Government's allocation of £275,565,518 Local Growth Funding to Coast to Capital has been distributed amongst 94 projects in the LEP's region, and the Investments team is fully resourced to monitor and evaluate each project to successful completion. These resources include the Investments team, both financial and legal support from our Accountable Body, Investment Committee, and Board.

Monitoring and evaluation is performed over several processes by individuals in the team and include evaluating the projects status, current risk and deliverables through the life of the project to completion and closure.

Purpose of this document

This document sets out the expectations of Coast to Capital with regards to the monitoring and evaluation of all 94 projects in receipt of Local Growth Funds (LGF).

The total LGF allocation from Government that has been distributed to projects in the Coast to Capital region is £275,565,518.

There is an expectation from Government that these funds will deliver at least 14,000 jobs and 5,000 new homes.

Coast to Capital has set out procedures as detailed below, which are followed to ensure this target is not only achieved but exceeded.

Project Monitoring Resources

Coast to Capital have a dedicated Board, Investment Committee and Investments Team that manage, monitor and evaluate all projects funded with LGF. Each Board, Committee and team member has a key role that ensures that the risk to our Investments are minimised, and that project delivery is successful. These roles are summarised below and are detailed in full within our Assurance Framework (March 2019):

The **Accountable Body** is responsible for playing an active role in all Board and Committee meetings, ensuring compliance of the National Local Growth Assurance Framework and giving legal advice for any decision that is made regarding LGF including, but not limited to, State Aid and Procurement laws and Conflicts of Interest. The Accountable Body's Section 151 Officer and Head of Finance has oversight of quarterly claims to ensure that delivery bodies are using funds with propriety, regularity and deliver value for money. Ultimate deployment of funds reside with the Section 151 Officer, and only takes place with their approval.

The Coast to Capital **Board** is responsible for the delivery of the Growth Deal on behalf of Government. The Board has sight of all projects and the Full Risk Register, and has authority to make final decisions regarding funding over £2,000,000 and noting decisions made by the Investment Committee for funding up to £2,000,000. Decisions can include, but are not limited to, allocation, re-allocation or virements of funding and any other action required for projects that are deemed as high risk and therefore put the Growth Deal delivery in jeopardy.

The **Investment Committee** is responsible for having sight of all projects in receipt of LGF, this includes but is not limited to, project and output delivery, risk ratings, business case and project delivery scrutiny and output creation. The Investment Committee have delegated responsibility for making decisions to allocate funding of up to £2,000,000 and making recommendations to the Board for investments over £2,000,000. These decisions can include allocation, re-allocation, virements of funding and any other action required for any project. Projects that are deemed as high risk are scrutinised by the Investment Committee who will make a decision to allow a project to proceed under 'Close Monitoring', 'Watch & Wait' or to withdraw and reallocate funding.

The **Chief Executive Officer** is the consistent link between the Board and Investment Committee and the executive and delivery team. The CEO is responsible for the successful achievement of all LGF objectives and works closely with the executive and delivery team to complete this goal. As a result of this responsibility the CEO is accountable to the Board and the Investment Committee.

The **Chief Operating Officer** leads the Investments Team and is responsible for overseeing all areas of investment and managing the team to ensure that processes are followed correctly and in line with the National Local Growth Assurance Framework and the Coast to Capital Assurance Framework.

The **Investment Programme & Risk Manager** oversees the LGF programme to include project risk, output delivery, attends project boards, monitors project delivery and assigns project audits.

The **Investment Programme Manager** oversees the LGF programme to include project financial and output claims and attends project boards.

The **Investments Audit & Compliance Officer** is responsible for conducting project audits.

The **Investments Administrator** is responsible for supporting the Team which includes, but is not limited to, arranging Committee meetings and taking accurate minutes to ensure decisions are recorded.

Project Claims

Claims are sent to the LEP on a quarterly basis for every ongoing project and consists of a financial report, current progress and outputs achieved.

These documents are completed by individual delivery bodies and sent to the **Investments Programme Manager** for review each quarter. Each claim consists of a summary document, a detailed expenditure list, invoices, proof of payment, a Highlight Report and Risk Register.

These documents detail LGF and match funding expenditure, forecasted spend, up to date outputs delivered, forecasted outputs and up to date milestones. Variations are detailed within a narrative along with a high level overview of the current project status. These claims inform the risk management process and can highlight areas of concern where a delivery body may not be achieving as expected.

These documents are checked thoroughly by the **Investments Programme Manager** and Head of Finance to ensure that any unexpected claims or inconsistencies are highlighted and can be further investigated. Payment of LGF is made in arrears subject to satisfactory sign off by the S151 Officer.

Inconsistencies may trigger a project audit to investigate more thoroughly with the delivery body what the projects status is and what will be delivered.

All claims are passed to the **Accountable Body** for oversight and to ensure compliance with the National Local Growth Assurance Framework.

Project Boards

All members of the **Investment Team** are able to sit on project boards where required, but predominately the **Programme Managers** will have project meetings to allow efficient monitoring and information gathering. This allows the LEP to gain firsthand knowledge of how a project is being managed, the challenges that the project come up against, current status and upcoming works and milestones.

Attending project boards allows the team to constantly monitor the risk of a project, evaluate the projects ongoing achievements, provide support to the delivery bodies experiencing issues and advising the delivery body on compliance with the funding agreement.

This will help to inform the LEP of project risk, and in turn determine the project risk rating.

Project Risk Management

The **Investments Programme & Risk Manager** is responsible for monitoring programme and project risk and highlighting areas of concern to the **Investments Committee**. This follows the High Risk Monitoring protocol within the Assurance Framework (March 2019), and is conducted through the production of an informative High Risk Report that details projects that are high risk, and those projects with the potential to become high risk, along with the full LGF risk register.

Project risk ratings are determined through information provided with project claims, board meetings and audits, and using the MHCLG risk assessment criteria detailed in [Table A](#).

Projects that become 'high risk' will have increased levels of monitoring and review, and if either Delivery, Finance or Reputational issues cannot be mitigated, or the project is unable to reduce their project risk, it would then trigger our Funding Withdrawal Process.

The Board will note all actions and mitigations agreed at Investment Committee via the consent paper, and will also decide upon any funding withdrawal recommendations.

Table A

The delivery confidence assessment RAG status definitions:	
RAG	MHCLG risk assessment criteria
Green	Successful delivery of the project appears highly likely including timeline, cost and quality. There are no outstanding or potential issues at this stage.
Amber / Green	Minor issues to timeline, cost or quality, are present and are being well managed to ensure risk isn't a threat to successful delivery.
Amber	Significant issues exist that need to be monitored and managed to ensure delivery is met. Outputs and finance need re-profiling.
Amber / Red	Major risks are apparent in key areas and the delivery is in doubt. Urgent action is required to bring project back on track, although this may include significant changes to outputs and finance profile.
Red	Major issues have led to the project appearing unachievable. A re assessment of viability may be required as expected outputs are likely to under deliver.

Project risk management and the High Risk Monitoring protocol is used to continuously evaluate project successes and mitigate risk to funding and to project outcomes both contracted and wider impacts.

Project Audits

Audits are conducted on each project at least once every 12 months by the **Investments Audit & Compliance Officer**. The audits purpose is to gain information on what the project has achieved, current status, upcoming works and milestones, challenges, financial profile, deliverables, project management and details of wider outcomes.

As a result of the project audit, an evaluative report is written for the **Investments Programme & Risk Manager**. This report includes recommendations that are deemed necessary for the successful completion of the project and a risk rating that is clearly defined as per the guidelines from MHCLG. These recommendations and risk rating can be used to inform project risk management and steps required to mitigate risk.

Project Audit paperwork can be found in **Annex A** and this includes both the *Pre-Visit Questionnaire* and *Report template*.

Project Closure & Final Evaluation

Once a project has reported, either through a claim document or via a project audit, that all deliverables and funding requirements have been achieved, a closure review can be conducted to formally close the project.

This closure includes confirmation that contracted funding, outputs and timeline have been achieved. Where there are variances, an explanation is required and can be evaluated for success. The document includes confirmation of output evidence and whether this has been seen by a member of the LEP and when a final evaluation will be completed.

A final evaluation is conducted by the delivery body to detail how the project met objectives including social value, wider impacts and lessons learned. Each evaluation is decided on a case by case basis as some projects require time following the closure to have enough information to properly judge impact.

Templates for both the *Closure Form* and the *Evaluation Form* can be found in [Annex B](#).

Looking forward

The LEP are always reviewing working practices and collaborating with other LEP's and organisations to learn from others and implement best practice that align with Government recommendations and expectations.

As projects come forward for completion the LEP is keen to explore with delivery bodies how best to ensure information on the wider outcomes achieved is accurately recorded. Several projects are in the process of completing a final evaluation and the LEP welcomes feedback on this process from the delivery body, peer groups and Government.

Prior to each new funding call commencing, all procedures and relevant documentation are reviewed to ensure that they are fit for purpose.

In the summer of 2019, a full review was conducted on the Funding Agreement to ensure key terms were suitable. This was subsequently approved by the Accountable Body and now includes more detailed clauses regarding the delivery body's responsibilities for monitoring, providing output evidence and project evaluations.

Annex A

Purposes and conduct of the Audit Review

The primary purpose of the Coast to Capital Audit Review is to ensure that the clauses and conditions within the funding agreement are being adhered to, that the project is in line with the Business case and to ensure that the delivery strategy is robust and appropriate. Including but not limited to the status of the project and to confirm that funding profiles and outputs are on track and in line with the most recent Schedule 2 Update.

Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Project Review

The people involved in the review are listed in Appendix B

Details of output evidence required can be found in Appendix C

Please submit the following documents to Coast to Capital for review by: XXXX 2019

- Risk register
- Most recent highlight report
- Pre Visit Questionnaire (pages 3-5 of this document)
- Forecast of spend up to the end of the 2020/21 financial year
- Organisation map

During the Audit review the following areas are likely to be discussed, please ensure this information is available during the visit:

- Policies and procedures relating to delivery
- Quarterly claims submitted to the LEP
- Project funding
- Project outputs
- Project status / delivery / risk
- Anything else related to the project that may affect delivery of contractual outputs, LGF draw-down or match funding

Timetable

This is a general structure for the day and is subject to change depending on the length of time required for the site visit, travel and findings prior to visit.

9.30 – 11am	Arrival and site visit
11am – 12pm	Formal discussion

Following the visit, a report will be drawn up for the Investment Programme Managers who may report findings to the Investment Committee and/or Board as part of our regular project reporting. This report will include all findings and recommendations.

Pre-visit Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire and return to Coast to Capital by the date as detailed above.

-
1. Please highlight the most up to date scope and aims of the project.
-
2. What is the projects current progress to date, and what will the next stage of the project include?
-
3. What are the key achievements this project has had to date?
-
4. How are you managing current risks to the project i.e delays, changes to cost or outputs?
-
5. Have there been any significant changes to the project delivery to include funding / outputs, along with reasons behind the changes.

6. Have you secured the full matched funding required to complete the project and deliver the outputs as set out in the funding agreement. If not, what do you have in place to guarantee the funding is achieved?

7. Are you aware of anything that has the potential to cause future delays to the scheme, or which will impact on the LGF drawn down / financial profiling?

8. How do you ensure the project receives value for money? Please include the current Value for Money assessment and how this compares with the approved business case.

9. Can you please give detail on the social value added by your project? Please include some examples.

10. Delivery Bodies are required to acknowledge Coast to Capital as a source of funding and use the Coast to Capital branding (as recently changed) to demonstrate that we are a funding partner. Please can you indicate where and how you are naming us?

The statements below reflect clauses within the signed funding agreement, please read through these carefully and confirm that the project is compliant. Please note that Coast to Capital reserve the right to ask for evidence to ensure compliance at any time:

Statements	Yes	No
The delivery body follows all applicable procurement regulations.		
The project remains State Aid compliant.		
The project improves the economic, social & environmental well-being as per the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.		
The delivery body is compliant with GDPR and all related legislation.		
The delivery body is compliant with all discrimination laws and the Human Rights act.		
The delivery body is compliant with the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974.		
The delivery body has all relevant insurances in place, including public liability, employer’s liability and professional indemnity.		
The delivery body has an appropriate complaint or dispute resolution policy in place.		
The delivery body follows all of Coast to Capitals branding and communication guidelines.		

I the undersigned can confirm that the project named below is compliant with the above and all other aspects of the Funding Agreement in place.

Project Name:	
Signature:	
Name & job title:	
Date:	

Appendix A

Purpose of Coast to Capital Project Review

- Ensure all clauses and conditions of the Funding Agreement are being adhered to.
- Review the funding profiles and outputs for the project and confirm that it makes the necessary contribution to Authorities overall strategy.
- Ensure that the project is supported by key stakeholders.
- Confirm that the project's potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of the Authorities delivery plans and change programmes.
- Review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the project.
- Review the arrangements for identifying and managing the main project risks, including external risks such as changing business priorities.
- Check that financial provision has been made for the project and that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised.
- Check progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes.
- Confirm the status of the Business Case.
- Ensure that the delivery strategy is robust and appropriate.
- Ensure that the project's plan through to completion is appropriately detailed and realistic, including the contract management strategy.
- Ensure that the project controls and organisation are defined, financial controls are in place and the resources are available.
- Confirm that the development and delivery approach and mechanisms are still appropriate and manageable.
- Confirm that appropriate project performance measures and tools are being used.
- Confirm that quality procedures have been applied consistently since the previous review.
- Confirm compliance with health and safety and sustainability requirements.

Appendix B

Participants (for completion by the Delivery Body)

NAME

ROLE

Appendix C

Evidence Requirements

A site visit may be required in addition to supplying this evidence and will be advised as necessary.

Output	Examples of acceptable evidence
Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An anonymised list of new or safeguarded employees with hours of work and company name.
Commercial Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor or Chartered Surveyor sign off report.• Before & after photos acceptable for minor refurbishments only.
Learning Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor or Chartered Surveyor sign off report.• Before & after photos acceptable for minor refurbishments only.
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council tax registration details.• Builder's practical completion or sale documentation.
Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anonymised, per year college registrations detailing full or part time learners.
Apprenticeships	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anonymised, per year registrations detailing apprentice numbers, qualification title and employer.
Public realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor's practical completion documentation.• Photographic evidence – before & after view.
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor's practical completion documentation.• Photographic evidence – before & after view.• Updated map – before & after version.
Cycle ways	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor's practical completion documentation.• Photographic evidence – before & after view.• Updated map – before & after version.

Audit Review Background

Scope of Review

An Audit Review was conducted on the ... Project following a request from the Investments Team. The project required a review to confirm the current status, details of any existing and potential risk and the expected deliverables and LGF draw-down. This included checking the following aspects;

- The status and quality of the outputs.
- The status of LGF and match funding.
- The processes in place surrounding delivery.
- Existing and potential risks.
- Overall management and delivery of the project.

Local Growth Funding Award

Text

Summary of project and expected Outputs

Text

Audit Review Findings

The audit consisted of a review of documentation and evidence provided along with a site visit and an interview with key personnel from the Delivery Body. Coast to Capital would like to thank all of those involved for their assistance and ongoing support that has enabled this audit review to take place.

Current project status

Text

Status and quality of delivery and outputs

Text

The status of LGF and match funding

Text

Existing and potential risks

Text

Audit Review Summary and Recommendations

Conclusion

Text

Recommendation:	Follow up action by:

RAG Rating - Green

This project has a recommended rating of GREEN for the following reasons:

-

The delivery confidence assessment RAG status definitions:	
RAG	MHCLG risk assessment criteria
Green	Successful delivery of the project appears highly likely including timeline, cost and quality. There are no outstanding or potential issues at this stage.
Amber / Green	Minor issues to timeline, cost or quality, are present and are being well managed to ensure risk isn't a threat to successful delivery.
Amber	Significant issues exist that need to be monitored and managed to ensure delivery is met. Outputs and finance need re-profiling.
Amber / Red	Major risks are apparent in key areas and the delivery is in doubt. Urgent action is required to bring project back on track, although this may include significant changes to outputs and finance profile.
Red	Major issues have led to the project appearing unachievable. A re assessment of viability may be required as expected outputs are likely to under deliver.

Annex B.

Purposes of the Closure Review

The primary purpose of the Coast to Capital Closure Review is to formally bring to a close the named project and ensure that all contracted outputs and funding have been achieved in line with the most recent Schedule 2 Update of the funding agreement.

In all instances an evaluation is required and this should be carried out by the delivery body and shared with Coast to Capital.

When is an evaluation expected to be completed?	Date / quarter / financial year:
---	----------------------------------

1. Project Summary

Delivery body to complete a short project summary to include the aim, delivery status, benefits realisation and any future plans-

--

2. Project Delivery

Project Start Date (month/year)	
Project Completion Date (month/year)	

Financial Spend

	Contractual	Claimed/reported
LGF		
Match Funding (include funders name & amount)		

Outputs and Outcomes

Output	Target	Progress Reported

Please give details of any variances:

--

3. Verification of Outputs

Has the delivery body met the funding agreement targets (if no please give a reason)	
Are targets being measured beyond the financial and project completion dates (if yes please provide details).	
Have outputs been seen by a member of Coast to Capital. (who, when)	
Has acceptable evidence of outputs been received?	

Actions for any outstanding outputs:

- The Project Closure Review is complete and no further action is required (Proceed to CLOSED status)
- The project closure review is complete however further action is required.

Detail any comments or further actions required;

Please sign below to verify all details within this document:

Delivery Body:

Coast to Capital:

Name:

Name:

Signature:

Signature:

Purposes of the Project Evaluation

The primary purpose of the Coast to Capital Project Evaluation is for the delivery body to provide evidence of outputs and detail how these outputs have met the expectations as outlined within the approved business case / application.

Please note that this is an evaluation of the project outcome in comparison to the approved business case and **not of any updated schedule 2 agreements**. Only details regarding a schedule 2 update that include change of funding or outputs should be detailed in question 1.3.

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Please summarise the overall project scope and how did this align with the approved business case.

1.2 Please summarise the project achievements including any opportunities that have been unlocked.

1.3 Were there any updates to the project schedule 2? Please give details of these changes including how and why these took place. **This should be the only reference to any updated schedule 2's, all other answers should be based on the Approved Business Case only.**

1.4 What was the total project cost and how does this compare with estimates detailed in the approved business case? Please include all funding amounts received from funding partners and what this was used for within the project.

1.5 What are the outputs achieved and how do these compare with the original scope as set out within the approved business case? Please list all delivered outputs, these details will require evidence as set in Annex A.

1.6 Were there any wider impacts or benefits of the project delivery? I.e. any positive stories, PR or any other outputs created.

2.0 The Strategic Case

2.1 You were asked to detail the 'compelling case for change' within the approved business case, how does this compare with the actual changes made as a result of this project? Please include what the objectives were to achieve the outcomes.

2.2 Please detail all stakeholders including their involvement and responsibilities. If there were any changes to stakeholders in comparison to the approved business case, please provide details for this change.

2.3 What were the project dependencies and how did these change throughout the project?

2.4 Please compare the stated risks and project disruptions noted within the approved business case with the actual risks experienced within the project.

3.0 The Economic Case

3.1 Within the approved business case, proposed options were stated including total costs, advantages and disadvantages. Please detail how these options compare with the projects outcome.

3.2 Was the preferred chosen option still the most economically viable? Please detail why this is or is not the case.

3.3 Please compare the stated economic impact with the project outcome including a value for money assessment.

3.4 Please compare the stated environmental impact with the project outcome, detailing any changes to the predicted impact.

3.5 Please compare the stated social impact with the project outcome including the number of people and businesses positively affected by the intervention. This should include any wider impact on skills provision, business growth, infrastructure, regeneration and housing.

4.0 The Commercial case

4.1 Please detail the procurement route taken during the project and how this compares with the route detailed within the approved business case. Please include how timescales met expectations or how and why these changed.

4.2 Were any private development partners used and how did this compare with the envisioned use as set out within the approved business case?

4.3 Please detail how State Aid was maintained throughout the project, to include any challenges experienced and how these were overcome.

5.0 The Financial Case

5.1 Please detail all changes to LGF draw-down and the reasons for these changes.

5.2 Please detail all changes to match funding and the reasons for these changes.

5.3 Please compare the estimated project costs as detailed within the approved business case with the actual project costs and the reasons for these changes. Please detail LGF and match funding separately.

6.0 The Management Case

6.1 When did the project commence and how does this compare with the expected date detailed within the approved business case? What are the reasons for any change?

6.2 When did the project complete and how does this compare with the expected date within the approved business case? What are the reasons for any change?

6.3 Please compare the expected milestones, as detailed within the approved business case with the actual milestones achieved, including the reasons for any differences.

6.4 Please detail how the project was managed in comparison to the expected arrangements as set out in the approved business case. Please give reasons for any changes.

7.0 Further information

7.1 It is a requirement of Coast to Capital and HM Government that any PR relating to the project or Local Growth Funds has pre-approval prior to public release. Please give details of how this clause has been met.

7.2 What lessons have been learnt as a result of this project that will be used in the future?

7.3 Has this project led to others or aspirations for other projects?

7.4 How did the allocated Local Growth Funds enable this project to take place?

7.5 What further support could the LEP provide following completion of the project?

