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1.0 Introduction to the Inception Report

ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd, working in cooperation with its sister company within the ECORYS Group, IDEA Consult NV, is delighted to submit this Inception Report for the Ex Post Evaluation of Cohesion Policy Programmes 2000-2006: the URBAN Community Initiative.

URBAN II was one of the four Community Initiatives funded through the Structural Funds in the 2000-2006 programming period, along with INTERREG, Leader+ and EQUAL. It followed on from the URBAN I Community Initiative in the previous programming period (1994-1999), which financed 118 urban development programmes across the EU, with a total Community assistance of € 900 million.

On the basis of the lessons learned from URBAN I and the earlier Urban Pilot Projects, the Commission included URBAN II as the new Community initiative for sustainable urban development in the general regulation on the Structural Funds for the period 2000-2006\(^1\). The Community Initiative was jointly financed by the Commission and the Member States, with a Community contribution of EUR 730 million, exclusively from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and a predicted total investment of EUR 1.6 billion for the period up to 2006. Community financing could fund up to 75% of the total eligible cost in urban areas covered by Objective 1 and 50% elsewhere.

This report follows the standard format for EU inception reports. In addition we would like to highlight a number of points that were discussed in the inception meeting held on 18\(^{th}\) July and the first steering group meeting held on 12\(^{th}\) September. The key points flowing from those meetings and influencing this report are;

- Concentration on the inception phase of the project to ensure that issues have been discussed and teased out in advance of the start of the evaluation work;
- A shift in the balance of time from Task 1 to Tasks 3 and 4;
- An increase in the overall proportion of senior days (which leads to a small reduction in overall days);
- The establishment of an Expert Panel with a balance of skills and perspectives. The three Expert Panel members (Prof. Alberto Martini, Prof. Jan Lambooy and Prof. Michael Parkinson) have been invited to make written comments on this document. Comments concerning methodological issues been received from Professors Martini

and Lambooy. Professor Parkinson will focus more specifically on the urban policy implications flowing from the evaluation findings;

- Adjustments in the time allocations of key individuals to reflect the roles they play. The most significant changes (both increases) are for Paul Jeffrey, as Project Director, and Jan Maarten de Vet, as Principal Evaluator;
- Development of a more detailed, step by step proposal for the methodology, which includes a particular assessment of the counterfactual approach, taking into account likely information and other constraints identified in the inception phase;
- Our recognition of the requirement for a robust evaluation, backed with quantitative information as far as practical, which can be used to inform Commission policies and other urban policy interventions.

The Inception Report comprises the following sections:

- Management and delivery of the project;
- An introduction to the methodology;
- A section on Task 1 Review of Urban II Programmes;
- A section on Task 2 Assessment of URBACT;
- A section on Task 3 Case Study analysis;
- A proposed outline of the Interim Report structure;
- Annexes covering additional CVs (that were not included in the original proposal), the planned allocation of days by team member and the project timetable.

The Inception Report concentrates on Tasks 1, 2 and 3, but mostly Task 1 and 2. The approach for Task 3 is outlined here but will be expanded upon on in the Interim Report, as will Task 4 which brings all of the elements of the evaluation together.
2.0 Management and Delivery of the Project

2.1 Introduction

As already indicated in the proposal, the evaluation must cover 70 URBAN II programmes in 14 countries, as well as an assessment of URBACT and other networks. This by necessity requires a comparatively large team with the appropriate set of skills and language competence as well as effective coordination to ensure the consistency of approach various outputs. In line with this, it is helpful to clarify a number of issues relating to the people who will lead the evaluation and those who will support them and the processes involved in implementing the evaluation work. These issues are:

- Management;
- Evaluation and analysis;
- Data and evidence collection and;
- The expert panel.

2.2 Management

2.2.1 People

Paul Jeffrey is the project director. ECOTEC's quality procedures require a senior director to take overall responsibility for projects of this size. Paul's role will be to oversee the implementation of the study, provide advice to the project manager and core team and act as the principal internal quality referee.

Chris Simpson is the project manager. He will be the day to day contact for DG REGIO and co-ordinate the day to day implementation of the project, including allocation of tasks, liaison with sub contractors and general process management.

2.2.2 Processes

The project started with the kick-off meeting in Brussels attended by the project director, project manager and other members of the team. In addition to this meeting, the Terms of Reference specify:

- Three meetings of the evaluation steering group (with wider representation than the day to day DG REGIO contacts) to discuss the Inception Report (19 September 2008), the Interim Report (planned for 22 April 2009) and the Final Report (10 September 2009);
• Three meetings to present final results of the evaluation to the Member States and the Commission Services after the final report. The dates for these meetings will be finalised at a later stage.

Short progress reports including detailed steps taken to implement the evaluation work plan will be delivered to the Commission every month, following submission of the inception report (excluding months where a formal deliverable is to be submitted). The reports will be no longer than two pages and will be prepared by the Project Manager. The first such report will be submitted on 18 December 2008. In addition, "ad hoc" progress meetings may be held with DG REGIO in Brussels as required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Summary of output</th>
<th>Date/frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>4 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering group</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>19 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim report</td>
<td>The Interim report will focus on answering the seven research questions for Task 1. In doing so it will present findings from Task 1 including a summary report for each programme area, a typology of Urban II areas, a proposed list of case studies for Task 3 and draft findings from the URBACT Assessment.</td>
<td>6 April 2009 (as agreed with DG REGIO. It represents a change to the originally agreed date of 18 February)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering group</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>22 April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert panel meeting</td>
<td>Commentary and discussion on the Interim Report, with a view to making the report. The expert panel will also comment on case study selection (for Task 3).</td>
<td>21 April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>The Draft Final Report will comprise a synthesis of findings linking Task 1, 2 and 3</td>
<td>18 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering group</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>10 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert panel meeting</td>
<td>Commentary and discussion on the Draft Final Report</td>
<td>9 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>The Final Report will incorporate comments on the Draft Final Report</td>
<td>18 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>Two page reports on progress highlighting issues arising in undertaking the evaluation and highlighting any ‘early warnings’ if difficulties arise in undertaking any of the tasks</td>
<td>Monthly reports starting in December 2008 (but only when there is no other deliverable that month)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Evaluation and analysis

2.3.1 People

Jan Maarten de Vet will be the principal evaluator. Jan Maarten has taken over this role from Dafne Reymen (specified in the proposal), although Dafne will remain engaged in other parts of the project. The role involves developing and refining the evaluation methodology used in the study and coordinating the team's response to methodological issues as they arise. This distinct role means that there is always a senior team member to maintain a clear focus on intellectual and methodological questions – a perspective which can sometimes be lost when process and project implementation issues become dominant. He will be supported by Rob de Lobel from IDEA Consult.

The assessment of URBACT (Task 2) will be undertaken by the URBACT team, consisting of Gareth Williams and Simon Roy. Gareth will lead the evaluation of URBACT.

2.3.2 Processes

Ad hoc meetings will be held with DG REGIO in Brussels as required to aid the evaluation and analysis process. In principle, these meetings will be attended by the team leader (who is UK-based), but, where appropriate, additional bilateral meetings can be held between DG REGIO and other, Brussels-based, members of the core team and particularly the principal evaluator.
2.4 Data and evidence collection

2.4.1 People

The following team of people will be deployed to undertake the necessary data and evidence collection as part of the first and third stages of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lead Correspondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Rob de Lobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Matthias Wihlborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Nick McAteer*/Ursula Mölders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Anna Manoudi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Javier Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Dafne Reymen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Tim Fox/Ian Atkinson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Federica Givone (CSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Sacha Koppert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Nick McAteer*/Ursula Mölders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Javier Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Matthias Wihlborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Matthias Wihlborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Tim Fox/Ian Atkinson*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These members of the team were not mentioned in the initial proposal submission. Their CVs are attached as the final annex, along with the CVs of other supporting staff.

2.4.2 Processes

The project manager and principal evaluator will play a key role ensuring the team is properly briefed and that research tools and outputs meet a high standard using telephone and written briefings. Our previous experience in EU-27 evaluations has shown the importance of a good coordination of this kind of data and evidence collection process. Two dilemmas often arise:
• Consistency of coordination versus span of control: coordinating this work can be highly labour-intensive for one person, however if several coordinators work next to each other then there is risk of inconsistency;
• Country-specific versus standardised approach: there is no one size fits all approach and therefore a need remains for adjustments of the approach to specific national situations.

Building on the proposal, our response to these challenges lies in the establishment of a core team where different team members will closely monitor the implementation of the tasks by country correspondents. We will distinguish between the following roles:

• Overall monitoring of deliverables against the evaluation plan and against the comments of DG Regio: project manager (Chris Simpson);
• Methodological checks: principal evaluator (Jan Maarten de Vet);
• Link between fieldwork team and core team: (Rob de Lobel).

With regard to the second dilemma, we foresee that one tool (Tool 3 - the Country Review template – set out in Section 3) will be adjusted by each country correspondent.

In addition, to aid communication and transfer of information and ideas, we have created a web-based "project portal" for the evaluation, using Microsoft SharePoint software. The project portal will have two main functions:

• It will provide a shared file server for sharing documents. Documents can be uploaded by the core team or country correspondents and downloaded by others. This will be useful not only for Tasks 1 and 3, where a considerable amount of material must be distributed from the core team and outputs subsequently submitted to the core team, but also as a place where "example" outputs can be posted;
• It will provide a useful additional communication channel for the team. Messages and project-related news can be posted on the portal notice boards.

2.5 Expert panel

2.5.1 Background

The call for tender for the project states that "the evaluator in consultation with DG REGIO will identify three experts in the fields concerned by the evaluation who will provide additional expert input to the evaluation. The evaluator should include in his tender the cost of three experts attending two meetings in Brussels during the course of the evaluation". 
The expert panel have provided written comments on the inception report (see also – 1.0 Introduction). In addition, two expert meetings in Brussels will be arranged to coincide with the steering groups to discuss the interim and draft final reports. In contrast to steering groups, which are chaired and managed by the Commission, the expert panel meetings will be chaired and managed by ECOTEC.

During discussions with DG REGIO, the following criteria for selection of a ‘package’ of experts were established:

- A good understanding of European urban policy within the context of the broader Cohesion policy;
- Good evaluation skills, with emphasis on methodological issues concerning the counterfactual;
- A combination of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ perspectives when it comes to European urban policy;
- An appropriate geographic balance, broadly representing the various countries where URBAN II has been implemented;
- Willingness and capacity to fulfil this role of expert;
- In the kick-off meeting held on 18th July, DG REGIO also stressed the need to have "critical voices" on the expert panel.

2.5.2 People

The expert panel proposed by ECOTEC and agreed by DG REGIO comprises:

- Professor Alberto Martini;
- Professor Michael Parkinson;
- Professor Jan Lambooy.

Pen portraits are provided below.

**Professor Alberto Martini**

*Universita del Piemonte Orientale*

*Facolta di Scienze Politiche*

Prof. Alberto Martini is associate professor in Economics and Statistics at the East Piemonte University. His research interests are broad and focus on the statistical modelling of the value added of public policies, through the development of micro-simulation models notably. Alberto Martini has applied this knowledge and skills in a number of areas, for instance on the effectiveness of training in preventing occupational injuries or the value
added of zoning in economic development policies. Recently, he has published a very relevant article on 'How counterfactuals got lost on the way to Brussels', prepared for the Symposium on Policy and programme evaluation in Europe, held in Strasbourg on 3-4th July 2008. His rigorous economic and statistical approaches to evaluation and the importance he attaches to counterfactuals was the key reason for proposing him as an expert.

**Professor Michael Parkinson**  
*Director European Institute of Urban Affairs*  
*John Moores University, Liverpool*

Michael Parkinson is Director of the European Institute for Urban Affairs. He produced the 'State of English Cities' Report for the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2006, the authoritative analysis of cities in Britain. He currently leads the Department of Communities and Local Governments' expert panel on Neighbourhoods, Cities and Regions. He was Director of the Economic and Social Research Council's Programme 'CITIES: Cohesion and Competitiveness', a major five-year research programme involving 25 Universities.

Michael acts as adviser on urban affairs to the European Commission, OECD, EUROCITIES, the Department of Communities and Local Government, the National Audit Office, the House of Commons Select Committees, the Core Cities and a range of cities in the UK. He lectures extensively nationally and internationally and is a regular contributor to the media. Michael was made a Commander of the British Empire for service to urban regeneration in 2007.

For the purpose of this exercise, it is important to highlight the fact that Professor Parkinson was deeply involved in the preparation of the URBAN programme, as well as in the development of the Urban Audit. He was one of the external experts in the preparation of the State of the European Cities Report (2006).

**Prof. Jan Lambooy**  
*Emeritus Professor of Geography*  
*Faculty of Geosciences*  
*University of Utrecht*

Jan Lambooy has been the leading Dutch economic geographer for some time. As Emeritus professor of Geography in Utrecht, he continues to exploit knowledge on urban and regional economics, approaching this from the perspective of evolutionary economics. Jan Lambooy has published a large number of books and articles, most recently on
'Knowledge dissemination and innovation in urban regions' and 'Knowledge and urban economic development: An evolutionary perspective'. He has established amongst others the Urban and Regional Research Centre in Utrecht and received the Carfax prize for the best article in European Planning Studies 2005. In addition to his academic work, Jan Lambooy has been deeply involved in policy development and evaluation in urban and regional development, within the Netherlands as well as on a European scale. Jan Lambooy was one of the external experts in the preparation of the State of the European Cities Report (2006).

The experts proposed are complementary to each other with regard to their perspectives on EU urban policy and overall, we consider that the three experts combine as a balanced proposition with some having detailed 'insider' knowledge of the programme and others having a more remote, 'outsider' connection with the programme. Geographically, all three experts are based in three countries where urban policy has a high importance and to which the URBAN programme has been essential, namely the UK, Italy and the Netherlands.

2.5.3 Processes

These experts will review the inception report by written procedure. ECOTEC will then organise two meetings, running back to back with the steering group meetings:

- To discuss the interim report findings and the proposed selection of case studies and;
- To discuss the findings of the case study work (draft final report), draft conclusions and help refine the lessons learned and recommendations emerging from the evaluation.

2.6 Sub contracting

2.6.1 People

The evaluation will be led and principally undertaken by ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd and IDEA Consult NV. ECOTEC will be the lead contractor and has signed the Service Contract with the European Commission. The majority of staff included in this proposal are employees of ECOTEC and IDEA Consult. In addition, we have included the following subcontractors within our team:

- Gareth Williams (Old Bell 3 - UK);
- Ursula Mölders (Stadt- und Regionalplanung Dr. Jansen GmbH – Germany);
- Federica Givone (CSIL – Italy);
- Sacha Koppert (ECORYS – Netherlands);
- Anna Manoudi (Freelance – Greece).
2.6.2 Processes

The sub contractors within the team have agreed to sign ECOTEC’s standard sub contract used for European projects of this nature.

2.7 Resource allocation

In the kick-off meeting, it was agreed that the balance of resource allocation should be weighted more evenly towards the final part (Task 3 and Task 4) of the project. In addition, it was agreed that a greater number of senior days would be included in the budget. We have also at the advice of DG REGIO spent more time at the inception phase planning the evaluation. To this end, we propose the following revised allocation of resources by task to emphasise the need for greater resource to be available at the analysis, rather than evidence collection, stage of the assignment. It can be noted that, as a result of more senior days, there has been a reduction in the overall number days. A detailed version of the proposed time allocation by task and by person is attached as the final annex to this report. The main changes in core, senior team day allocations are;

- Paul Jeffrey  11 to 25
- Chris Simpson  59 to 61
- Jan Maarten de Vet  5 to 66
- Rob de Lobel  9.5 to 64.5
- Dafne Reymen  45 to 20.5
- Simon Roy  25.5 to 36.5

Table 2.2 Resource allocation by phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Initial Proposal - Number of day and total percentage</th>
<th>Revised Proposal – Number of days and total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>21 (3.5)</td>
<td>57 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 Review of Urban Programme</td>
<td>280 (46.1)</td>
<td>199 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 Assessment of URBACT</td>
<td>32 (5.3)</td>
<td>32 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 Case studies</td>
<td>182 (30)</td>
<td>181 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 Conclusions and lessons for the future</td>
<td>57 (9.4)</td>
<td>69 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and coordination</td>
<td>35 (5.8)</td>
<td>25 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>607</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Introduction to the Methodology

3.1 Objectives and principles of URBAN II

Central to this evaluation is an attempt to understand the extent to which URBAN II achieved (or contributed to achieving) its objectives. These objectives were:

1. To formulate and implement innovative strategies for sustainable economic and social regeneration of small and medium-sized towns and cities or distressed urban neighbourhoods in larger cities and;
2. To enhance and exchange knowledge and experience in relation to sustainable urban regeneration and development in the areas concerned.

In order to fulfil these objectives, the urban regeneration strategies for the URBAN II programmes had to adhere to a set of principles, established in the Commission Communication, namely:

- To have sufficient critical mass of population and associated support structures to facilitate the formulation and implementation of innovative urban development programmes;
- To have strong local partnership to define challenges, strategy and priorities, allocate resources and monitor and evaluate the strategy. Partnerships are wide and include economic and social partners, non-governmental organisations and residents' groupings;
- To adopt an integrated territorial approach linked to development strategies for the wider urban area or region;
- To integrate the economic, social and environmental, security and transport aspects, including equality of access to education and training opportunities;
- To promote equal opportunities between men and women;
- To ensure complementarity with the main forms of assistance under the Structural Funds and other Community initiatives.

Member States selected URBAN II areas through national selection processes, based on criteria established by the Commission. To be eligible, urban areas had to comply with at least three of the following criteria:

- A low level of economic activity and a specific need for conversion due to local economic and social difficulties;
- A high level of long-term unemployment, poverty and exclusion;
• A low level of education, significant skills deficiencies and high drop-out-rates from school;
• A high number of immigrants, ethnic and minority groups, or refugees;
• A high level of criminality and delinquency;
• Precarious demographic trends;
• A particularly degraded environment.

The above eligibility criteria leave some room for strategic choices at the level of individual URBAN II programmes, some of which are likely to focus on social, and others on economic or environmental priorities. It is important to acknowledge that there may not be a 'one size fits all' regarding the success criteria.

3.2 Objectives of the evaluation

To understand the extent to which URBAN II contributed to achieving its objectives, this evaluation will focus on the 70 URBAN II programmes financed in the period 2000-2006 in 14 EU Member States\(^1\) and the URBACT programme for networking and exchange of experience and good practice.

The Terms of Reference provided by DG REGIO for this assignment distinguish two principal and related objectives:

• To analyse "the impacts of URBAN II\(^2\) on economic and social cohesion. This includes an assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness, "community added value" and management of the programmes";
• To identify "lessons for current and future programmes, including in the new Member States"\(^3\).

This distinction highlights the dual role of this evaluation in providing;

• An accountability function - the study must firstly address the classic evaluation questions that relate to effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and "Community added value". Providing answers to these key questions will verify whether the considerable sums of public money invested have been "well spent";
• A learning function - at the same time, and drawing on the same research activities, the evaluation must also look to the future, identifying and highlighting elements of the programmes which worked well, and which could serve as examples for current and

---

\(^1\) See section 3.3
\(^2\) Including the URBACT programme
\(^3\) ToR, p.5
future cohesion programmes, as well as aspects which did not work well, and which should be avoided in future in other urban policy interventions. The importance as stressed in the Terms of Reference and at the kick off meeting of this emphasis has been reflected in our proposed methodology.

The latter objective of the evaluation is particularly important, given that interim findings and the final conclusions and recommendations will be used during the forthcoming policy review of the EU budget from 2009 onwards and for the discussion of a future programming period of Cohesion Policy.

The fact that the URBAN Community Initiative has not been continued in the current programming period means that lessons learned from the 2000-2006 period cannot be applied in future in a directly comparable context. In contrast, the URBACT programme has been continued in the current funding period, so learning points can be interpreted and applied more directly.

Nevertheless, in our view, and in line with the Terms of Reference, there are two main areas where lessons from URBAN II will be particularly useful and where specific emphasis must be placed in the evaluation:

- Lessons specific to the urban or urban regeneration context. Although URBAN no longer exists as a separate programme, the core principals which underpinned it (including the integrated approach, local partnership working and learning) remain equally relevant today and are clearly recognisable in the principles agreed at Leipzig in 2007 and the wider "sustainable communities" agenda. Moreover, it remains generally accepted that urban areas require specific approaches and attention within wider development strategies. It will therefore be important to identify lessons from the URBAN II experience relevant to the urban dimension of mainstream cohesion programmes and national or urban regeneration and development programmes;
- Lessons relevant to a wider range of cohesion policy activities. Certain aspects of the URBAN approach, including local partnership working and capacity development, are potentially of wider relevance to cohesion / regional development policy in general (i.e. of relevance to programmes which do not necessarily have an urban focus). Attention will also be placed on identifying and highlighting these general lessons.

### 3.3 Overview of methodology

The methodology for this evaluation has been developed in order to understand the extent to which URBAN II has met its objectives and respond to the key research questions from the Terms of Reference. In the following sections, we present how our method will answer
the evaluation questions, with a particular focus on Task 1 (see section 4). At this point, however, it is useful to set out an outline of the different tasks involved. We do this with the help of a diagram which seeks to establish a 'road map' for the evaluation.

Figure 3.1 Evaluation road map (enhanced for Task 1)
4.0 Task 1 – Review of URBAN II Programme

4.1 Introduction

Task 1 will focus on the 70 URBAN II programmes in the 14 Member States.

4.2 Aims

The emphasis of this task will be on answering the seven questions outlined in the Terms of Reference\(^5\). We have presented each of these seven questions relating to Task 1 in Table 4.1. In each case we have sought to expand on the questions and the specific issues they are intended to address, the methodological issues in addressing the questions and a cross-reference to the relevant elements of the methodology that will be deployed. Where we have already set out in some length – as with the discussion of the counterfactual analysis in Section 3 – the key methodological points, we have signposted to the relevant sections in the text. The analysis relating to Task 1 will be enhanced with the findings of the Task 3 case study work. At this stage, we have not elaborated that work – and the relevant Terms of Reference questions - to the same level of detail. That will follow in the Interim Report.

\(^5\) Page 7 Terms of Reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ToR Question</th>
<th>Questions behind the question</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Methodology used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | A brief description of the method by which areas were chosen in each country. | In most Member States there was a strong interest in URBAN II necessitating a selection process and resulting in a set of successful and non-successful 'bids' for URBAN II programmes. Different methodologies were used in different Member States. For the evaluation the two key considerations will be:  
  - That an 'urban policy logic' has been applied in selecting areas. This may manifest itself in different ways, which can be equally valid. For example, were the programme areas selected because they had particularly bad urban conditions in a given Member State or because they had the best opportunities for positive change? Are the areas selected because intervention at this stage could ward off decline? Do different programmes in specific Member States represent different types of "urban problem" and were they chosen to be broadly representative? We would expect different answers and country patterns (see also Question 7), but would expect to see evidence of a rational selection based on an evidence base and urban strategies (clarity of objectives for tackling urban problems in the selected areas)  
  - The balance between 'top down' and 'bottom up' approaches and in particular the involvement of cities in the process. Whilst national and regional governments will have been involved in the selection process, the role of cities (and by extension the role of local partnerships – see also question 6), their ability to make their case, and be selected on a rational basis is a key question (were cities aware of the criteria for selection?). | The selection process is largely a factual issue and should be relatively easy to discern. The actual choice of cities will be based on judgements on the relative merits of their selection case and will be harder to discern but the application of a rational process is the key issue here.  
We are able to review and comment on 'failed' bids, although the research programme does not include interviews with those cities. Specific factors to be considered include:  
  - Number of bids received and number approved (as a measure of 'competition')  
  - Key socio-economic indicators for selected cities compared to national averages and other cities (at the time of selection) – were the chosen cities those with the most significant problems?  
  - Conversely, if they were selected on the basis of opportunity for positive change, did they live up to the promise?  
  - Correlation of programme areas with other EU programmes (e.g. was there a policy to align with Structural Funds areas?) | This will be addressed in Task 1.2 through the review of programme documentation and also in Task 1.4 and specifically the telephone interviews with national and regional authorities.  
*Key tool for collating evidence: Country Review template* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>ToR Question</th>
<th>Questions behind the question</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Methodology used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2  | What were the main challenges facing URBAN II areas at the start of the programmes? What have been the key features of the strategies deployed under URBAN II? The contractors should develop a simple typology of programmes on the basis of challenges and strategy, for use in selecting case studies (Task 3) | The "challenges" facing URBAN II areas can be broadly categorised as:  
- The baseline conditions they are seeking to address, which are likely to include a mix of physical, economic and social problems;  
- The 'capacity' to address those problems, notwithstanding URBAN II resources, will be affected by the experience of public and other agencies in tackling the problems (and progress pre-URBAN), the extent of partnership working (addressed in Question 6), the availability of match funding and other financial resources, and the differing regeneration cultures in different countries (which can result in different priorities).  
We expect a variety of strategies to address the challenges at programme level, although the extent to which all of the strategies are internally robust (evidence based, with a clear vision and objectives, clarity of targets and delivery) is part of the assessment.  
In terms of measuring effective approaches, the extent to which strategies have focused on specific themes (possibly as part of a wider urban strategy for the area) needs to be explored as does the spatial coverage of the programme area. The literature (see also Question 3) generally points to a link between concentration of resources and effectiveness and we will comment on this as part of Task 1 and 3. | We will have the programme documentation on strategies and the key challenges and we will also have the views of key stakeholders including the programme managers, plus the local information they hold. The availability of comparable baseline data for programme areas is a clear issue when it comes to actually measuring the extent of (some of) the challenges faced. The criteria by which areas have been selected (set out in section 3.1) provides a basis for mapping the changes by using indicators (e.g. unemployment, education levels) at the time of selection provides an indication of the challenges faced by areas. The capacity and partnership challenges are discussed below in Question 6.  
We have proposed an approach for developing the typology of URBAN II areas set out in Table 4.2 and Figure 4.1 based on data and qualitative assessment. | This will be addressed in Task 1.2 through the review of programme documentation and also in Task 1.4, specifically the telephone interviews with programme managers.  
*Key tool for collating evidence: Socio-economic context template* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ToR Question</th>
<th>Questions behind the question</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Methodology used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>How do the programme’s perception of the challenges and the strategies deployed fit within the literature on urban regeneration and urban neighbourhoods in crisis?</em></td>
<td>The selection of the Programme areas will have been based on the objectives and principles of URBAN II (see section 3.1), which in turn reflect views on urban areas and strategies addressed to urban areas that are drawn from academic literature, previous Commission policies (including the Structural Funds, URBAN (I) and Urban Pilot Projects), Member State policies and the work of trans-national organisations such as <em>Quartiers en Crise</em>. The challenges therefore should not come as a surprise, although individual programmes will have focused on specific urban policy themes. The key question here is the extent to which the programme strategies, plans and delivery, reflect knowledge and good practice on urban challenges and strategies. Have they learnt from and applied this knowledge, or in some cases used URBAN II to develop new approaches which could add value in terms of wider lessons and good practice? We will link this to Task 2 to comment on the utility of networks and exchange of experience, with respect to the assessment of URBACT.</td>
<td>The extent to which programmes reflect and build on established good practice and knowledge is a value judgement, but one based on the evidence of the strategy/programme documentation and the interviews with key stakeholders, including the programme managers. The topic guide (Task 1.4) covers the information required (key challenges, the relevance of the strategies deployed).</td>
<td>This will be addressed in Task 1.2 through the review of programme documentation and also in Task 1.4 specifically the telephone interviews with programme managers. We will seek the inputs of Prof. Michael Parkinson on the key literature references we should use to address this question. <em>Key tool for collating evidence: Programme Review template</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ToR Question</td>
<td>Questions behind the question</td>
<td>Methodological issues</td>
<td>Methodology used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>What concretely have been the results and impacts of URBAN II programmes?</strong> The contractors should attempt to compare results and impacts with the initial baseline: what has changed from before the programmes? How do changes compare to general trends in similar non-URBAN areas across the EU?</td>
<td>This question has been given the greatest priority in the Terms of Reference and has prompted the counterfactual analysis approach that is detailed in Section 3 and the proposal to use a comparison group methodology to compare the results of the URBAN II programme areas with similar areas that have not had URBAN II funding. What is a realistic expectation for improvement in such an area, especially bearing in mind the enduring nature of some of the problems they face?</td>
<td>In the text in Section 3, we have highlighted the methodological issues and the potential constraints, in terms of securing an appropriate comparison group and in terms of data availability, which has influenced our choice of indicators. Nevertheless, this evaluation offers an opportunity to develop the counterfactual methodology with the expectation of some interesting results. The focus on the counterfactual was a key consideration in the selection of an expert in the field, Prof. Alberto Martini, to the expert panel for the evaluation. In respect of the URBAN II programmes we will have the evidence from the programme documentation and the data that allows us to quantify the outputs and results of the programmes and to provide a commentary on the impact that can be further elaborated in the Task 3 case studies.</td>
<td>The methodological approach is detailed in section 3 and includes the document collection and review and the analysis that follows to produce the programme and country review templates and undertake the counterfactual analysis. <strong>Key tools for collating evidence: Programme Review template and Socio-economic context template</strong> The intervention logic (inputs-outputs-results impacts) is an important part of the assessment process. The Programme Review Fiche (part A) provides a basis for this; to be elaborated in Task 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>ToR Question</td>
<td>Questions behind the question</td>
<td>Methodological issues</td>
<td>Methodology used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have some elements of URBAN II been more successful than others? For example, have the programmes been more successful in social than in economic terms? Or have physical regeneration measures been more successful than socio-economic interventions? What about the degree to which physical regeneration measures have (directly or indirectly) incorporated environmental actions? Should the balance between instruments have been different?</td>
<td>For informing future policies and providing learning lessons to cities and urban policy makers, this is a key question. In defining programme elements, we can broadly categorise by physical, socio-economic and environmental components, but we can also look more specifically at the different aspects of these – for example, interventions to develop the business base or to promote cultural activity. From the literature we will have a base from which to assess urban strategies that are more likely to result in successful outcomes. However, we are also interested in seeing how ‘success’ has been defined and view by the programmes and their partners and the extent to which there are common expectations and/or differences at member state level (see also question 7). We will know from the assessment of outputs, results and (to a more limited extent) impacts the extent to which programmes have been successful in economic and social terms and we can add to this through the qualitative evidence gained from telephone interviews.</td>
<td>We will need here to consider local factors and not just absolute achievements. The reasons why a specific intervention might have been more or less successful can be strongly influenced by several factors including funding, the commitment of partners and prevailing economic and market conditions. We need to take these into account and the reasons why some elements have been less successful is as important as those that have demonstrated positive results. The specific programme objectives provide the basis for defining success but progress against key socio-economic indicators such as unemployment rates provides a context against which assessments can be made. We can make a judgement on the balance of instruments based on the evidence we collect. This is also a question we can explore more thoroughly in the Task 3 case studies.</td>
<td>The programme documentation will be the starting point with the information collected on outputs, results and impacts of the programme but the telephone interviews in Task 1.4 will provide information to inform our assessment and judgements. <em>Key tool for collating evidence: Programme Review template</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>ToR Question</td>
<td>Questions behind the question</td>
<td>Methodological issues</td>
<td>Methodology used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6  | **What can be said about the degree of local partnership?**                   | The core issue is the added value that partnership working has brought to URBAN and whether particular forms of partnership (extent and mode) have been more effective. We understand that some urban programmes have been quite innovative in their approach to partnership. Partnership working is generally seen as vital to the development of effective local policies if it can be demonstrated that as a result of partnership working:  
  - Additional resources (including capacity, skills and ability to reach certain communities) can be levered in. The extent to which partners have been actively involved (design and implementation) rather than passively (attending meetings) is a key question  
  - Programme activity is integral to local strategies and other programmes (including linked policy areas)  
  - The views of local communities (residents, businesses, environmental groups etc.) have been taken into account and integrated into the development of the programme  
  The evaluation needs to probe for  
  - Different types of partnership model (who has been involved, who leads, how does the partnership work and how frequently does it meet, is it formal and informal)  
  - The influence of the partnership on the development of the URBAN programme (concrete examples)  
  - The sustainability of the partnership after URBAN (has it continued and in what form)  
  - The role of the Commission in influencing and participating in partnership working. | Participants in partnerships can ‘talk up or down’ the value of partnership working depending on whether their particular aims were met or not and whilst opinions are valid and will be canvassed the qualitative dimension needs to be measured against quantitative evidence of (as far as information is available):  
  - Numbers of and categories of participants (e.g. local community representatives, heritage interest groups etc.)  
  - Status of partnership  
  - Frequency of meetings  
  - % of budget invested in partnership working  
  A partnership can meet frequently and spend a high level of resources on partnership working without being especially effective, but the use of factual measures alongside qualitative evidence drawn from interviews and the programme documentation will help to build up a picture of what forms of partnership have worked best, acknowledging that there is no standard model that is appropriate in all cases. | Task 1 will allow for a review of partnership working across all 70 programmes drawn from:  
  - Programme documentation  
  - Interviews with programme managers  
  - Quantitative evidence of partnership activity (as above)  
  The collective evidence from Task 1 will inform a simple typology of partnerships that will be used to select case studies for Task 3. The more in-depth assessment work in Task 3 will allow for a thorough appraisal of partnership working.  
  **Key tool for collating evidence:** Programme Review template |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ToR Question</th>
<th>Questions behind the question</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Methodology used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>For the questions above, are there systematic variations by Member State or by Structural Funds Objective (1, 2 or outside the mainstream Objectives)? To what extent does URBAN II add value vis-à-vis national and sub-national policies for urban regeneration? Has URBAN II impacted public policies in this field?</td>
<td>The extent to which there are patterns that can be determined by a review of the 70 programmes is an interesting question and can be used to inform future policies. The wider added value and impact of URBAN II is concerned with its contribution to policy thinking and development beyond the targets of the 70 programmes. We need to consider the extent to which URBAN has stimulated, directly or indirectly national urban policies and structures (e.g. Urbana and Urban Italia).</td>
<td>The extent to which there are systematic variations can be ascertained in part from our review of all 70 programmes. If specific patterns emerge (e.g. more evidence of impact in Objective 1 areas) we will probe further and can pick up with discussions with key stakeholders. We need to be aware of the background to programmes (e.g. access to more resources in Objective 1 areas – following the above scenario.) To measure the wider added value and impact of URBAN II we will look for specific examples of the influence URBAN II has had on policy development and evidence of wider programme recognition (e.g. citing of programmes in national policy documents and good practice guidance, regeneration awards etc.). The discussions with national and regional stakeholders will be the starting point but we may need to verify examples given through additional probing.</td>
<td>This will emerge from the collective evidence from Task 1 but specifically the data and documentation review (Task 1.2) the telephone interviews (Task 1.4) and the Programme and Country review templates (Task 1.4). <em>Key tool for collating evidence: Country Review Template</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Evaluation tools

In Task 1 we use three evaluation tools which are discussed below:

- Tool 1 – Socio-Economic Context Fiche (see section 4.3.1 and Figure 4.2);
- Tool 2 – Programme Review Template (see section 4.3.2 and Figures 4.3 and 4.4);
- Tool 3 - Country Review Template (see section 4.3.3 and Figure 4.5)

In this section, we provide some more background on these tools and how they will be deployed.

4.3.1 Tool 1 – Socio-Economic Context Fiche

**Concept**

In the proposal and during the inception stage, we stated that we view the quantitative counterfactual analysis of URBAN II areas as a tool to help assess the impact of the 70 programmes. It represents an interesting and an innovative opportunity to test the theory and practice of the counterfactual in a high-level European policy evaluation.

This type of analysis is seen to complement the other elements of the evaluation methodology in addressing the questions of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The analysis will be fully integrated with the other parts of the evaluation, as depicted in the evaluation road map above. It will be an important tool for assessing impact by exploiting the observed differences between the programme areas and a set of non-programme areas (which we call the "comparison group") at a pre-programme and a later stage. This is elaborated below.

Implementing the quantitative counterfactual analysis in the context of the URBAN II programme will not be free from hurdles and risks. Most problematic is the ex post identification of a comparison group and the absence of a common and consistent data set which includes both URBAN II programme areas and reference areas. It should be stated here that for this the development of an ex ante monitoring system at EU level would ideally be required. Therefore, in light of the above constraints and warnings, the exploratory nature of this analysis needs to be clear at this stage. This point has also been emphasised by one of our experts, who has specialist knowledge of using counterfactuals to assess programme impacts. While we see clear value in the counterfactual approach, it will require a pragmatic approach and will need to be delivered in an open and exploratory way, which may or may not deliver fully what we – consultants and client - are looking for.
The Approach
The Socio-Economic Context Fiche (see Figure 4.2) will establish comparative socio-economic data for the URBAN II areas, the city in which they are located, the region (particularly relevant in larger countries where significant regional differences exist, such as Germany and Italy) and the country, to inform the assessment of impact and to provide context. We will assemble relevant data for these areas and for the appropriate comparison group (see below). This data will help isolate the impact delivered by URBAN II interventions, by comparing trends with areas that have not received such interventions.

The key indicators we will use are actual population, unemployment rate and long term unemployment as a percentage of total unemployment – indicators for which the consistency of data supply from the programme documents and from the Urban Audit, Eurostat and complementary national sources is reasonable, although not perfect. We are aware of potential methodological pitfalls around data comparability for unemployment and will highlight any issues that arise as caveats to our findings.

We appreciate that the three above indicators do not alone, encapsulate the URBAN II programmes and to this end we have considered a range of additional or alternative indicators such as demographic data (age splits) and the composition of the business base, but our final choice is based on data availability at city and sub-city level as too many gaps in the data sets will impact negatively on the counterfactual analysis. We also believe that the selected indicators are good measures of the health and vibrancy of urban areas with the healthier and more vibrant areas having lower levels of unemployment and (entrenched) long-term unemployment, and stable or rising populations.

We will add other indicators which are country specific, such as a deprivation index for the UK and the RMI in France. We know that some countries (e.g. UK) have worked on measuring 'sustainable urban areas' but the extent of 'useable' indicators that can add value to our evaluation is not known at this stage (it is an issue to explore with national authorities in Task 1). For the selection of these country-specific indicators, we will focus on availability across programmes. Finally, we fully acknowledge the importance of indicators which are relevant to the objectives of each individual programme – which may be social, economic or environmental. However, at this stage, a choice of indicators at the level of individual programmes will not allow for any comparison between programmes or a comparison group, and should therefore be further elaborated in the case study work (Task 3).
We propose to use a difference-in-difference and matching approach (see Figure 4.1), whereby we match URBAN areas with non-URBAN areas and compare differences in development over time between those types of areas. Thereto, we will compare the average values for those areas having received URBAN II support and those which have not received. We will do so at a base point (year 2000 in principle) and then identify differences that develop over time (until 2006 in principle). As a starting point, we will take the average value for unemployment, and complement these with other key indicators as appropriate. For example, if unemployment averaged at 10% across the programme areas in Country X in the base year 2000, we would select a comparison group where the average was also 10% and then compare again at a later date (2006).

Figure 4.1 Definitions regarding Difference-in-Difference methods ¹

**Propensity Score Matching**

Propensity score matching is a tool for identifying a suitable comparison group to compare to the recipients of the project (the treatment group). Essentially, propensity score matching finds a comparison group comprising individuals who did not in fact receive the project, but who, given their observable characteristics, had the same probability of receiving the project as individuals in the treatment group. The project’s impact is then the difference in outcomes between the treatment and comparison group.

**Difference-in-Difference (more elaborated Propensity Score matching method)**

The difference in a given outcome between recipients of the project (the treatment group) and a comparison or control group is computed before the project is implemented. This difference is called the “first difference”. The difference in outcomes between treatment and control groups is again computed some time after the project is implemented, and this is called the “second difference”. Under the difference-in-difference technique, the impact of the project is the second difference less the first difference. The logic is that the impact of the project is the difference in outcomes for treatment and control groups after the project is implemented, net of any pre-existing differences in outcomes between treatment and control groups that pre-date the project.

**Implications for this project**

We will aim to minimize the “first difference” – possibly to zero – as we strive to optimize similarities between observable characteristics of the two groups. This is particularly important in the subject area of urban development, where it is known that segregation trends in the period covered tend to strengthen dissimilarities within city areas in the period covered. Hence, the expected dynamics of unemployment over time are different between an area where unemployment starts with 10% compared to an area where unemployment starts with 5%.

¹ Based on work by the World Bank on Impact Evaluation Methods see http://web.worldbank.org/website/external/countries/africaext/extimpeva/0
If the URBAN II areas have overall performed better between 2000 and 2006 than the comparison group, it will be possible to draw some conclusions and raise some questions. These conclusions can also be tested in discussions, especially in the more in-depth case study work in Task 3. During the course of this exercise, we will seek to identify additional appropriate indicators that are likely to be country specific which we would propose to use where there is good quality data. This additional data gathering would be best focused on those countries with the highest number of URBAN II programmes.

The Comparison Group
Our preferred approach is to establish comparison groups using areas within the cities for which URBAN II was approved, and, where this is not possible, to use neighbouring cities. The knowledge we gain from the review of the 70 URBAN II programmes and the policy context at urban area and national level, which will be picked up as part of that review, will help us to check whether or not specific comparison areas are appropriate, especially in terms of receipt of alternative European or national funding (effectively mirroring URBAN II). This will require an informed judgement from the consultants.

Our approach is thus that after data for programme areas, cities, regions and the country as a whole have been compiled in Tool 1, a comparison group of cities and sub city districts (an equal number of districts as programmes for that of the country) will be selected. The sub city districts will be selected using the following criteria:

- No URBAN or URBAN II funding has been provided;
- Proximity to URBAN II programmes (thereby reducing contextual variation);
- Limited interaction with national urban support programmes; this is particularly challenging in countries where areas similar to URBAN II programme areas were compensated with national funding; this applies in particular to countries such as Italy and Spain national programmes such as Urbana and Urban Italia have been implemented1;
- Data on key indicators are available for at least two years from the Urban Audit database or comparable national databases.

In addition, the comparison group of sub city districts as a whole will need to have comparable socio-economic characteristics compared to the programme areas at the baseline point.

1 This issue will be explicitly addressed as part of Task 1.5, where telephone interviews with national Member State representatives will be held. In case these programmes are used as 'compensation', we will need to look into additionality issues; in case these national programmes follow URBAN I interventions they can be regarded as a wider impact of such programmes.
The data for the chosen comparison group will then be gathered and added to the programme and city level data in one spreadsheet per country (Tool 1 – the Completed Socio-economic context fiches). We will carry out a data filtering check on robustness and reliability of data, to prevent any major anomalies from distorting the outcome – which may lead to the need to leave out a number of sub city districts out of the computations. By reviewing information from different sources, including programme documentation, other reports providing local context and the interviews, we will cross check for consistency and probe further where obvious inconsistencies emerge. Corrections for time series will need to take place as well, if the period covered in the comparison group does not coincide with that from the programme areas. For this, we will compute all evolutions on an annual basis.

Subsequently, the assessment of the performance of the programme areas vis-à-vis the comparison group will take place per country and over time. Furthermore, the annual trends for each programme area will be compared with the annual trend in the cities, the country as a whole and the comparison group for that country.

Finally, at the inception meeting the idea of 'blind testing' was mentioned, whereby the expert panel, or a single member of the panel, might compare data from URBAN II and other areas, without knowing which is which, and attempt to rate relative progress and correlate against urban spend. We will explore this further during Task 1 and will attempt a 'blind testing' exercise. An interpretation of the results will then take place. We will focus on the key conclusions, issues and questions arising from this analysis – and draw conclusions both on methodological and on content issues.

Both sample sizes and data reliability will be issues in undertaking this work (hence the pilot nature of the exercise, but also the intention to test the application of the counterfactual analysis for subsequent applications in other evaluations). It is important to underline at this stage that the above approach requires a minimum sample size, in order to produce outcomes that are of any significance. Therefore, as far as possible comparisons will be conducted at the EU level. We will, where necessary, focus at the national level the analysis on those countries where a significant number of programmes exist, namely Germany (12 programmes), UK (11), Spain (10), Italy (10) and France (9).

Further Developing the Counterfactual through the Case Studies
The case studies allow us to put the results from the counterfactual analysis into context and to test the findings (for example through discussions with national authorities) for a selected number of programmes. Whereas in Task 1, we are concerned with data drawn...
from 70 programmes and comparators, the case studies provide an opportunity to probe further at a quantitative and qualitative level, both for the Programme area and comparator areas. In particular, in Task 3 we will be able to probe further into what might have happened in absence of URBAN II funding, through a review of documentation, a review of a wider range of indicators (such as environmental - e.g. derelict land, or demographic indicators - e.g. age profiles) than is possible in Task 1, and an assessment of alternative plans and funding strategies that would have been pursued in the absence of URBAN II. We will develop our questions during Task 1 and as part of the interim report, but our early thoughts include the following:

- Did URBAN II prompt the programme or was it already in an advanced stage (effectively looking for funding)? We would assume that, in most cases, there was a high degree of pre-programme strategy development and planning, if only because the experience of urban programmes is that the gestation period is often lengthy;
- Would the programme have taken place without URBAN II? (this is a key additionality question and one that can be partly addressed qualitatively through interviews and also by reference to a group of ‘failed’ submissions);
- Did URBAN II shape and influence the programme (if ideas were already formulated) and did this influence the spatial or thematic focus?;
- What has been achieved (specific outcomes) that has seen the programme area improve relative to other areas? (but also checking that this is not at the expense of neighbouring areas, which is sometimes the case with area-based regeneration programmes);
- Has URBAN II (the resources and the programme) led to outcomes that were not originally envisaged? (the presumption is that this would be the case, but we have examples of programmes that have ‘followed the funding’, arguably to the detriment of the locality and its communities).

An example of the layout of Tool 1 is illustrated in Figure 4.2 below.
### Figure 4.2 Tool 1 Socio-economic Context Fiche

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme area 1</th>
<th>Period Start Year</th>
<th>Period End Year</th>
<th>URBAN area Start</th>
<th>URBAN area End</th>
<th>URBAN area Change</th>
<th>City Start</th>
<th>City End</th>
<th>City Change</th>
<th>Region Start</th>
<th>Region End</th>
<th>Region Change</th>
<th>Country Start</th>
<th>Country End</th>
<th>Country Change</th>
<th>Comparison Group Start</th>
<th>Comparison Group End</th>
<th>Comparison Group Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment as % of total Unemployment</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator X</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Y</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Z</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme area 2</th>
<th>Period Start Year</th>
<th>Period End Year</th>
<th>URBAN area Start</th>
<th>URBAN area End</th>
<th>URBAN area Change</th>
<th>City Start</th>
<th>City End</th>
<th>City Change</th>
<th>Region Start</th>
<th>Region End</th>
<th>Region Change</th>
<th>Country Start</th>
<th>Country End</th>
<th>Country Change</th>
<th>Comparison Group Start</th>
<th>Comparison Group End</th>
<th>Comparison Group Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme area 3</th>
<th>Period Start Year</th>
<th>Period End Year</th>
<th>URBAN area Start</th>
<th>URBAN area End</th>
<th>URBAN area Change</th>
<th>City Start</th>
<th>City End</th>
<th>City Change</th>
<th>Region Start</th>
<th>Region End</th>
<th>Region Change</th>
<th>Country Start</th>
<th>Country End</th>
<th>Country Change</th>
<th>Comparison Group Start</th>
<th>Comparison Group End</th>
<th>Comparison Group Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment level</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Support</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator X</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Y</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Z</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Programme areas</th>
<th>Period Start Year</th>
<th>Period End Year</th>
<th>URBAN area Start</th>
<th>URBAN area End</th>
<th>URBAN area Change</th>
<th>City Start</th>
<th>City End</th>
<th>City Change</th>
<th>Region Start</th>
<th>Region End</th>
<th>Region Change</th>
<th>Country Start</th>
<th>Country End</th>
<th>Country Change</th>
<th>Comparison Group Start</th>
<th>Comparison Group End</th>
<th>Comparison Group Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment level</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Support</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator X</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Y</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Z</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Most appropriate reference is the borough, not the city
(2) The borough is used as a proxy for the URBAN area
(3) From the OECD stats
(4) Based on 2001 Census
(5) Based on wards not URBAN area
(6) Not clear whether figure refers to Ward or URBAN area
(7) Inner North Belfast
(8) Estimates for UK population is from the UK national Statistics office

= required field
4.3.2 Tool 2 – Programme Review Template

The second tool to be deployed in Task 1 is the Programme Review Template, and aims to capture all information which is specific to the programmes. This tool is to be seen as a living and evolving document, which will be gradually completed throughout Task 1. Firstly, it is important to capture the key information from the programme- specific document – and focus on the descriptive elements. Initial feedback from the core team will provide direction for the telephone interviews at programme-level – and the Review Fiche. The Completed Programme Review fiche will then inform the reporting and typology stage, and also assist in the interpretation of country-specific findings as well as those arising from the counterfactual analysis. The Programme Review Template has two parts:

- **Part A**, the Programme Overview Table and;

**Part A** (the Project Overview Table - a presentation tool that will provide an overview and assist comparisons between countries. The template Programme Overview Table (presented in Figure 4.2 overleaf) includes the key factual and quantitative aspects of each URBAN II programme, with an emphasis on objectives, themes, and input and outcome indicators.

We will also include an overview of outputs as this is a useful barometer of programme activity (what the money was spent on, especially when viewed in the aggregate), acknowledging that this is not a proxy for results and impacts. It does though provide useful headline figures. However, from our reading of the programme documentation we need to be cautious at this stage as there is not a consistency of reporting on outputs (regularly being mixed with result indicators) and some outputs are very specific to particular programmes which hampers aggregation. The annual reports of the individual programmes will be reviewed to pick out output indicators. It may be necessary and desirable to focus on aggregating core indicators once we have reviewed all of the outputs recorded by the Programmes.

Here it should be noted that in some programmes, objectives and targets have been adjusted along the way – especially after the midterm evaluation. Within the context of the evaluation, it is important to know why such changes have been made. It could be because the socio-economic context has evolved, but it could also be because the initial target levels were seen as too high. The information collected in the Programme Overview Table will provide a useful basis for further research and analysis in Task 3.
**Part B** comprises a set of Document Review Questions for the country correspondents, which provides a structure for recording the findings from the review of programme-related documents. It will also provide space for capturing assessments, derived from telephone interviews.
Figure 4.3 Tool 2 Programme Overview Table - Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AXIS</td>
<td>Theme code 1)</td>
<td>No. Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>EUR 0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Fund/Urban population</td>
<td>EUR 0</td>
<td>EUR 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME CODES</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Physical and environmental regeneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and communication technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B comprises a set of questions for the country correspondents which provide a structure for recording the findings from the review of programme-related documents. These answers should be based on the Socio-economic fiche and the Programme Review Template (part A). This tool seeks to obtain assessments from the evaluator.

**A. Relevance of Area**

1. What was the baseline socio economic context in the URBAN area at the start of the programme? - This will include a brief description of headline statistics. Source: Community Initiative Programme and Programme Complement

2. Based on (1) what were the main challenges facing the URBAN II area at the start of the programme?

3. Based on (1) and (2), how relevant was the choice of this particular URBAN II programme area?

**B. Relevance of Inputs and Objectives**

4. What has been the balance in terms of thematic priorities deployed under URBAN II in terms of inputs of resources? (compare with the thematic codes P, E, S, T, ICT and TA)

5. Based on (4), have the strategies deployed under URBAN II been relevant to the challenges in the programme area?

**C. Effectiveness (and Utility)**

**C.1 - Overall programme effectiveness (outputs, results and impacts)**

6. Based on information of the Programme Review Template (part A), what have been the outputs, results, specific and wider impacts of the URBAN II programmes?

7. Based on the Programme Review Template (part A), how do targets and actual values compare to each other both at the level of results and of impacts?

8. Based on the Programme Review Template (part A), how do these results and impacts relate to the objectives initially set?

**C.2 - Contextual socio-economic situation and utility**

9. How has the situation in the programme areas changed in comparison to the initial baseline (contained in the programming documentation)?

10. How do the changes observable compare with general trends in similar non-URBAN areas?

**C.3 - Success factors**

11. Overall, which factors have determined whether projects and programmes been successful in terms of outputs, results and impacts? (Country/Community Initiative Level)
D. Efficiency

12. Based on the Programme Review Template (part A), how do inputs (funds) relate to outcomes (outputs, results and impacts)? Answer at the level of priority or preferably by measure.

13. What has been the degree of leverage between ERDF and other funding? Answer at the level of priority or preferably by measure.

E. Partnership and Management

E.1 - Partnership and coordination issues

15a. Which are the main partners in the implementation of the programme? (more than one answer possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Local governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Public agencies (including semi-public and development agencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Higher tier governments (regional and national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Private partners (including business associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Social sector or environmental NGO's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15b. Who leads the partnership? Detail in terms of partnership arrangement where appropriate.

16. To what extent have the above partners been involved in the design and preparation of the URBAN II programme.

E.2 - Networking and links to other programmes

17. Was the URBAN II area covered by Objective 1, Objective 2 or a designated national urban development programme? Please comment.

18. Where an URBAN II area has been covered by Objective 1, 2 or any designated national urban development programme (outside of Objective 1 and 2), what has been the link between URBAN and the strategy pursued in the mainstream?

4.3.3 Tool 3 - Country Review Template

This final tool provides a structure for recording findings from country-specific information throughout Task 1. The Country Review Template should be seen as a living and evolving document that will be gradually filled in throughout Task 1 – and more so in the latter activities following feedback from the core team. The main purpose of the Country Review
Template is to provide a country-specific reporting basis, which will allow for direction for the telephone interviews at Member State level, possibly accompanied by coverage of additional national documents. The completed Country Review fiche will also inform the typology stage, and assist in the interpretation of programme-specific findings, as well as those arising from the counterfactual analysis.

Figure 4.5 Country Review Template (indicative – to be refined in the guideline document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Selection process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How relevant was the choice of the URBAN II areas in each country? What were the key criteria for selection and how do they relate to the key features as mentioned below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How appropriate was the method that was used for making these choices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Characteristics of chosen areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The relevance of the URBAN II Strategy(ies) deployed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall performance of the URBAN II programme(s);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key socio-economic challenges for the programme areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key socio-economic challenges for the comparison group selected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Success factors (to be supported in the guideline document for country experts but also building on the points raised for questions 4 and 5 in Table 4.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general / country specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence of socio economic context (national / regional) / country specific socio-economic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- influence of other regional, national (even local) complementing programmes / funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any systematic variation in effectiveness between programmes in Objective 1 areas, Objective 2 areas or areas covered by neither Objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, which factors have determined whether projects and programmes have been successful in terms of outputs, results and impacts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to define success at the level of countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Type of measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have some types of URBAN intervention (e.g. social, economic, and physical) been more successful than others and what factors explain this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How successful has the integrated approach been (combining economic measures, social inclusion and physical and environmental regeneration)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent has there been a genuine synergy between measures and what are the factors underlying success in this area?

What are the factors determining the success or failure of the different types of URBAN intervention?

D. Management

How well have the programmes been managed in terms such as project selection, project support, monitoring, evaluation, communication (including publicity)?

What have been the main factors underlying the success (or otherwise) of programme and project management?

- Success of different instruments within programmes and the factors behind this;
- Partnership
- Success or otherwise of (different) partnership arrangements;

What have been the sources and degree of co-financing

E. Policy links / impact beyond

- Complementarity and Community Added Value - Links with other programmes and policies;

To what extent does URBAN II add value in relation to national and sub-national public policies for urban regeneration?

Has URBAN II had an impact on national and / or sub-national policies for urban regeneration?

To what extent are the impacts of URBAN II likely to prove sustainable beyond the end of the period? What are the main factors driving this?

F. Selection of Case Studies

- Identification of possible case study areas.

What are examples of successful projects and why have projects and programmes been successful or unsuccessful in terms of outputs, results and impacts?

Finally, the three tools presented above will be piloted by country experts, after which more detailed guidelines will be prepared to facilitate effective implementation of the tools thereafter (see below).
4.4 Specific Tasks

4.4.1 Pilot stage

Our first activity in Task 1 will be to undertake a rapid piloting exercise to understand the extent to which our method and tools for this stage require adjustment. For this purpose we will carry out a pilot exercise over a two week period, for two to three programme areas in each of the following countries: Germany, France, Spain and the United Kingdom. The lead researchers for the pilots are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Javier Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Dafne Reymen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Nick McAteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Ian Atkinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Task 1.1 Internal team briefing and guideline

In order to ensure all country correspondents involved in Task 1 have the same understanding of the purpose of tasks involved, we will prepare a separate stand alone guideline document that will be presented to the Commission for review before being deployed (see Figure 4.6 for suggested contents). We will hold a series of team briefings through which core team members will explain in detail the objectives of the evaluation and the methodology for implementing Task 1 to the country correspondents. Briefings will take place either face to face or through telephone or video conference, as appropriate, and will be led by the project manager, principal evaluator and members of the core team, as appropriate.
The main objective is to explain to national experts that tools should be used throughout the evaluation and that they should be treated as ‘living and evolving’ documents.

1. The Inception Report

The country experts need to be familiar both with the content of the Inception Report and the emphasis on specific points raised by the Commission. Table 4.2 will be central to this and will be highlighted and explained in the guideline document.

2. Guideline for Evaluation tools

2.1. Tool 1: Socio-economic fiche.

Issues regarding the use of the right indicators and data will be addressed such as the use of relevant country-specific indicators and sources as well as problems related to areas and period of time covered by the indicators. It will also give some clarification as concerns the computing of the control group and its use.

2.2. Tools 2A and Tool 2B

National experts raised confusion about output, result and impact information in Programme Documents and thus difficulties to transpose it in table 2A. Guidance regarding the use of appropriate outcome and methods to facilitate aggregation and thus analysis for Tools 2B and 3 will be provided.

2.3. Tool 3

Tool 3 provides a structure for recording findings from country-specific information and little information will be available at the first stage of the evaluation.

3. When and how to proceed

In this part of the guideline, we will provide instructions to national experts on where and when to fill in the respective templates and fiches – in relation to the activities elaborated in this Chapter.

4.4.3 Task 1.2 Document collection and review

The evaluation research activities in Task 1.2 focus on document collection and review and will be guided by the programme-specific and country-specific tools as set out in the previous section. These tools will enable us to collect information about inputs, outputs, results and (to a lesser extent) impacts of the programmes on the basis of the documentation received. The country correspondents will provide summary statistics for each of the programmes they are responsible for drawn from the documentation and data review and the telephone interviews with programme managers (see below) which will flag up additional information and statistics.
These tools take full account of the evaluation questions highlighted above and represent a fundamental part of our approach to answering these questions in a consistent fashion across the 70 URBAN II programmes.

This approach to the programmes and countries will assist not only in the development of the typology of URBAN II programme areas (necessary for the final selection of case studies), but also the overall synthesis of the results of the programme reviews for the Interim Report (see Task 1.6).

4.4.4 Task 1.3 Initial assessments of results

Following discussions within the team and at the Inception and first Steering group meetings we understand the value of undertaking an initial assessment of results at this stage. This will be an important point at which the core team can take stock of the data and information that has been collected for the 70 programmes. The core team will make an interim assessment of the completion of the above tools based on:

- Completeness – any missing information that would need to be added or, at least, explained;
- Consistency – the material from the various sources will be checked that it is sufficiently informative and can be compared.
- Complementarity – the information from the country fiches with Urban Audit data where appropriate;
- Feedback - Prepare feedback for country correspondents, including areas to further improve;
- Conclusions and further questions - Assess the information and draw initial conclusions, identifying further questions that must be addressed in more detail through the telephone interviews.

4.4.5 Task 1.4 Telephone interviews

The next stage is to test our emerging findings through telephone interviews with a representative of the managing body for each URBAN II programme and with two representatives of national or regional managing authorities. The purpose of these interviews will be primarily to check factual shortcomings and to receive additional information that helps to position the programme in its national and urban context. Through discussions at the kick off meeting we are aware of concerns about potential bias in the responses from this stage of the work. We do feel, however, that having views from a local ‘insider’ in the shape of the programme manager can be balanced with views from national and regional managing authorities, who will hopefully have a more strategic viewpoint. In
addition to this, in Task 1 we are explicitly asking our national experts to assess the opinions of the programme managers. Moreover, the findings will be reviewed with greater depth and detail in Task 3.

The telephone interviews will be based on the Programme Review Fiche (programme-specific) and the Country Review Fiche (country-specific). These fiches will be tailored to the specific questions coming out of the initial data collection and the feedback from the core team.

Country correspondents will record notes of the interviews in the topic guides used and incorporate findings in their programme and country review templates. Information and opinions from interviews will be clearly referenced in the review templates for internal use. In principle, interviewees' names will also be published in the final report.

4.4.6 Task 1.5 Completion of programme and country review template

Country correspondents will complete the three tools on the basis of all evidence gathered and highlight those areas to where the evidence available has not allowed full answers to be developed. Although we will aim for as much consistency as possible, some variation between programme reviews is inevitable because of differences in data availability and/or the ability of interviewees to provide meaningful answers to the questions posed. The completed templates will be sent to the core team for checking, to allow time for comments to be addressed.

4.4.7 Task 1.6 Inputs to the Interim report

The country correspondents will use the completed tools to produce a summary report, using the same key headings and following instructions from the core team. These summary reports will be annexed to the Interim Report (see section 7).

The data gathered in the templates and the summary report will provide a systematic overview of the characteristics and implementation of the URBAN II programme across the EU, allowing preliminary general conclusions to be drawn and, crucially, a typology of URBAN II programmes to be developed. This typology will be based on the categorisation and scoring undertaken in the programme reviews – for this we will develop a typology worksheet. The typology (classification) will serve both as a tool for case study selection in Task 3 and as a means to help structure the interim report.
In developing the typology, and on the basis of the Terms of Reference, we will focus on priorities, challenges, strategy and partnership but from our own reflections will also include additional axes to add further depth. Hence, we believe the axes set out in Table 4.3 should be taken into account when developing this typology.

**Table 4.3 Axes for typology of URBAN II programmes / areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Operationalisation</th>
<th>Possible categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical characteristics</td>
<td>Size of city</td>
<td>Small – medium – large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of area chosen</td>
<td>Inner city – suburban large city – small city location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenges faced</td>
<td>Selection criteria for the URBAN II areas based on the Socio-economic context fiche</td>
<td>Social challenges – economic challenges – infrastructural challenges – environmental challenges – or a combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategy chosen</td>
<td>Spending priorities of the programme – based on the Programme O</td>
<td>Thematically focused programme (one particular theme dominant): social inclusion – entrepreneurship and employment – physical and environmental regeneration – other aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-theme strategy: integrated approach between more than one aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Funding intensity</td>
<td>ERDF Euros per capital</td>
<td>Programme with higher resources versus programmes with less resource-intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extent and mode of partnership</td>
<td>Local government, private sector, NGOs</td>
<td>Extent and mode of Involvement of partners in the developmentimplemetation/managemen t of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Degree of networking</td>
<td>Participation in networks on urban development</td>
<td>Participation in URBACT: yes –no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integration with other EU/national support programmes</td>
<td>Participation in other urban networks</td>
<td>Participation in Objective 1 region, Objective 2 region, Urban I: yes – no – partly overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 1 or 2 region, past Urban I</td>
<td>Part of national urban regeneration policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of national urban regeneration policies</td>
<td>National urban regeneration area: yes – no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When preparing the typology, a number of axes will be taken forward, notably those for which sufficient reliable information is available and where enough differentiation can be recorded. See for an example of possible typologies Figure 4.7.

**Figure 4.7 Examples of typologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>II. STRATEGY &amp; FUNDING LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of city</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Large cities,</td>
<td>I. Large cities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic challenges</td>
<td>social challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Type of challenge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Medium cities,</td>
<td>II. Focused,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic challenges</td>
<td>limited funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Focused,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. OPENNESS</th>
<th>IV. EMBEDDEDNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of partnership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integration with EU programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Autonomous, networked</td>
<td>I. Embedded in EU programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Partner-based, networked</td>
<td>I. Embedded in EU &amp; nat. progr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of networking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integration with Nat. Pr.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Autonomous, stand-alone</td>
<td>III. Not embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Partner-based, stand alone</td>
<td>IV. Embedded in nat. programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the various possible typologies emerging from the above exercise, a short list of typologies will be prepared and discussed with both DG REGIO and the Expert Panel. On the basis of these discussions, a final list will be agreed for typologies which would serve as a basis for the case study selection.

This stage of the task will be completed by the drafting of the interim report, which will be structured around the key questions research questions from the Terms of Reference and those included in the programme review template, relating to the evaluation topics of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and Community added value.

The typology will allow findings, particularly those relating to effectiveness, to be broken down by programme “type”, thus make it easier to make meaningful statements with general relevance, while avoiding risks of over-generalisation.
In addition to preparing the synthesis report, the core team will check and edit the two-page programme summary reports for each of the 70 programmes and prepare 14 country reports in accordance with the country correspondents. These will be annexed to the Interim Report.
5.0 Task 2 – Review of URBACT

5.1 Introduction

Task 2 will involve an assessment of the first URBACT programme, which formed part of the URBAN II Community Initiative. This task will form the core of the evaluation of URBACT, although additional evidence on the results and impacts achieved by the programme will be obtained from the case studies in Task 3.

5.2 Aims

The aims of Task 2 are:

- To evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and Community Added Value of the first URBACT programme (2002-2006).
- To assess briefly the work performed by other urban networks in the same period, most notably the Austria/Germany and UK URBAN networks.
- To assess the role of URBACT in promoting exchange of good practice in urban development with and between the new Member States.

Given the scope of URBACT and that fact it was an integral part of the URBAN II approach, we will focus the majority of resources under Task 2 (85%) on this programme. In line with the Terms of Reference, we will also examine the work of two national URBAN networks (in Germany and the UK), as well as two EU-level urban-related networks8. The evidence collected in relation to these URBAN networks will allow us to compare the URBACT approach with alternative networking models and help identify the potential added value of the URBACT programme.

The findings of Task 2 will form the basis of the assessment of the URBACT I programme. However, the case studies in Task 3 will also include a small number of questions on the role and impact of the URBACT programme in the urban areas selected. As such, Task 3 will provide some complementary information and, in particular, will allow us to gain the perspective of some relevant actors who have not been directly involved in the work of URBACT about their awareness of the programme and the relevance of its outputs. For the sake of clarity, the link between the four questions included under task 2 in the Terms of Reference and our proposed methodological approach is summarised in the table below.

8 Eurocities and EUKN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ToR Question</th>
<th>Questions behind the question</th>
<th>Methodological issues</th>
<th>Method used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What outputs (e.g. in terms of knowledge, exchange of experience) have been generated? Did networks tend to focus on practicalities or new areas?</td>
<td>The key issue here is to identify a) the focus of the activities undertaken in URBACT projects and b) what the projects produced in terms of immediate outputs.</td>
<td>Both the project networking meetings themselves and the written &quot;products&quot; can be viewed as &quot;outputs&quot;. While the products are tangible and can be assessed, it is more difficult to judge the quality of the meetings / networking – interviewees will be asked about this.</td>
<td>Document review (task 2.2), including assessment of &quot;products&quot; from case study projects. Interviews with project leaders, partners and experts (task 2.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To what extent have the outputs generated concrete results and impacts &quot;on the ground&quot;? What could be done to optimise this final impact?</td>
<td>To what extent can we identify improvements in knowledge on urban regeneration issues among participants and the wider pool of practitioners (results) and to what extent do we think URBACT has impacted on actual practice? What other types of result and impact can be identified?</td>
<td>Two key issues are a) the intangible nature of results and impacts (making them difficult to identify and measure and b) the risk of reporting bias by interviewees (as main source of information). We have sought to address this through triangulation of view points.</td>
<td>Interviews with project leaders, partners and experts, URBACT Secretariat, Monitoring Committee and other networks (task 2.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Who has participated and why? To what extent have new Member States been involved? What concretely could be done to optimise participation?</td>
<td>What has been the actual pattern of participation and what are the factors affecting motivation for participation?</td>
<td>It will be particularly important to hear the opinions of New Member State city representatives on the relevance of URBACT for them.</td>
<td>Document review (task 2.2) Interviews with project leaders and partners (task 2.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The answers to the previous questions should be used to give an overall judgement as to how effective the networks have been, as well as recommendations for good practice</td>
<td>What lessons can we draw for the continued implementation of URBACT II and any future URBACT-type programme? What is the evidence to support the underlying rationale for URBACT-type programmes?</td>
<td>Again, the key issue will be to ensure the evidence collected is as robust as possible in light of the intangible nature of results and impacts and the risk of reporting bias by respondents.</td>
<td>Interviews with project leaders, partners and experts, URBACT Secretariat, Monitoring Committee and other networks (task 2.3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Responding to challenges

A number of methodological challenges need to be confronted in the ex post evaluation of the URBACT programme. We foresee three main issues, which we have sought to address through our methodological approach:

- Firstly, the type of results and impact envisaged by the programme (essentially knowledge and improved practice) are largely intangible and certainly very difficult to measure with any degree of certainty. Our methodology seeks to obtain the views of different types of actor with knowledge of the programme on the results and impacts achieved and, where possible, identify specific examples. Moreover, the impact of URBACT in specific localities will be explored in more depth as part of the 15 case studies undertaken in Task 3.

- Secondly, the programme is intended to benefit a wider population than just project participants, but this wider population is difficult to identify. Even if a wide-ranging survey of urban practitioners across Europe were possible within the scope of this evaluation, the risk of low response rates would be considerable and the detailed programme knowledge of the wider urban practitioner community could be expected to be low – thus reducing the utility of results. Again, by interviewing selected actors outside the programme, we will seek to assess the likely wider impact of URBACT I for the practitioner community at large;

- Thirdly, there is a strong probability of reporting bias among direct programme beneficiaries (and most notably among lead partners for projects). In addition to project lead partners, we therefore propose to interview project partners (with less direct responsibility for projects), Secretariat and Thematic experts who worked with and advised projects (but who might be expected to bring a more critical perspective) and representatives of national and European urban networks and associations.

5.4 Activities and tools

In line with the Terms of Reference for the ex post evaluation, the data collection within Task 2 will involve a combination of desk research and interviews. Task 2 will involve four sub-tasks as follows.

5.4.1 Task 2.1 Developing methodological tools

_Evaluation questions_

The starting point for the desk review, interviews and reporting for Task 2 is the list of core evaluation questions relating to URBACT established by the Terms of Reference. The
desk review will be used to obtain a range of information about programme implementation, including the quantitative data collected for the programme indicators. While this will provide a basis for analysis of the programme, a great deal of the evidence to be collected (notably on the issues of results and impact) will need to be obtained via interviews. The respective contribution of document review and interviews in relation to the different evaluation questions is presented in Table 5.2 overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Document Review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Who has participated in URBACT and why?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What has been the involvement of the new Member States and why?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What concretely could be done to optimise participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs and effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) What have been the outputs of the programme? What has been their quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What has been the primary focus of URBACT projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) To what extent have the outputs generated concrete results and impacts on the ground, for example in terms of changes to practice in specific cities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) To what extent have URBACT projects achieved their objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) What could be done to optimise the final impact of URBACT projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong>&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) How efficiently has URBACT I achieved the outputs, results and impacts identified?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of other networks and added value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) What have been the activities and outputs of other networks of URBAN II cities and how do these differ from / overlap with URBACT?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) What results and impacts have been achieved by these networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) How does URBACT add value in relation to these networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) What examples of good practice can be identified within URBACT and other networks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>9</sup> This evaluation question has been added on the basis of feedback received in the kick-off meeting.
Intervention logic for the programme

In order to develop appropriate evaluation tools (to ask the "right" questions), it is important to establish a clear understanding of the objectives, intended outputs, results and impacts of the programme – the programme intervention logic. On the basis of the URBACT programme document, work undertaken for the mid-term evaluation and mid-term evaluation update of the programme and the latest annual implementation report (2006), it is possible to "reconstruct" the intervention logic for the programme. It is useful to highlight a number of important points at this stage.

Firstly, the programme document makes clear that the overall aims of the programme are twofold:

- "To contribute to the improved relevance and effectiveness of actions tackling the concentration of economic and social problems in small, medium-sized and large European cities" (UP, p.4);
- "To contribute to better inclusion of urban issues – especially social exclusion in an urban environment – in the European Structural Funds, both current and post-2006" (UP, p.11).

As such, while a key stated objective of the URBACT programme was "to develop transnational exchange of experience between cities, other actors, URBAN programmes or UPPs", this networking and exchange should be considered primarily as the means to achieve the ultimate programme aims cited above. Networking and exchange cannot be seen as ends in themselves.

In our view, increased knowledge about how to achieve effective socio-economic regeneration among urban practitioners in Europe (URBACT project participants, EU and national policy makers and other urban actors) is the most important intended result of the programme. Application of this knowledge in urban regeneration policy and practice is the most important intended impact. The difficulties of measuring these types of rather intangible result and impact, along with measures that can be taken to address these difficulties have already been mentioned in Chapter 2. What is clear, however, is that our evaluation tools – essentially the interview topic guides – should place particular emphasis on the benefits gained from networking and the effectiveness of the so-called "capitalisation" activities undertaken by the programme.

The programme intervention logic appears to us to be partially based on the assumption that the capitalisation of knowledge generated by URBACT projects can generate considerable added value – impacting on policy in practice in Europe's cities. This assumption could be questioned. For example, do those responsible for regenerating our
cities really turn to good practice literature of the type generated by URBACT for inspiration and knowledge? Do the type of events and conferences organised within the context of URBACT I really have the potential to impact on the working practices of those who attend them? We approach the programme evaluation with an open mind about these issues.

Assessing the work of other URBAN networks
The URBAN II programmes in some countries formed their own national networks, principally as a means to exchange information and experience. The German-Austrian URBAN Network\(^\text{10}\) was one of the most developed and active, with the explicit aim of acting as an "interface" for exchange between German and Austrian cities (including non-URBAN cities) tackling urban regeneration challenges. A slightly more informal network of cooperation was established between UK URBAN II cities, again focusing on exchange of experience\(^\text{11}\).

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation call for a brief assessment of the work performed by these networks and, as such, our methodology includes a review of relevant activity reports and outputs (part of Task 2.2) and interviews with coordinators or members of the networks (part of Task 2.3). The key objective of this is to obtain an understanding of the work undertaken, the benefits perceived and how these compare with and relate to the work of URBACT. In a sense, national networks represent an alternative model of networking to URBACT. This may be complementary to URBACT, but may also duplicate certain aspects of URBACT activities. Consideration of the work of national networks will help to highlight the real and potential added value of a pan-EU, project-based network such as URBACT. In addition to these national networks, we have opted to include interviews with two EU-level network-type organisations active in the field of urban regeneration – Eurocities\(^\text{12}\) and EUKN\(^\text{13}\). The former organisation also seeks to provide a platform for exchange between its member cities, while EUKN aims to "facilitate the exchange of demand-driven knowledge and experience on urban issues". Talking to representatives of these networks and taking into account their objectives and activities will further help us to identify the added value of URBACT and, at the same time, provide us with additional "external" perspectives on the effectiveness of URBACT.

\(^{10}\) Deutsch-Österreichisches URBAN Netzwerk: http://www.deutscher-verband.org/selten/urban-netzwerk/default.asp
\(^{11}\) No dedicated website exists. Information will be gathered from UK URBAN programme managers and the Department of Communities and Local Government.
\(^{12}\) http://www.eurocities.org
\(^{13}\) http://www.eukn.org/eukn/
### Interview tools

Interviews will take place with different target groups in order to seek different perspectives on the programme. As the focus on the interviews will vary somewhat between target groups, four tailored interview topic guides will be required.

#### Table 5.3 Interview target groups and topic guides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TG</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific topics of interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Representatives of the URBACT Secretariat and Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC)</td>
<td>Overall implementation of the programme  &lt;br&gt;Perspectives on outputs, results and impacts achieved at an aggregate level  &lt;br&gt;Perspectives on more successful and less successful interventions  &lt;br&gt;Lessons learnt about programme implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Project lead partners  &lt;br&gt;Project partners  &lt;br&gt;Thematic or Secretariat Experts involved in project implementation</td>
<td>Implementation of individual projects (selected)  &lt;br&gt;Outputs, results and impacts produced by individual projects  &lt;br&gt;Perspectives on the wider impact of URBACT on urban regeneration policy and practice  &lt;br&gt;Lessons learnt about project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Representatives of the European Commission</td>
<td>The impact of URBACT on EU urban policy making (an aim of the programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Representatives of EU and national urban networks and associations</td>
<td>The added value of URBACT in relation to existing networks and activities  &lt;br&gt;The quality of outputs produced by URBACT  &lt;br&gt;The impact of URBACT on urban regeneration policy and practice in the EU (an aim of the programme)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We intend to focus the semi-structured interviews with the target groups above on a limited number of key questions in each case. These key questions, which will form the basis of the actual topic guides used, are formulated in table 5.3 below. The precise phrasing of questions will naturally be adapted to reflect the connection of the respondent to the programme.
### Table 5.4 Key questions for interview topic guides

#### A. Representatives of the URBACT Secretariat and PMC

1) To what extent are you satisfied with a) the geographical coverage within URBACT projects and b) the themes addressed in relation to the original goals? What gaps, if any, can be noted?

2) What are the main difficulties that have been encountered in project implementation? How have these been addressed?

3) To what extent have the outputs ("products") produced by the different projects corresponded to expectations in terms of a) from and b) quality?

4) Have the different project types (Thematic Networks, Qualification, Studies, Working Groups) been equally successful?

5) Can you highlight specific examples of new knowledge / insights generated by the programme?

6) Are you aware of specific examples of exchange and knowledge generation supported by the programme impacting on policy making and practice?

#### B. Project (lead) partners (beneficiaries) and Thematic or Secretariat Experts

1) What motivated your participation in an URBACT project and what did your role entail?

2) To what extent did you participation in the project have an influence on:
   - Your personal knowledge of the subject?
   - Knowledge of the subject in your department / organisation? Who, if anyone, has benefited?
   - Work / working practices that you have been involved in?
   - The work of your department / organisation? What form has this influence taken?

3) Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of your participation in URBACT / the URBACT project for:
   - Your personal knowledge of the subject? (1-5, where 1 is least useful)
   - Knowledge of the subject in your department / organisation? (1-5, where 1 is least useful)
   - Work / working practices that you have been involved in? (1-5, where 1 is least useful)
   - The work of your department / organisation? (1-5, where 1 is least useful)

4) To what extent do you believe direct exchange with your counterparts in other cities is actually useful for your work or the work of your organisation? (What examples can you give of this utility?)

5) To what extent do you believe "good practice" material is useful for your work or the work of your organisation?

6) How does the role and utility of URBACT compare with that of other networks or associations in which you are / have been involved?
### C. Representatives of the European Commission

1) What is your understanding of the role of URBACT in relation to EU policy making?
2) What is your view about the quality of the networking and outputs produced by URBACT I?
3) To what extent have the activities of URBACT influenced a) your own work and b) the work of department?
4) Has URBACT been a good use of taxpayers' money?

### D. Representatives of EU and national urban networks and associations

1) How do the objectives and activities of your organisation compare to those of URBACT?
2) To the extent of your knowledge, how would you assess the quality and utility of the exchanges and products supported by URBACT?
3) Has URBACT been a good use of taxpayers' money?

#### 5.4.2 Task 2.2 Document review

We have already started to review a number of key documents relating to URBACT I in order to prepare the outline intervention logic and inform the design of the evaluation methodology. In the early stages of task 2, the following sources will be reviewed in order to obtain further information for the evaluation report:
### Table 5.5 Documentary sources for the document review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentary source</th>
<th>Information to be obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Latest Annual Implementation Report (2006)</td>
<td>Detailed data on: Location of project leaders and partners Project budgets Project outputs (number, type) and final conferences Programme indicators (quantitative indicators are: 1) Number of projects created; 2) Number of partner cities 3) Number of working seminars 4) Number of reports produced 5) Number of people involved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  The URBACT website: <a href="http://urbact.eu/">http://urbact.eu/</a></td>
<td>Availability, number and type of outputs per project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Websites of EU and national level urban networks (including DE-AT and UK)</td>
<td>Information on objectives and activities Outputs produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Written outputs of 8 selected URBACT projects</td>
<td>Nature and quality of the written output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our original proposal, we suggested focusing work on 12 URBACT projects. However, in view of the comments made in the kick-off meeting, and the issues of potential reporting bias in relying too heavily on evidence from lead partners outlined above, we believe there is much to be said for interviewing a larger number of actors about a more limited number of projects, in order to have some opportunity for triangulation. We will therefore select 8 URBACT projects for detailed assessment (an appropriate balance between Thematic Networks or Working Groups and Qualification projects). We will in any case focus primarily on Thematic Networks, reflecting their importance within the scope of URBACT activities. The first stage of this assessment will be a review of the written outputs produced by the projects in question, which will be followed by interviews. The criteria for selecting projects will be as follows:

- The project type (thematic network, working group, qualification project);
- The theme addressed (physical regeneration, citizen participation, housing etc);
- Geographical representation, with a balance between projects from UPP, URBAN I and URBAN II cities and new Member State cities;
- The range of outputs produced (assessed through desk review and initial consultations with the URBACT Secretariat) to ensure a mix of those which appear to have been most and least focused on “products” as opposed to networking between the participants.
It will be important to select a high proportion of projects with URBAN II city participation to maximise synergy with the case study work on URBAN II programmes (Task 3) which will include questions on what these areas have got out of participation in URBACT. Equally, it will be necessary to select projects with New Member State participation to examine the effectiveness of URBACT for transferred practice. The final selection of projects will be discussed with DG REGIO.

5.4.3 Task 2.3 Interviews

Much of the evidence of this evaluation will come from interviews with the different target groups highlighted above.

Table 5.6 Interviews for Task 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of the URBACT Secretariat / Managing Authority and Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC)</td>
<td>4 interviews</td>
<td>During 1 day visit to Secretariat in Paris Undertaken in early stages of Task 2 in parallel with desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 interviews</td>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project lead partners</td>
<td>8 interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project partners</td>
<td>8 interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic or Secretariat Experts involved in project implementation</td>
<td>8 interviews</td>
<td>If experts are not available or are the same for several projects, an additional partner will be interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of the European Commission</td>
<td>2 interviews</td>
<td>Face to face in Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of EU and national urban networks and associations</td>
<td>4 interviews</td>
<td>Provisionally DE-AT network, UK network, Eurocities and EUKN(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews with the URBACT Secretariat and Managing Authority will be undertaken in a one-day visit to Paris. We believe this is a cost effective approach given the scope to undertake several interviews in one place and on one day.

\(^4\) We have expanded the number of external urban networks / associations consulted in comparison to our proposal, in order to gather additional external perspectives of URBACT from (potentially) well informed respondents.
For URBACT projects, interviews will in principle be undertaken by telephone. The projects examined will be those selected and reviewed in Task 2.2. For each project we will interview:

- a representative of the lead partner organisation
- one other active partner
- a secretariat or thematic expert involved in the project

This will allow the views of the lead partner to be cross-checked with the opinion of other actors with a good knowledge of the project. The interviews will be structured by the topic guides outlined in Task 2.1.

Although the sample size is small, as indicated in the key questions for topic guides, we propose to use a five-point scoring system for some questions on results and impacts in interviews with URBACT project participants. This will facilitate comparison of interview results and, in the absence of a wider survey, allow at least some quantification of opinions expressed to include in the final report on URBACT.

5.4.4 Task 2.4 Preparing report

The results of the document review and interview write-ups (including scores attributed in URBACT project interviews) will be analysed systematically and the findings grouped. The two team members involved in the URBACT evaluation (both of whom will have undertaken interviews) will meet to discuss findings and agree on key conclusions and recommendations arising from Task 2. The key findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as best practice examples identified on the basis of interviews, will be presented in the report on URBACT submitted as part of the interim report in Month 7. The report will be structured in line with the key evaluation topics.
6.0 Task 3 – Case Studies

6.1 Introduction

Task 3 will involve an in-depth analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the URBAN II Community Initiative in 15 programme areas.

6.2 Aims

The aim of the Task 3 will be to deepen answers to the questions posed in Task 1, as well as address the specific questions taken from the Terms of Reference and highlighted below.

The case study sample will be selected on the basis of the findings of Task 1, presented in the Interim Report and agreed in consultation with the study steering group. As such, this section provides a brief overview of the methodology for Task 3. The methodology will be developed further in the Interim report and presented along with the relevant methodological tools. As with previous chapters we highlight the relevant terms of reference questions, method and exploration of output in the table below. This is an early attempt to address the Terms of Reference questions which will need to be revised and expanded in the Interim Report, prior to the commencement of Task 3.
## Table 6.1 Task 2 Evaluation Questions from Terms of Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question from Terms of Reference</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Exploration of Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Has there been a gap between theory (as set out in the programming documents) and practice? Has the programme been experienced &quot;on the ground&quot; as a solution to the most pressing problems of the area?</td>
<td>Comparison of submission documents and subsequent reports Perceptions from case study fieldwork</td>
<td>This is a fundamental question as to whether the programme was 'fit for purpose' and whether the reality of the programme delivery matched the vision and initial objectives of the programme. If there is a clear divergence we would want to probe for reasons which might be a combination of factors: The vision and objectives were unrealistic given the depth of problems to be resolved The strategy was inappropriate (with the benefit of hindsight) The challenges changed/worsened Partnership working was not as productive as expected We would also want to probe for local perceptions (e.g. at the level of the municipality) as to whether the programme was perceived as successful in addressing the key challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) What is the link between the URBAN II area and the broader economy, as well as economic polices of the city? Where an URBAN II area is covered by Objective 1 or 2, what is the link between URBAN and the strategy pursued in the mainstream?</td>
<td>Assessment of programme documentation Perceptions from case study fieldwork</td>
<td>The first part of the question is relatively straightforward and can be mainly assessed from a review of city strategies, augmented by discussions. We would want to probe for the added value in both directions – the extent to which the programme has been successful/more successful because it has benefited from integration with other programmes and policies, and also whether the programme has influenced and supported other policies and programmes, contributing to their success. We recognise and will take into account that sometimes the link between a deprived...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question from Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Exploration of Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second part calls for a review of Objective 1 and 2 programmes (and we would suggest also Objective 3) to assess explicit policy links. The extent to which the programme activities and/or lessons are being carried through into current Structural Funds programmes, where appropriate, is relevant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbourhood and the local economy can be odd, e.g. East London's poverty in close proximity to the rich financial district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We note that in the context of the larger programmes, URBAN often tended to occupy a particular niche and was only intended as a partial solution to the problems of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The work on impacts and results should be deepened by developing a counterfactual. This should include comparing each case study with trends in at least one similar area (in the same Member State and possibly even in the same city) which has not benefited from URBAN II. The analysis should attempt where possible to draw general conclusions from the comparison between the urban areas studied and this &quot;comparison group&quot;.</td>
<td>Comparisons with comparison areas Assessment of programme documentation Perceptions from case study fieldwork</td>
<td>We set out in the text in section 3.4.1 how we will deepen the counterfactual from the work in Task 1. There is scope in the case studies to probe further in terms of key decisions, alternative funding that was available, together with the uniqueness of specific outcomes that may have been the result of URBAN II programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) What are examples of successful projects? Why have projects and programmes been successful or unsuccessful in terms of outputs, results and impacts? What are the factors determining success or failure of the different types of URBAN intervention?</td>
<td>Selection of specific projects demonstrating good and innovative uses of EU resources (this will fall out of the programme reviews in Task 1 and subsequent more detailed work in Task 3</td>
<td>We need to agree what we mean by successful and unsuccessful. The starting point is the overarching objectives for URBAN II followed by the programme specific objectives and targets (expected results) and how those objectives have focused on addressing specific challenges. Where the programme, or specific elements of the programme have not met objectives and targets we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question from Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Exploration of Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need to probe further. For example, was the approach valid but failed for reasons beyond the control of the programme (e.g. worsening socio-economic conditions), or was the approach valid but the processes of delivery and partnership lacking, or was the approach itself overly ambitious and/or ill conceived. Indeed were targets rather too easy to meet and could have been set differently, stretching the programme and its achievements further? We will have some evidence from Task 1 but the case studies provide an opportunity to explore further. The outcome of these questions will be particularly valuable for dissemination purposes and informing Task 4. Together this work will help inform one of the outputs of the evaluation (the 10 good practice projects, drawn from the URBAN II programmes).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) A key feature of URBAN II has been the “integrated approach”, i.e. the idea of bringing together in a coherent way and in a small area: economic measures, entrepreneurship and employment etc), social inclusion and physical and environmental regeneration. This concept includes of course the combination of ERDF with ESF-type measures. How successful has the integrated approach been? To what extent has there been a genuine synergy between measures? What are the factors underlying success in this area? Assessment of programme documentation Perceptions from case study fieldwork Here we will be interested as much as in what has not worked, as to what has. Experience of urban regeneration programmes show that the ‘intent’ to be fully integrated is often strong and is agreed by key partners, but that the reality can disappoint. We know that integration in practice between agencies and departments, between national, regional and local organisations can be challenging. The job here is to identify key factors that have led to strong or weak integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) How well have the programmes been managed in terms such as project selection, project support, monitoring,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material on good practice in urban regeneration delivery (there is a body of material at member state level) The 15 case study programmes could become a ‘comparator group’ in their own right allowing us to benchmark them against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question from Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Exploration of Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What have been the main factors underlying the success (or otherwise) of programme and project management? | Assessment of programme documentation  
Perceptions from case study fieldwork | each other for good practice in terms of the more generic practices of management, delivery, communication although we will be careful to consider ‘local’ variations that can influence the effective organisation and delivery of programmes. We would though hope to establish some general patterns of what and what has not worked, which in turn informs the dissemination process. Our objective would be to establish the critical success factors in the delivery of effective urban programmes. |
| Have administrative costs been reasonable and proportional? | Perceptions from case study fieldwork  
Assessment of programme documentation | |
| Where municipalities have been in the driving seat, how have they fared? | | |
| What factors have driven their performance and determined its success or otherwise? | | |

(7) How successful have the programmes been in building the capacity of local partners? And in building links between partners (e.g. links between universities and economic partners, the use of local communication as a tool to build partnerships)? What factors underlie success or failure? | Perceptions from case study fieldwork  
Assessment of programme documentation | The first step will be to map partnerships and the steps that have been followed to develop and nurture (e.g. communication processes, partnership protocols). We will have some evidence from Task 1 but here we can probe further and ‘cross check’ responses from a wider range of stakeholders than is possible in Task 1.  
As in question 6 by comparing and contrasting within the group of 15 case studies we should be able to identify and comment on critical success factors. |

(8) To what extent have programmes benefited from the various networks, especially URBACT? | Perceptions from case study fieldwork | To be assessed through discussions with the programmes and linked back to the Task 2 work. We are clear that network participation is not in itself an output it is the value gained, and the extent to which both outward dissemination and learning from others has occurred. |
| What has driven the degree to which they benefit? | | |

(9) To what extent are the impacts of URBAN II likely to prove sustainable beyond the end of the period? What are the main factors driving this? | Perceptions from case study fieldwork  
Assessment of programme documentation | Regeneration is rarely achieved within the confines of a programme period so continuation of funding and programme area focus are key |
The results from Task 3 will allow us to draw lessons on the effectiveness and impact of the URBAN II programmes and answer the nine questions in the Terms of Reference¹⁵ listed above. In addition, this task will identify and present 10 good practice projects from URBAN II programmes.

We will use the case studies to test some ‘ideas’ that we have from previous experience of EU urban policy, including URBAN I and Urban Pilot Projects, plus ‘ideas’ that arise from the Task 1 research. One ‘idea’ is the concept of an URBAN II ‘club’ and the importance attached by cities and Member States to the membership of that ‘club’. We know that there was very strong interest in URBAN II, as reflected in the high number of applications, but also from cities who never progressed to that stage. We suspect that the availability of EU resources, while welcomed, was not the prime motivation, but that for many cities the unique ability to have a direct dialogue with the European Commission and other URBAN II cities was an important factor. This may have been seen as a way of introducing the regeneration needs of a city/urban area to others through the mechanisms of URBAN II, and possibly as a way of making contacts, learning from others and forming networks. We will test this and other ‘ideas’ through the case studies. The extent to which there are or may be wider programme benefits in the localities where URBAN II monies have been spent from participating in URBAN II is a key evaluation question.

6.3 Activities and tools

6.3.1 Task 3.1 - Selection of case studies

A proposed list of 15 URBAN II programme case studies, as well as a step-by-step methodology for how they were selected, will be included as the third element of the Interim Report and will thus be prepared in parallel with the last stages of Tasks 1.

It would be normal to include some substitutes/options for consideration, but, as we will need to move quickly to the case study fieldwork, the selection process needs to be efficient. We are aware from the inception meeting in September that there is

¹⁵ Terms of Reference page 8
considerable interest from Commission colleagues in the selection of case studies and the country balance. We are sensitive to this and also appreciate that such selection can not be a precise science. A coherent case can be made for several programmes. We will apply logic and justification to our recommendations and look to our Steering Group to help us move smoothly and quickly to a final selection and fieldwork. With the resources we have, and to do justice to the case studies, the number of programmes that can be reviewed is capped at 15.

The list of programmes for case study analysis will be drawn up to achieve an appropriate balance between a) geographical location, b) the position of the programme in the typology developed in Task 1 and c) data availability for the URBAN area in question.

Our approach to the typology of URBAN programmes has been described above. In terms of geographical balance, we suggest the following allocation.

**Table 6.2 Proposed geographical balance of URBAN II case studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Total number of Programmes</th>
<th>Number of case studies suggested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK and Ireland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain and Portugal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden, Denmark and Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany and Austria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These allocations between Member States will be used as a framework for the application of the other criteria. While some variation is possible, straying too far from these indicative allocations would undermine geographical balance across the EU. The German allocation
(as part of the Germany/Austria cluster) would include at least one programme from the former East Germany (the German programmes were distributed across the former West and East Germany). In terms of urban and economic characteristics, the East German URBAN II programme areas would be expected to be close to those of cities in Central and Eastern Europe – cities which may be able to draw particular benefit from the lessons learnt from URBAN II.

Once an initial short list of possible case study programmes has been produced on the basis of geographical spread and typology position, data availability will be brought into consideration. The programmes with the best potential data availability will be selected for the sample proposed in the interim report.

6.3.2 Task 3.2 - Case study research and field work

The case studies will involve both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative part will precede the qualitative part so that missing information can be gathered through interviewing. We are aware that programme managers have access to information that goes beyond the formal programme management documentation (local context, additional information on the progress of programmes etc.).

We will test the research tools and approach by undertaking one of the case studies as a pilot. Data collection and initial analysis will be completed and adjustments made to templates and the approach as appropriate, before work on the other case studies in launched. The pilot will be undertaken by members of the core team.

The key steps in the case study research will be:

1. To review and augment the material we already have from Task 1.
2. Selection for each case study, of two appropriate areas for counter-factual comparisons (see earlier section for discussion of our use of counterfactuals in this project)
3. Comparison of quantitative data from the selected programme area with that in selected counterfactuals
4. For each case study programme, face to face interviews as follows:
   - Programme managers and monitoring committee members and other local stakeholders with a "programme-level" perspective - 2 interviews;
   - Representatives of key projects per programme (in principle project managers) – 3 interviews;
   - Community groups or other local stakeholders (potentially with more of an outsider perspective on the programme) – 2 interviews
5. A **focus group** (4-6 people) bringing together local policy makers and academics that have studied the city to consider the initial findings of the case study research.

6.3.3 Task 3.3 - Drawing lessons

Conducting the case studies should give insight in how effective the selected programmes were in reaching their objectives and why. In other words in reporting on the case studies (with a specific template to be developed by the core team) the critical success factors for successful implementation of the projects need to be identified.

These critical success factors can be linked to, for example:

- Strategy: coherence between strategy and challenges, timely review of strategy in early years of the programme, sufficient embedding in other local/regional strategy;
- Implementation/management: selection criteria, delivery mechanisms, strength of management authority, concentrated spending on strategic projects or dispersed spending on very complementary projects, monitoring and evaluation practices;
- Partnership: width of the partnership (and involvement of stakeholders), integration (of actions) between partners of different sectors, degree of contribution of the private sector (directly or indirectly);
- Networking: experience of local authority, learning from others (knowledge transfer).

Case studies will be written up by the case study researchers in the standard templates provided. The indicative length is 15 pages. The proposed structure for these reports is:

- **Typology**: A description of the type of URBAN II programme according to the criteria of the typology enriched with the quantitative and qualitative information collected.
- **Objectives and results**: Clear indication of the main objectives that were to be achieved with the programme. Overview of the results achieved: quantitatively in terms of achievements compared to baseline, but also overview of the realisations on the field in a descriptive way.
- **Success factors**: key elements that have supported and been crucial to the achievement of the results. These elements can be linked to strategy, implementation, partnership, networking, other, as said before.
- **There will be a clear cross reference in the case study write-ups to the terms of reference questions listed above.**

First drafts of the case study reports will be supplied to the core team in time to allow feedback to be provided, comments to be addressed and reports to be edited for inclusion in the draft final report.
6.3.4 Task 3.4 - Profiling "good practice" projects

On basis of the projects identified in case studies, we will identify 10 projects and write them up such that they are suitable for the Regions for Economic Change database of good practices. The write ups will include an assessment of problems encountered and the techniques employed to address those problems.

Potential "good practice" projects will be identified in each programme case study and short profiles of these projects submitted to the core team with the first draft of the case study results. On the basis of the full set of potential good practice projects, 10 will be selected for additional research and profiling, in consultation with DG REGIO. Typically some of the critical success factors that apply at the level of the programme will also apply at the project level in a more operational way. For example, strength of management authority would be translated into strong project ownership or project leadership, effective delivery mechanisms would be translated into clear implementation plan.

The writing style for the project profiles is very important in order to get the message clear and across and should be sufficiently worked on. The project profiles will contain information on: (i) goals, (ii) implementation, (iii) result and impacts, (iv) transferability of the good practice. The profiles will be prepared initially by building on the information collected for the case study in which the project is located. On this basis, the case study researcher will obtain additional information from the project manager, those who benefited from the project outputs and results or others related to the programme. We would envisage including quotes from interviewees in the project write-ups to give them a "human face".

The project profiles will be completed in parallel with the finalisation of the case study reports and production of the synthesis report.

6.3.5 Task 3.5 - Coordination and synthesis of case study work

The case study selection process, the preparation of the templates and indicative topic guides mentioned above, the coordination of the case study researchers and the checking and final editing of case study report and project profiles will be the responsibility of the URBAN II programme team.

The same team will also be responsible for drafting the synthesis report, summarising the key findings from the case studies in relation to the main evaluation questions (relating to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, management and partnership and sustainability and Community Added Value).
7.0 Synthesis and Interim Report structure

7.1 Introduction

The synthesis of the work from Tasks 1, 2 and 3 leading to the development of our conclusions in the Interim Report (for Tasks 1 and 2) and the Final Report (adding the work of Task 3) makes up Task 4 of the evaluation and will be led by the core team, ensuring that we respond to all of the Terms of Reference questions, systematically. This is also the point where we work closely with the country experts to ensure that have fully absorbed and interpreted their work in Tasks 1-3 and share our findings with the expert panel for their inputs. To help shape our thoughts on the synthesis process it is helpful to outline a report structure for the Interim Report, which can be further elaborated for the Final Report (deepening and adding to the analysis, rather than a new structure). We would therefore, expect some early conclusions in the interim Report which can be tested in Task 3.

We see the process of analysis and synthesis as ongoing (i.e. we are not waiting for all of the outputs of the Tasks to begin the process). In particular we are very keen that neither the Interim nor the Final Report include ‘surprises’ and that emerging issues and findings are raised with the Commission and the expert panel periodically (the monthly progress reports would be a vehicle for this) which might prompt the need for additional discussions before the reports are formally submitted.

Figure 7.1 Proposed structure for the Draft Interim Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Draft interim report will provide a skeleton and have a broadly similar structure as the Draft final report – which adds on the flesh;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The case studies will therefore deepen the analysis (include Boxes on ‘practices’ of case studies, case studies themselves as Annexes). Results from Task 3 will need to be fed into the structure below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interim report will include some hypothesis to be tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interim report will include methodological proposals and proposal for case studies for Task 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each report should be a stand-alone document, of publishable quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Typologies to be elaborated in Task 3 and therefore in the Final report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation / purpose of the report
- Overview of URBAN II Community Initiative + URBACT
- Methods and approach including counterfactual (details in Annex)
- Introduction of typology (?)
- Structure of the Report

II. Rationale of the URBAN programmes

II.1 Selection of areas

- Brief description of the method by which areas were chosen
- Relevance of the selection method and choice

II.2 Main challenges facing URBAN II areas

- Socio-economic, physical etc. of the 70 programme areas (by country and by typology if possible)
- Baseline and development over time; in relation to cities, regions, countries and comparison group

II.3 Key features of the strategies deployed under URBAN II

- Strategic fit of the programmes in relation to the socio-economic context (and against the literature) at the level of objectives

II.4 Conclusions

III. Impact and Effectiveness of the URBAN Programmes

III.1 Assessment

- By financial inputs/ output/result/impact
- By type of priority (economic, social, physical)
- By country
- By typology
- By Objective (1, 2 or outside) and national support programmes and Urban I support

III.2 Factors underlying success

- Balance between instruments
- Intensity of funding

IV. Implementation and capacity building

IV.1 Management arrangements
• Descriptive
• Assessment of organisational capacity

IV.2 Local partnership
• Description of Partnerships
• Assessment of partnerships and their influence on the design and implementation of the programmes

IV.3 Factors underlying success
• Capacity issues
• Leadership and vision
• Outward orientation – use of good practices
• Use of URBACT and other networks

V. Evaluation of the URBACT Programme
V.1 Introduction
V.2 Rationale
V.3 Participation and Outputs
V.4 Impact, Effectiveness and Efficiency
V.5 Implementation and Management Issues
V.6 Conclusions: Lessons for the Future

VI. Added Value of URBAN and URBACT
VI.1 Relation with existing national and EU programmes and policies
VI.2 Leverage effects
VI.3 Transnational cooperation and learning
VI.4 Subsidiarity, proportionality and partnership
VI.5 Community value added and transaction costs

VII. Moving forward
VII.1 Key conclusions
VII.2 Hypothesis and key questions for Task 3
VII.3 Next steps – detailed description of Task 3
VII.3 Proposals for case study package based on typology
VII.4 Structure of the final report

Annexes
- Methodological

16 When drafting the Interim Report this section may be included as part of other sections
Annex One: Additional staff CVs
PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name  Nicholas Daniel McAteer
Address  Flat 4, 69 Withington Road, Manchester, UK, M16 7EX
Telephone  0161 226 3700
Fax  
E-mail  Nick.mcateer@ecotec.com

Nationality  British
Date of birth  16th March 1974

WORK EXPERIENCE

• Dates (from – to)  April 2006 to date
• Name and address of employer  Ecotec, Tower Business Centre, Portland Tower, Portland Street, Manchester, UK, M1 3LF
• Type of business or sector  Public sector research and consulting
• Occupation or position held  Senior Consultant
• Main activities and responsibilities  Primary and secondary research relating to regeneration and housing, policy and programme evaluation, housing market analysis, data and GIS analysis, report writing, project management, presentations and consultations, business development

• Dates (from – to)  July 2005 to April 2006
• Name and address of employer  CSR Partnership, 14 Edward Street, Birmingham, UK, B1 2RX
• Type of business or sector  Regeneration consultancy
• Occupation or position held  Consultant
• Main activities and responsibilities  Research, data and GIS analysis, report writing, presentations and consultations

• Dates (from – to)  August 2003 to September 2004
• Name and address of employer  Mediavest, 115-117 Portland Street, Manchester, UK, M1 3LF
• Type of business or sector  Media and market research
• Occupation or position held  Researcher
• Main activities and responsibilities  Primary and secondary research, data and GIS analysis, report writing, presentations
• Dates (from – to) October 1996 to December 2002
• Name and address of employer Mantra, Factory Lane, Brantham, Manningtree, Essex, UK, CO11 1NJ
• Type of business or sector Media and market research
• Occupation or position held Senior Consultant
• Main activities and responsibilities Media research and evaluation of marketing and PR, written translation and précis, data analysis, research, report writing, customer, project and team management, presentations, acquiring new business

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

• Dates (from – to) October 2004 to September 2005
• Name and type of organisation providing education and training Birmingham University
• Principal subjects/occupational skills covered Research and policy relating to urban regeneration, community involvement, economic development, European regional policy and place marketing
• Title of qualification awarded MSc Urban and Regional Studies
• Level in national classification Post-graduate

• Dates (from – to) October 1992 to June 1996
• Name and type of organisation providing education and training University of Essex
• Principal subjects/occupational skills covered Comparative European history, German language, European politics and integration
• Title of qualification awarded BA Hons History with European Studies
• Level in national classification Bachelor Degree

PERSONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES

Acquired in the course of life and career but not necessarily covered by formal certificates and diplomas.

MOTHER TONGUE

English

OTHER LANGUAGES

A3
**German**
- Reading skills: Excellent (C1 in CEFRL)
- Writing skills: Very good (B1)
- Verbal skills: Very good (B1)

**Polish**
- Reading skills: Basic (A2)
- Writing skills: Basic (A2)
- Verbal skills: Basic (A2)

**Italian**
- Reading skills: Basic (A1)
- Writing skills: Basic (A1)
- Verbal skills: Basic (A1)

**SOCIAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*Living and working with other people, in multicultural environments, in positions where communication is important and situations where teamwork is essential (for example culture and sports), etc.*

Have lived and worked abroad and am used to working in both large and small teams. Enjoy meeting and working with diverse backgrounds and experiences. Have also developed long-term relationships with clients and other external agencies. Have broad experience from working in both commercial and public sector research.

**ORGANISATIONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*Coordination and administration of people, projects and budgets; at work, in voluntary work (for example culture and sports) and at home, etc.*

Well used to managing own time and others', prioritising work and managing research projects (balancing the requirements of different tasks). Includes producing work on time and on budget, meeting commercial objectives.

**TECHNICAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*With computers, specific kinds of equipment, machinery, etc.*

Highly computer literate, with strong data analysis skills and use of spreadsheets, databases and specialised software including Geographic Information Systems.

**DRIVING LICENCE(S)**
Full UK Driving License

---

**SELECTED CURRENT AND RECENT RESEARCH AND CONSULTANCY PROJECTS**

**Housing Market Restructuring and Neighbourhood Renewal across Europe**
This comparative study was funded by the ECORYS Research Foundation. Nick has been involved in several aspects, from writing country profiles to compiling and analysing housing and demographic data.

**Neighbourhood Sustainability Model for Riverside Group**
Nick is currently working on a model to measure the sustainability of Riverside Group’s housing in neighbourhoods right across the UK. The work includes defining and mapping neighbourhood boundaries and combines a variety of in-house data with secondary socio-economic statistics to give a detailed and updateable picture of local conditions. The model will provide a strategic tool to monitor change, target investment across the group and to track the impact of local spend.

**National Evaluation of Housing Market Renewal Areas, DCLG**
This ongoing study includes a number of thematic papers, including one aimed at identifying indicators of the sustainability of housing markets and neighbourhoods, evaluating pathfinders’ progress in this area. Nick played a leading role in conducting research, consulting stakeholders and compiling outputs.

**Yorkshire and Humber Sustainability Index**
Nick is managing the scoping and compilation of a housing market sustainability index for the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly, using available data to measure a number of factors associated with neighbourhood sustainability such as deprivation, employment and crime. This will inform future rounds of funding allocations.

**Castle Vale Endowment Trust Fund – Evaluation for English Partnerships**
Nick is project managing an ongoing annual evaluation of the work of the Castle Vale Endowment Trust Fund for English Partnerships. The organisation was set up to continue the work of the Castle Vale Housing Action Trust and is administering a comprehensive local regeneration programme.

**Ribble Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment**
Nick is leading on an assessment for Ribble Valley Borough Council, a predominantly rural borough in the North of England. This involves compiling information from various sources to complete a housing market assessment that meets current Government guidance. ECOTEC are carrying out detailed statistical and geographical analysis.

**Association of Greater Manchester Authorities – Making Housing Count in the Manchester City Region**
Nick has been involved in several aspects of this large and complex research assignment, from setting up neighbourhood geographies, writing detailed local profiles, mapping data across the city region area and compiling housing market reports crossing local authority boundaries.

**Evaluation of New Heartlands Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder**
Nick has been involved in a number of aspects of the ongoing evaluation of housing market renewal work in Merseyside, from project visits and interviews to focus groups with private tenants in Liverpool and Sefton.

**Impact of City Region Work on Cheshire**
Nick project managed this review of city region development work carried out in Liverpool, Manchester and Stoke-on-Trent and the implications this has for Cheshire districts. The work includes detailed geographic analysis of housing need and affordability and will help to identify the main strategic priorities and overlaps with other policy areas for a new sub-regional housing strategy for Cheshire.
PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: MANOUDI, ANNA
Address: 39 SPIROU MERKOURI, 116 34 ATHENS, GREECE
Telephone: +30 210 725 4855 (office), +30 6977 235344 (mobile)
Fax: +30 210 822 2723
E-mail: amanoudi@otenet.gr
Nationality: GREEK
Date of birth: 07 JANUARY 1972

WORK EXPERIENCE

- Dates (from – to): SEP 2002 TO DATE
- Name and address of employer: Independent consultant, based in Athens
- Type of business or sector: Public Sector Consultancy
- Occupation or position held: Senior Consultant
- Main activities and responsibilities:

  Anna has been working as an independent consultant based in Athens since 2002 and was previously working in the Brussels office of an EU consultancy firm for five years (see next box for details). Throughout this period of 11 years, Anna has participated in a wide range of evaluation and transnational research studies focusing on the thematic areas of regional and local development, education, training and skills, lifelong learning, employment, inclusion and the social economy. Projects that Anna has worked on have covered, among other issues: the European employment strategy, local responses to unemployment; the job creation potential of the social economy; training and support for young people and disadvantaged groups; initiatives promoting equal opportunities and combating unemployment as well as research assignments in the area of social dialogue.

  Experienced in a range of evaluation and research methods as well as work in a multicultural environment, Anna has undertaken work in the context of a variety of assignments and has vast experience of EU-wide comparative studies as well as country-specific studies, including fieldwork in many EU member states, and especially in Greece and Cyprus. Past research and evaluation assignments have entailed developing methodological tools, analysing qualitative and quantitative data, and data collection through surveys, interviews, focus groups and case studies entailing consultation with a
wide range of actors, such as EU officials; national, regional and local government representatives; social partners; NGOs and many others. In 2007 Anna was the project manager of the External Evaluation of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop), which was carried out for DG Education and Culture of the European Commission. From 2001 to 2005, Anna was closely involved in managing the work of the European Employment Observatory.

• Dates (from – to)
• Name and address of employer
• Type of business or sector
• Occupation or position held
• Main activities and responsibilities

MAR 1997 to SEP 2002
ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd, Brussels
Public Sector Consultancy
Consultant and then Senior Consultant
Participation in numerous evaluations and transnational research studies either as project manager, core team member or national expert.

• Dates (from – to)
• Name and address of employer
• Type of business or sector
• Occupation or position held
• Main activities and responsibilities

OCT 1996 to FEB 1997
EUROPEAN COMMISSION, DG ENTERPRISE (DG XXIII at the time), Brussels
EU Institution
Stagiaire in Unit A1, Concerted Actions for SMEs
Tasks involved compiling information and participation in preparing the third biannual report of the Commission on the “Co-ordination of activities to assist SMEs and the Craft sector”; inter-service consultation with other DGs; assistance in the preparation of a Recommendation on improving SME access to Community programmes.

• Dates (from – to)
• Name and address of employer
• Type of business or sector
• Occupation or position held
• Main activities and responsibilities

SEP 1993 - SEP 1995
ABN AMRO Bank N.V., Thessaloniki, Greece
Bank
Junior account manager in the corporate loans division
Tasks included financial statement analysis, corporate loans monitoring and management, credit administration, preparation of periodic reports and client liaison.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
• Dates (from – to)
• Name and type of organisation providing education and training
  • Principal subjects/occupational skills covered
  • Title of qualification awarded

1995-1996
London School of Economics, UK
Principal subjects: International Relations, EU Institutions, European History, EU Economics
M.Sc. European Studies

1990-1993
University of Birmingham, UK
education and training

- Principal subjects/occupational skills covered
- Title of qualification awarded

**Principal subjects:** Economics, Finance, Accounting, EU and UK Banking Law

**B.Soc.Sc. Money, Banking and Finance**

**PERSONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*Acquired in the course of life and career but not necessarily covered by formal certificates and diplomas.*

**MOTHER TONGUE**

GREEK

**OTHER LANGUAGES**

- Reading skills: Excellent
- Writing skills: Excellent
- Verbal skills: Excellent

FRENCH

- Reading skills: Excellent
- Writing skills: Good
- Verbal skills: Excellent

SPANISH

- Reading skills: Excellent
- Writing skills: Good
- Verbal skills: Good

PORTUGUESE

- Reading skills: Good
- Writing skills: Basic
- Verbal skills: Basic

**SOCIAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*Living and working with other people, in multicultural environments, in positions where communication is important and situations where teamwork is essential (for example culture and sports), etc.*

Excellent communication skills acquired throughout university studies in the UK and by living and working in the Brussels multicultural environment for 6 years. This offered Anna the opportunity to build friendships and work collaborations with people from many different nationalities. Anna’s communication skills are enhanced by a strong interest in foreign languages and in travelling.

Work for the European Employment Observatory has required Anna to coordinate teams of experts and civil servants from 29 countries over a four year period.

**ORGANISATIONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**
*Coordination and administration of people,*

Through 11 years of experience in the management of a number of large, pan-European research and evaluation projects, Anna has developed good client relationships, strong people management skills, the ability to manage complex
Anna also has a good commercial awareness through the management of projects and budgets and through 2 years of corporate banking experience. Anna possesses strong analytical skills, a solid awareness of qualitative and quantitative analysis methods, strong report writing and presentation skills, and a proven ability to win work.

**TECHNICAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**

*With computers, specific kinds of equipment, machinery, etc.*

- Computer skills in word processing, spreadsheet and database programmes, acquired on the job and through on-the-job training.

**ARTISTIC SKILLS AND COMPETENCES**

*Music, writing, design, etc.*

- Piano
- Oil painting

**DRIVING LICENCE(S)**

- Greek driving licence

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Reference:
Ms Pat Irving
GHK Consulting Ltd
Email: Pat.Irving@ghkint.com

**ANNEXES**

ANNEX 1: SELECTED RELEVANT RESEARCH AND EVALUATION EXPERIENCE

**ANNEX 1: Selected Project Experience:**

**Evaluation Experience**

- Project Manager, External Evaluation of the Centre for the Development of Vocational Education and Training in Europe (Cedefop) - EC DG EAC (2007/2008)
- Core team member, Evaluation of the European Year of Languages 2001 – DG EAC (2002)
- Core team member, Evaluation of the European Voluntary Service Programme – DG EAC (2000)
- Core team member, Ex-Ante Appraisal of the Human Resources aspect of the Greek Regional Development Plan and Greek Operational Programmes under the Structural Funds 2000-2006 – DGEMPL (1999)
Core team member, Evaluation of the Jean Monnet Pilot Action –DG EAC (1999)
Core team member, Evaluation of the European Year of Lifelong Learning 1996 – DG EAC (1997)

National research experience

- Country Expert for Greece and Cyprus, A European Inventory on Validation of Non-formal and Informal Learning – EC DG EAC (2007)
- Country Expert for Greece: Study on the management systems for the demand and supply of continuous training in the EU - INEM Spain (2000)
- Project Manager for Greece: Study on ways to promote women’s entrepreneurship in the Greek region of Thrace ADAPT (1999)
- Project Manager for Greece: Identification of market needs for new professions to inform careers’ advice and training provision in the Prefecture of Rodopi, Greece (1998)

Transnational Research Experience

- Core Team Member, the New EU Member States and Local Employment Development: Taking Stock and Planning for the Future. - EC DG EMPL (2005/2006)
- Core team member, ‘Identification, Dissemination and Exchange of good practice in Local Employment development (IDELE)’ - EC DG EMPL (2005)
- Core team member, Feasibility Study on the Creation of a Cultural Observatory on Cultural Cooperation – EC DG EAC (2002)
- Project Manager, Study “Foundations and Social Capital” on best practice in interventions building social capital – AICE (2001)
- Core team member, Study on the status of older workers in five EU countries – EC DG EMPL (2001)
- Core team member, Study on the status of third country nationals entering EU member states for the purpose of paid or self-employment – EC DG JHA (2000)
- Core team member, Study on the status of asylum seekers in five EU member states – EC DG 1A (2000)
- Core team member, Study on the impact of EU policy and programmes on lifelong learning – EC DG EAC

A10
- Core team member, Urban Audit – EC DG REGIO (1999/2000)

**Technical Assistance Experience**

- Project Manager, Secretariat of the European Employment Observatory - EC DG EMP (2001-2005)
- Core team member, European Refugee Fund Technical Assistance Office – EC DG JHA (2000-2001)
- Core team member, TETRISS, DG XIII (1998)
PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name  Ian Atkinson
Address  31-32 Park Row, Leeds, LS15JD, UK
Telephone  +44 (0)113 2904107
Fax  +44 (0)113 2904119
E-mail  ian.atkinson@ecotec.com
Nationality  British
Date of birth  01/06/1973

WORK EXPERIENCE

• Dates (from – to)  FROM 2003 – CURRENT
• Name and address of employer  ECOTEC Research & Consulting, 31-32 Park Row, Leeds, LS1 5JD, UK
• Type of business or sector  Research and Consultancy
• Occupation or position held  Senior Consultant
• Main activities and responsibilities  Managing projects, conducting research, in particular related to:
  - evaluation
  - employment and labour markets
  - regeneration
  - learning and skills

• Dates (from – to)  2002 – 2003
• Name and address of employer  Department for Work and Pensions, Kings Court, 80 Hanover Way, Sheffield, S3 7UF
• Type of business or sector  UK Central Government Research
• Occupation or position held  Research Officer
• Main activities and responsibilities  Design, management and undertaking of research into employment and pensions

• Dates (from – to)  2001 – 2002
• Name and address of employer  Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN
• Type of business or sector  University
• Occupation or position held  Research Associate
• Main activities and responsibilities  Undertaking research on an ESRC funded project on 'Devolution and the
responsible for politics of business representation.

Dates (from – to) 1997 – 2000
Name and address of employer Department of Politics, University of Sheffield, Elmfield, Northumberland Road, Sheffield, S10 2TU
Type of business or sector University
Occupation or position held Part time Lecturer and Tutor (whilst undertaking PhD)
Main activities and responsibilities Lecturing and tutoring undergraduate students, assessing work and examination marking

**EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates (from – to)</th>
<th>1995 – 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and type of organisation providing education and training</td>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal subjects/occupational skills covered</td>
<td>Politics, Philosophy, Economics, Sociology, Ecology, International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of qualification awarded</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level in national classification</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates (from – to)</th>
<th>1994 – 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and type of organisation providing education and training</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal subjects/occupational skills covered</td>
<td>Modern International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of qualification awarded</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level in national classification</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates (from – to)</th>
<th>1991 – 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and type of organisation providing education and training</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal subjects/occupational skills covered</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of qualification awarded</td>
<td>BA (Hons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level in national classification</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES

Acquired in the course of life and career but not necessarily covered by formal certificates and diplomas.

MOTHER TONGUE

English

ORGANISATIONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES

Qualitative and quantitative research design
Formative and summative evaluation
Conference and other presentations of research findings
Policy and programme analysis, evaluation and strategy development
Technical assistance for policy implementation

TECHNICAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES

Skilled in MS Office including Excel and Visio. Project management.

DRIVING LICENCE(S)

Full UK, no endorsements

SELECTED CURRENT AND RECENT RESEARCH AND CONSULTANCY PROJECTS

Academy for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice and European Urban Knowledge Network. ECOTEC is working with the ASC to enable the development of a best practice and research e-library as part of the latter’s role as the UK’s national focal point for the European Urban Knowledge Network. Ian is managing this project which involves identifying relevant documentation on the subject of skills for sustainable communities and summarising key details onto a template for uploading to the EUKN website. In addition recommendations are being developed for a peer review/quality assurance process for use in the future.

Department for Work and Pensions and DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities - EU EQUAL Programme. As part of the EU's seven year trans national EQUAL programme Ian acts as expert advisor to the programme's 'lifelong learning and inclusive work practices' theme. This involves providing expert input to the regular technical network group meetings for this theme. The last meeting in March 2007 focussed on the Leitch Review during which Ian facilitated a discussion group on the implications of the review for future policy and the EQUAL programme.

North West Development Agency - Northern Way Evaluation C1: Bringing More People into Employment. Ian is managing ECOTEC’s recently commissioned evaluation of the Northern Way's C1 Investment Priority: Bringing More People into Employment. The evaluation will run for two years, assessing the operation and impact of the C1 investment strand and the projects within it. The work also aims to deliver evidence and intelligence to inform future policy and practice at the local, regional and national level to ensure that the needs of the Northern Way are met.
Yorkshire Forward – Developing a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Regional Skills Partnership. The aim of this study was to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for the Regional Skills Alliance/Regional Skills Partnership that can be used to evaluate and track Regional Skills Partnership activity over the medium term. It involved reviewing activity in other regions and working with regional partners to develop qualitative and quantitative indicators and impact measures to measure activity. Ian was involved both in the high level consultations undertaken for the work and in the development of the framework itself.

Communities and Local Government – Evaluation of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (Local Research Project) Ian led on the Sheffield case study area for ECOTEC’s Local Research Project which has formed part of the overall evaluation of the UK Government’s National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. A range of desk research and extensive consultation with over 100 interviewees led to the production of a Sheffield Case Study report to feed into the overall evaluation. Interviews were undertaken at a range of levels from Leader of the City Council and Council Chief Executive, through Directors of Service in the Council, members of the Local Strategic Partnership, individuals representing service providers such as the Police and health services, Council officers, representatives of local VCS groups, and local residents.

dmeda - Evaluation of emda (Enterprising Communities and Employment, Learning and Skills Strands) Ian led the evaluation of emda’s Enterprising Communities and Employment, Learning and Skills strands of the 2003 RES as part of ECOTEC’s 3 year overall evaluation of the economic impact of emda. The economic impact assessment for each strand used an adaptation of the standard RDA model for assessing impact, calculating net impacts through assessing deadweight, displacement, leakage and applying applicable multiplier values. The work also involved a detailed analysis of the profile of expenditure, activities and outputs under each strand of emda’s work, project assessments, interviews with key stakeholders, strategic added value workshops and assessment, along with the quantitative impact analysis.

Department for Work and Pensions - Jobcentre Plus Ethnic Minority Ward Performance Evaluation. Ian was responsible for two case study areas in Bradford and Leeds as part of this work which looked at the performance of Jobcentre Plus in respect of its ethnic minority customers. The evaluation focused on the additional resources given to certain districts to improve performance, and provided a number of recommendations in respect of this.

South Yorkshire ILM Consortium – Evaluation of the South Yorkshire Intermediate Labour Market Programme (SYCON). Ian managed the evaluation of the SYCON ILM programme. The study involved interviewing a range of business and social enterprise managers along with the beneficiaries of the programme – the long term unemployed and those with multiple barriers to employment. The interim report and its recommendations were disseminated through a conference involving a minister from DWP and key regional policy makers from the RDA and Objective One Directorate.
**One North East - Evaluation of the Regional Language Network.** The overall aim of this study was to evaluate the performance of the Regional Language Network North East, between March 2002 and July 2007, and inform its future development given the end of its funding in March 2008. Informed by the RDA evaluation framework, Ian developed the impact assessment of RLN as part of the evaluation, involving measuring the outputs, outcomes and net impacts of the project including strategic added value.

**Department for Work and Pensions – Assessment of the Cities Strategy Pathfinder Business Plans.** Ian recently assessed the business plans of five of the Cities Strategy Pathfinder areas which began operating in 2007. The assessment involved appraising the degree to which the Plans fitted DWP's criteria and assisting the Pathfinder areas in developing their plans so they could be signed off by Ministers prior to their implementation. As part of this Ian gave feedback to each of the multi-agency Pathfinder management teams and the team in charge of Pathfinder implementation within DWP.

**Yorkshire and Humber Assembly – Scrutiny Review 11 on 'Employment'.** Ian recently provided expert consultancy advice to the Regional Assembly's standing Scrutiny Board as part of its statutory review of employment policy in Yorkshire and the Humber. Working with the Scrutiny Board, Ian assisted with developing lines of enquiry, selecting and refining questions for the formal Scrutiny Hearing and presenting a key issues paper at the hearing.

**Yorkshire Forward - Evaluation of Yorkshire Futures.** ECOTEC was commissioned by Yorkshire Forward to evaluate Yorkshire Futures, the regional observatory for Yorkshire and Humberside. Ian managed the evaluation which involved desk research into, and follow-up phone calls with, each of the English regional observatories along with a series of face-to-face consultations with Yorkshire Futures staff, lead partners and wider partners / end users of the observatory's services. Following the consultations a 'Way Forward' workshop was held with members of the Yorkshire Futures steering group to refine a series of recommendations relating to the future development of the observatory.

**One NorthEast – Evaluation of the North East Regional Information Partnership.** ECOTEC was awarded a contract to evaluate the North East Regional Information Partnership (NERIP), the regional observatory for the North East. Ian managed the evaluation which involved desk research into, and follow-up phone calls with, each of the English regional observatories along with a series of face-to-face consultations with NERIP staff, lead partners and wider partners / end users of NERIP's services. Following the consultations a 'Way Forward' workshop was held with key NERIP stakeholders to refine a series of recommendations relating to the future development of NERIP.

**Department for Education and Skills - Evaluation of the ‘Success for All’ Testbeds.** Ian was responsible for evaluating the Greater Merseyside ‘testbed’ as part of ECOTEC’s national evaluation of the government’s high profile ‘Success for All’ testbed pilots. The aim of the testbeds is to accelerate progress in respect of implementing the four ‘themes’ of ‘Success for All’. The evaluation provided formative recommendations and summative reporting of the impact of this ‘acceleration’ funding throughout the testbed programme.
PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name  Adrien MOULIN
Address  Rue Joseph II, 9, B-1000 Brussels
Telephone  +32 (0)2 743 89 49
Fax  +32 (0)2 732 71 11
E-mail  adrien.moulin@ecotec.com

Nationality  French and German
Date of birth  30th August 1985

WORK EXPERIENCE

• Dates (from – to)  SEPTEMBER 2008 - PRESENT
• Name and address of employer  ECOTEC Research and consulting, Rue Joseph II, 9, B-1000 Brussels
• Type of business or sector  Research and Consulting
• Occupation or position held  Research Assistant
  • Main activities and responsibilities  Member of the ECOTEC Brussels core research team. Research support

• Dates (from – to)  APRIL 2008-SEPTEMBER 2008
• Name and address of employer  Global Urban Research Unit (GURU), Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
• Type of business or sector  University Research Centre
• Occupation or position held  Research associate
  • Main activities and responsibilities  Coordination support for the EU research project ‘Social Polis’: organisation of a workshop at the European Commission, communication with Lead Partners, Stakeholders and Researchers, research and website support

• Dates (from – to)  AUGUST 2006 – SEPTEMBER 2006
• Name and address of employer  Deutsches Seminar für Stadtentwicklung und Wirtschaft, DSSW, Berlin, Germany
• Type of business or sector  Research organisation
• Occupation or position held  Intern
  • Main activities and responsibilities  SPSS and Excel-dataset analysis related to the project “supply oriented area development”, construction of graphs, research support

• Dates (from – to)  SEPTEMBER 2005
• Name and address of employer  Société Anonyme d’économie mixte d’Aménagement Foncier et
employer: d’Urbanisme (SAFU), Perpignan, France
- Type of business or sector: Public-Private Regeneration Agency
- Occupation or position held: Intern
- Main activities and responsibilities: Research into housing provision in France and Europe, building analysis (listing of buildings scheduled for rehabilitation), written reports.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
- Name and type of organisation providing education and training: Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- Principal subjects/occupational skills covered: Infrastructure, Mobility and Society; Land economics; Sustainable Communities; Spatial Strategies; Planning in Developing Countries; Planning Frameworks; The Reflective Practitioner. 
Dissertation: Regenerating tower block areas, case study in Newcastle.
- Title of qualification awarded: MSc in Town Planning
- Level in national classification: ISCED 5

- Name and type of organisation providing education and training: Université de Paris I – Panthéon Sorbonne, Paris, France
- Principal subjects/occupational skills covered: Human and Physical Geography, Town Planning and Urban Development (Housing, Local Development, Planning Policies, Environment and Territory, Urbanism Workshop etc.) and the essential tools for practice (Statistics, Spatial analysis, GIS, cartography etc.).
- Title of qualification awarded: ‘Licence’ (BA) in Geography
- Level in national classification: ISCED 5

PERSONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES

MOTHER TONGUE
- French and German

OTHER LANGUAGES
- English
  - Reading skills: Excellent
  - Writing skills: Excellent
  - Verbal skills: Excellent
- Spanish
  - Reading skills: Very Good
  - Writing skills: Intermediate
  - Verbal skills: Intermediate
| SOCIAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES | Active member of the ‘Fédération Paris 1’, platform gathering most societies from Paris 1 University and representing (2005-2007)  
University advisor in high schools, Paris 1 University. (2006–2007)  
| ORGANISATIONAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES | President of the association « Oekoumène », Faculty of Geography, Paris 1 University. Working budget: 2000 - 8000 Euro.  
*Skills gained: responsibility, teamwork, communication skills, efficiency, organisation.* |
| TECHNICAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES | Computer literate: Word, Excel, PowerPoint.  
Intermediate level: Cartaphilo, SPSS, GIS – ArcGIS, Adobe Illustrator. |
Annex Two: Allocation of human resources and timetable
### Inputs by task and individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Management, Analysis and Evaluation</th>
<th>Data and evidence collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOTEC</td>
<td>USE/Ital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 0 Inception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 Collection and collation of documents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 Inception report and first steering group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 Review of URBAN II programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Internal team briefing and guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Document collection and review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Initial assessment of results</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Telephone interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Programme and Country Review Templates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 Assessment of URBACT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Developing methodological tools</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Document review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Interviews</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Preparing report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 Case Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Selection of case studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Case study research and field work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Drawing lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Profiling “good practice” projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Coordination and synthesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 Conclusions and lessons for the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Collecting and analysing data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 Management and coordination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Steering group and presentation meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Progress meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Expert Panel Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- **Total Tasks**: 5
- **Total Members**: 14
- **Total Task Hours**: 211
- **Total Task Days**: 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 0</th>
<th>Inception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 0.1</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 0.2</td>
<td>Collection and collation of relevant documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 0.3</td>
<td>Inception report and first steering group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Review of URBAN II Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.1</td>
<td>Internal team briefing and guideline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.2</td>
<td>Document collection and review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.3</td>
<td>Initial assessments of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.4</td>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.5</td>
<td>Programme and Country Review Templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.6</td>
<td>Interim Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Assessment of URBACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.1</td>
<td>Developing methodological tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.2</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.3</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.4</td>
<td>Preparing report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.4</td>
<td>Second Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.4</td>
<td>First Expert Panel Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.1</td>
<td>(Finalising) selection of case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.2a</td>
<td>Case study research and field work pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.2b</td>
<td>Remaining case study research and field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.3</td>
<td>Drawing lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.4</td>
<td>Profiling “good practice” projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.5</td>
<td>Coordination and synthesis of case study work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.5</td>
<td>Second Expert Panel Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.5</td>
<td>Presentation of case study findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Conclusions and lessons for the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.1</td>
<td>Collating and analysing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.2</td>
<td>Synthesis, conclusions and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.2</td>
<td>Presentation of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.2</td>
<td>Third Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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