

Evaluating the Impact of East Midlands Development Agency – Annex 1: Summary Strand Level Assessments

A report prepared for *emda*

Ecotec

2009

This work, with the exception of logos, photographs and images and any other content marked with a separate copyright notice, is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 UK: England & Wales License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/)

The use of logos in the work is licensed for use only on non-derivative copies. Under this licence you are free to copy this work and to make derivative works as long as you give the original author credit.

The copyright is owned by Nottingham Trent University.



This document forms part of the *emda* Knowledge Bank

Annex One: Summary Strand Level Assessments

Origin of project

Table A1.1 Origin of the Project

Origin of the Project	Project developed by emda/SSP	Project inherited by emda from another organisation	Project developed by applicant organisation and submitted to emda/SSP for funding	Project developed between emda/SSP and other partners	Total
Coalfields	1	2	2	0	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	2	3	16	2	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	8	0	12	5	25
Enterprise	8	2	20	13	43
Enterprising Communities	2	0	10	9	21
ICT	4	0	0	3	7
Innovation	2	1	10	2	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	4	1	1	2	8
Rural Development	1	2	11	9	23
Site Provision and Development	2	2	23	5	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	4	0	9	4	17
Transport	1	0	6	0	7
Urban Regeneration	4	0	13	5	22
Total	43	13	133	59	248

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.2 emda / SSP influence on project development

Strand	The project appraisal process lead to significant changes to the planned project	The project remained largely unchanged	Total
Coalfields	1	4	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	2	21	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	3	22	25
Enterprise	8	35	43

Strand	The project appraisal process lead to significant changes to the planned project	The project remained largely unchanged	Total
Enterprising Communities	5	16	21
ICT	0	7	7
Innovation	0	15	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	0	8	8
Rural Development	2	21	23
Site Provision and Development	7	25	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	1	16	17
Transport	1	6	7
Urban Regeneration	5	17	22
Total	35	213	248
% of total	14	86	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Project Performance against Financial Targets, Timetable and Output Targets

Table A1.3 Project Performance Against Financial Targets

Strand	On Budget	Over Budget	Under Budget	Unknown	Total
Coalfields	3	1	1	0	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	17	2	3	1	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	16	3	6	0	25
Enterprise	37	1	5	0	43
Enterprising Communities	18	1	2	0	21
ICT	6	1	0	0	7
Innovation	13	0	2	0	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	5	1	2	0	8
Rural Development	22	0	1	0	23
Site Provision and Development	19	3	7	3	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	13	1	3	0	17
Transport	5	0	2	0	7
Urban Regeneration	13	3	6	0	22

Strand	On Budget	Over Budget	Under Budget	Unknown	Total
Total	187	17	40	4	248
% of total	75	7	16	2	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.4 Reasons for over-spending

Strand	Unforeseen additional costs	Unforeseen complexities	Increase in project scale or scope	Legislative change and inflationary pressure	Issues with Contractors	Unknown	Total
Coalfields	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Economic Growth and the Environment	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Employment, Learning and Skills	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Enterprise	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Enterprising Communities	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
ICT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
International Trade & Inward Investment	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Rural Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Provision and Development	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Tourism, Culture and Sport	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Transport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urban Regeneration	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Total	5	1	4	1	1	5	17
% of total	29	6	24	6	6	29	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.5 Reasons for Underspending

	Competitive tendering led to reduced costs	Cost elements overestimated	Decreased project scale or scope	Funding withdrawn	Poor project planning	Project delays	Loss of staff	Issues with contractors	Change in project sponsor	External factors	No evidence	Total
Coalfields	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Economic Growth and the Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Employment, Learning and Skills	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	6
Enterprise	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5
Enterprising Communities	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ICT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
International Trade and Inward Investment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Rural Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

	Competitive tendering led to reduced costs	Cost elements overestimated	Decreased project scale or scope	Funding withdrawn	Poor project planning	Project delays	Loss of staff	Issues with contractors	Change in project sponsor	External factors	No evidence	Total
Site Provision and Development	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	7
Tourism, Culture and Sport	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Transport	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Urban Regeneration	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Total	2	5	9	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	11	40
% of total	5	13	23	5	3	8	5	5	3	5	28	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.6 Performance Against Timetable

Strand	On Schedule	Ahead of Schedule	Behind Schedule	Not complete	Unknown	Total
Coalfields	2	0	1	0	0	3
Economic Growth and the Environment	13	1	6	0	1	21
Employment, Learning and Skills	11	1	2	9	2	25
Enterprise	24	1	0	11	0	36
Enterprising Communities	18	0	5	0	0	23
ICT	7	0	1	0	0	8
Innovation	4	1	0	9	0	14
International Trade and Inward Investment	8	0	3	0	0	11
Rural Development	22	1	6	0	0	29
Site Provision and Development	13	1	0	0	3	17
Tourism, Culture and Sport	12	0	9	0	0	21
Transport	7	0	14	0	1	22
Urban Regeneration	15	0	3	0	0	18
Total	156	6	50	29	7	248
% of total	63	2	20	12	3	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.7 Reasons Behind Schedule

Strand	Limited staff capacity	Project start delayed	Delays with contracting, and difficulties with securing beneficiaries	Poor project planning	Increase in project duration	Delays due to planning process	Delays in delivery	Increase in project scope	Unforeseen factors	Unrealistic timescale	No evidence	Total
Innovation	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Enterprise	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Employment, Learning and Skills	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Strand	Limited staff capacity	Project start delayed	Delays with contracting, and difficulties with securing beneficiaries	Poor project planning	Increase in project duration	Delays due to planning process	Delays in delivery	Increase in project scope	Unforeseen factors	Unrealistic timescale	No evidence	Total
ICT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tourism, Culture and Sport	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	5
Rural Development	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
International Trade and Inward Investment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enterprising Communities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Urban Regeneration	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	6
Transport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic Growth and the Environment	0	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	9
Site Provision and Development	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	4	1	3	14
Coalfields	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total	1	5	12	4	1	6	5	2	8	1	5	50
% of total	2	10	24	8	2	12	10	4	16	2	10	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.8 Reasons Ahead of Schedule

Strand	Delivery progressed more rapidly than expected	Withdrawal of funding	Loss of Staff	Unforeseen factors	Unknown	Total
Coalfields	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic Growth and the Environment	0	0	0	0	1	1
Employment, Learning and Skills	0	0	1	0	0	1
Enterprise	0	1	0	0	0	1
Enterprising Communities	0	0	0	0	0	0
ICT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation	0	0	0	1	0	1
International Trade and Inward Investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural Development	1	0	0	0	0	1
Site Provision and Development	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tourism, Culture and Sport	0	0	0	0	0	0

Strand	Delivery progressed more rapidly than expected	Withdrawal of funding	Loss of Staff	Unforeseen factors	Unknown	Total
Transport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urban Regeneration	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	1	1	2	6
% of total	17	17	17	17	33	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.9 Performance Against Output Targets

	Mostly Below Target	Mixed Performance	Mostly In Line With Target	Mostly Exceeded Target	Not Applicable - No outputs	Total
Coalfields	0	1	2	0	2	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	1	2	18	2	0	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	6	5	7	4	3	25
Enterprise	4	5	23	7	4	43
Enterprising Communities	7	3	3	8	0	21
ICT			5	2	0	7
Innovation	2	5	8	0	0	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	2	0	3	3	0	8
Rural Development	5	3	9	6	0	23
Site Provision and Development	1	3	27	0	1	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	4	4	5	4	0	17
Transport		1	5	0	1	7
Urban Regeneration	1	2	17	0	2	22
Total	33	34	132	36	13	248
% of total	13	14	53	15	5	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Project additionality

Table A1.10 Would the project have gone ahead in the absence of emda funding?

Strand	No	Yes	N/a	Total
Coalfields	2	2	1	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	14	9	0	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	11	14	0	25
Enterprise	26	17	0	43
Enterprising Communities	19	2	0	21
ICT	5	2	0	7
Innovation	10	5	0	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	7	1	0	8
Rural Development	13	10	0	23
Site Provision and Development	27	4	1	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	11	6	0	17
Transport	3	4	0	7
Urban Regeneration	17	5	0	22
Total	165	81	2	246
% of total	67	33	1	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.11 emda/SSP funding improved the quality of service provided/outputs beyond what would otherwise have been achieved

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields		2	2
Economic Growth and the Environment	4	5	9
Employment, Learning and Skills	2	12	14
Enterprise	10	7	17
Enterprising Communities	1	1	2
ICT	1	1	2
Innovation		5	5
International Trade and Inward Investment		1	1
Rural Development	4	6	10
Site Provision and Development	2	2	4
Tourism, Culture and Sport	2	4	6
Transport	0	4	4
Urban Regeneration	1	4	5

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Total	27	54	81
% of total	33	67	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.12 emda/SSP funding enabled the timing of the project to be brought forward.

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	2		2
Economic Growth and the Environment	6	3	9
Employment, Learning and Skills	3	11	14
Enterprise	10	7	17
Enterprising Communities	2		2
ICT	1	1	2
Innovation	2	3	5
International Trade and Inward Investment	1		1
Rural Development	5	5	10
Site Provision and Development		4	4
Tourism, Culture and Sport	5	1	6
Transport	1	3	4
Urban Regeneration	2	3	5
Total	40	41	81
% of total	49	51	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.13 emda/SSP funding increased the scale of project outputs.

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	2		2
Economic Growth and the Environment	5	4	9
Employment, Learning and Skills	4	10	14
Enterprise	5	12	17
Enterprising Communities	2		2
ICT	1	1	2
Innovation		5	5
International Trade and Inward Investment		1	1
Rural Development	5	5	10

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Site Provision and Development	3	1	4
Tourism, Culture and Sport	2	4	6
Transport	1	3	4
Urban Regeneration	3	2	5
Total	33	48	81
% of total	41	59	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.14 emda/SSP funding expanded the geographical scope of the project

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	2		2
Economic Growth and the Environment	7	2	9
Employment, Learning and Skills	4	10	14
Enterprise	11	6	17
Enterprising Communities	2		2
ICT	1	1	2
Innovation	2	3	5
International Trade and Inward Investment	1		1
Rural Development	6	4	10
Site Provision and Development	4	0	4
Tourism, Culture and Sport	6		6
Transport	4		4
Urban Regeneration	4	1	5
Total	54	27	81
% of total	67	33	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.15 emda/SSP funding expanded the scope of target sector/groups

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	2		2
Economic growth and the environment	8	1	9
Enterprise	16	1	17
Enterprising communities	1	1	2
ICT	1	1	2

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Innovation	3	2	5
International trade	1		1
Rural development	9	1	10
Site provision and development	4	0	4
skills	3	11	14
Tourism, culture and sport	6		6
Transport	4	0	4
Urban regeneration	3	2	5
Total	61	20	81
% of total	75	25	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Synergy and Leverage

Table A1.16 Was the project part of a series of linked projects?

Strand	No	Yes	Unknown	N/A	Total
Coalfields		5			5
Economic Growth and the Environment	9	10		4	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	12	13			25
Enterprise	18	25			43
Enterprising Communities	14	7			21
ICT	2	5			7
Innovation	7	8			15
International Trade and Inward Investment	2	6			8
Rural Development	11	12			23
Site Provision and Development	9	21	1	1	32
Total	84	112	1	5	202
Tourism, Culture and Sport	14	3			17
Transport	4	3			7
Urban Regeneration	9	11		2	22
% of total	41	50	0	9	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.17 Did the project secure leverage from the public sector?

Strand	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	3	2	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	4	19	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	20	5	25
Enterprise	23	20	43
Enterprising Communities	12	9	21
ICT	4	3	7
Innovation	8	7	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	6	2	8
Rural Development	10	13	23
Site Provision and Development	10	22	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	11	6	17
Transport	2	5	7
Urban Regeneration	6	16	22
Total	119	129	248
% of total	48	52	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.18 Did the project secure leverage from the private sector?

Leverage private	No	Yes	Total
Coalfields	2	3	5
Economic Growth and the Environment	5	18	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	25	0	25
Enterprise	30	13	43
Enterprising Communities	5	16	21
ICT	7	0	7
Innovation	14	1	15
International Trade and Inward Investment	7	1	8
Rural Development	7	16	23
Site Provision and Development	13	19	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	8	9	17

Leverage private	No	Yes	Total
Transport	2	5	7
Urban Regeneration	9	13	22
Total	134	114	248
% of total	54	46	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.19 Amounts leveraged

Total Leverage	Private	Public
Coalfields	207125800	2005000
Economic Growth and the Environment	139192	213500
Employment, Learning and Skills	0	2074162
Enterprise	8607014	8624063
Enterprising Communities	485498	7635583
ICT	0	317374
Innovation	110000	1507916
International Trade and Inward Investment	151625	14500
Rural Development	2410693	2467808
Site Provision and Development	92463016	12812764
Tourism, Culture and Sport	942053	2411146
Transport	0	260000
Urban Regeneration	1529000	1928215
Total	313963892	42272031

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Long-term benefits, Effectiveness and Value for Money

Table A1.20 Is the project likely to generate long-term benefits?

Strand	No	Yes	Unknown	Total
Coalfields		2	3	5
Economic Growth and the Environment		15	8	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	7	17	1	25
Enterprise	5	32	6	43
Enterprising Communities		21	0	21
ICT	4	3	0	7

Strand	No	Yes	Unknown	Total
Innovation	3	12	0	15
International Trade and Inward Investment		8	0	8
Rural Development	3	20	0	23
Site Provision and Development	2	23	7	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport	1	16	0	17
Transport	2		5	7
Urban Regeneration		15	7	22
Total	27	184	37	248
% of total	11	74	15	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.21 How effective was the project in meeting its objectives?

Strand	Not effective	Effective	Very effective	Unknown	Total
Coalfields		2	2	1	5
Economic Growth and the Environment		8	11	4	23
Employment, Learning and Skills	3	22			25
Enterprise	2	29	12		43
Enterprising Communities	1	6	14		21
ICT	1	5	1		7
Innovation	4	10	1		15
International Trade and Inward Investment		2	6		8
Rural Development	2	6	15		23
Site Provision and Development	2	11	15	4	32
Tourism, Culture and Sport		6	11		17
Transport		4	2	1	7
Urban Regeneration		5	16	1	22
Total	15	116	106	11	248
% of total	6	47	43	4	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments

Table A1.22 Value for Money

Strand	Insufficient information to comment/un known	Poor	Reasonable	Good	total
Innovation	1	1	3	10	15
Enterprise	4	1	15	23	43
Employment, Learning and Skills	1	1	8	15	25
ICT		1	3	3	7
Tourism, Culture and Sport	6		4	7	17
Rural Development	2	2	6	13	23
International Trade and Inward Investment	3		2	3	8
Enterprising Communities	1	1	4	15	21
Urban Regeneration	2	1	5	14	22
Transport	2		3	2	7
Economic Growth and the Environment	5	1	10	7	23
Site Provision and Development	6	2	5	19	32
Coalfields	2		1	2	5
Total	35	11	69	133	248
% of total	14	4	28	54	100

Source: ECOTEC project assessments