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A Executive Summary

1 This report assesses the quality of support given to providers during project delivery under the Learning and Skills Council London (LSC London) Pan London 2 ESF programme (Pan London 2). The assessment is based on the outcomes of a survey undertaken of Pan London 2 project providers.

2 Overall, all areas of support given to providers in relation to project delivery received a positive rating (that is, ‘satisfactory’ or above). In addition, almost all individual areas examined received the same or a better rating than in the equivalent survey undertaken of Pan London 1 projects and the responses indicate that ECOTEC have reacted positively to the recommendations made in the report following the Pan London 1 survey.

3 In particular, the survey results reveal the following highlights:

   a Contract Manager support was rated as ‘good’ in terms of ease of access, speed of response and quality of advice provided, ‘satisfactory to good’ in terms of consistency of advice provided and was ranked as the most useful support tool by 66% of projects;

   b Feedback from monitoring mechanisms was rated as ‘good’ overall and four of the six mechanisms examined individually were rated as ‘good’;

   c Project support documents were rated as ‘satisfactory’ overall, with the Provider Manual and monthly email bulletins individually rated as ‘satisfactory to good’;

   d Provider support events were rated as ‘satisfactory’ overall, with ten of the 13 events examined rated as ‘satisfactory’ or better;

   e The PDM helpline and support service was rated as ‘satisfactory’ overall, with the speed and quality of response rated as ‘satisfactory to good’;

   f The London O3 website was rated as ‘satisfactory’ overall, with the quality of information rated as ‘satisfactory to good’;

   g Support tools to help projects understand how to meet data collection requirements were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’;
h Support tools to help projects understand how to publicise their projects were rated as ‘satisfactory’; and
i Mechanisms to help projects share good practice were rated as ‘satisfactory’.

4 This report contains 14 recommendations, which have been made to seek further information about aspects of support that attracted positive feedback or high levels of satisfaction as well as to address aspects attracting a level of negative feedback or relatively low levels of satisfaction. LSC London will ask ECOTEC to respond to the recommendations through a final report they prepare on the programme management. LSC London will use this report, as well as feedback gained from this evaluation, to consider improvements it can make to its own systems for managing future ESF project delivery.

5 LSC London is asking for good practice to be highlighted in:
   a Contract management;
   b Use of monitoring mechanisms;
   c Support documents, particularly the usefulness of the documents employed and how they supported projects with beneficiary and evidence requirements; and
   d Supporting projects with data collection, publicity and sharing good practice.

6 LSC London has also made recommendations seeking feedback on:
   a Concerns raised by some projects about the consistency of advice given by Contract Managers with other advice;
   b Comments made about issues with Monthly Monitoring Returns and confirmation that any issues with individual projects that resulted in delays in payment have been resolved;
   c Comments made about areas support documents did not cover and about support documents in general;
   d Lessons learned from using events to support project delivery, including highlighting any good practice and analysing why some events were seen as useful and others were not;
   e Concerns raised about the timing of events and the relatively lower satisfaction expressed with launch events compared to Pan London 1;
   f Concerns raised by some projects about the PDM support service (particularly the speed of response, availability of support and its usefulness in assisting projects understand data collection requirements) and about duplication of information;
   g Lessons learned from the operation of the London O3 website as a tool for supporting project delivery.
   h Comments made about obstacles projects felt prevented them from publicising their projects effectively;
   i Lessons learned from the operation of the Pan London User Group as a way of engaging with projects; and
   j Comments made about ECOTEC’s role compared to that of the LSC London in managing the programme.
B Background to Pan London 2

1 Pan London 2 began in October 2005 and is delivered under a Co-Financing Plan with Government Office for London (GOL). That Plan covers both Pan London 2 and the earlier LSC London Pan London 1 ESF programme (which began in November 2003 and was closed in June 2007). Pan London 2 providers directly contract with, and are managed by, ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd (ECOTEC), the Co-ordinating Organisation appointed by the LSC to manage provider delivery its behalf. The total value of the programme available to support project delivery was £37.58 million.

2 Pan London 2 is strategically focused on two key themes for London – reducing worklessness and increasing the number of people with a Level 3 qualification. In addition, part of the programme is the LSC London element of “On Your Marks”, a tri-regional initiative (covering London, the South East and the East of England) to raise skill levels for the 2012 Games. In London, LSC London delivers On Your Marks in conjunction with the London Development Agency (LDA).

3 57 projects were awarded funding under Pan London 2 following three tending rounds:
   a The Pan London 2 tendering round, which was launched on 23 January 2006 and closed on 17 March 2006 and sought to allocate £35.32 million of ESF – following assessment and moderation, a total of £30.29 million was awarded to deliver 35 projects;
   b The On Your Marks tendering round, which was launched jointly with the LDA on 7 March 2006 and closed on 28 April 2006 and sought to allocate the LSC London’s £2.26 million of On Your Marks ESF – following assessment and moderation, a total of £2.11 million was awarded to deliver six projects; and
   c The Unallocated Funds tendering round, which sought to allocate £5.15 million of ESF unallocated after the first two tendering rounds and was launched on 11 September 2006 and closed on 27 October 2006 – following assessment and moderation, a total of £5.14 million was awarded to deliver 16 projects, including a further On Your Marks project.

4 Project delivery began from August 2006 (although projects funded from the Unallocated Funds tendering round began in early 2007) and all projects are due to run to July 2008. However, as six projects had terminated by the time the survey was conducted in March 2008, there were 51 live projects at the time of the survey.
C Background to the Report

1 This evaluation focuses on the support given to providers in delivering their projects. As well as a general review of support, these specific aspects were assessed:

   a  Contract Managers;
   b  Monitoring mechanisms;
   c  Support documents;
   d  Support events;
   e  PDM helpline and support service;
   f  London O3 website; and
   g  Support with data collection, project publicity, and sharing good practice.

2 The evaluation is based on information collected in a provider survey undertaken by LSC London. The survey questions were based on those used in a similar survey undertaken of Pan London 1 projects, allowing a comparison of responses (where possible) across the two programmes. The survey contained 17 rating and text-based questions – the rating questions asked projects to score on a scale from 1 (very poor or not useful) to 5 (excellent or very useful) and the text-based questions were free-form.

3 The survey was conducted through an online questionnaire, with a link sent to a contact from each of the 57 Pan London 2 projects (the contact list was provided by ECOTEC). The survey was launched on 5 March 2008 and a reminder was sent through ECOTEC’s email bulletin on 18 March. The initial deadline for submitting the survey was 25 March but this deadline was extended to 28 March to allow as many projects as possible to complete it.

4 33 projects responded to the survey (a response rate of 58%). Responses were received from projects awarded funding under all three tendering rounds (a breakdown is available in Annex 1). The response rate was comparatively higher from projects approved under the first Pan London 2 tendering round, meaning the majority of responses were based on the experience of the programme from the beginning of delivery.

5 The method used to analyse results gathered from the rating questions in the survey was similar to that used for the Pan London 1 survey:

   a  If the score that attracted the highest percentage of responses was reflected in the rounded mean score, this was taken as the overall rating and was labelled accordingly, e.g. ‘satisfactory’ or ‘excellent’;
   b  If these two factors did not correspond, further consideration was given to the results and a more detailed label applied (e.g. ‘satisfactory to good’).

6 The qualitative information gathered from text-based questions was analysed by identifying recurring themes so as to make best use of these responses.

7 Section D summarises the statistical results and comments from the survey and Section E offers conclusions and recommendations based on these results (including a comparison with outcomes of the Pan London 1 survey). A list of the survey questions and a breakdown of the data collected and the rating given to summarise results for each question is available at Annex 1.
D Results of the Assessment

Contract Managers

1 Overall, projects expressed a high level of satisfaction with the support offered by ECOTEC Contract Managers in relation to the following aspects:
   a The ease of access to the Contract Manager when a query arrives was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 4.00);
   b The speed of the Contract Manager’s response to the query was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.67);
   c The quality of the advice provided by the Contract Manager was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.52);
   d The consistency of the advice provided by the Contract Manager with other advice was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.21).

2 More than 50% of projects gave a score of 4 or 5 to all four aspects of Contract Manager support.

3 Consistency of advice arose as an issue following the Pan London 1 survey. The rating and percentage of projects that gave a score of 4 or 5 suggests a majority of projects were very satisfied with the consistency of advice received. However, the spread of scores indicated a significant minority were not as satisfied (30.30% of projects gave a score of 1 or 2).

Monitoring Mechanisms

4 There was a similarly high level of satisfaction expressed with the relevance and quality of feedback given through monitoring mechanisms employed by ECOTEC. Ranked by mean score, projects rated the usefulness of these mechanisms as follows:
a Other meetings were rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.71);
b Monthly Monitoring Returns (MMRs) were rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.70);
c Phone and email communication was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.67);
d Monitoring visits were rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.64);
e Action plans were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.42);
f Project audit visits were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.27).

All mechanisms apart from audit visits were given a score of 4 or 5 by more than 50% of projects (and 45% gave audit visits a score of 4 or 5). As action plans and other meetings were not employed for all projects, the number of projects scoring them was understandably lower than the number that scored the other mechanisms (which are common to all projects).

6 The high rating for MMRs was broadly reflected in responses to the text-based question asking projects about issues they had encountered that prevented them completing it effectively. Ten projects made substantive comments, mostly related to specific data issues and a lack of user-friendliness and/or flexibility in the system and its requirements. A number of projects did comment, however, that the issues they had highlighted had resulted in delays in payment.

Support Documents

7 Projects expressed satisfaction with the usefulness (in terms of relevance and quality of information) of the range of documents created to support delivery of their projects. Ranked by mean score, projects rated the usefulness of these documents as follows:
a The Provider Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.45);
b The London O3 monthly email bulletins were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.44);
c The London O3 website good practice documents were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.41);
d The sample beneficiary/project delivery forms were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.29);
e Other documents were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.25), although only four projects scored this mechanism;
f The Publicity Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.00).

8 Both the Provider Manual and email bulletins were given a score of 4 or 5 by more than 50% of projects.

9 Only five responses were made to the text-based question about areas projects felt these documents did not adequately cover. Generally, these responses suggested two separate areas of concern:

a Forms not being suitable for learners, with duplication of information requested through various forms;
b Changing definitions, with one respondent suggesting that “…very specific guidelines should be produced before contracts are signed” around evidence and eligibility.

Support Events

10 There was a varied response, both in terms of the number of responses and scores, to the usefulness (in terms of relevance and quality of information) of
events held to support project delivery. Ranked by mean score, projects rated the usefulness of these events as follows:

a The PDM training on end of LSC year record closure was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.58);
b The PL2 information event on assurance, quality, cross cutting themes, impact assessments, PDM, SAR and QIP was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.33);
c The health and safety workshop was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.33);
d The evidencing workshop was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.30);
e The Pan London User Group was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.13);
f The milestone reports workshop was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.09);
g The new provider briefing was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.07);
h The sport sector networking event was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.00);
i The London O3 summer PL2/OYM launch event was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.94);
j The PDM training on how to get the best out of PDM reports was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.80);
k The health and social care sector networking event was rated as ‘poor to satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.33);
l The PDM training on preparation for OFSTED inspection was rated as ‘poor’ (mean score of 2.17);
m The construction sector networking event was rated as ‘poor to very poor’ (mean score of 1.80).

11 The PDM training on end of year record closure and the evidencing workshop were given a score of 4 or 5 by more than 50% of projects. Generally, the fewer projects that scored an event, the lower the mean score was for that event. More than 60% of projects gave a score of 1 or 2 to the construction networking event (five responses) and the PDM OFSTED inspection preparation training (six responses). None of the networking events were scored by more than five projects.

12 In addition to these events that were organised by ECOTEC, projects were also asked to score any events they had attended organised by LVSTC (such events are also open to providers delivering ESF projects for other London Co-Financing Organisations). Six projects scored these events and they were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.33), suggesting that projects that did attend these events found them beneficial.

13 Only five relevant responses were made to the text-based question about areas projects felt these events did not adequately cover. The responses suggested that:
a. Some of the events held were too late to be of great use;
b. Events should have been held on the Common Inspection Framework and to explain an end-to-end beneficiary journey in terms of the forms to be used (possibly echoing some of the comments made about documents); and;
c. The PDM training was not very user-friendly.

**PDM Helpline and Support Service**

Projects expressed satisfaction with the support offered by the PDM helpline and support service, with the responses indicating they were slightly more satisfied with the quality of the response received than with the service itself:

a. The speed of response to a query was rated as ‘satisfactory to poor’ (mean score of 3.04);
b. The quality of the response to a query was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.43);
c. The availability of telephone support was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.07).

The quality of response was given a score of 4 or 5 by more than 50% of projects. Conversely, at least a third of projects gave a score of 1 or 2 to the speed of response and the availability of telephone support.

**London O3 Website**

Projects were also satisfied with the support offered through the London O3 website, although the responses again indicated a slight disparity between quality of information and its presentation and accessibility:

a. The layout of information was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.26);
b) The quality of information was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.44, with 52% of projects giving a score of 4 or 5);

c) The timeliness and/or updating of that information was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.22).

**Specific Areas of Support**

*Data Collection*

17 Projects expressed satisfaction with the relevance and quality of information provided through the range of support services available to help them understand data collection requirements. Ranked by mean score, projects rated the usefulness of these support services as follows:

a) Contract Manager advice was rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.52);

b) PDM training and support events were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.38);

c) London O3 monthly email bulletins were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.35);

d) The Provider Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.28);

e) London O3 website advice was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.07);

f) The PDM data management support service was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.04).

18 The rating given to Contract Manager advice (59% of projects gave a score of 4 or 5) supports the high ratings given to earlier questions about Contract Manager support. Conversely, the fact that, despite its rating, 35% of projects gave a score of 1 or 2 to the PDM data management support service
supports the argument suggested by responses to other questions about this service that a significant minority were dissatisfied with the support it offered.

Publicity

19 Projects also expressed satisfaction with the relevance and quality of information provided through the range of support services available to help them publicise their projects. Ranked by mean score, projects rated the usefulness of these support services as follows:

a Contract Manager and/or ECOTEC team advice was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ (mean score of 3.32);

b Examples provided by other providers’ or ECOTEC’s own publicity were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.24);

c The Publicity Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.04);

d London O3 website advice was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.96);

e The publicity training given at the London O3 Summer Event was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.67).

20 The fact that 3 was the most common score given to all support services apart from ECOTEC Contract Manager or team member advice (which 54% of projects gave a score of 4 or 5) suggests most projects were satisfied with support for publicity. However, although it was rated as ‘satisfactory’, the relatively poor mean score for the publicity training at the Summer Event reflects the mean score given to the event overall.

21 Six responses were given to the text-based question about obstacles that projects felt prevented them from publicising their project effectively. The responses were varied, although time was a common theme, and they mentioned the following obstacles:

a Lack of reviews of marketing strategies, with a suggestion made that it might have been useful to formalise the requirement to design and implement them at an early stage through project milestones;

b The number of logos reducing the amount of content available and having to access the LSC logo separately from ECOTEC slowing the process down;

c Internal and external approvals taking up unnecessary time;

d Sector-specific publications not finding project news;

e Inability of Contract Managers to properly deal with publicity resulting in lack of coordination.

Sharing Good Practice

22 Projects were asked to rate a number of mechanisms for sharing good practice with other projects. Although projects expressed satisfaction with their effectiveness for sharing good practice, the mean scores indicate a varied response. Ranked by mean score, projects rated them as follows:

a Contract Managers were rated as ‘good’ (mean score of 3.50);

b London O3 monthly email bulletins were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.38);
c Case studies were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.27);
d The London O3 website was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.20);
e Research reports were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.08);
f The Pan London User Group was rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 3.00);
g Measure level reports were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.79);
h The sector networking events were rated as ‘satisfactory’ (mean score of 2.55).

23 Again, these ratings and mean scores generally reflect responses made in relation to these mechanisms in other questions, with a high level of satisfaction with Contract Manager support (63% of projects giving a score of 4 or 5) and a slightly lower level given to the sector networking events (37% of projects giving a score of 1).

24 It should be noted that research reports and measure level reports were developed for Pan London 1 and, although these reports are still available on the London O3 website, similar reports have not been developed for Pan London 2.

25 It is also instructive to note that generally, the higher the number of projects scoring a mechanism, the higher level of satisfaction was expressed. The top four mechanisms were all rated by at least 22 projects, whereas the bottom four were rated by no more than 16 projects. This may suggest that projects were satisfied with more commonly used methods of sharing good practice.

Most Useful Support Tools

26 Projects were asked to rank ten support tools in terms of their overall usefulness to the project. Given responses to other questions, it is not surprising that Contract Managers were ranked top (as was the case under Pan London 1), with 66% of the 29 projects that responded ranking them first. The full list ranked by the number of top votes was as follows:

a Contract Manager (65.52% ranked first and mean rank of 2.45);
b Provider Manual (13.79% ranked first and mean rank of 4.45);
c Feedback from monitoring mechanisms (6.90% ranked first and mean rank of 3.34);
d London O3 monthly email bulletins (6.90% ranked first and mean rank of 4.72);
e Support documents (3.45% ranked first and mean rank of 4.10);
f Pan London User Group (3.45% ranked first and mean rank of 8.66);
g Support events (none ranked first and mean rank of 5.72);
h London O3 website (none ranked first and mean rank of 6.00);
i Sharing good practice (none ranked first and mean rank of 7.69);
j Publicity Manual (none ranked first and mean rank of 7.86).
Comments on Support Offered

27 Projects were asked two final questions about any further comments they had on the support offered during contract management and any further support they felt would have helped them to deliver their projects.

28 13 projects responded to the questions, offering a mixture of responses. Two comments on the further support projects felt would have helped them were:

   I don't think any further support was necessary.
   We have found the support we have received to be very helpful so far.

29 At the other end of the spectrum, however, one project commented that:

   Support from ECOTEC was very poor with no clear direction and it was hard to get a clear answer with any issues and different staff had differing opinions...

30 Some of the common themes emerging from the responses were as follows.

   **Contract Management Support**

31 The high level of satisfaction with Contract Manager support suggested by the quantitative information was supported by a number of comments. One project found them “…to be very professional, helpful and supportive…” and “…always very quick to respond to any queries.” Another said “My contract manager is brilliant. If I have any queries, he is always quick to respond and let me know the answer.” Similarly, another project commented that:

   *Coming into manage a contract after the initial stages always causes a problem with catch up – support from [my] contract manager has always been available and detailed…*

32 However, other projects expressed a differing view of the support given by Contract Managers. One said their “Contract manager's support [was] not as expected” and that the “Availability and the quality of advice were not always satisfactory.” One project felt that they would have benefited from “…more support and relevant advice from the contract management team…” and that “Comments that everything is included in the provider manual is not always the best way to manage contracts.”

33 This issue of consistency of opinion was expressed more than once, with one project stating that, having had one Contract Manager that did not undertake monthly monitoring, “…when the next contract manager identified issues with the evidencing of claims on MMRs, we were made to feel responsible when clearly there was a lack of communication within the ECOTEC 03 team.” These comments echo similar comments made in the Pan London 1 survey.

34 Some comments expressed support for monitoring visits, with one project stating that “The support has been really good from the monitoring visits to the questions we asked about potential ESF learners.” Another said the visit report was “…a great way of feeding back discussions and issues that were agreed at the visits.” One project did express concern about these visits, stating that visit summaries included items not discussed during visits and comments not relevant to the project and that the Contract Manager did not check files or talk to learners.
35 A majority of projects expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the speed of their Contract Manager’s response to a query in the earlier question in the survey. However, one project did comment that it “Often took some time to get a response from contract manager to queries.”

Other Support Mechanisms

36 A number of other support and monitoring mechanisms were commented on, some of which reflected those made in response to other quantitative and text-based questions in the survey.

37 The PDM Tracker system received negative feedback from some projects, with one stating:

*PDM Tracker is an onerous system with a disproportionate amount of maintenance required relative to the benefits it offers the project, especially given the ‘doubling’ of effort required with the completion of the OOM’s spreadsheet, which we keep up-to-date to a very detailed level. The support offered by the PDM team has also at times been disappointing…*

38 The comment about duplication of information was picked up by another project, which thought that the further support they required was a “Better more user-friendly and responsive database. I don’t understand the need for a database and a spreadsheet sharing the same information.”

39 Contractual evidence requirements were another area provoking comment, with the amount of paperwork and expense involved in meeting them being commented on. One project picked up on a potential conflict in ESF by commenting that they would have benefited from “Less bureaucracy, in keeping with sustainability agenda.” Another thought that “ECOTEC should look at the outcome results positively and avoid focusing on petty matters such as time sheets, full history of clients journey, time spent with providers, few missing signatures, etc.” Another felt ESF projects were expensive to manage and administer and that some of this cost could be directed to support further training.

40 The problems associated with changing definitions for deliverables was also picked up by a couple of projects – one project stated that:

*The evidence requirements (eligibility, outputs and support costs) needed to be more carefully considered at the beginning of the project. The initial requirements were extremely onerous and it very quickly became evident that they were to all intents and purposes unworkable. The project team has spent a great deal of time over the course of the project negotiating more reasonable evidence requirements, and given the length of time which such suggestions often take to be approved, this has contributed to delays in delivery. It has also been unhelpful when new evidence requirements have been introduced towards the end of the programme…In practice, it is very difficult to implement such changes to delivery at such a late stage, especially when working as part of a large project partnership. All evidence requirements needed to be more clearly explained at the outset of the project, rather than things unexpectedly emerging months into delivery…*
More generally, one project said “ECOTEC's management of the Project has been inconsistent, specifically on the project focus changes.” Another felt more flexibility in the approach to reprofiling would have helped their project.

ECOTEC and the LSC

A number of comments were made about the roles of ECOTEC and the LSC in managing the programme and how the involvement of two bodies affected project delivery. One project stated:

ECOTEC have been quite good as a contract management agency, but the system itself is not helpful to providers. Putting a level of management between LSC (as the funder) and providers leads to delays in getting answers to queries that need to be referred. Most importantly, ECOTEC are clearly bound by their contract with LSC, and this allows very little flexibility for providers, particularly compared to other co-financing agencies…

The issue of two bodies being involved in managing the programme causing delays to responding to queries or to agreeing changes to projects was mentioned by a number of projects.

Another issue mentioned in this regard, and alluded to in the quote above, was a perception that while ECOTEC were good at contract management, they possibly were not as supportive in relation to the wider educational or strategic environment. One project said that “Support from ECOTEC has generally been good, however as ECOTEC is sub contracted to LSC most support guidance has been based around contract compliance not development.” Another said that “Initially ECOTEC were difficult to work with as some of the educational issues were unclear to them. However after some convincing and as long as we were delivering, they were very supportive.”

In terms of the further support projects felt would have helped them to deliver their projects, a number commented simply that they would have liked more direct contact with the LSC. In line with some of the other comments mentioned above about strategic support for projects, another commented that they would have liked “Specialist knowledge of the sports industry by the organisation who manage the contracts in behalf of the funding Partners.”
E Conclusions and Recommendations

1 The recommendations made in this section have been made to seek further information about aspects of support and advice that attracted positive feedback or high levels of satisfaction, especially compared to Pan London 1, as well as to address aspects attracting a level of negative feedback or a relatively low rating or mean score.

2 As Pan London 2 project delivery is now complete and 2007-10 LSC London ESF projects will be managed by LSC Partnership Teams, any recommendations cannot be implemented for further Pan London programme project delivery as was the case for Pan London 1. Instead, LSC London will ask ECOTEC to respond to these recommendations through a final report they prepare on the programme. This report is due to be delivered to LSC London by 31 October and once received will be made available, along with this evaluation, on the LSC London website (www.lsc.gov.uk/regions/London/ESF/).

3 This report from ECOTEC as well as the feedback gained through this evaluation will be used by LSC London to consider any improvements it can make to its own systems for managing ESF project delivery in the future.

Overall Assessment

4 As highlighted in the various sections below, all areas of support given to providers in relation to project delivery received a positive rating (‘satisfactory’ or above), which is a welcome outcome. Even more importantly, almost all individual areas examined received the same or a better rating than in the Pan London 1 survey and the responses indicate that ECOTEC have reacted positively to the recommendations made in the report following the Pan London 1 survey.

Contract Management

5 Overall, projects were very satisfied with the support offered by ECOTEC Contract Managers, with the overall rating across the four aspects examined being ‘good’. These ratings were also generally reflected in comments projects made about the support they received from their Contract Manager. The ratings reflect an overall higher level of satisfaction than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects, with ease of access, speed of response and quality of advice all achieving a higher rating and mean score than in the Pan London 1 survey. LSC London will ask ECOTEC to highlight any good practice in contract management that may explain this high level of satisfaction and the comparatively higher level of satisfaction compared to Pan London 1.

6 In addition, this high level of satisfaction was reflected in ratings given in response to questions about support given by Contract Managers in specific areas. As monitoring mechanisms, both monitoring visits and phone and email communication were rated as ‘good’. Advice from Contract Managers was rated as a ‘good’ support service to help providers understand data collection requirements, a ‘satisfactory to good’ support service to help providers publicise their projects and a ‘good’ mechanism for sharing good practice with other projects. Given the central role the Contract Manager
plays in linking ECOTEC and projects, it is welcome though perhaps not surprising that 66% of projects ranked their Contract Manager as the most useful support tool to their project.

7 The rating given to consistency of advice and the fact a majority of projects expressed a high degree of satisfaction about this aspect suggests ECOTEC have largely responded to the recommendations about this concern following the Pan London 1 survey. However, the spread of scores and the comments made about this aspect of support suggest further investigation is required.

Recommendation 1: ECOTEC to highlight good practice in contract management.

Recommendation 2: ECOTEC to respond to concerns raised by some projects about the consistency of advice given by Contract Managers with other advice.

Monitoring Mechanisms

8 There was a similarly high level of satisfaction with the relevance and quality of feedback given through monitoring mechanisms employed by ECOTEC, with the overall rating across the six mechanisms examined being ‘good’.

9 Again, these ratings reflect an overall higher level of satisfaction than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects and that ECOTEC have largely responded to the recommendations about monthly monitoring phone calls and MMRs following the Pan London 1 survey. Monitoring visits and MMRs achieved a higher rating and mean score than in the Pan London 1 survey and audit visits achieved the same rating but a slightly higher mean score. Again, LSC London will ask ECOTEC to highlight any good practice in monitoring that may explain this high level of satisfaction and the comparatively higher level of satisfaction compared to Pan London 1.

10 The rating of phone and email communication highlights an improvement from Pan London 1, where projects rated monthly monitoring phone calls. The broadened of this aspect for this survey reflects a change of approach by ECOTEC in Contract Manager monitoring. That this aspect achieved a much higher rating and mean score than monthly monitoring phone calls in the Pan London 1 survey suggests ECOTEC has addressed the recommendations following that survey about the relevance and quality of those calls.

11 The Pan London 1 survey did not ask projects to rate action plans and other meetings, as these monitoring mechanisms have been more prominent in Pan London 2. As these mechanisms have not been employed for all projects, a lower number of projects rated them than rated the other mechanisms (which are common to all projects). However, the rating and mean score suggests that projects that have experienced these additional mechanisms are satisfied with their relevance and quality.

12 7% of projects ranked feedback from these monitoring mechanisms as the most useful support tool to their project and it achieved the second highest mean ranking of the ten support tools.

13 Despite this overall high level of satisfaction, the comments made about the impact of various issues with MMRs resulting in delays in payment will be fed
back to ECOTEC and LSC London will be seeking assurance that such issues have been resolved.

Recommendation 3: ECOTEC to highlight good practice in use of monitoring mechanisms.

Recommendation 4: ECOTEC to respond to comments made about issues with MMRs and confirm that any such issues with individual projects that resulted in delays in payment have been resolved.

Support Documents

Projects were satisfied with the relevance and quality of information provided through the range of documents created by ECOTEC to support project delivery, with the overall rating across the six documents examined being ‘satisfactory’.

The ratings and mean score for the Provider Manual and email bulletins reflect an overall higher level of satisfaction with these support documents than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects. The comments made about the documents demonstrate that ECOTEC have largely responded to the recommendations about needing additional information on eligibility and beneficiary requirements following the Pan London 1 survey. ECOTEC have also communicated changes in guidance through email bulletins, updating the Provider Manual and separately advising of what has been updated in new versions of the Manual. LSC London will ask ECOTEC to highlight any good practice in using support documents, particularly in terms of the usefulness of the documents employed and how they supported projects with beneficiary and evidence requirements.

In addition, these levels of satisfaction were reflected in ratings given in response to questions about support given through these support documents in specific areas. The email bulletins were rated as a ‘satisfactory to good’ in terms of helping projects understand data collection requirements and sharing good practice with other projects. The Provider Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ in terms of helping projects understand data collection requirements. The Publicity Manual was rated as ‘satisfactory’ in terms of helping projects publicise their projects. 3% of projects ranked these support documents as the most useful support tool to their project and they achieved the third highest mean ranking of the ten support tools. Ranked separately, the Provider Manual and email bulletins were ranked by 14% and 7% of projects as the most useful support tool respectively and they had the fourth and fifth highest mean ranking of the ten support tools.

However, some of the comments reveal that projects may feel that there is almost too much information and/or a lack of direction about the relationship between different documents and forms. In addition, there were comments made about the amount of paperwork and expense involved in meeting contractual evidence requirements and the problems associated with changing definitions for deliverables.

As payment of ESF contracts is based on delivery of outputs, outcomes and milestones, the need for strict evidence requirements to satisfy payment for these activities is determined by European, national and LSC audit requirements. However, there is a balance to be struck between the need for
such evidence requirements and ensuring that their impact on project delivery and particularly beneficiary engagement and participation is minimised. Some of the changes to evidence requirements (such as in relation to evidencing the right to work and employment status) were introduced by ECOTEC under the LSC London’s direction to attempt to redress this balance. Although these changes were unfortunately not able to be introduced until after project delivery had begun, it is to be hoped that their impact in terms of the burden of evidence on projects has been positive.

19 Similarly, issues of clarification of some evidence requirements have resulted from project queries and therefore have been responded to as they have arisen. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to establish criteria prior to contracting that cover every potential eventuality. Any such changes have been designed to try to minimise impact on projects in terms of consistency with previous practice, although it is not always been possible to achieve this design. In addition, where they are relevant such changes will be built upon as good practice in managing delivery of future ESF projects.

20 The comments made about areas support documents did not cover and about support documents in general will be fed back to ECOTEC and LSC London will ask ECOTEC to respond to this issue.

Recommendation 5: ECOTEC to highlight good practice in using support documents, particularly in terms of the usefulness of the documents employed and how they supported projects with beneficiary and evidence requirements.

Recommendation 6: ECOTEC to respond to comments made about areas support documents did not cover and about support documents in general.

Support Events

21 Although the response to the relevance and quality of information provided through the range of events held by ECOTEC to support project delivery was mostly positive, the varied response to these events is of worth noting. Of the 13 ECOTEC events rated (excluding LVSTC events), ten achieved a rating of ‘satisfactory’ or better and the overall rating across the 13 events examined was ‘satisfactory’. However, the two provider launch events for Pan London 2 both received a lower rating than the equivalent launch event did in the Pan London 1 survey. Moreover, the health and social care sector and construction sector networking events and the PDM training on preparation for OFSTED inspection were rated relatively poorly.

22 However, a distinction needs to be made in terms of the importance of various events to delivery of a project – some events covered material sufficiently central to the delivery of a project that they were made mandatory. Other events were aimed at particular projects having difficulties with certain areas and others were added value. This distinction may help to explain the varied response rate to scoring particular events. In addition, this distinction allows for a more meaningful assessment of how much weight should be placed on the ratings given to particular events. So, for example, although the health and social care and construction networking events had relatively low ratings and mean scores and this in itself is a cause for some
concern, the importance of this in terms of judging the overall effectiveness of events to assist project delivery can be slightly discounted as:

a These events were offered to projects as an added value opportunity to network with projects working in similar sectors and as such were not intended as being instrumental to overall project delivery; and

b The small number of projects offering a score for these events makes any meaningful analysis of the results difficult.

23 Generally, the fewer projects that scored an event, the lower the mean score was for that event. However, as it is difficult to make any conclusions based on the small responses made for some events, further information based on feedback gathered at the time of the events will be sought from ECOTEC.

24 The varied response to individual events was reflected in ratings given in response to questions about support offered through these events in specific areas. PDM training and support events were rated as a ‘satisfactory to good’ support service to help providers understand data collection requirements. The publicity training given at the Summer Event was rated as ‘satisfactory’ in terms of helping providers publicise their projects, although it achieved a relatively low mean score and this mean score was very slightly lower than that given by Pan London 1 projects for the publicity training at their launch event. Support events had the sixth highest mean ranking of the ten support tools in terms of overall usefulness.

25 These ratings and the comments made about areas that these events did not cover suggest further investigation is required about:

a Lessons learned from using these events to support project delivery, including highlighting any good practice and analysing (particularly by reference to any feedback gathered at the time) why some events were seen as useful and others were not;

b The timing of events;

c The relatively lower satisfaction expressed with the delivery launch events compared to Pan London 1.

Recommendation 7: ECOTEC to highlight lessons learned from using events to support project delivery, including highlighting any good practice and analysing why some events were seen as useful and others were not.

Recommendation 8: ECOTEC to respond to concerns raised about the timing of events and the relatively lower satisfaction expressed with launch events compared to Pan London 1.

PDM Helpline and Support Service

26 Projects were satisfied with the support by the PDM helpline and support service, with the overall rating across the three aspects of the service examined being ‘satisfactory’. The responses indicated projects were more satisfied with the quality of the response they received to a query than with the speed of response and the availability of telephone support and the spread of scores for these two aspects requires further investigation.

27 This variation was also reflected in ratings given under other questions on various aspects of PDM support and comments made about that support.
For instance, the three PDM-related events were rated as ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ and ‘poor’ and there were comments that PDM training was not very user-friendly. PDM training and support events were rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ in terms of supporting data collection. And although the PDM data management support service was rated as ‘satisfactory to good’ in this regard, there was a wide spread of scores and an overall slightly lower mean score than in the Pan London 1 survey. The specific comments made about the support offered by PDM and those about PDM Tracker (particularly about the duplication of information required) reflect this varied response.

28 As the Pan London 1 survey asked for projects to rate the London O3 helpline service, a direct comparison with that survey is not possible.

29 The spread of scores in relation to support from PDM and the comments made about PDM support and the duplication of information will be fed back to ECOTEC and LSC London will ask ECOTEC to respond to these issues.

Recommendation 9: ECOTEC to respond to concerns raised by some projects about the PDM support service (particularly the speed of response, availability of support and its usefulness in assisting projects understand data collection requirements) and about duplication of information.

London O3 Website

30 Projects were satisfied with the support offered through the London O3 website, although there was again a slight disparity between the ratings for the quality of information on the website and the layout and timeliness and/or updating of that information. The overall rating across the three aspects of the website examined was ‘satisfactory’. The lower rating and slightly lower mean score for layout and quality of information compared to the Pan London 1 survey requires further investigation.

31 The website was also rated as a ‘satisfactory’ tool to support projects to understand data collection requirements, publicise their projects and share good practice. The website had the seventh highest mean ranking of the ten support tools in terms of overall usefulness.

Recommendation 10: ECOTEC to highlight lessons learned from the operation of the London O3 website as a tool for supporting project delivery.

 Specific Areas of Support

32 Projects expressed a high level of satisfaction with the range of support services offered by ECOTEC to help them understand data collection requirements, with the overall rating across the six services examined being ‘satisfactory to good’. All six support services were rated as ‘satisfactory’ or higher and the ratings reflect a similar or higher level of satisfaction than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects about these support services. The only concern was the spread of scores for the PDM data management support service and the fact it achieved a slightly lower mean score than for Pan London 1, which has been covered through Recommendation 9.

33 Projects also expressed satisfaction with the range of support services offered by ECOTEC to help them publicise their projects, with the overall rating across the five services examined being ‘satisfactory’. All five support services were rated as ‘satisfactory’ or higher and the ratings reflect a similar
or higher level of satisfaction than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects about these support services. In particular, the rating given to the Publicity Manual compared to that given to the Provider Manual in the Pan London 1 survey demonstrates that ECOTEC have responded to the recommendations about the need for more specific support in this area (the Publicity Manual had not been developed at the time of the Pan London 1 survey). The only concern was the mean score for the publicity training at the Summer Event and the fact this mean score was lower than for the launch event in the Pan London 1 survey, which has been covered through Recommendation 8.

34 As the comments made about obstacles projects felt prevented them from publicising their projects effectively demonstrate some areas of concern, they will be fed back to ECOTEC and the LSC London will ask ECOTEC to make a response on this issue.

Recommendation 11: ECOTEC to respond to comments made about obstacles projects felt prevented them from publicising their projects effectively.

35 Projects were also satisfied with the range of mechanisms available to share good practice with other projects, with all eight mechanisms rated as ‘satisfactory’ or higher and the ratings reflecting a similar or higher level of satisfaction than that expressed by Pan London 1 projects about these mechanisms. The overall rating across the eight mechanisms examined was ‘satisfactory’.

36 Again, these ratings generally reflect responses made in relation to these mechanisms in other questions, with a high level of satisfaction in relation to Contract Manager support and a relatively low level given to the sector networking events. The correlation between the number of projects rating a mechanism and the scores given suggests that projects were satisfied with more commonly used methods of sharing good practice.

37 The recommendations following the Pan London 1 survey about the usefulness of the message board and measure level reports have been answered by these facilities not being used for Pan London 2. The only concern was the mean score for the networking events, which has been covered through Recommendation 8.

38 The fact that the support services and mechanisms across data collection, publicity and sharing good practice all achieved the same or better ratings than under Pan London 1 is pleasing and LSC London will ask ECOTEC to highlight any good practice in supporting projects across these areas.

Recommendation 12: ECOTEC to highlight good practice in supporting projects with data collection, publicity and sharing good practice.

Pan London User Group

39 Although there were no specific questions asked about the effectiveness of the Pan London User Group, this group was formed in response to recommendations arising from the Pan London 1 survey. The Group was rated as ‘satisfactory’ in terms of its usefulness to support project delivery and as a mechanism to share good practice with other projects.
It is interesting to note that the overall ranking of the User Group reflected the fact that a minority of projects ranked it highly in terms of overall usefulness, even though it had the lowest mean ranking of the ten support tools. This mean ranking should not be seen as surprising given its intended purpose and importance relative to the other tools. However, the fact that 18 projects ranked it as the least useful support tool and the relatively lower number of projects that scored other questions about the support offered through the User Group (15 and 16 responses were received about the User Group to the two questions respectively) suggests that a number of projects did not engage with the Group.

Recommendation 13: ECOTEC to highlight lessons learned from the operation of the Pan London User Group as a way of engaging with projects.

ECOTEC and the LSC

The final matter arising from the survey was the respective roles of the LSC London and ECOTEC in managing the programme, with projects expressing concern about:

a. Delays in responding to queries or agreeing changes to projects;

b. ECOTEC’s ability to advise on more strategic issues; and

c. The lack of direct contact with the LSC.

In addition to considering these comments in terms of its own evaluation of the programme, LSC London will also feed these comments back to ECOTEC and will ask ECOTEC to make a response on this issue from its perspective. The LSC London views these comments more as comments on the use of the Co-ordinating Organisation model rather than on ECOTEC as the appointed organisation.

Some of the comments demonstrate a potential confusion about the respective roles of the two organisations. Under the Co-ordinating Organisation model, the LSC London remains responsible to Government Office for London and other national and European bodies for the proper delivery of the programme as well as having responsibility for determining the strategic direction of the programme. Within the limits set by this responsibility, the Co-ordinating Organisation is responsible for the end-to-end management of all projects funded under the programme. Beyond the need to ensure projects are managed in a manner that ensures compliance with relevant European regulations governing the use of ESF, the arrangement allows the Co-ordinating Organisation to devise its own methods of managing and monitoring projects. LSC London has taken a more active role in the management of Pan London 2 with ECOTEC than it did under Pan London 1, primarily to assist resolving some of the delivery performance issues that some projects have suffered while still ensuring the strategic objectives of the programme are being met. However, the model itself is designed so that it is the Co-ordinating Organisation that directly manages and liaises with projects and resourcing for managing the programme within ECOTEC and the LSC London reflects this design.

Recommendation 14: ECOTEC to respond to comments made about its role compared to that of the LSC in managing the programme.
## Annex 1 – Pan London 2 Provider Survey Questions and Results

1. **Please indicate after which tendering round your LSC Pan London ESF Programme project was approved.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendering Round</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Pan London 2 tendering round (Jan 2006 – Mar 2006)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Your Marks programme (Mar 2006 – Apr 2006)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan London 2 unallocated round (Sep 2006 – Oct 2006)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Response: 31)

2. **Please rate the following aspects of support provided by your ECOTEC Contract Manager (where 1 is very poor and 5 is excellent).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access to Contract Manager when query arises</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Contract Manager's response to query</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No definitive rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of advice provided by Contract Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of advice provided by Contract Manager with advice from other ECOTEC team members/other sources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Mean and Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Response: 33)

3. **Please rate the following ECOTEC monitoring mechanisms, in terms of the relevance and quality of the feedback given to you (where 1 is very poor and 5 is excellent).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring visits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication by phone/email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor to Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project audit visits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Monitoring Returns (MMR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No definitive rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans (if applicable)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Pan London 1 survey asked projects to rate monthly monitoring phone calls.
Other meetings & Other documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>3.71</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean and Rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Response: 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please list below any issues you encounter which prevent you from completing the Monthly Monitoring Returns (MMR) effectively.

5. How useful, in terms of the relevance and quality of information, are the following documents in helping you to deliver your project (where 1 is not useful and 5 is very useful)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider manual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 monthly email bulletins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample beneficiary/project delivery forms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 website good practice documents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other documents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean and Rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Response: 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please list below any areas of project delivery which you feel these documents do not adequately cover.

7. How useful, in terms of the relevance and quality of information, were the following events in helping you to deliver your project (where 1 is not useful and 5 is very useful)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London O3 Summer Event - included PL2 /OYM launch (01/08/2006)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2 Training – Information event on assurance, quality, cross cutting themes, impact assessments, PDM, SAR and QIP (23/01/2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Provider Briefing (28/02/2007)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Event – Sport (17/04/2007)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Event – Health and Social Care (17/04/2007)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Poor to Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Event – Construction (19/04/2007)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Poor to Very Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidencing Workshop (27/06/2007, 04/07/2007)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Pan London 1 survey asked projects to rate launch event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating (excluding LVSTC Events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDM Training – End of LSC Year Record Closure Training (24/07/2007)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Training – Preparation for OFSTED Inspection (26/10/2007)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Training – How to get the best out of PDM reports (26/10/2007)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety workshop (29/11/2007)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone Reports workshop (24/01/08)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan London User group</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVSTC events</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is there any information you would like to have received at an event but did not or are there other areas you would have liked an event to cover?

9. Please rate PDM helpline/support service (where 1 is very poor and 5 is excellent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating (excluding LVSTC Events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed of response to query (Email and telephone)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of response to query (Email and telephone)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of telephone support</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please rate the London O3 website (where 1 is very poor and 5 is excellent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating</th>
<th>Overall Mean and Rating (excluding LVSTC Events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layout of information</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of information</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness and/or updating of information</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How useful, in terms of the relevance and quality of information, are the following support elements in helping you understand how to meet data collection requirements (where 1 is not useful and 5 is very useful)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Element</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Manager advice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 website advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM data management support service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM training and support events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly email bulletins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Mean and Rating**

(Response: 29)

12. How useful, in terms of the relevance and quality of information, are the following support elements in helping you understand how to publicise your project (where 1 is not useful and 5 is very useful)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Element</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicity manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Manager/ECOTEC team advice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>No definitive rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 website advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Satisfactory to Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example provided by other providers’ or ECOTEC’s own publicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity training at Summer event (01/08/06)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Mean and Rating**

(Response: 29)

13. Please list below any obstacles which prevent you from publicising your project effectively.

14. How useful are the following mechanisms for sharing good practice between you and other programme providers (where 1 is not useful and 5 is very useful)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>PL1 Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PL1 Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

3 Pan London 1 survey asked projects to rate Provider Manual and the full rating was ‘Satisfactory but with some low scores prompting further investigation’.

4 The full rating was ‘Satisfactory but with some low scores prompting further investigation’.

---
 Sector level networking events (Sport, Health and Social Care, Construction) April 2007 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 2.55 | 2.89 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
Case studies | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 3.27 | 2.92 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
London O3 monthly Email bulletins | 0 | 2 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 26 | 3.38 | 2.95 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
London O3 website | 0 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 3.20 | 2.52 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
Measure level reports | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 2.79 | 2.32 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
Research reports | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 3.08 | 2.68 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory
Contract Manager | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 24 | 3.60 | 2.90 | Good | No definitive rating
Pan London user group | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 3.00 | N/A | Satisfactory | N/A
**Overall Mean and Rating** | | | | | | | 3.17 | Satisfactory | (Response: 26)

**15. Please rank the support tools listed below in order of how useful they have been for you (1=most useful, 10=least useful).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>PL1 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Manager</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from monitoring mechanisms listed in question 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support documents listed in question 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support events listed in question 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 monthly email bulletins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London O3 website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider manual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing good practice through the methods listed in question 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity manual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan London user group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(=Pan London 1 survey asked projects to rate policy field networking events.

(=Pan London 1 survey asked projects to rate website message board and the full rating was ‘Satisfactory but with some low scores prompting further investigation’.

(=The full rating was ‘Satisfactory but with some low scores prompting further investigation’.

**16. Please list below any further comments you have on the support offered to you during contract management. If necessary, please refer to a particular issue that has arisen and how you felt it was dealt with.**

**17. Please list below any further support you feel would help you to deliver your project**