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## Foreword

This document serves as a template for the benefits management and evaluation plan which meets the Department for Transport's (DfT) requirements for local authority major schemes. This document is intended to be used in conjunction with the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) to aid scheme promoters when developing the benefits management and evaluation plan. This document is intended for benefits management, monitoring, and evaluation practitioners working on a local authority major schemes project.

We recommend that authors follow the structure set within this template. However, this template can be adapted to best suit the requirements of individual schemes. The details set out represent minimum requirements for benefits management and evaluation. Scheme promoters are encouraged to include additional information where applicable (for example, where local monitoring and evaluation exceeds the requirements in this template).

The benefits management and evaluation plan should be prepared in conjunction with the full business case. Upon completion, the benefits management and evaluation plan should be handed to DfT for review. Please note that DfT approval of the benefits management and evaluation plan is required before the full business case can be approved.

For all queries, and to submit a benefits management and evaluation plan to DfT, please contact local.evaluation@dft.gov.uk.

## Executive summary

Please provide an executive summary that sets out in two to three pages:

* A summary of the proposed scheme;
* The key scheme objectives and research questions that the planned benefits management and evaluation activities will seek to address;
* The benefits management and evaluation approach(es), including which types of evaluation will be conducted (e.g. process, impact, value for money evaluation);
* The key outcomes and impacts which will be evaluated, and a brief overview of the methods used to evaluate these;
* Planned timelines for benefits management, monitoring, and evaluation activities (including procurement, if relevant, and baseline data collection); and
* The proposed budget for the delivery of the planned benefits management, monitoring, and evaluation.

### Scheme factsheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scheme name: |  |
| Benefits management and evaluation tier: | Choose an item. |
| Scheme typology: | Add the scheme typology, or typologies. See paragraph 2.2 of the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) for full list of typologies. |
| Scheme forecasted costs: | Estimated whole scheme capital costs |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Status | Version | Author | Approved by | Date | Changes |
| Brief description (e.g. internal draft, internal approved, external final) | V0.1 | Name Surname Email | Name Surname Email | dd/mm/yyyy | A brief description of the key changes relative to the previous version |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scheme approval: | Date of outline business case approval |
| Scheme commencement: | Forecast dates from the full business case |
| Scheme completion: | Forecast dates from the full business case |
| Scheme opening: | Forecast dates from the full business case |

1. Scheme background and context

### Scheme background

* 1. This section should outline the location of the scheme. An annotated map or aerial view is recommended to show the location of all scheme elements.
	2. This section should indicate the wider contextual factors of the region served by the scheme: e.g. what are the main area(s) that will be served by the scheme, or where are the new developments that have affected the transport network in the area. The current 'state of play' of the scheme area should be described here, with a focus on any contextual factors relevant to the key scheme objectives (e.g. if a key scheme objective is to reduce journey times, this section may refer to congestion, bottlenecks, needing to serve an expanding area, etc.), which should then clearly indicate why the proposed works are necessary.

### Scheme description

* 1. This section should provide a description of the scheme. It should include the proposed works, scheme costs, delivery timeframe, and any contextual factors which may influence delivery of the scheme as a whole. Where a scheme consists of multiple phases, or tranches, it is recommended to present a table or timeline clearly indicating the location, the scope of the proposed works, the planned costs, and any risks associated with each delivery phase. If an annotated map of the scheme was provided in the scheme background section, scheme promoters may wish to refer to it here in conjunction with the table or timeline.
1. Scheme objectives and theory of change

### Scheme objectives

* 1. This section should outline the key objectives of the scheme. This should include at least three main objectives, plus secondary objectives if relevant. The identification of the main objectives should be consistent with the strategic dimension presented in the business case, including the scheme's [spending objectives](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a6bb9864060200143cb7ae/tag-spending-objective-analysis.pdf).
	2. Scheme objectives are not the same as research questions, which are set out in Section 3. Scheme objectives form the central strategic goals of the scheme (e.g. to improve road safety for users, reducing collisions). Research questions are how scheme promoters can test whether the scheme has met its objectives (see Section 3.1). Scheme promoters are required to present both the scheme objectives and associated research questions as part of the benefits management and evaluation plan.
	3. It is recommended to frame the objectives on the basis of the key proposed benefits of the scheme. Scheme objectives should be distinct (i.e. having each objective focus on the same impact, such as economic growth or journey times, would not be sufficient).
	4. While the identification of three main objectives is sufficient for the majority of schemes, scheme promoters are welcome to present more than three main objectives where relevant. However, scheme promoters will be expected to evaluate whether each of their stated objectives has been achieved, meaning that schemes with a larger number of objectives will typically conduct more monitoring and evaluation activities. As such, smaller schemes or those conducting routine renewal and maintenance may wish to have fewer objectives, and larger or transformational schemes may include more objectives.

### Theory of change

* 1. This section should provide a theory of change for the scheme, explaining how the intended benefits, outcomes, and impacts are expected to be achieved. The theory of change should include: context, inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impacts.
	2. It is recommended to visually convey the information in this section, for example using a logic map.
	3. Section 4 of the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) provide detailed guidance on developing a theory of change, and Annex B of the Framework sets out illustrative logic maps for each scheme typology.
1. Benefits management and evaluation objectives and research questions
	1. This chapter is required for standard tier schemes only.

### Benefits management approach

#### Identified benefits

* 1. This section should outline the approach taken to identifying benefits. The glossary in the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) (Annex C) defines what is meant by benefits and disbenefits.
	2. The prioritised list of benefits and disbenefits should be recorded in the table below. Where possible, record the desired/quantified level of change for each benefit e.g. “decrease journey times by X minutes”. Include the scheme objective that each benefit links to.
	3. Benefits can be prioritised based on:
* Contribution to scheme objectives – do the benefits contribute towards one or more specified objective(s)?
* Stakeholder perception – during benefits identification were certain benefits deemed to be more important by key stakeholders?
* Reach of realisation – which benefits have the greatest impact in terms of the number and distribution of beneficiaries, likely geographical reach, and economic or social impact?
* Scale of realisation – where can the biggest improvements be made?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **Benefit description** | **Rationale** | **Taken forward for measurement and planning? (Y/N)** | **Method to measure benefit**  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |

Table 1 Benefits priority list

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **Disbenefit description** | **Rationale** | **Taken forward for measurement and planning? (Y/N)** | **Method to measure disbenefit** |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 Disbenefits priority list. Scheme promoters may order disbenefits by expected likelihood and/or impact of the disbenefit materialising

* 1. Scheme promoters should ensure the method or approach used to prioritise the benefits and disbenefits is clearly described.
	2. Scheme promoters and project delivery officials may wish to use benefits profiles to map and measure the expected benefits from the scheme. This includes the following for each benefit:
* How, when, and by whom the benefit will be measured;
* Any known risks and mitigations to realising the benefit;
* Details of who owns the benefit and who is accountable for realisation; and
* Timeline of when you expect the benefit to be realised (if possible).

#### Outline of appraisal approach

* 1. This section should briefly outline how the Cost Benefit Analysis was undertaken for the Economic Case (see [TAG unit A1-1](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/webtag-tag-unit-a1-1-cost-benefit-analysis-may-2018) for further information). This should include who was responsible for the analysis when the assessment was undertaken and where the information is stored. A high-level overview of the assumptions underpinning the model should also be outlined.
	2. If the project has completed an Appraisal Handover Pack (which is recommended) a high-level outline of the process undertaken and who was involved would be beneficial. More information on Appraisal Handover Packs can be found in Appendix D of [TAG TPM - Guidance for the Technical Project Manager](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5fbfb363e90e077edee80818/tag-guidance-for-technical-project-manager.pdf).
	3. For each of the benefits that can be monetised using [TAG](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/transport-analysis-guidance-tag), the table below should be populated with the expected monetary value and should be updated each time appraisal is re-done. This data can be obtained from the Appraisal Summary Table. Any sensitivity analysis carried out for any of the benefits should also be mentioned here.
	4. Providing this data will be useful when conducting value for money evaluation in the post-opening reports, allowing forecast benefits to be compared to what has materialised.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category of impact | Benefit / disbenefit | £ value |
| Economy | Business users and private sector providers |  |
|  | Reliability impact on business users |  |
|  | Regeneration |  |
|  | Wider impacts |  |
| Environment | Noise |  |
|  | Air quality |  |
|  | Greenhouse gases |  |
|  | Landscape |  |
| Social | Commuting and other users |  |
|  | Accidents |  |
|  | Physical activity |  |
|  | Journey quality |  |
|  | Reliability impact on commuting and other users |  |
|  | Option and non-use values |  |
| Public accounts | Cost to broad transport budget |  |
|  | Indirect tax-revenues |  |

Table 3 Benefits business case values example. Scheme promoters should add in any additional impacts from the appraisal summary table where present

### Evaluation scope

* 1. This section should be completed by all schemes allocated to the standard tier. Schemes allocated to the basic monitoring tier are not required to set out the scope of evaluation.
	2. This section should outline the scope of the evaluation. It should include a discussion of what the evaluation will cover, as well as any objectives which will not be within the scope of the evaluation (and why these will not be covered by the evaluation). Scheme promoters should ensure the scope of the evaluation covers all scheme objectives and identified benefits, where proportionate.

### Research questions

* 1. This section should be completed by all schemes allocated to the standard tier. Schemes allocated to the basic monitoring tier are not required to formally set out research questions, although they may choose to do so.
	2. This section should set out the research questions which will be addressed by the benefits management and evaluation plan. Scheme promoters may wish to include a set of overarching research questions which are linked to scheme objectives, in addition to a set of detailed sub-questions. Sub-questions are specific, narrow questions that are used to further explore a particular aspect of an overarching research question. For example, if a key objective is improving road safety, sub-questions might be included covering vehicle collisions, pedestrian and cyclist collisions, and public perceptions of pedestrian and cyclist safety.
	3. Research questions must be included which address each scheme objective (except objectives considered out of scope in the 'evaluation scope' section) and cover each impact which scheme promoters are required to report on. It is recommended to include research questions which assess the main identified benefits. It is also recommended that scheme promoters number research questions, so that they can be referred to easily in future sections.
	4. Scheme promoters may also include research questions which are of interest, but not directly related to scheme objectives. For example, although the scheme may not be intended to address noise outcomes, scheme promoters might choose to include this question in the evaluation to understand unintended consequences of the scheme.
	5. While overarching research questions will be broad in nature, sub-questions should be specific and measurable. Scheme promoters can consider the following guidelines for formulating appropriate research sub-questions:
* The direction of the anticipated effect (e.g. increase, decrease, no change).
* What will be measured (e.g. a reduction in journey times during peak hours);
* Where the data will be collected from. What locations, groups, etc. (e.g. a reduction in journey times during peak hours on the X road, between junction 1 and 2);
* The magnitude of the effect. While it is acceptable for scheme promoters to simply say they expect a change resulting from the scheme (e.g. a reduction in journey times during peak hours on the X road), scheme promoters should indicate the size of this effect, where known or anticipated (e.g. an average reduction in journey times of X minutes or more during peak hours on the X road between junction 1 and 2);
* When the outcome is to be expected (e.g. a reduction in journey times during peak hours on the X road between junction 1 and 2, within one year of scheme opening).
* The type of evaluation that will be undertaken to address each research question, and the type of data collected. For example, research questions developed for process evaluation may require qualitative interview data from key stakeholders; these will be different to impact evaluation questions which may require assessing journey times based on traffic count data.
	1. Scheme promoters should refer to modelling and appraisal when formulating research questions, to determine the size of the anticipated impacts. Further, scheme promoters should consider existing research and evaluation data where relevant to inform anticipated impacts, for example by referring to ex-post evaluation of schemes of a similar nature. Scheme promoters may wish to refer to previous [local authority major schemes meta-evaluations](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-major-schemes-meta-evaluation-2011-to-2016).
	2. While the guidelines above provide considerations when formulating research sub-questions, it may not be possible to include all considerations for all research sub-questions (e.g. where anticipated effects are unknown, the direction and magnitude of effects may be omitted). As such, some research sub-questions may be more open-ended. At a minimum, research sub-questions should specify what will be measured (for example, a research sub-question for air quality could at minimum specify to measure 'changes in PM2.5 and PM10 concentration, between pre-construction and post-opening'). It is recommended that the research questions are clearly numbered, for ease of reference in future sections.
	3. Below is an example table which shows a recommended way to structure research sub-questions, which would link to overarching research questions tied to the scheme's objectives. For example, RQ2.1 would link to overarching RQ2 which explores the scheme's impacts on travel time.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number | Research question | Category | Evaluation  |
| RQ1 | What worked well, and what worked less well during delivery of the scheme? | Scheme build | Process evaluation |
| RQ2 | Has the scheme had an overall positive impact on reducing travel times in the scheme area?  | Travel times and reliability | Impact evaluation |
| RQ2.1 | Has a reduction in journey times of anticipated journey time reduction occurred, during peak hours on the road name between location 1 and location 2, within three years of scheme opening? | Travel times and reliability | Impact evaluation |
| RQ2.2 | Has there been any change in journey times, during peak hours on surrounding roads in locations 3, 4, and 5, within three years of scheme opening?  | Travel times and reliability | Impact evaluation |
| RQ3 | Has the scheme had an overall positive impact towards its environmental objectives (reducing emissions and improving air quality)?  | Carbon, air quality | Impact evaluation |
| RQ3.1 | Has a reduction in PM2.5 and PM10 concentration in monitoring locations occurred, relative to pre-construction levels?  | Air quality | Impact evaluation |
| RQ4 | Has the scheme had an overall positive impact on the local economy? | Impacts on the local economy | Impact evaluation |
| RQ4.1 | Have local businesses in the town centre, surveyed pre-construction and three years after scheme opening, felt a positive change towards revenue and volume of customers?  | Impacts on the local economy | Impact evaluation |
| RQ5 | Is the scheme on track to deliver the expected value for money?  | Value for money | VfM evaluation |
| RQ5.1 | Is the expected outturn BCR comparable to the ex-ante BCR? | Value for money | VfM evaluation |

Table 4 Example research questions. Research questions may be split into main questions (summarising the main impact towards each objective) and sub-questions (narrower specific research questions of interest)

### Evaluation approach

* 1. This section should be completed by all schemes allocated to the standard tier. Schemes allocated to the basic monitoring tier are not required to set out the evaluation approach.
	2. This section should outline the approach(es) taken to evaluation. This should clarify whether process, impact, and value for money (VfM) evaluation will be used.
	3. Scheme promoters should clarify whether they will conduct a light-touch 'lessons learned' exercise or a fuller process evaluation (see Section 5 of the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) for guidance). Scheme promoters should contact local.evaluation@dft.gov.uk to discuss whether a process evaluation is required.
	4. All standard tier schemes are required to conduct an impact evaluation and a VfM evaluation. For further guidance, see Sections 6 and 7 of the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) respectively.
	5. For each type of evaluation (process, impact or VfM), scheme promoters should specify the approach to analysis. For example, when conducting impact evaluation, it is expected that most scheme promoters will employ, at a minimum, a before/after analysis, comparing trends and levels in the key indicator(s) of interest prior to the introduction of the scheme, to those following the completion of the scheme. Scheme promoters should explain the chosen approach in sufficient detail that an unfamiliar reader could understand and replicate this evaluation. Where using counterfactuals, comparators, or synthetic controls to contextualise or isolate a scheme's impacts; scheme promoters should explain how these were selected.
	6. Any specialist terms and acronyms should be clearly defined in this section for readers unfamiliar with evaluation.
	7. Scheme promoters should explain the strengths and limitations of the chosen evaluation approach(es). Scheme promoters are reassured that including any limitations and caveats will not hinder approval of the benefits management and evaluation plan. Rather, the purpose is to establish a proportionate approach to benefits management and evaluation, while maintaining awareness of areas where evidence may be limited.
	8. For further guidance on evaluation approaches, see the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes), [TAG unit E-1](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tag-unit-e-1-evaluation), and the [Magenta Book](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book).
1. Data requirements and collection methods
	1. This section should provide details of the data being collected for each metric of relevance (for example, travel times and punctuality, passenger satisfaction, air quality) including data source(s) used, frequency of data collection, sample sizes, and other considerations (such as barriers to data collection).This section should contain subheadings for each collected metric (e.g. travel times and reliability, passenger satisfaction, air quality, impacts on the local economy, etc.).
	2. Data collected for both benefits management and evaluation purposes should be considered together in this section, as there is likely to be substantial overlap in monitoring conducted.
	3. This must include the required metrics, at a minimum. For basic tier schemes this includes:
* Scheme build;
* Outturn costs; and
* Delivered scheme.
	1. Standard tier schemes should include the above, with the addition of information on:
* Transport outcomes;
* Travel time and reliability; and
* Carbon.
	1. If relevant to the scheme's objectives, or if identified as a potential unintended consequence, standard tier schemes should also measure:
* Impacts on the local economy;
* Air quality;
* Safety; and
* Wider environmental impacts.
	1. Scheme promoters are encouraged to include any further metrics that are relevant to the scheme's objectives.
	2. For guidance on recommended metrics and data sources, see Annex A of the [Benefits Management and Evaluation Framework.](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes) The data sources highlighted in the framework are intended to reduce extensive monitoring requirements on local authorities where possible. In addition, they will aid the Department to make standardised comparisons across the local authority major schemes portfolio.
	3. The table below sets out the type of information that scheme promoters will be expected to provide for each identified metric.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Data  | Collection |
| Data source(s) | Where does this data come from (e.g. existing datasets, automatic traffic counters, …)  |
| Sample size | Where will this data be collected from? How many locations?  |
| Transport mode | What transport modes does this measure collect data on (e.g. all traffic, bus, cycle, etc.)? This will not be applicable to all data, for example scheme build information. |
| Frequency  | How often will this data be collected? Will data be aggregated?  |
| Risks or barriers  | Are there any risks or barriers to successful collection of this data? |
| Other factors  | Are there any special requirements for data collection to be aware of, e.g. seasonality, planned roadworks, school holidays, etc. |
| Scheme objective | What scheme objective(s) and research questions does this metric relate to? |

Table 5 Example data collection table for a metric

* 1. Scheme promoters should ensure details are provided about how both pre-construction baseline data and post-opening data will be collected. Further, if scheme promoters are including counterfactual or comparator data, details should be provided here.
	2. Baseline data should be gathered prior to the intervention; this will be either pre-construction or pre-operation depending on the scheme type. Where the implementation of a scheme is expected to cause widespread disruption (e.g. where scheme construction affects local traffic), the baseline should be gathered pre-construction. Where minimal disruption is expected, the baseline should be gathered pre-operation. Scheme promoters should not use data collection from the base year model development as these may be quite out of date by the time the intervention is operational.
	3. For each metric, where relevant, it is recommended to include a diagram which outlines the location(s) at which the data will be collected. For cases where monitoring is conducted at several locations, a table can also be useful.
	4. Where data collection involves the use of user surveys, please use an appendix to include a copy of the survey questions (if known at the planning stage).
1. Resourcing and governance

### Resourcing

* 1. This section should provide details of the budget allocated for benefits management and evaluation activities. This should include details on the budget for specific deliverables, including but not limited to: staff, data collection and monitoring, surveys, and final reporting.

### Governance

* 1. This section should provide details of the governance structure responsible for delivering the benefits management and evaluation. It recommended to include an organogram or diagram setting out the roles responsible for delivering benefits management, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.
	2. It may be helpful to provide a breakdown of the roles and responsibilities of those involved in benefits management, monitoring, and evaluation (e.g. project manager, evaluation manager, stakeholder lead).
	3. Where aspects of benefits management, monitoring, and evaluation are being externally contracted, this should be specified and described.

### Risk management

#### Risks to benefits realisation

* 1. This section should outline any risks to benefits realisation overall and suggested mitigating actions. This should also include risks to management and mitigation of disbenefits. Severity and likelihood of the risk occurring should be used to score a risk rating for each identified risk. It is recommended to include these in a red/amber/green format (Red = High, Amber = Medium, Green = Low). Risk mitigations should include dates wherever possible.
	2. Scheme promoters should outline how these risks were identified and assessed including who was involved, the process undertaken and how the risks will be managed going forward (for example will they be included in the project risk register). Management of risks to benefits realisation should be an integral part of the overall project/programme risk management process, in the same way as project delivery risks.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk scenario | Implications | Risk rating  | Risk mitigation(s) | Updated risk rating |
| Describe the risk | Detail what the implications of this risk would be for the project | Consider the severity of the risk and the likelihood of it occurring. It is recommended to provide this information in a red, amber, green format | Describe what mitigations or controls will be put in place to manage this risk | Provide an updated risk rating, after consideration of the mitigation measure(s) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6 Example benefits risk management table

#### Risks to evaluation

* 1. This section should identify and document any risks which may occur throughout the entire evaluation process. It is important to consider risk management at this stage, to allow for appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place proactively.
	2. The following categories of risk should be considered, but are not limited to:
* Data;
* Communication and stakeholder engagement;
* Competing interests;
* Changes in policy or environment;
* Resourcing and governance;
* Capacity and capability; and
* Ethical considerations.
	1. It is recommended to organise this information in a risk management table. An example is provided below, with 2 illustrative risk scenarios.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk scenario | Implications | Risk rating | Mitigation(s) | Updated risk rating |
| Describe the risk | Detail what the implications of this risk would be for the project | Consider the severity of the risk and the likelihood of it occurring. It is recommended to provide this information in a red, amber, green format | Describe what mitigations or controls will be put in place to manage this risk | Provide an updated risk rating, after consideration of the mitigation measure(s) |
| Illustration 1: Failure to obtain patronage data from bus operator | Evaluation of bus passenger patronage could not be conducted | Red - high severity, medium likelihood | Early data sharing agreements in place with bus operator, ensuring these agreements last the full duration of evaluation | Green - high severity, low likelihood  |
| Illustration 2: High staff turnover in evaluation team  | Could lead to scheme promoter being unclear about evaluation objectives, methods, deadlines. Could result in missing data if not correctly stored and labelled.  | Amber - medium severity, medium likelihood | Maintain accurate records of planned evaluation including benefits management and evaluation plan. Ensure data is clearly labelled and stored. Provide handover notes for team | Green - low severity, medium likelihood |

Table 7 Example evaluation risk management table

### Quality assurance

* 1. This section should provide details on the quality assurance processes. Scheme promoters should consider questions such as:
* Quality assurance. Who is responsible for conducting monitoring, evaluation, data analysis, and reporting? Is this someone with the technical knowledge to conduct this activity? What protocols will be in place for checking the accuracy and quality of all analyses and reporting? Will other individuals with sufficient technical knowledge also check outputs?
* Data governance. Who is in charge of the data? How will it be stored, labelled, and documented? How will the risk of data loss over the full evaluation period be mitigated?
* Data screening and cleaning. How will issues such as missing data, incomplete entries, and outliers be handled? What automatic and/or manual checks will be in place to inspect data?
	1. Further detail on best practices for assuring data quality and analytical outputs is available in [The Aqua Book: guidance on producing quality analysis for government](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7f3bb8e5274a2e87db49be/aqua_book_final_web.pdf).
1. Project and dissemination plan

### Project timeline

* 1. This section should contain a timeline outlining the anticipated dates for each stage of the project. Consideration should be given to key scheme milestones, monitoring and data collection, and post-opening reporting. This table should also include milestones for when the scheme's benefits and disbenefits are expected to be realised and targets are expected to be achieved.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Milestone** | **Anticipated date** |
| Baseline data collection |  |
| Scheme build |  |
| Scheme opening |  |
| Expected realisation of benefits |  |
| Year 1 post-opening data collection  |  |
| Year 1 post-opening report |  |
| Year 3 post-opening data collection |  |
| Year 3 post-opening report |  |

Table 8 Example project timeline

### Stakeholders

* 1. This section should provide detail on all relevant stakeholders who will be consulted and involved in the scheme. These may include, but are not limited to: central government, local and regional government, public consultations, contractors, developers, local businesses and industries, and environmental groups.
	2. Scheme promoters may wish to provide a diagram outlining the relevant stakeholders, as well as the timing of their involvement (scoping phase, analysis phase, delivery phase).

### Dissemination timeline and activities

* 1. This section should detail when and how findings from the evaluation will be communicated to key stakeholders.
	2. This should include consideration of when and with whom the benefits management and evaluation plan and post-opening reports will be shared.
	3. Scheme promoters are encouraged to consider other dissemination activities beyond the reporting requirements: for example, presentations to key stakeholders, meetings, steering groups, media and press opportunities, and drop-in sessions.
	4. This section should include a discussion of how lessons learned will be communicated to stakeholders, and at what stage of the project. For example, scheme promoters should consider how frequently dissemination activities will occur, and opportunities to provide interim lessons learned and improvements.