

Report to	<b>Policy &amp; Resources Committee</b>
Date	<b>29 March 2018</b>
By	<b>Performance and Projects Manager</b>
Title of Report <b>Note</b>	<b>Project Evaluation Report</b>

**Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:**

- 1) Receive the project evaluations for the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) and the Arun and Rother Rivers Trust Project Officer**
- 2) Note the recommendations for learning at Appendix 2**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 During and at the end of large projects, and following completion of projects funded by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Strategic Fund, evaluations are carried out. This report presents two project evaluations for consideration, the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) and the Arun and Rother Rivers Trust Project Officer. The Committee is asked to consider the evaluation reports and endorse the recommendation(s) for learning at section 3.

**2. Policy Context.**

- 2.1 Evaluation of projects contributes to the corporate plan objective 4 an organisation that is confident, secure and respected – providing value for money. They help the SDNPA to be more effective and make best use of the resources it devotes to project work as well as making sure we get better outcomes from future projects. Learning from projects is part of an overall approach to performance improvement and learning.

**3. Issues for consideration**

The Food Enterprise Zone Project – end of project evaluation

- 3.1 This project initially involved the concept of an area-wide Local Development Order (LDO) to support a fully developed vertical supply chain for dairy businesses in the South Downs National Park (SDNP). During the project it became apparent that the focus on a process rather than the desired outcome meant that the project as originally envisaged was not achievable.
- 3.2 SDNPA Officers therefore agreed with Defra a revised project, which built on the emerging development of Whole Estate Plans (WEPs), in order to achieve the outcomes originally planned for the LDOs. WEPs support the food & drink sector but do not meet the site based FEZ/LDO concept originally envisaged by Defra. Two positive Outputs from the project include the development of the WEP process and production of planning guidance on agricultural permitted development rights. In addition, the WEP process has been

enthusiastically embraced by landowners and managers in the National Park, and interest in them has been shown by other National Parks and protected landscapes. The evaluation report is at **Appendix 1**.

- 3.3 The total project cost was projected to be £50,000. This was funded entirely by grant from Defra. SDNPA Officer time to the value of £10,121 was claimed from the grant funding to support the project. Further in-kind support has also been used to develop VEPs. The final project cost was £50,034.55.
- 3.4 As part of the evaluation process key learning from projects is captured. Any recommendations that have corporate applicability are included in the improvement plan. Learning recommendations have been developed by the relevant manager, two are partially accepted and two are accepted. The recommendations that have most corporate applicability relate to ensuring that there is sufficient internal discussion in the initial phases of deciding whether to participate in such government initiatives. The themed programme boards offer an effective mechanism for this to happen in future. The management response is at **Appendix 2**.

#### The Arun and Rother Rivers Trust Project Officer – mid project review

- 3.5 This project builds on the successful work carried out by the Arun and Rother Connections HLF Project. Following the completion of this project there has been a lack of capacity to take forward further project work in the Arun and Western Streams Catchment Partnership area. The AWS Catchment Partnership therefore proposed that a project officer be employed to seek funding and develop further projects. The post was agreed with funding provided by a range of partners. Indications are that the post will become self-sustaining as there seem to be a range of potential projects and partners willing to support further work. The mid project evaluation report is at **Appendix 3**.
- 3.6 The total project cost is projected to be £30,000. This includes a range of funding from partners including the Environment Agency, Southern Water, Portsmouth Water, the Arun and Rother Rivers Trust, and funding from SDNPA of £5,000. This allocation of funding was reported to and approved by members as part of Q2 project update on 21 November 2017.
- 4. Next steps**
- 4.1 The corporate learning from evaluations is pulled together and reviewed by relevant staff and Themed Programme Boards. Where it is significant it is added to the improvement plan. The Committee is asked to note the recommendations in the evaluation reports; and to note that there are no recommendations that need to be added to the corporate improvement plan arising from these evaluations.

#### **5. Other Implications**

<b>Implication</b>	<b>Yes*/No</b>
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority?	No
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	Not in itself although the value for money of the projects themselves are reported as part of the evaluations.
How does the proposal represent Value for Money?	Each project is assessed separately for value for money. Overall the projects evaluated did represent either appropriate or good value for money.
Are there any Social Value implications arising from the proposal?	No

Have you taken regard of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	Any such considerations are taken into account in the developments of the projects themselves.
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	None
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	None
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	None
Are there any Data Protection implications?	Requirement for collection and management of personal data are built into the development of projects as they come forward.
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy.	Learning from projects contributes to sustainability principle 2 ensuring a strong healthy and just society – considering social cohesion and wellbeing; principle 3 achieving a sustainable economy – considering impacts on or contribution to a sustainable economy; and principle 4 Promoting good governance – considering how to encourage active participation.

## 6. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

- 6.1 The risks associated with developing and delivering projects and learning from them effectively are set out below. Each project has its own risk register which is monitored regularly by the project team.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
That learning from projects is not fully captured	2	2	Well understood mechanisms are in place to capture information about the progress of projects and identifying learning through evaluation.  Evaluation reports and case studies are routinely produced.
Learning from projects is not fed into future project development	3	2	Improvement planning is in place but there is potential to review and improve how this takes place.  Project specific learning is followed up by themed programme boards which meet several times a year. Corporate learning is beginning to be captured and disseminated in a more comprehensive way via a revised improvement plan and in any revisions to guidance that might be deemed appropriate.

**ANNE REHILL**  
**Performance and Projects Manager**  
**South Downs National Park Authority**

Contact Officer:	Anne Rehill – Performance and Projects Manager
Tel:	01730 819217
email:	Anne.Rehill@southdowns.gov.uk
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. FEZ – Evaluation</li><li>2. FEZ – evaluation management response</li><li>3. ARRT Project Officer – mid project evaluation</li></ol>
SDNPA Consultees	Chief Executive; Director of Countryside Policy and Management; Director of Planning; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Legal Services; Countryside and Policy Managers; Landscape and Biodiversity Lead Water
External Consultees	None
Background Documents	<a href="#">Case study ARRT</a> <a href="#">FEZ</a> <a href="#">Endorsed Whole Estate Plans</a> <a href="#">Q2 project update</a>