



Independent Evaluation of Local Growth Interventions: West Yorkshire Combined Authority – Complementary report

November 2019

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to summarise information on the Leeds City Region Growth Deal to complement the Independent Evaluation of the Growth Deal Interventions: Leeds City Region Transport Fund undertaken by SQW. The paper also highlights areas where the Leeds City Region requires further support or clarification.
- 1.2 MHCLG has provided the evaluation criteria for the review. Alongside side this, SQW has set out where their reports cover the criteria either fully, in part, or not at all. Tables 1-4 (below) include this checklist together with our response which signposts where the relevant evidence can be found to support MHCLG requirements.

2. Strategy

Development of the Strategic Economic Plan

- 2.1 The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and the Growth Deal programme were originally developed through the Leeds City Region Enterprise Partnership (the LEP) and the Leeds City Region Joint Board. At the time of the programme development, the Joint Board had been in operation since 2004 and the Leeds City Region Enterprise Partnership since 2011; both bodies commenced as strategic partnerships. In 2014 when the final programme was submitted, Leeds City Region demonstrated strong strategic development but had limited experience of direct delivery.
- 2.2 The development of the SEP and the new programme were undertaken from 2012 onwards culminating in a final bid submission in March 2013. The LEP Board was involved at each stage of the operational development of the SEP with reports and consideration at each meeting. Key meetings included:
 - 28 November 2013 LEP Board Away Day – including consideration of the outline SEP and the four proposed priorities and projects
 - 17 March 2014 LEP Board - sign off of the SEP final draft
 - 29 May 2014 LEP Board – extraordinary meeting to discuss negotiations and feedback on the submission and agree a joint approach
- 2.3 During the SEP development, extensive stakeholder engagement was undertaken (this is outlined in the Growth Deal submission documents Appendix G, which is [Attachment 3](#) to this report).

Challenges

- 2.4 The West Yorkshire Combined Authority commenced on 1 April 2014 and the LEP team joined the new body on 1 April 2015. The implementation of the Growth Deal programme, and in particular the Transport Fund, was a

challenge for the new organisation and its partners, as in most cases the level of funding and delivery was beyond previous experience. Development of capacity and resources, systems and processes have been ongoing to address this.

- 2.5 The expenditure profile for the allocated funding was set by Government, rather than bearing a relationship to the delivery profile. Income in the first two years represented 43.6% of the initial funding allocated for the six year period (GD1 and 2 total £448.90 million, £195.92 million paid in 2015/16 and 2016/17). Achieving full spend against this allocation was not possible, but the partnership did achieve expenditure of 63% of funding received.
- 2.6 The implementation of the Transport Fund has been challenging with some partner councils moving forward with delivery more quickly than others. Where they already had projects in development these have come forward much quicker. However, the formation of a new Delivery Directorate in in Autumn 2016 (with subsequent population of staff by June 2017) has led to a step change in driving the delivery of the Transport Fund. Action was taken to address resources and capacity across the Combined Authority and district partners.
- 2.7 Whilst the implementation of the Transport Fund has proved challenging, the initial focus of the Growth Deal programme was the delivery of the economic development projects. In particular, grants to business and the skills capital programme were driven to commence delivery early. The team and processes to deliver business grants were already in place as activity had previously commenced through the LEP's Regional Growth Fund projects. These were further enhanced by the introduction of the new Growth Service (Growth Hub) Team which was recruited in 2015/16.
- 2.8 The Skills Capital programme delivered early with the majority of projects completed by the end of year 3 (2017/18) with only three continuing into delivery in year 4 (2019/20). 10 of the 11 Skills Capital projects have now reached completion and are being used to deliver skills and training.
- 2.9 Since the Growth Deal commenced there have been many personnel changes at all levels; political, chief executive, senior management and officers. This could have been problematic, but the robust governance processes (see below) set up have ensured that there has been continued buy-in and understanding of the fund. The governance processes have also had flexibility built in, and as part of the Assurance Framework review have been amended as necessary to reflect the needs of the fund.
- 2.10 Through the assurance process all project business cases are appraised using HM Treasury five cases. This has ensured that only projects that benefit the Leeds City Region as a whole are approved and has avoided a parochial view".

3. Governance

Assurance Framework

- 3.1 In line with Government requirements, the West Yorkshire Combined Authority publishes an Assurance Framework annually which is approved by the LEP Board and signed off by the Section 73 officer. This document has proved to be particularly effective in providing a clear template for scheme promoters to work to in terms of adherence to national guidance. By having a document which offers clear and consistent advice with compliance as an essential focus, we have found that the quality of business cases submitted for approval has improved significantly. As the approving authority to the 'Investment Funds' the existence of this coherent framework has proved to be highly effective and has led to delivery efficiencies that were not possible earlier on in the delivery programme. We have also welcomed, as an authority, the opportunity to be able to provide a level of check-and-challenge around updated national guidance. This has helped to ensure that published guidance is workable in practice.
- 3.2 The [Assurance Framework](#) is published on the Combined Authority's website. It was first published in February 2016 and has been reviewed annually. For example, Stage 1 of our Assurance Process has been updated for 2019 to ensure compatibility with Stage 2 and 3, but also with HM Treasury business case guidance.
- 3.3 Further to the Assurance Framework review, other improvements include ongoing refinements to governance in order to expedite project approvals while ensuring that scrutiny and transparency are front and centre.
- 3.4 Furthermore, flexibility has purposely been built into the assurance process to allow approval of development costs assist schemes to the next decision point, including advance purchase of land where necessary.

4. Delivery

Economic Benefits

- 4.1 Whilst the Assurance Framework provides clarity around requirements and expectations to scheme promoters, a key challenge has been how to assess value for money for some projects where they are expected to adhere to (for example) WebTAG guidance. A number of the programmes (for example rail station gateways) are predicated on their ability to generate transformational impacts through place-making, but which cannot readily be valued using conventional approaches to economic appraisal. In such cases we have adopted a pragmatic approach whereby we have looked at the benefits at a portfolio or programme-level. This enables some poorer performing schemes to progress in recognition that the aggregate level of outcomes required is being achieved. Wider benefits, linked back to original scheme and portfolio objectives have also been calculated. Reporting of forecast scheme benefits

through the approvals process ensures that the approach we have adopted remains transparent.

Development of the Combined Authority

- 4.2 The Growth Deal programme was initially developed by the LEP in 2012 and 2013 when it was hosted through Leeds City Council. The set-up of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority in April 2014 saw the lead into the transfer of the LEP Team to the Combined Authority and the commencement of the Growth Deal programme in April 2014. Whilst some initial activity had been undertaken to prepare for the implementation of the programme, there were major issues that needed to be addressed relating not only to capacity but also systems and procedures. Recruitment of new staff focussed initially on the economic development elements of the programme and these were the first to commence to full delivery. Whilst activity was ongoing from the start of the Growth Deal to implement the Transport Fund, the formation of the Delivery Directorate in late 2016 (with the full new structure in place from June 2017) led to a concentrated drive to ensure the delivery of the projects. This included recruitment of a district resource team and appointment of consultant resources to support the partner councils to deliver their projects and recruitment set up of two internal teams: Transport Projects to support Combined Authority-led projects; and Transport Partnerships to drive the delivery of projects through districts.
- 4.3 A key lesson that has been learnt from the Transport Fund is that development of projects needs to continue whilst funding body approval decisions are being made. Therefore, £3 million of WY+TF funding is being utilised to forward fund the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) schemes – picking up on lessons learned in terms of being agile and moving quickly to meet tight delivery timescales

Transport Fund Review

- 4.4 As projects within the Transport Fund progressed through the assurance process it became clear that funding allocations were in some cases insufficient (due to a variety of reasons including inflation, improved valuations, etc.). In order to address the increasing cost of the programme a review was undertaken in summer/ autumn 2019 which included re-baselining each of the projects, quantification of the level of risk on each project, and removal of projects which had either progressed without Growth Deal funding or were no longer required. This exercise will be finalised in December 2019 and in future an annual review of the finances and progress of the Transport Fund will be undertaken.
- 4.5 A level of over-programming is still included within the programme and the exact amount is expected to remain between 10% and 20%. This will also be reviewed annually and is subject to final agreement by the Combined Authority to accept the risk of overspend.

- 4.6 In the Growth Deal submission it was originally proposed that the Transport Fund projects would be delivered over a 10 year period. In practice this is unlikely and the expectation is that the programme will be delivered over 12 to 15 years. This is more practical as the level of borrowing required to support the programme until all grant income is received by 2034/35 will be at a more manageable level.
- 4.7 The Combined Authority contribution to the £1 billion programme is £217 million with an original expectation that some level of borrowing would be required in the first six years. In practice, particularly with the likely extension of the programme beyond 10 years, it is likely that borrowing will be required after 2021.

Performance

- 4.8 The Government focus of delivery to date has been on achievement of spend. This provides a measure of the level of implementation of the programme in the first years of the programme before impact can be measured. Whilst spend has initially been slower than originally planned, implementation of projects is escalating to a reasonable level that is sustainable. The focus is now on measuring the programme achievements. At present only three of the outputs measured through Government quarterly monitoring relate to transport projects and none of these cover rail. An exercise has been undertaken by the Combined Authority to identify the transport outputs that need to be monitored in order to demonstrate delivery, these have been devised in line with the outputs identified by the consultants undertaking the Gateway 1 Independent Evaluation of the Transport Fund. These outputs are attached.
- 4.9 The Leeds City Region Growth Deal programme has now spent £325.75 million (63%) against a total Local Growth Fund allocation of £516.35 million (as at September 2019). The tables below were presented at the 2019/20 Mid-year Review showing spend and forecast and demonstrating that the programme is almost fully committed:

Programme Forecast and Spend

	2018/19 Actual		2019/20 Forecast	
	Cumulative Amount (£m)	%	Cumulative Amount (£m)	%
Growth Deal Income Received	£342.50		£416.01	
Outturn	£305.16	89%	£410.59	99%
Expenditure	£290.15	85%	£395.58	95%
Remaining Funding (income received less outturn)	£37.34		£5.42	

Funding Approved to Projects

(£m)	Economic Development	Transport Fund	Total
Funding Available	£235.45	£280.90	£516.35
Current Approvals	£230.63	£267.04	£497.67

- 4.10 The programme is currently 96% committed against target expenditure, however it is expected to exceed full commitment before the end of 2019/20. The reason for this is that in 2018 a review of the programme identified risks where underspend could occur. In order to address this the Combined Authority agreed a number of new projects which would be funded from the over-programming the Growth Deal. The risk of overspend has been covered by an agreement to borrow up to £90 million, however the aim is for full spend and it is hoped that borrowing will not be required. The ten additional projects were identified through a call for new projects which received 93 applications, these were assessed against ability to deliver, contribution to outputs of the programme, strategic fit etc.
- 4.11 All the projects originally included in the programme that are expected to be delivered are being progressed through the assurance process (note: for various reasons some projects are now not required and have been removed from the programme). By September 2019 26 projects had been completed including 10 of the 11 Skills Capital projects and 3 flood resilience projects.
- 4.12 Programme outputs are monitored each quarter against forecast targets, the latest achievements reported at quarter 1 2019/20 are as follows:

Output	Target (includes Growth Deals 1, 2 and 3)	Achieved to date Quarter 1 (30/06/2019)	Remaining Forecast 2019/20	Forecast 2020/21	Forecast 2021-25	Total
New jobs	19,595	6,902	467	3,822	4,874	16,065
Jobs safeguarded (flood resilience programme)	11,100	23,177	316	1,116	3,605	28,214
Houses	2,300	346	213	1,168	2,124	3,851
Public / private investment (match funding)	£1,031,000,000	£526,795,327	£210,559,091	£120,028,554	£110,233,627	£967,616,599

Impact Sites

- 4.13 A paper ([Attachment 5](#)) setting out the Leeds City Region approach to impact sites was submitted to the Cities and Local Growth Unit initially in draft in 2018 with the final version submitted in December 2018. Whilst there has been limited response to this by Government it will be used for the future evaluation of Growth Deal interventions.

Programme Flexibility

- 4.14 When the 'Investment Fund' was established, a clear list of priority schemes were agreed with Government as those which would be delivered over the 20 year fund period. It was recognised within this that things change over time and therefore the fund has had to have the scope to be flexible to changing

circumstances. Some examples are provided below where we have been able to adopt a flexible approach to portfolio management while still maintaining the integrity of the fund and the clear requirement to achieve defined outcomes:

- One of the original schemes in the programme related to rail journey time improvements on the Calderdale Line through targeted interventions working collaboratively with Network Rail. Two years into the fund programme it was evident that it wasn't going to be possible to implement the required changes due to wider uncertainty relating to the Trans-Pennine Route upgrade and linked to Network Rail delivery priorities. Discussions with the local authority (Calderdale) led to a position whereby the scheme was replaced by another rail project (Elland Station) for which it was established that similar scale benefits could be derived. This project is currently working through the Network Rail GRIP stages towards delivery
- Further flexibilities have been utilised within programmes such as the Corridor Improvement Programme (£120 million), which was defined as a broad series of corridor interventions but with no named projects, and Rail Station Park & Ride projects (£30.5 million), for which 15 projects were listed where potential exists to extend car parks. Over time the schemes within these programmes have evolved and changed as a result of factors relating to land requirements/purchase, feasibility issues, value for money etc. This has required strong portfolio management across the West Yorkshire districts linked back to forecast scheme benefits.
- In 2017 a Call for Projects was run in response to political concerns that opportunities had arisen to deliver projects that were not on the prioritised list that had been agreed with Government, as well as an identified need at that time to have a higher level of over-programming in recognition of the fact that some schemes may fall away. The outcome of the Call was to introduce new transport schemes to the programme in the areas of cycling, rail park & ride (extensions to existing programmes) and an inland port south of Leeds. These schemes are currently being progressed through our Assurance Process
- A final category where flexibility has been helpful relates to where some schemes will no longer move forward. Of particular note was an identified scheme costing £90 million which was to be an extension of a mass transit network. The initial route was cancelled by Government in 2016 meaning that an extension would no longer be possible. Rather than be lost, the £90 million was subsumed back into the central pot.
- Being able to apply the fund with a degree of flexibility has been beneficial to the progression of schemes. A limited allocation of the fund has been agreed to develop a future pipeline such as the Transformational Schemes. These are projects whereby the scale of expenditure can't be accommodated within the existing programme, but

has allowed for opportunities to have schemes shelf/funding bid-ready which didn't exist previously.

Constraints

4.15 Constraints at a funding programme level have been identified as below:

- The perception that LEPs are being treated inconsistently, in particular how outturn and expenditure is being reported, despite Government providing a definition around this
- An ongoing lack of clarity from Government throughout the programme around issues such as definitions and requirements of reporting outturn costs and expenditure, changes to guidance and data capture requirements
- A lack of CLoG outputs in relation to transport projects. Only three outputs have been defined that relate to transport schemes, whereas the SQW work has encompassed a much wider spectrum of measurements requirements
- The imposition of in-year deadlines, in terms of project expenditure within a programme of the scale of circa £1 billion, has proven to be counter-productive when seeking to optimise benefits accruing from schemes. There is a danger that this pressures authorities to maximise spend in order to achieve Government targets rather than deliver the best projects
- A lack of clarity on whether projects that are contractually committed / on-site at 31 March 2021 will be detrimentally impacted if full grant has not been spent and that grant for projects in this situation can be retained by the Combined Authority to be paid to project sponsors once costs have been defrayed and funding not lost. Based on current forecasts it is expected that full spend will be achieved on the programme, but as deadlines are tight it is possible that there will be some slippage.
- Ensuring appropriate stakeholder engagement and agreement for consent issues with national organisations that are leading to significant delays (Network Rail)
- Government requirements in relation to scheme evaluation – differential treatment appears to be applied to Mayoral and non-Mayoral Combined Authorities in respect provision of clear guidance and support to meet this objective
- Delays to projects due to issues with working within existing land designations / environmental constraints including heritage, archaeology, flooding, land contamination and remediation

Outlook for the next five years and challenges

4.16 Since the formation of the Investment Fund, there have been developments at the national political level around a number of key policy areas that will

impact around future scheme selection, and to some extent existing projects. These relate to inclusive growth, clean growth and the climate emergency. Work is currently underway as to how we will address these. In tackling these there will undoubtedly be challenges around issues such as lengthened delivery programmes and cost increases, as well as a recognition that value for money (in the conventional sense) may be compromised to some extent.

- 4.17 The initial five years of the Growth Deal has seen a significant upsurge in project delivery at the local level. There is a clear need for Government to look at the collective portfolio of schemes and to look at lessons learned across all authorities rather than on an individual or scheme only basis.
- 4.18 The idea of having a 20 year programme was visionary, and assisted in building capacity around a pipeline of schemes. The initial expectation was that the fund would continue and that new government funding would be added in. This hasn't been the case, and while new pots such as the Transforming Cities Fund are welcomed, they run the risk of distracting from the focus as a distinct fund.

Evaluation Criteria

The following is the Local Growth Interventions Evaluation, which set out the evaluation criteria for the review. This shows the green, amber and red rated criteria and provides information on each. Where green, it is assumed that the SQW reports fully answer the points and therefore no further evidence is required to be put forward.

A: Evidence of intervention progress (relevant for all projects assessed)

Table 1: Evidence of intervention progress (relevant for all projects assessed) indicators

Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
<p>1. A description of how the intervention was agreed by the CA, City Board or Cabinet</p> <p>- Where applicable, a description of how challenge or disagreement being handled effectively</p>	Red	None	<p>The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and Growth Deal submission were developed during 2013/14. Reports on the progress of this development were considered throughout the financial year by the Leeds City Region Joint Board and the LEP Board. A final report to agree the SEP prior to its submission was approved by the LEP Board on 17 March 2014 (attachment 1).</p> <p>An extraordinary meeting of the LEP Board was held on 29 May 2014 (attachment 2) to consider issues relating to the negotiations with Government.</p> <p>Challenge and disagreement on the submission was handled through negotiation and consensus agreement at the LEP Panels and Board.</p>
<p>2. A description of how the views of stakeholders were considered during intervention development</p>	Red	None	<p>See Growth Deal submission document Appendix G (attachment 3).</p>

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
3. A description of how the intervention aligns with pre-existing investment programmes in the area	Red	None	Pre-existing investment was addressed within Part B of the Growth Deal submission, the Delivery Plan. Funding addressed included the European Structural and Investment Fund, Private Sector Funding and other public funding.
4. Assurance of an approved business case; including a description of the business case process which demonstrates that a robust appraisal has been undertaken for Investment Funds interventions. Robust appraisal should demonstrate value for money and potential for positive economic impact, developed in line with the HM Treasury Green Book.	Amber	Information related to business cases and expected economic impacts will be covered, where relevant e.g. progress against expected effects. However, a robust appraisal of the business case and whether businesses cases were developed in all cases in the project appraisal and selection process, and demonstrated impact/value for money, will not be covered.	Refer to paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4 of this document
5. A description of how the intervention fits with pre-existing stakeholder frameworks, strategies and plans	Red	None	The SEP was developed as a partnership initiative to address priorities identified for the City Region. These priorities took into consideration the strategies of local stakeholders but do not directly reflect these. Projects included within the Growth Deal many existing plans of local authorities and other partners which had been identified but for which funding had not been found.

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
			The Growth Deal also incorporated the existing identified priorities included within the City Deal. This was never formally agreed with Government but was a key priority for the area.
6. Intervention milestones agreed at Board level that are likely to result in successful delivery of the intervention	Red	None	<p>The LEP Board and Investment Committee receive a capital programme update at each of their meetings. This outlines progress and performance against the milestones originally agreed as part of the Growth Deal.</p> <p>Although the Combined Authority (with certain delegations to the Investment Committee and Managing Director) are the accountable body and make decisions on behalf of the LEP, the chair of the LEP sits on IC as a member and therefore any changes to intervention milestones required are escalated to CA, IC or MD.</p>
7. A description of the delivery of the intervention against agreed intervention milestones - Where applicable, in the event that milestones are missed, evidence of adjusting project/programme plans to mitigate the impact and to ensure value for money and successful delivery	Green	None	Not required

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
8. An agreed spending profile for the intervention	Green	None	Not required
9. Evidence of keeping to the spending profile and mitigating overspend or delays - Where applicable, in the event of an under- or over-spend on the intervention, evidence of adjusting spending and project/programme plans to mitigate the impact and to ensure value for money and successful delivery	Green	None	Not required
10.Explanation of outputs generated to date by intervention activities	Green	None	Not required
11.Local evaluation plans and commitment to Investment Funds evaluation activities including the Independent Panel evaluation beyond the first gateway review in line with agreed milestones.	Amber	Progress evaluation will cover evidence on planned activities to meet original objectives post Gateway Review 1. The development of (or commentary on) monitoring and evaluation plans post Gateway Review 1 will not be covered.	Refer to paragraph 3.5 of this document. An essential part of the business case development is to include a Monitoring and Evaluation plan. This is required before approval is given through the assurance process to proceed to the next activity. Also, Arcadis have recently been commissioned to develop a monitoring and evaluation strategy for the Growth Deal, which is expected in the new year.

Supported by



Source: SQW

B: Evidence of intervention impact (relevant where projects have been delivered)

Table 2: Evidence of intervention impact (relevant where projects have been delivered) indicators

Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
1. Description and evidence that all evaluation activities set out in the evaluation plan developed by SQW has been completed. Evaluation plans developed sets out a range of activities e.g. surveys, before and after data comparisons that would inform reporting against logic models.	Green	None	Not required
2. Evidence of delivery of the outcomes specified in the agreed logic model for each intervention	Green	None	Not required
3. Where possible, evidence that existing outcomes will result in a reasonable expectation that interventions will have long-term positive economic benefits	Red	None	All approved business cases set out the benefits associated with schemes for up to a 60 year period. Completed schemes are subject to pre-agreed Monitoring & Evaluation over defined time periods and the findings of these are captured on our Portfolio Management Information System. A Growth Deal Impact Sites report has been developed and reviewed by Government. This

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
			approach will be utilised in the future to quantify impacts and wider benefits. Arcadis consultants are currently undertaking a commission for the Combined Authority to seek to review and enhance our approach Monitoring and Evaluation and to identify capacity requirements.
4. Where possible, a description of outcomes that are expected to be delivered in the future	Green	None	Not required
5. Delivery of information and data to SQW to evidence the outcomes of specific interventions	Green	None	Not required

Source: SQW

C: Evidence of capacity development and partnership working

Table 3: Evidence of capacity development and partnership working indicators

Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
1. Description of leadership roles and responsibilities assigned within the locality	Red	None	Refer to the Assurance Framework.
2. A description of engagement between local authorities within the locality on development and decision-making, both in relation to	Amber	Evidence on the effects of the Fund on stakeholder engagement will be covered. Specific evidence on whether stakeholder views were considered in	Engagement and consultation on projects is undertaken at a project level. Further to this, all projects are subject to the Assurance Framework and the Combined Authority (made

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
specific interventions (where appropriate) and the Investment Fund as a whole		decision-making, or whether this engagement was considered timely and meaningful will not be covered.	up of lead members from each local authority) must approve all schemes at decision point 2. Further approvals at future decision points are usually delegated to IC where the project is complex or politically sensitive and therefore local authorities continue to be involved in decision making. If delegations are made to the Managing Director, all projects are reported to IC so that they can be challenged as necessary. All projects are also subject to the key decision process at DP2 and most also at DP5. With regards decisions on the investment fund as a whole the IC receive a programme update on the Growth Deal and 6 monthly workshops are undertaken to review the fund. All projects are also reported to Transport Committee.

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
3. Evidence that the City, CA or Cabinet has engaged stakeholders of a wider range, greater seniority and, where relevant, greater regularity than under previous governance and funding arrangements	Amber	Evidence on the effects of the Fund on stakeholder engagement nature/coverage will be covered.	The CA has well thought out and extensive governance arrangements that have been developed as part of the Assurance Framework. Please refer to the Assurance Framework. This has greatly enhanced decision making and transparency since the commencement of the Growth Deal, including the formation of the LEP Board, CA, IC, TC and the various advisory panels, as well as setting out a progressive delegation scheme. Furthermore private sector partners are members of these boards and panels.
4. Evidence that stakeholders felt it was easier and more beneficial to engage with the City, CA or Cabinet than with previous governance arrangements	Amber	As noted above, evidence has been collected on engagement with stakeholders, which may include perspectives on engagement with the City or CA and how this has changed. However, specific evidence on whether stakeholders felt sufficiently engaged will not be covered.	Please refer to the SQW report and the partnership comments
5. Description of how the new governance structures for economic development have affected decision-making across the locality	Green	None	Not required

Supported by



Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
6. Evidence of an improved plan for the development of the locality as a whole including evidence of consensus among stakeholders about the future development of the local economy compared to existing processes under previous governance and funding arrangements.	Green	None	Not required
7. Description of how evidence has been used in the development of strategies and projects	Amber	Evidence on the effects of the Fund on the quality and role of evidence will be covered. How this evidence has been used specifically in the development of strategies and projects will not be covered.	Evidence used to develop the SEP and projects within it are included in attachment 4 , which is Appendix F of the original Growth Deal submission

Source: SQW

D: Contextual economic forecasting and comparison to out-turns

Table 4: Contextual economic forecasting and comparison to out-turns indicators

Indicator	Rating	CLGU Notes	CA Reply
1. Forecast of economic growth in locality for GVA and employment to Year [5 or 10]	Green	None	Not required

Supported by



2. Forecast of economic growth nationally for GVA and employment to Year [5 or 10]	Green	None	Not required
3. Out-turns of economic growth in locality for GVA and employment to Year [x]	Green	None	Not required
4. Out-turns of economic growth nationally for GVA and employment to Year [x]	Green	None	Not required