

Evaluation of the Bristol Objective 2 Neighbourhood Action Plan (2000 –2008)

Final Report December 2008

Vivid Regeneration



Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
1.1	Background.....	3
1.2	Have the aims and objectives of the Action Plan been met?.....	3
1.3	Was the delivery model effective?	4
1.4	What impact has the Action Plan had?.....	5
1.5	Was the money spent effectively?	5
1.6	What are the key lessons learned?	5
2	The Brief	7
3	Methodology	7
4	Background.....	8
5	Activities and Performance	9
5.1	Measure 1.1 - Develop the potential of the local community.....	9
5.2	Measure 1.2 - Address social, economic and environmental decline and disadvantage	11
5.3	Measure 1.3 - Remove barriers to employment and training for disadvantaged groups	14
6	Cross cutting themes	16
6.1	Equalities	16
6.2	ICT.....	17
6.3	Environmental sustainability.	17
7	Impacts	18
7.1	Population.....	18
7.2	Indices of Deprivation	18
7.3	Out of work benefits.....	18
7.4	Employee and Business Composition	19
8	Action Plan Management.....	19
8.1	The Accountable Body and Objective 2 Team	19
8.2	Decision making	19
8.3	Funding and Financial Management	21
8.4	Partnership Working	22
8.5	Evaluation	24
8.6	Sharing best practice.....	24
8.7	Marketing and Communication	24
9	Conclusion	25
	Appendix 1 Outputs.....	26
	Appendix 2 Baseline Data Update	30

Image Front Cover: BEST Managed Workspace – “The Old Library”

1 Executive Summary

1.1 Background

This evaluation was commissioned by Bristol City Council to assess the overall performance of the Bristol Objective 2 Neighbourhood Action Plan Programme, 2001–2008, specifically examining the following:

- Have the aims and objectives of the Action Plan been met?
- Was the delivery model effective?
- Was the money spent effectively?
- What impact has the Action Plan had?
- What are the key lessons learned?

The evaluation was carried out by Vivid Regeneration LLP between 11th November and 15th December 2008. The methodology included desk research, interviews, focus groups and two e-surveys. The Bristol Objective 2 Action Plan operated in two (continuous) phases, covering the period 2000 to 2004 and 2004 to 2008. After the initial phase, the Objective 2 team successfully secured additional funding to extend the work.

The Action Plan's three strategic objectives were to develop the potential of the local community; address social, economic and environmental decline and disadvantage; and remove barriers to employment and training for disadvantaged groups. In addition, the Action Plan sought to address three overarching themes relating to equalities, ICT and environmental sustainability.

The Action Plan covered the five Bristol wards of Ashley, Easton Lawrence Hill, Windmill Hill and Filwood. Levels of deprivation within the Objective 2 target area were significantly higher than in other wards in the South West region, with Lawrence Hill and Filwood being the most deprived wards in the South West Objective 2 Programme area.

Overall, the Action Plan proposed a total investment package of £30,042,018, of which £7,885,613 would be ERDF and £2,724,900 would be ESF, making a total of £10,610,513 EU Structural Funds. In addition, match funding of £19,431,505 was forecasted, predominantly from public sector sources.

In practice, the Action Plan invested a total of £30,835,183, of which £7,782,070 was ERDF and £2,617,300 was ESF, making a total of £10,399,370 Structural Funds. A total of £20,435,813 of match funding was secured. 49 projects were supported representing a broad range of capital and revenue initiatives.

1.2 Have the aims and objectives of the Action Plan been met?

The Action Plan was successful in meeting and over achieving its outputs. Full details are available in Appendix 1.

Key success factors included:

- Early investment in marketing and capacity building activities
- The two stage application process enabled the early sifting of projects, and identified quality bids with a good fit with the Action Plan priorities
- The retention of skilled staff from Urban 1 programme, experienced in managing projects and administering EU funding

- The majority of applicants had a good track record of managing regeneration funding (including EU funding) and delivered projects on time and to budget.
- The Action Plan benefited from Bristol having a very dynamic VCSE.

1.3 Was the delivery model effective?

Overall, the Action Plan was an effective delivery model and has been largely successful in providing a strategic, integrated and coherent framework for the delivery of EU Structural funds. The Objective 2 manager and staff team worked well to overcome the challenges arising from EU regulations, and the fact that some partnerships worked better than others.

The strengths of the delivery model were as follows:

- Decision making through Bristol Partnership's RDG (previously RPMG and PSG) ensured a strategic fit (which didn't happen with the delivery of structural funding in other parts of the SW region)
- Links with Neighbourhood Management and Neighbourhood Renewal areas assisted in focussing on local priorities and actions
- The two stage application process reduced the burden for applicants and encouraged a more diverse pool of project ideas
- Some processes were streamlined with other funders (e.g. SRB6)
- The Action Plan encouraged innovation and funded organisations and initiatives not traditionally supported with EU Structural funds
- Gaps in service provision were researched and solutions identified (ESOL, SME workspace)
- Opportunities to share best practice across Europe were undertaken through the INTERREG II initiative
- Identification of JCP match funding enabled commissioning of some 100% funded projects
- Organisations received good support and advice from Action Plan staff
- The Action Plan approach enabled the Objective 2 team to offer, where appropriate, increased flexibility in projects to overcome delivery challenges

Weaknesses of the delivery model were:

- Stakeholders commented that it was difficult for smaller organisations (and those without a track record of managing similar funding) to secure funding. Encouraging consortia bids could have addressed.
- More could have been done to strengthen black-led organisations, including infrastructure organisations
- The Action Plan had to operate during changes to the decision making structures which, in the early days, meant that decision making was perhaps less representative of the broad spectrum of partners, including VCS organisations and residents
- Projects that were successful at securing funding were those that could bring their own match funds. Other projects might have had a better strategic fit to the Action Plan priorities but, without match funding, could not be supported
- Recording beneficiary outputs for ESF was undertaken on a project by project basis which did not encourage projects to cross refer clients as it would impact on their agreed outputs
- Only 2 projects were evaluated and some of the lessons learnt will have been lost
- Efforts to bring projects together to share learning were not particularly successful

- BCC Regeneration was relatively unsuccessful at putting funding streams together in a way that was manageable and meaningful for projects on the ground
- There was a lack of capacity from the Action Plan staff to support projects with their exit strategies

1.4 What impact has the Action Plan had?

There have been some improvements in the Objective 2 area in terms of overall deprivation and unemployment. However, attributing changes to the work of the Action Plan is inherently difficult, and, given the current economic climate, it is likely that some of these positive trends will be reversed.

There has been a slight improvement in the Objective 2 area's IMD ranking. However, the majority of Filwood's LSOA's rankings have got worse, and Filwood and Lawrence Hill continue to have LSOAs that are within the worst 1% in England. The Objective 2 area has seen a reduction in the WAPG claiming out of work benefits. Particular successes have been a drop in Lone Parents claiming out of work benefits and the reduction of JSA claimants. There has been little change to the number of businesses and number of people employed within the Objective 2 area over the period (2001 – 2008).

Impacts need to be assessed against the context in which the Action Plan operated. There are a number of factors inhibiting swift improvements.

- Most of the Objective 2 target area has experienced very long-term deprivation.
- Using more recent population estimates, there was a rise in both the total numbers of Objective 2 area residents and the proportion of working age residents.
- There was a significant in-migration of BME communities into the area, primarily from EU accession countries and Africa, mainly from Somalia, including refugees and asylum seekers.
- Parts of the area – Lawrence Hill and Easton – experience significant population churn of about 14% annually. Residents leaving the area are likely to be more economically and socially mobile, resulting in a static or higher level of deprivation as the remaining residents are often those hardest to help.

1.5 Was the money spent effectively?

The Bristol Action Plan has been delivered to budget, which compares favourably to the financial performance of the rest of the South West programme. The Action Plan slightly under spent in terms of the amount of ERDF and ESF forecast. However, it secured an additional £1m of match funding compared to its initial projections. Most projects met their financial projections.

Given the over achievement of most outputs, the Action Plan has provided excellent value for money.

GOSW report that BCC, as the Accountable Body, provided robust financial management of the project and cited competent and experienced staff as an essential success factor.

1.6 What are the key lessons learned?

In the coming period, there will be less additional regeneration funding for Bristol, either from the EU, or central or regional government. The NDC programme will end shortly, and Bristol has not been included in the new Working Neighbourhoods initiative, though there are some opportunities for targeted regeneration work through

the new South West ERDF programme, particularly the Urban Enterprise strand. Major developments are planned for South Bristol, which incorporates Filwood, but there appear to be less clear follow-on regeneration plans for the inner city Objective 2 wards. This means that the “lessons learned” need to be applied to the way mainstream agencies deliver regeneration activities, and there are opportunities to take forward learning within the “refreshed” Bristol Partnership, re-organised local authority and the new Neighbourhood Partnerships.

This evaluation has drawn out a number of “lessons learned” throughout this report, relating to specific areas of the Action Plan programme. The following are a summary of key points:

1.6.1 Priority areas and needs

There are LSOAs throughout the Objective 2 area which continue to show high levels of multiple deprivation. Lawrence Hill and Filwood wards are particularly deprived. There are ongoing needs around job creation. Employment support should not just be about giving advice. Investment in “intermediate labour market” interventions, supporting the growth of real and sustainable jobs, may produce fewer outputs in regeneration programmes and thus look more costly, but in the long run, produce better outcomes. The role of social enterprises is key here, and existing and emerging social enterprises should be supported either directly or through resources deployed in specialist business advice. BCC and/or the Bristol Partnership should ensure that the new Business Simplification Support Programme (BSSP) reflects this priority in Bristol.

1.6.2 Resident engagement in decision-making

Through Objective 2 and other regeneration programmes, particularly Neighbourhood Renewal, Neighbourhood Managements Pilots and the NDC programme (Community at Heart), Bristol has developed a pool of experienced residents that continue to be active in VCSE organisations and in Neighbourhood Partnerships. There is also some ongoing support for this work delivered by Voscur. Both the LAAs and the Government’s Community Engagement White Paper see local decision making as key to improving regeneration outcomes. The lessons from the Action Plan are that this kind of work needs to be established early on in regeneration programmes, operate within all decision making structures, and be supported with training, resources and skilled staff.

1.6.3 Strategic working

Local, citywide and regional regeneration strategies need to be in place to inform funding priorities. Some Objective 2 funded projects developed specific locality plans (e.g. BEST’s work on Stapleton Road North) and some Neighbourhood Partnerships now have well-developed neighbourhood action plans. It would be useful for future regeneration work to have both strategies across wider geographical areas (such as the Inner City and South Bristol) as well as an over-arching, citywide Regeneration Strategy, providing a more detailed and coherent framework for locality based plans.

1.6.4 Partnership working

It is now well understood that successful regeneration requires excellent partnership working. Whilst there was some good collaborative working as part of the Action Plan programme, some partnership work was poor. Links between key BCC departments and the Objective 2 initiative could have been better, as could collaboration with key regional and sub-regional partners, such as SWRDA and the LSC. The “refreshed” Bristol Partnership offers opportunities to ensure that partners in regeneration are able to improve co-working, and efforts should be made to ensure that through Delivery Groups or task/sub-groups, key players are brought together. The

Employment Group and Enterprise Groups are good models, as they have focussed remits and appropriate memberships. The Government's consultation paper "Transforming places; changing lives" (2008) sets out proposals to put "communities and their councils at the heart of regeneration", with greater powers for local authorities to drive and co-ordinate regeneration locally.

1.6.6 Managing Regeneration Programmes

Clearly the Bristol Objective 2 Action Plan benefited from having excellent staff that were committed to achieving its objectives and "went the extra mile". However, at times it would have been useful to have more management and operational capacity. Though individual projects had exit strategies, there is no overall succession strategy for the Action Plan as a whole nor identified officers to ensure that the investment made continues to be sustained and built upon. This should be addressed.

The Objective 2 team developed some good management models - the two-stage application process and Working Manual - that should be implemented in other programmes. Both the team and Objective 2 projects developed considerable expertise that could be put to good use in future EU programmes, such as Urban Enterprise. Other key programme management lessons learned include the need to understand and plan for long lead in times for capital projects, especially if these include site identification. If programmes include cross cutting themes, these should be better monitored. In the light of some project closures, outcome measures should include economic sustainability (not just environmental sustainability), and project risk assessments should be strengthened to reflect this.

2 The Brief

This evaluation was commissioned by Bristol City Council, and was required to assess the overall performance of the programme, specifically examining the following:

- Have the aims and objectives of the Action Plan been met?
- Was the delivery model effective?
- Was the money spent effectively?
- What impact has the Action Plan had?
- What are the key lessons learned?

3 Methodology

The evaluation methodology comprised:

- A review of key documents and statistical information, including evaluations of Objective 2 funded projects, progress reports, minutes of meetings, financial information and statistical data.
- One-to one interviews and telephone interviews with key stakeholders.
- Two focus groups, comprising a range of stakeholders, including Objective 2 funded project managers; people contributing to decision making in the Objective 2 programme; and other regeneration and neighbourhood management initiatives.
- Two surveys, using an e-questionnaire, for Objective 2 funded projects and for a wider stakeholders group.

There were a number of challenges in assembling and accessing relevant information and data. These included:

- The Action Plan programme took place over a long period (7+ years), during which time some delivery organisations ceased to operate, many staff involved in the projects and programme management moved on, and decision-making structures and personnel changed.
- Contact details for key stakeholders over the whole time period were not all available. This, coupled with the short timescale allocated to the evaluation meant that only a relatively small number of stakeholders could be contacted or had time to provide feedback. Altogether, 13 projects and 3 stakeholders completed an e-survey; a total of 8 people attended focus groups; and 4 people were interviewed.
- There was a regional South West Objective 2 mid-term evaluation (Ecotec Research and Consulting, 2003). However, there had been no specific detailed mid term review of the Bristol Action Plan. Furthermore very few projects had undertaken an evaluation.
- There was no requirement to undertake a specific assessment of the cross cutting themes, therefore except for outputs there is no additional evidence to measure achievements.
- Some baseline socio-economic data was provided in the Action Plan proposals. However, it difficult to use statistical data to assess impacts over time, as some baseline data was not relevant to the interventions, follow up data was not always available, or collection methods had changed over time.

4 Background

The Bristol Objective 2 Neighbourhood Action Plan formed part of the South West of England Objective 2 Programme 2000 – 2008, and was funded under Priority 1: Neighbourhood Renewal, which had three measures:

- Measure 1.1 Neighbourhood ownership, leadership and democracy
- Measure 1.2 Taking forward neighbourhood regeneration
- Measure 1.3 Pathways to employment.

In previous rounds of regional EU programmes, it was usual practice for Government Office South West to invite direct applications from organisations in targeted areas for projects that delivered against the programme's strategic objectives (measures). However, Bristol's approach in the 2000 – 2008 Objective 2 round was to draw up an overall Action Plan for the city's target wards, and locally manage the delivery of a sub set of the agreed regional outputs and outcomes.

Overall, the Action Plan proposed a total investment package of £30,042,018, of which £7,885,613 would be ERDF and £2,724,900 would be ESF, making a total of £10,610,513 EU Structural Funds. In addition, match funding of £19,431,505 was forecasted, predominantly from public sector sources.

The Action Plan covered the five Bristol wards of Ashley, Easton Lawrence Hill, Windmill Hill and Filwood. Levels of deprivation within the Objective 2 target area were significantly higher than in other wards in the South West region, with Lawrence Hill and Filwood being the most deprived wards in the South West Objective 2 Programme area.

The Action Plan gives the total population of the Objective 2 area as 69,422 in 2000 (from AHA GP Registrations). However, revised estimates for 2001 (ONS Experimental statistics) show a population of only 62,770, which (from this baseline) rose to 68,830 in 2006. The Action Plan gives the proportion of the population from

ethnic minorities in the target area as 19.3% in 2003, compared to the then Bristol average of 8.2%.

The Action Plan's three strategic objectives were to develop the potential of the local community; address social, economic and environmental decline and disadvantage; and remove barriers to employment and training for disadvantaged groups. In addition, the Action Plan sought to address three overarching themes relating to equalities, ICT and environmental sustainability.

Overall, the Bristol Action Plan received a total of 261 outline applications for project funding from 170 organisations, requesting around £45million Objective 2 ERDF and ESF funding, with a total cost of projects, including match funding, in the region £174 million, although it should be noted that some applications were re-submitted a number of times. Of these outline applications, approximately 55 were approved to progress to full application stage, and of these, a total of 49 separate projects, managed by 25 different organisations, were eventually delivered.

In terms of geographical spread, the majority of Objective 2 funding was spent in the wards of Easton, Ashley, Lawrence Hill and Filwood. No capital funding was spent in Windmill Hill, reflecting the relatively higher levels of disadvantage experienced in Bristol's east inner city and Knowle West. In practical terms, Windmill Hill was only included to make sense of a geographical area and this neighbourhood was therefore not prioritised within the Action Plan.

5 Activities and Performance

Overall, the Bristol Objective 2 Action Plan achieved or over achieved its targets. (See Appendix 1 for details).

5.1 Measure 1.1 - Develop the potential of the local community

MEASURE 1.1 PROJECTS	Actual Spend	
	ERDF	Total Project Cost
Bristol Community Engagement Project	146,357	281,646
BrEAZ Parent Co-ordinators	109,489	456,203
St Werburgh's Project Development	10,000	20,000
People Power	441,587	1,184,927
Inn's Court- A Community In Control	24,198	48,394
The Silai Nappy Company	27,500	61,392
Community Groups Advice Service- ABLC	29,472	67,312
The City Academy Parent Coordinators	40,324	140,475
Fully Approved Total:	828,927	2,260,350
Action Plan target	829,492	2,224,829

This strategic objective aimed to address social exclusion by encouraging greater community participation and enhancing community confidence. Indicative actions included marketing the Action Plan; local research, consultation and feasibility studies; developing community capacity and leadership; and developing new community networks and partnerships.

Of the eight projects funded under this measure, three smaller projects within specific organisations concerned capacity building, feasibility studies and community engagement. One other small project provided community groups with advice on charity law and training for management committee members. Two projects funded parent co-ordinators within schools in the east inner area.

The majority of Measure 1.1 ERDF (almost £600,000) was allocated to two engagement and capacity building projects, both managed by Bristol City Council. The Bristol Community Engagement project provided marketing and support to community and voluntary organisations to develop Objective 2 projects. By far the largest project, in terms of ERDF support, was People Power, which aimed to raise the confidence and skills of people living in the socially and economically disadvantaged areas of central and south Bristol.

Outputs and key achievements

Within this measure, the Action Plan overachieved its outputs, particularly in relation to community groups supported (196 against a target of 50), people trained (ERDF - 1000+ against a target of 625) and community organisations set up (44 against a target of 2). This measure therefore shows exceptional value for money.

The work of the Bristol Community Engagement Project did provide the resources needed to publicise the Action Plan and assist organisations to make applications. Feedback from stakeholders indicates that most respondents heard about Objective 2 from either the Objective 2 team or its events and website, and found the team very helpful and supportive.

The national Neighbourhood Renewal (NR) Strategy was launched during the early years of the Action Plan, and Bristol was successful in securing around £7m NR funding from 2002 –07, as well as additional funding for Neighbourhood Management pilots, in parts of the Objective 2 area. The People Power project was match funded with NR funds, extending the reach and remit of this area of work.

The initial investment in the Silai Nappy Company directly led to new employment opportunities, as the company went on to establish itself as a new social enterprise (Babeco) and access further ERDF and ESF funding through the other Objective 2 Measures.

Though a relatively small sum (£10k), Objective 2 funding enabled St Werburgh's Community Association (SWCA) to develop a funding strategy for a major capital project. Though SWCA was unsuccessful in securing more substantial capital funding through the Action Plan (as it was unable to secure match funding), a subsequent £1m application to the Community Asset Fund was successful.

Lessons Learned

The capacity building programmes (Bristol Community Engagement Project and People Power) were largely run by Bristol City Council, and did not directly involve existing community based organisations. Elements of this work could have been contracted out to Bristol's voluntary, community and social economy (VCSE) infrastructure organisations, bringing the added benefit of their membership, networks, ability to reach hard to reach communities and independence from the Council. During the period of the Action Plan, there were significant national initiatives to strengthen VCSE infrastructure (the ChangeUp programme), which could have provided added value to the work.

Both the work of the capacity building programmes and the work of Avon and Bristol Law Centre did successfully target BME communities and organisations. However, the funding from Measure 1.1 only directly funded one black led organisation. There was a lost opportunity to do more to strengthen black-led organisations, including infrastructure organisations.

Over the period, Bristol City Council had made a decision to restructure the way that it delivered its Community Development responsibilities. This reduced the number of Community Development workers on the ground, and stakeholders have commented that they felt an element of substitution occurred where BCC funded work through the Action Plan which should have been delivered by the Community Development team.

Some respondents felt that there were significant successes of the People Power project, such as capacity building work in Filwood, leading to the setting up of a Street Representative scheme. However, given the relatively large level of investment in this project, it would have been useful for the Action Plan to commission a more detailed assessment, particularly to learn more about good practice in community engagement and capacity building work.

5.2 Measure 1.2 - Address social, economic and environmental decline and disadvantage

M1.2 PROJECTS	Actual Spend	
	ERDF	Total
Knowle West Media Project	207,695	425,392
Knowle West Media Project 2	235,401	472,397
Personal and Community Finance Project	194,838	416,182
St Paul's Community Wardens Scheme	84,716	420,914
Knowle West Community Wardens Scheme	135,035	609,201
St Paul's Learning and Family Centre	614,796	1,673,826
Silai For Skills	235,000	500,518
The Beacon IT Adult Learning Centre	65,741	174,243
City Academy	299,000	6,669,560
Childrens Scrapstore	324,900	855,000
Somerset Square Doorstep Green	52,216	159,014
Gatton Road Gateway Enhancement	382,107	826,598
Circo in the Square	245,653	571,950
Community Links	9,730	32,928
Stapleton Road and Old Market Improvement Project	1,091,495	2,616,329
Redfield and Avonvale Road Improvement Project	1,445,421	3,453,762
Reinforcing Eastside Regeneration	64,675	137,127
Access to Financial Services	139,646	284,989
TCS (Hannah Moore)	202,262	411,188
Barton Hill Centre	322,696	647,389
Archimedia	400,000	800,000
Trinity Centre Access to Training	54,000	109,988
Babeco Back to Work	146,120	292,240
Fully Approved Total:	6,953,143	22,560,735
	Action Plan target	7,056,121
		21,761,856

This strategic objective sought to “develop integrated projects which contribute towards developing sustainable neighbourhoods focussing on community enterprise

and the social economy to create jobs for local people.” Indicative spend for the capital element included initiatives to create or improve community buildings, provide workspace for social enterprises and facilities for training. The indicative spend for the revenue element included a range of activities to tackle financial exclusion, enhance community safety and promote employment opportunities.

Altogether, 23 separate projects were funded under this measure, managed by 12 different organisations. In terms of revenue spend, 3 smaller projects (one a continuation scheme, so in practice 2 projects) provided community wardens in St Pauls and Knowle West, to address local concerns about anti-social behaviour and poor street environments. 2 projects (managed by Social Enterprise Works, formerly BACEN) supported the development of credit unions, responding to the need to address financial exclusion in the area. One project was a continuation of Objective 2 investment made under Measure 1.1, to further support the development of an innovative social enterprise – Babeco.

The majority of ERDF revenue spend was allocated to Bristol East Side Traders (BEST) to deliver 2 linked projects (which included a capital element) to promote small business start up, growth and sustainability in central east Bristol, and to Knowle West Media Centre for 2 linked projects to enhance to improve community participation and increase skills and employability through media based activities in Filwood.

Within the capital element under Measure 1.2, BCC were the lead or major partner in 6 projects, including a road realignment scheme (St Werburghs Gateway Enhancement scheme), funding for the Legible Cities Team for signage (Reinforcing Eastside Regeneration) and an environmental improvement scheme (Somerset Square Doorstep Green). BCC were also major partners St Pauls Learning and Family Centre and in the 2 community adult education capital projects at Barton Hill Children’s Centre and Hannah More School. There was also capital support for 2 further learning facilities at the Bristol Academy, at its main site and its adult learning centre (The Beacon Centre).

A further 5 community based facilities were supported by Objective 2 capital funding - Children’s Scrapstore, Circomedia, Silai for Skills, Knowle West Media Centre and Trinity Arts Centre. As part of its two large regeneration projects in Easton and Lawrence Hill, BEST were awarded ERDF to purchase and refurbish two buildings to provide workspace for local small businesses.

Outputs and key achievements

The Action Plan delivered almost double the amount of workspace estimated within the original targets (8920m² against a target 5500m²). Outputs relating to occupancy, sales and jobs resulting from the workspace will not be available until later (the workspace is not yet occupied). Other outputs where targets were over achieved include community enterprises assisted, individuals given employment / self-employment help, brown field land/redundant buildings refurbished and environmental improvement projects (49 environmental improvements schemes in total were delivered, against a target of 25). The measure created 85 Full Time Equivalent Jobs (FTE) and safeguarded an additional 42.

It has proved problematic to measure and demonstrate the outputs relating to “Net additional new value added (£m)” and “Net additional value added safeguarded (£m)”. However, this has been a problem at a regional level; the targets were set at the beginning through the use of a formula and it is not clear how to measure this or even how relevant it is.

Overall, this measure funded a broad range of initiatives delivered by a diverse range of organisations and far exceeded the majority of its outputs. The reported outputs demonstrate that the projects on the whole provided excellent value for money. Some of the projects were innovative in nature and not activities traditionally funded through structural funds (e.g. Circomedia). One of the benefits of delivering the Action Plan locally (from Bristol) has been the ability to take risks and use the money more creatively than may otherwise have occurred if funding decisions had been made at a regional level.

The funding has been instrumental in the eventual establishment of a single citywide credit union in Bristol, staffed with paid and voluntary workers and in a position to access a broader range of funding opportunities.

Undoubtedly, training facilities across the Objective 2 area have been improved. The Action Plan has been particularly successful at improving adult education facilities linked to schools (the Beacon Centre, Hannah More and Barton Hill Primary schools), which has contributed significantly to delivering Bristol's "extended schools" agenda.

There were some good examples of projects involving and consulting residents (including young people) in the design of the building (St Paul's Learning Centre, Knowle West Media Centre, Barton Hill Primary School). A number of these projects also worked hard to maximise local employment and business opportunities during and after the build phase.

Lessons Learned

Some stakeholders have expressed concern that a number of BCC led environmental capital initiatives should (and probably would eventually) have been paid for through mainstream local authority funding.

Only two projects were delivered by black led organisations (Silai for Skills and Babeco), although a number of organisations funded have an excellent track record for their accessibility by, and provision for, BME communities (St Paul's Family and Learning Centre, BEST, Knightstone Housing Association, and The Beacon Centre).

In terms of environmental improvement projects, the larger scale projects tended to be focused in the inner-city wards of Easton, Ashley and Lawrence Hill. Less money was invested in Filwood, and there was a missed opportunity to act as a catalyst for change and unlock an investment package for Filwood Broadway. The withdrawal of SWRDA funding (through its Building Communities programme) for Filwood Broadway no doubt played a part here, as there had been an aspiration to use this as match funding for Objective 2.

Babeco was one of the few projects delivered through the Action Plan that actually directly created significant employment opportunities for local residents. The Objective 2 investment enabled Babeco to employ 23 people. Much has been made of the problem of the issue of "State Aid"¹ as a barrier to providing this kind of support to businesses. However, social enterprises can be an exception to this rule and more could have been done to pilot this job creation approach.

¹ State Aid State Aid rules aim to ensure fair competition and a single common market with the assumption that giving favoured treatment to some businesses would harm business competitors, risk distorting the normal competitive market; and hinder the long-term competitiveness of the European Community.

Although this measure delivered additional and improved workspace and facilities, many organisations faced huge difficulties in managing their capital projects. Some potentially excellent projects could not secure match funding and therefore did not proceed, yet had to invest a great deal of capacity in the application process. Successful projects dealt with a range of complex problems that included the long timescale required to complete any capital project; rising costs for purchase and renovations, especially in a volatile property market; and having a range of co-funders operating with different timescales and conditions. Some projects reported that they had underestimated the time and capacity required to deliver capital projects. Whilst some new build and building refurbishment was excellent (and award winning) other projects reported that poor workmanship had led to serious building management, maintenance and health and safety issues.

Some capital projects were completed at or towards the end of the Objective 2 programme. Though many had exit strategies based on lettings income, this will take time to develop, and there is now little regeneration investment available to help bridge any shortfall. The current economic conditions have had an adverse effect on all property rentals. Though there is undoubtedly a strong “Objective 2 legacy” in terms of buildings, some of these are perhaps less viable or sustainable than was initially envisaged.

5.3 Measure 1.3 - Remove barriers to employment and training for disadvantaged groups

M1.3	Actual Spend	
PROJECTS	ESF	Total Project Cost
Bridging The Gap	476,817	1,133,600
Pathways To Work	487,130	1,105,522
Silai First Steps Training	79,982	178,213
CEED New Media Training	65,764	146,144
IT Works	28,432	68,412
Beacon Adult Learning Centre	432,066	1,050,132
Removing Barriers	288,945	642,101
Bridging The Gap 2	111,629	248,054
Circomedia2	308,018	689,650
CEED New Media Training 2	89,819	199,600
Single Parent Study Centre	104,365	231,922
Community Vehicle Programme	39,884	88,634
JCP Outreach Project	28,781	63,961
New Horizons (Routeways)	4,758	10,574
Balanced Futures (Routeways)	10,785	23,967
Pre-Employment ESOL	25,700	57,113
Pre-Entry & Entry Level ESOL	34,425	76,500
Fully Approved Total:	2,617,300	6,014,098
	Action Plan target 2,723,942	6,053,206

This measure sought to create learning and employment opportunities, targeting the most disadvantaged groups. Indicative actions included basic and technical skills training; employment and careers advice; and childcare provision linked to training and employment.

A total of 18 projects were supported, managed by 14 organisations. By far the largest element of ESF went to 2 employment schemes (in 3 projects), both managed by BCC (Pathways to Work and Bridging the Gap). Altogether, these schemes received around 40% (nearly £1.1 million) of the ESF available.

Other significant ESF investment included 3 projects that were also supported through Action Plan ERDF capital investment, namely Circomedia, Silai for Skills and the Beacon Centre (a total of around £1.1 million ESF). A further five community based organisations received ESF allocations – CEED (2 projects), Single Parent Action Centre (SPAN), IT works and the Community Vehicle Programme. CSV were awarded funding but did not go ahead with its project due to the complexities of the funding in relation to the total amount awarded.

Two further projects were led by BCC. The first employed two outreach workers seconded to Job Centre Plus. The other project - Removing Barriers - helped secure 'clean' match funding and additional outputs from Job Centre Plus (JCP) to enable vocational training and guidance projects to proceed (see later). BCC employed staff to interrogate JCP systems to identify eligible expenditure and activity.

As the Action Plan progressed, the Objective 2 team were informed that the demand for ESOL training, from new communities settling in the target area, far outstripped local supply. It commissioned research, which showed that there was an unmet need for ESOL provision. As match funding from Job Centre Plus had been identified (via the Removing Barriers project), the Objective 2 team were able to commission (and fully finance) two organisations to deliver additional ESOL training. CJI Solutions delivered Pre-entry and Entry level ESOL support, and the Learning Curve delivered Pre-employment ESOL Support.

Similarly, using the match funding identified via Removing Barriers, the Objective 2 team commissioned two further training projects - Scout Enterprises, to provide mental health support to enable unemployed people to become job ready, and WTCS, to support incapacity benefit recipients to access employment.

Outputs and key achievements

Except for one target ("People trained in environmental management"), all outputs were not only achieved but also significantly exceeded. For example, 6658 people were assisted against a target of 3215, and 4664 people were trained against a target of 2581. Ethnic minorities receiving training was 2340 against a target of 554 and people achieving an ICT related VQ was 1788 against a target of 67. In terms of impacts 843 residents were recorded as in employment 6 months after ESF support, and 716 unemployed people were in work after ESF support.

Given that ESF funding is notoriously difficult to manage (in terms of monitoring requirements), the Action Plan has funded a diverse range of providers and greatly exceeded original targets, demonstrating excellent value for money.

Objective 2 investment enabled a relatively new organisation – the Beacon Centre – to expand its provision, particularly ESOL, and to engage with hard to reach groups by addressing specific barriers such as childcare.

The mapping of provision and commissioning of ESOL training demonstrated that the Action Plan was flexible and able to respond to the growing demand for ESOL due to the changing local population.

Lessons Learned

Stakeholder feedback indicates that because outputs were predicted and then recorded by individual projects rather than being aggregated for the Action Plan as a whole, this did not encourage cross referrals and joint working. This does not make sense from the client's perspective. Beneficiaries should have been able to access a number of individual projects, and any duplication of clients could have been identified through a central database updated within the Action Plan office.

Although it is to the credit of staff and local partners that ESOL provision was mapped and funded, some stakeholders have argued that ESOL should and could have been funded through the Learning and Skills Council, but that it was more difficult to access through this channel.

Around 40% of funding under this measure went to two employment initiatives (Bridging the Gap and Pathways to Work) both of which have now closed. There is therefore some question as to the sustainability assessment of these projects and a lost opportunity to track beneficiaries and to learn lessons from the approach.

The commissioning process brought forward new organisations and new approaches, although some of these were not local providers and it is questionable whether and how their work will be sustained locally.

Many projects operated over a wider area than the Objective 2 target area. As is the case for all area based regeneration programmes, only residents living within the area can be beneficiaries. Stakeholders, though understanding the residency rules, were frustrated by the additional administrative burden caused by postcode checking and having to devise sometimes complex financial systems to allocate funding to eligible beneficiaries within multiple funding streams covering areas not co-terminus with Objective 2.

6 Cross cutting themes

All project applicants had to demonstrate (and be assessed on) how their proposals supported three cross cutting themes. However, it appears that there was little specific guidance about how, in practice, these were to be evidenced, aside from the projected outputs, and no separate evaluation has been undertaken. It has not been possible within the scope of this evaluation to provide a very detailed assessment of how successfully the Action Plan has delivered against these themes.

6.1 Equalities

Most activities relating to this cross cutting theme related to outputs for BME residents, women and people with disabilities delivered in Measure 1.3. There was no requirement to provide outputs for older people or other equalities groups experiencing disadvantage or specific barriers in accessing employment, training and other services.

There was only one output in Priority One that directly related to BME communities (in Measure 1.3 - "black and minority ethnic people receiving training"). Within the South West Objective 2 programme, there was a target of (only) 120 BME people receiving training under Measure 1.3 for the whole South West region, which the Bristol Action Plan proposed to deliver in its entirety. As it was, the Action Plan significantly exceeded this, in part due to the demographic changes in the Bristol Objective 2 area. This is very positive, but it could be said that the regional targets

were set at too low a level compared to the known social and economic disadvantage experienced by black communities (locally, regionally and nationally).

Comparatively few equalities-led projects were funded. Perhaps more could have been achieved in developing project applications from equalities-led organisations, or helping applicants to more specifically address equalities needs and issues in other measures, had GOSW taken the same approach as it did with environmental sustainability (see below), and employed a specialist worker to assess applications and offer equalities advice and support to all projects.

One of the most deprived equalities groups in terms of employment, training and business start up are people with disabilities. The Action Plan did deliver – and over achieve – its targets Measure 1.3 targets relating to this group. There were also significant achievements in terms of women beneficiaries, and some investment in targeted work with women (Silai for Skills, and probably Babeco and BEST). Knowle West Media Centre undertook some creative and hugely successful work with young people.

6.2 ICT

Though ICT was a priority for the EU Commission, there is not a great deal of detailed evidence to assess how successful this cross cutting theme has been within the Action Plan as a whole. However, some funded projects - the Beacon Centre, IT Works and CEED's New Media Training - specifically addressed ICT skills, and Knowle West Media Project innovatively and successfully used new media as a community engagement and capacity building tool.

During the lifetime of the Action Plan, there have been other significant funding streams directed at addressing ICT (e.g. UK On-Line) as well as LSC mainstream funding, which could have been used to match fund more ICT training.

6.3 Environmental sustainability.

The Action Plan benefited from a worker funded at regional level, based at GOSW, who assessed applications from an environmental sustainability perspective and offered advice and support to some projects. However, there has been no specific environmental evaluation of projects to determine how well each improved the local environment and addressed environmental issues in its delivery. (BCC did, though, commission an excellent, in depth environmental evaluation of projects funded through the Urban 11 programme (South Bristol Urban 11 Programme – Environmental Evaluation and Good Practice Development, Resource Futures, 2007), which included Knowle West Media Centre.) Given the fact that the Action Plan invested a significant proportion of its funding into capital projects and environmental improvements, it is unfortunate that a more thorough environmental evaluation was not undertaken.

Overall, there does appear to be some significant successes. Knowle West Media Centre was designed to meet state of the art environmental standards, and has won awards for its innovative, green features. Other funded projects have involved new uses for old or listed buildings, including Circomedia, BEST and Silai for Skills. However, some capital projects were less successful, and feedback about one new build indicated that it was “environmentally unsound”.

There was also significant investment in a range of environmental improvement projects including Somerset Square Doorstep Green, Gatton Road Gateway Enhancement, Stapleton Road and Old Market Improvement Project and Redfield and Avonvale Road Improvement Project.

The Bristol Objective 2 Neighbourhood Action Plan has been used as a case study by the Environment Agency lead trans-national GRDP project on integrating environmental concerns into the delivery of Structural Funds.

7 Impacts

Appendix 2 Figures 1-8 give an update to the some of the baseline data provided in the Action Plan proposal for the Objective 2 area. Bristol City Council has supplied all figures and specific sources are indicated. Attributing changes to the work of the Action Plan is inherently difficult. National and indeed global economic changes have undoubtedly had an impact, as has the rapidly changing demographics and population churn within the Objective 2 area. There are also other difficulties in using area statistical information. Some data measures have changed over time, and for some figures provided in the Action Plan proposal (such as Council Tax benefits), it has not been possible to elicit follow up data. Some relevant data, such as BME claimant figures, is not available.

7.1 Population

(See Appendix 2 Figure 1)

The population in the Objective 2 wards has shown an increase between 2001 and 2006, as has also been seen in Bristol. The population in the Objective 2 area increased by 9.7% over this time period; which is greater than the relative increase in Bristol's population (5.2%) over the same time period.

The under 16 population in the Objective 2 wards has dropped between 2001 and 2006, as it has done in Bristol. The fall in the Objective 2 wards is marginal, at 0.5%. In Bristol, the proportion is greater, at 5.7%.

The Working Age Population has increased in both Objective 2 wards, and in Bristol overall. In the Objective 2 Area, the increase was of 16.7%; in Bristol it was 10.6%.

Parts of the area – Lawrence Hill and Easton – have experienced significant population churn understood to be about 14% annually. It is not possible to provide updated figures for a known increase in the percentage of BME residents in the Objective 2 area. There is an updated figure for Bristol as a whole but it has not been calculated at ward level. However, BCC report that over the past five years, 14,000 new BME residents have settled in Bristol predominantly in Easton, Ashley and Lawrence Hill.

7.2 Indices of Deprivation

(See Appendix 2 Figure 2)

Caution should be taken in making assumptions based on Bristol's position within the Indices of Deprivation, as it is based on rankings across England and Bristol's position will therefore fluctuate as a result of changes in other areas.

In summary, overall the Objective 2 area has seen a slight improvement in its IMD ranking. However, the majority of Filwood's LSOA's rankings have got worse over the period and Lawrence Hill and Filwood continue to have LSOAs which sit within the worst 1% of the country.

7.3 Out of work benefits

(See Appendix 2 Figures 3 and 4)

In summary, the Objective 2 area has seen a reduction in the WAPG claiming out of work benefits. Particular successes have been a fall in Lone Parents claiming out of work benefits and also the reduction of JSA claimants.

7.4 Employee and Business Composition

(See Appendix 2 Figures 5 – 8)

In summary, there has been little change to the number of businesses and number of people employed within the Objective 2 area over the period.

8 Action Plan Management

8.1 The Accountable Body and Objective 2 Team

BCC was the Accountable Body for the Bristol Action Plan. It employed a small staff team that became part of BCC's Regeneration Department. There were a number of changes in BCC line managers over time. As the most recent line manager has left the council, and no other member of staff has been identified, it has not been possible to obtain any direct feedback from BCC about its role.

The Action Plan Manager has been in post throughout the whole programme. However, due in part to short term contracts as well as normal turnover, there have been a total of 7 different Objective 2 Project Development workers and 5 Finance and Monitoring Managers. Feedback has indicated that project managers and other stakeholders found the Objective 2 staff team very helpful and supportive, though some found the staff turnover difficult. As the Accountable Body, BCC could have ensured longer-term contracts.

GOSW's view is that BCC have taken their role as Accountable Body very seriously, employing high calibre staff who were competent and experienced in managing European funding, and benefiting from retaining staff involved in delivering URBAN 1.

The Objective 2 team was well resourced earlier on in the programme through the Objective 2 funded capacity building projects. However, the team could have done with more capacity towards the end. Some projects were very complicated and would have benefitted from more support throughout. Some stakeholders expressed the view that they would have liked more help with match funding issues, and with advice about exit strategies and forward plans. If Objective 2 staff cannot be retained after the end of the programme, it would be useful for BCC to identify specific officers to assist Objective 2 funded projects as needed, helping them to sustain the benefits of the regeneration investment over the medium term.

A number of projects said that they would have welcomed more opportunities to meet together. Although there was a Community Engagement Action Plan network at the outset, it would have been useful to develop and sustain a more active network of all projects in order to share best practice, identify and fill gaps in provision and encourage peer support.

8.2 Decision making

Decision-making processes were evaluated using stakeholder feedback and a review of Progress Reports and minutes of meetings. It has not been possible within the scope of this evaluation to undertake a completely thorough assessment. There has been limited feedback from stakeholders, as decision-making bodies and their personnel changed over time, with many stakeholders (particularly those active the

early stages of the Action Plan) not readily contactable. Also, there is a large volume of documentation relating to over seven years of work (including around 70 sets of minutes and over 30 substantial Progress Reports), which could only be sampled.

The Action Plan operated a staged application process. Outline applications were assessed by the decision making body (see below) and those projects approved were asked to submit full applications. These were first subject to a technical appraisal based on numerical scoring against a set of EU/Objective 2 criteria. There was delegated approval of applications below £50k by BCC Head of Regeneration, and referral to GOSW for approval of all ESF applications and ERDF revenue above £100k and ERDF capital above £250k ERDF. The Objective 2 team developed a useful Working Manual outlining the decision making process.

Until its demise in mid-2003, project approvals were made by the Bristol Regeneration Programme (BRP) management sub-committee, called (variously) the Programme or Project management Group. Subsequently, the Bristol Partnership's Regeneration Programme Management Group (RPMG), later known as Regeneration Delivery Group (RDG) became the Objective 2 project approval body.

There were some good elements within the decision making process, including the staged application process and the clear Working Manual. The Action Plan was at least strategically linked to the LSP, which was not the case in other parts of the South West region, and having a GOSW contact based in Bristol was beneficial.

Stakeholder views indicate that having a local Action Plan to deliver part of a regional EU funding programme contributed to better decision-making than would have been achieved at a regional level (the Priority Entry Groups), which largely operated without detailed knowledge of the applicant organisations and the Bristol Objective 2 area.

The Objective 2 team inherited the regeneration structures created largely by BCC, and were not really in a position to improve on these. The early decision making groups did not appear to be very representative of a broad spectrum of agencies, community and residents groups, with few members having any direct connection with the Objective 2 area. Though some of the earliest meetings had better representation from the VCSE sector, it was only in the latter stages of the programme – when most of the funding had already been allocated – that a more representative RDG was formed.

The RPMG/RDG was a separate BP sub-group, and not well linked into BP Economy Delivery Group, which covered the key Action Plan objectives of employment, training and enterprise, and which was made up of representatives from the LSC, Job Centre Plus, Business Link, the Social Economy, SWRDA and GOSW. As the Action Plan was not part of its remit, useful expertise and agency links to the Economy Deliver Group were not therefore made. This was clearly outside of the responsibility of the Objective 2 team itself, though BCC, as the Accountable Body and overall manager (through its Head of Regeneration), could have ensured better synergy.

There was also a lost opportunity for expertise and partnership working through the Technical Appraisal Panel. This had places for GOSW and SWRDA staff, who appear to have rarely attended.

8.3 Funding and Financial Management

Overall, the Action Plan proposed a total investment package of £30,042,018, of which £7,885,613 would be ERDF and £2,724,900 would be ESF, making a total of £10,610,513 EU Structural Funds. In addition, match funding of £19,431,505 was forecasted, predominantly from public sector sources.

The final spend of the Action Plan saw a total investment of £30,835,183, of which £7,782,070 was ERDF and £2,617,300 was ESF, making a total of £10,399,370 Structural Funds. A total of £20,435,813 of match funding was secured.

Despite over programming by in excess of £1m (10%) during the course of Action Plan delivery, there is a 2% ESF/ERDF under spend with £10,399,370 spent against a target of £10,609,555. However, the Action Plan levered in 5% (an additional £1m) more match funding than originally planned, with an overall investment of £20,435,813 against a target of £19,430,336.

Given the over achievement of most outputs, the Action Plan has provided excellent value for money. The Tables in Section 5 (Activities and Performance) illustrate expenditure against each measure on a project-by-project basis. Overall, most projects met their initial projections, and more match funding was provided than was initially projected. There has been (not unexpectedly) some slippage in relation to some capital allocations, but this has now been overcome. GOSW report that BCC, as the Accountable Body, provided robust financial management of the project and cited competent and experienced staff as an essential success factor.

The Bristol Action Plan has been delivered almost to budget. This compares favourably to the rest of the South West region, where (across all priorities and all measures) the South West Objective 2 programme is currently at around 90.15% spend against allocation, indicating a remaining allocation of £13m (part of this relates to the fluctuating exchange rates, which has increased the allocation to the programme).

Bristol City Council responded well to issues such as the n+2 rule, which meant that money not spent within the period would be de-committed. The Objective 2 team worked hard to minimise the impact of this, although the process was somewhat painful for projects on the ground. The team also managed to bring the Action Plan in close to budget by considered and careful over programming and monitoring progress of projects.

Initially, the Action Plan anticipated providing more help to projects to secure match funding, including match funding at source, and compiling a “match funding database”, enabling surplus match funding in one project to support another within the Action Plan. The team did provide a web page to help organisations identify potential sources of match funding. The majority of match funding has come from BCC Neighbourhood Renewal, LSC, JCP, New Deal for Communities and SRB6. Mostly, it was the projects themselves that put together sometimes quite complicated match funding packages, and there were some innovative examples of match funding used.

In the early period of the Action Plan, outline applications to SRB6 and Objective 2 were made on the same form, which enabled the PSG/RPMG/RDG and staff to make a decision about which funding stream was most appropriate and flag up match funding opportunities. According to the records supplied, only 10 Objective 2 applications were actually co-funded with SRB6. A further 31 were directed to SRB6

rather than Objective 2 for funding, although it has not been possible to find out if these projects went ahead.

SWRDA only co-funded 2 projects, Circomedia (£100k) and Knowle West Media Centre (£400k). As previously mentioned, there were a number of missed opportunities here for using RDA match funding for Filwood Broadway (funding withdrawn) and St Pauls (wrong sort of spend). It is surprising and disappointing that the RDA was not able to provide any match funding towards the workspace provision at BEST, Children's Scrap Store and Silai for Skills.

Feedback from stakeholders indicates that for some projects, securing match funding was problematic. Difficulties included needing to undertake research and applications for other funds; trying to match (other funders') timescales with that of Objective 2; seeking "clean" match funding or being clear about what was allowable; and securing match funding that did not in the end materialise. For some projects, match funding relied on other organisations spending money. One of BEST's Objective 2 projects, for example, profiled significant match funding from spend in the area via a BCC managed Heritage Lottery initiative, but a large under spend on this scheme put the whole project in jeopardy. Using external partners as match funders proved a risky strategy but one which was managed well within the Action Plan.

Undoubtedly, the availability of match influenced the Objective 2 investment, as projects were approved only if they could bring forward sufficient match funding. Towards the end of the Action Plan, the Objective 2 team identified and provided match funding (from Job Centre Plus) and used this to commission services funded entirely with ESF. It would have been interesting to see how different the projects and interventions would have been if more of this had been done earlier with other mainstream budgets. The LSC, for example, have successfully used co-financing for ESF funding.

Given that one of the main priorities of the Action Plan was "economic decline", it is surprising that so little private sector match was projected and demonstrated. Perhaps more could have been made of harnessing private sector investment, either directly or in the form of planning gain (Section 106 monies), especially as there was significant private sector investment in capital projects within or immediately adjacent to the Objective 2 area during the lifetime of the Action Plan. In addition, within the design of applications, projects found it difficult to use sales income as match and there was a sense that the process did not fully appreciate or take account of social enterprise principles

8.4 Partnership Working

In order to be successful, the Action Plan needed to "join up" strategically, and in terms of its delivery, with other regeneration work, locally and regionally, and thus aimed to ensure good collaborative working with a range of partners. Aspects of partnership working have already been mentioned in previous sections.

Regionally, in strategic terms, the Action Plan was an integral part of the South West Objective 2 programme, which itself drew on the strategic priorities identified in SWRDA's Regional Economic Strategy. The Objective 2 team worked well with the Government Office South West in Bristol, and both parties agree that having a local contact in Bristol has been beneficial to the delivery of the Action Plan. However, there appears to be less close partnership working with SWRDA, both in terms of the management of the Action Plan and in terms of co-ordinating its investment in Bristol. It is not clear why the RDA did not work better with the Action Plan. Some stakeholders cited the RDA's slow and bureaucratic process of assessing funding

applications, whilst others thought that the RDA's reluctance to work at a local level and continuous staff changes were a problem. Relationships between GOSW and the RDA could have been better.

Within Bristol, the Action Plan fitted in initially with the strategic priorities identified by the Bristol Regeneration Partnership, and later, could be seen as part of the Bristol Partnership's Community Strategy. However, throughout the lifetime of the Action Plan, BCC did not produce a detailed Regeneration Strategy for the city, and thus there was no overarching set of priorities within which the Action Plan operated.

A number of stakeholders commented that Bristol's leadership around employment and training for the city was weak and that perhaps not enough was done to co-ordinate the funding available through JCP, LSC, and BCC (through NDC, SRB and NR). The Objective 2 team did develop successful relationships with some mainstream partners (Job Centre Plus), but there was less collaboration with the LSC around expertise, match funding and more collaborative delivery.

SRB6, NR and Objective 2 were all managed within the same department of Bristol City Council. Aside from some successes with SRB6, BCC Regeneration Department were relatively unsuccessful at putting these funding streams together in a way that was manageable and meaningful for projects on the ground. Financial claims and monitoring remained separate and were often very different in their requirements. This was a burden for the administration of projects and was not cost effective. To a large extent, criticism cannot simply rest with BCC for this. Across other local and regional organisations (GOSW, RDA, LSC, Job Centre Plus) as well as with national government, there is a lack of joining up of initiatives.

NR funding began two years after the Action Plan began. Through NR, neighbourhood action plans were written for each of the Neighbourhood Management areas (covering the Objective 2 area with the exception of Windmill Hill), which identified key issues and priorities and gave the Objective 2 Action Plan a more local reference point. NR staff were keen for decisions on Objective 2 projects to be made through the NR task groups, which would have taken local ownership and control to another level. This did not happen, although in the latter stages of the Action Plan, residents from Neighbourhood Partnerships become members of the Regeneration Delivery Group. For the Objective 2 team, there were occasionally problems in relation to residents of the RDG campaigning for certain projects from within their neighbourhoods. In terms of awareness, Neighbourhood Managers had a good understanding of the ERDF capital spend; the capacity building projects and the environmental improvement work. They were less knowledgeable and understood less about the employment and training elements of the Action Plan.

A consortium of Bristol agencies (Bristol Means Business - BMB) successfully bid for Objective 2 funding under the Regions Priority 2 "SME Development, Technology and Innovation"² to support enterprise development in Bristol's designated Objective 2 area. This initiative was seen as largely successful in better co-ordinating enterprise support. There would have been benefits were Business Link to have called on the Objective 2 team's expertise, or ensured that the team undertook the management of the scheme, in terms of better administration, added value and improved synergy.

² Measure 2.1: Support for Start Ups and Micro-Enterprise (ERDF) and Measure 2.2: Support For SME Development (ERDF)

The Action Plan had identified that additional workspace was a priority in the Objective 2 area. Within the South West Objective 2 programme, Priority 2, Measure 2.4 (“A Better Environment for Business”) had identified £29m ERDF for workspace development. During the course of the Action Plan, the Objective 2 team became aware that funding under this measure was still available and that Bristol agencies (such as BCC and Business Link) had not progressed any plans to secure additional ERDF via this measure. The team commissioned further research (in 2004) into workspace needs in the Objective 2 area, and applied for additional funding. The application was turned down but it has not been possible to discover why. Less than £1m has been spent under this measure in Bristol. Regionally, this measure is currently under spent by around £2.5m, representing a significant missed opportunity for Bristol.

Overall, it is questionable whether the expertise and local knowledge developed by the Objective 2 team, and the learning accrued through the operation of the programme on the ground, have been as well used as it might have been by the local authority. In 2006, Bristol City Council developed a LEGL bid, which was unsuccessful. The external bid development contractors did not consult in any great depth with either the Objective 2 team or the Objective 2 projects. Similarly, BCC is currently negotiating with SWRDA for new £15m ERDF Urban Enterprise funding for enterprise development in Bristol’s deprived areas. BCC have not used the expertise of the Objective 2 team in developing the city’s Strategic Investment Framework (SIF).

8.5 Evaluation

Only one organisation undertook an external evaluation of their projects. Other regeneration initiatives (NR and NDC) have undertaken thorough evaluations. Without individual project evaluations, evaluating the Action Plan as a whole has been problematic and many of the lessons will have been lost. It could have been beneficial to bring together the evaluation budgets of each of the regeneration initiatives to carry out more meaningful evaluations of projects, organisations and area based initiatives.

8.6 Sharing best practice

In 2004, Bristol City Council became the lead partner in a network looking at sharing and disseminating good practice in delivering Structural Funds and other regeneration programmes at a sub-regional level. SRN (funded through INTEREG II) includes 11 European partners. Eight partners have hosted workshops and the network has developed a website for sharing information and ideas. The network has published an early findings report and Good Practice Guide.

It is to the credit of the Objective 2 manager for taking this initiative, which represents a significant additional outcome that could well have impacts across Europe, in terms of how EU structural funds are used in the future. The work has highlighted the fact that few countries (aside from UK and Finland) have successfully delivered Structural Funds at a sub-regional level.

8.7 Marketing and Communication

The Action Plan staff actively encouraged and supported projects to seek positive publicity. Each project was provided with publicity material to assist them in publicising the role that European Funding played in the delivery of the project and the appropriate ESF/ERDF, Bristol City Council and Objective 2 logos were used on all publicity/marketing materials and official programme records/documents. A website (www.bristolregeneration.org.uk) provided a useful source of information to both funded projects and organisations thinking of applying for Objective 2 funding.

Several projects had skilled staff and worked hard to secure positive media coverage for their work.

9 Conclusion

Overall, the Bristol Objective 2 Neighbourhood Action Plan successfully met its aims and objectives and delivered significant benefits to residents of Bristol's most deprived neighbourhoods. An excellent staff team provided sound management, bringing the Action Plan in on budget, attracting more match funding than anticipated and significantly over achieving on almost all projected outputs. There is still ongoing need for regeneration work in Bristol's Objective 2 area, particularly in Filwood and Lawrence Hill wards. It is therefore important that achievements of the Action Plan are sustained and developed.

Appendix 1 Outputs

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1	Action Plan Total Targets	Action Plan Projects contracted to Deliver	Total Achievement including off measure achievement to November 2008	Off Measure Achievement
Outputs				
Community groups supported	50	196	323	62
People trained (ERDF)	625	1057	2564	24
Animateurs / facilitators provided	4	27.75	33.75	0
Community strategies supported	6	11	11	0
Capacity building projects	0	8	7	0
Projects raising environmental awareness	4	4	4	0
Results				
Community organisations set up	2	44	55	0
New networks / partnership established	4	4	11	2

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2	Action Plan Total Targets	Action Plan Projects contracted to Deliver	Total Achievement including off measure achievement	Off Measure Achievement
Outputs				
Community strategies / integrated action plans produced	5	7	8	0
Community enterprises assisted	29	60	86	7
Area of workspace provided (m ²)	5500	8920	9611	0
Centres enhanced / established	9	11	14	0
Individuals given employment / self-employment help	302	549.75	863.7	0
Environmental improvement projects	25	33	52	0
Cross cutting outputs				
Project using ICT to improve access to employment / training opportunities	9	29	51	0
Information society-related community businesses assisted	6	3	3	0
Centres enhanced with ICT facilities	2	7	7	0
Brownfield land / redundant buildings refurbished	5	5	8	0
Footpaths and cycleway improvements	2	4	5	0
Community led environmental improvement schemes	6	6	3	0
Historic buildings / sites improved and / or adapted of new use	2	5	3	0
Redundant buildings refurbished	0	3	1	0
Businesses assisted to develop environmental activities, including reviews / audits and implementing management systems.	0	1	2	0
Results				
Occupancy rates of floor provided (%)	85%	85	90*	0
Gross new sales (£m)	4.95	2.49	0.335	0
Gross sales safeguarded (£m)	14.85	6.36	2.568	0
Gross FTE jobs created	82	107.85	129.6	6
Gross FTE jobs safeguarded	41	65.1	49.2	0
Projects demonstrating cost reductions		0	0	0

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2	Action Plan Total Targets	Action Plan Projects contracted to Deliver	Total Achievement including off measure achievement	Off Measure Achievement
Businesses marketing environmental elements of their products or specialising in environmental related activities or processes	2	3	3	0
Projects demonstrating increased transport modal choice	6	5	5	0
Impacts				
Net additional new jobs	26	84.3	106.5	6
Net additional jobs safeguarded	13	41.7	37.1	0
Net additional new value added (£m)	2.08		0	0
Net additional value added safeguarded (£m)	0.68		0	0
Projects contributing to improved air quality		5	3	0
Projects using recycled materials		2	3	0
Projects contributing to the energy efficiency of economic activity		1	2	0
*not all projects reported on this				

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3	Action Plan Total Targets	Action Plan Projects contracted to Deliver	On Measure Outputs Delivered to November 2008
Outputs			
People assisted	3215	6658	6539
People trained	2581	4664	4317
People working towards a qualification	1724	3209	3242
Women receiving support (ESF)	1489	3487	2937
Trainers trained	41	61	47
Capacity building projects	5	8	3
Cross cutting outputs			
Women receiving training	1347	2577	2184
Disabled people receiving training	177	402	392
Ethnic minorities receiving training	554	2340	2696
People trained in ICT	173	3728	2877
People achieving an ICT related VQ	67	1788	490
People trained in environmental management	28	8	106
Results			
Beneficiaries in work on leaving	497	1285	829
Beneficiaries going on to other training	300	1227	1366
Beneficiaries moving into self-employment	41	99	94
Positive outcomes on leaving	1596	3159	2499
People securing a VQ	855	1630	734
Impacts			
Residents in employment 6 months after ESF support net of deadweight	329	843	600
Unemployed in work after ESF support	107	716	160

Appendix 2 Baseline Data Update

1. Population Change

Details are provided in Figure 1 for population change in the Objective 2 Area, compared with Bristol overall, for the years 2001 and 2006.

Figure 1: Population Change in the Objective 2 Area, 2001 - 2006

Indicator	2001 Objective 2 Ward Proxies*	2006 Objective 2 Ward Proxies	2001 Bristol Population	2006 Bristol Population
Total Population	62,770	68,830	390,050	410,490
Total Population under 16 years of age	13,070	13,010	73,540	69,600
Working Age Population	41,290	48,180	250,750	277,240

*Ashley, Easton, Filwood, Lawrence Hill, Windmill Hill wards

Source: ONS Experimental Statistics Crown Copyright 2001 – 2006 Population Estimates

Figure 1: Points of Note:

- The population in the Objective 2 wards has shown an increase between 2001 and 2006, as has also been seen in Bristol. The population in the Objective 2 area increased by 9.7% over this time period, which is greater than the relative increase in Bristol's population (5.2%) over the same time period.
- The under 16 population in the Objective 2 wards has dropped between 2001 and 2006, as it has done in Bristol. The fall in the Objective 2 wards is marginal, at 0.5%. In Bristol, the proportion is greater, at 5.7%.
- The Working Age Population has increased in both Objective 2 wards, and in Bristol overall. In the Objective 2 Area, the increase was of 16.7%; in Bristol it was 10.6%.

2. Index of Multiple Deprivation

Details are provided in Figure 2 of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2000, 2004 and 2007. Details are provided for the overall Index, and not for the individual domains comprised within the overall Indices of Deprivation.

Comparability between the 2000 Index, and the subsequent 2004 and 2007 is difficult, as the 2004 Index introduced the use of analysis at LSOA data³, whereas the 2000 Index analysed data at ward level.

Information in Figure 2 is organised by the wards within the Objective 2 Area. The ranks given in **bold text** for each ward indicate the LSOA with highest rank and therefore greatest level of relative deprivation for that ward, for the 2004 and 2007 data. For 2000, 2004 and 2007, geographies sitting within the top 10% most deprived geographies in England, are highlighted in blue.

Figure 2: Index of Multiple Deprivation, Objective 2 Area, 2000 - 2007

Ward/LSOA	IMD 2000 Rank ⁴	IMD2004 LSOA rank ⁵	IMD2007 LSOA rank	Rank Change 2004 - 2007 ⁶
Ashley	756			
St Pauls		107	815	Improved
<i>St Agnes</i>		556	1659	Improved
<i>Lower Montpelier</i>		1236	4159	Improved
<i>Upper Montpelier</i>		5585	8357	Improved
<i>Mina Road</i>		6385	8701	Improved
<i>Cromwell Road</i>		13072	16738	Improved
<i>Ashley Hill</i>		14700	17596	Improved
Easton	1043			
St Marks Road		889	2468	Improved
<i>Chelsea Park</i>		4008	5661	Improved
<i>Robertson Road</i>		3718	6225	Improved
Gilbert Road		6035	6992	Improved
Netham		9551	9341	Got Worse
Church Road		8313	9691	Improved

³ LSOAs are geographies of approximately 1,500 people which sit within ward boundaries, and have allowed identification of variance within wards.

⁴ Rank of all 8,414 wards in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 8,414 the least.

⁵ Rank of all 32,482 LSOAs in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 32,482 the least.

⁶ A change in rank indicates only a change in extent of deprivation *relative to all other LSOAs in England*. It does not necessarily indicate any actual change in extent of deprivation in any given area therefore, as fluctuations in rank are dependent upon all 32,482 LSOAs against which ranks are made.

Ward/LSOA	IMD 2000 Rank ⁷	IMD2004 LSOA rank ⁸	IMD2007 LSOA rank	Rank Change 2004 - 2007 ⁹
Whitehall		8056	10464	Improved
Filwood	221			
Throgmorton Road		603	275	Got Worse
Ilminster Avenue West		439	485	Improved
Filwood Broadway		948	488	Got Worse
Inns Court		862	562	Got Worse
Leinster Avenue		1033	1322	Improved
Glyn Vale		2124	2266	Improved
Wedmore Vale		4769	4079	Got Worse
Novers		5496	4752	Got Worse
Lawrence Hill	133			
Easton Road		89	206	Improved
Old Market and the Dings		19	364	Improved
Barton Hill Road		243	771	Improved
Stapleton Road		320	1097	Improved
St Philips		327	1832	Improved
St Judes		665	2411	Improved
Redcliffe		4258	7099	Improved
Windmill Hill	1278			
Marksbury Road		1508	2456	Improved
St Johns Lane		4996	6103	Improved

⁷ Rank of all 8,414 wards in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 8,414 the least.

⁸ Rank of all 32,482 LSOAs in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 32,482 the least.

⁹ A change in rank indicates only a change in extent of deprivation *relative to all other LSOAs in England*. It does not necessarily indicate any actual change in extent of deprivation in any given area therefore, as fluctuations in rank are dependent upon all 32,482 LSOAs against which ranks are made.

Ward/LSOA	IMD 2000 Rank ¹⁰	IMD2004 LSOA rank ¹¹	IMD2007 LSOA rank	Rank Change 2004 - 2007 ¹²
Lower Totterdown		4677	7455	Improved
Upper Totterdown		6068	7474	Improved
Wells Road		7680	10539	Improved
Windmill Hill West		9300	11541	Improved
Windmill Hill East		10343	11978	Improved
Victoria Park		11705	13455	Improved

Source: Index of Multiple Deprivation, 2000, 2004, and 2007.

Figure 2: Points of note:

- Ashley ward sat within the top 10% most deprived wards in 2000; in 2004 three of its seven LSOAs sat within the top 10%. In the 2007 Index this had dropped to two LSOAs, indicating a relative¹³ drop in extent of deprivation in Ashley. All of Ashley's LSOAs showed a drop in rank between 2004 and 2007.
- Easton ward sat just outside the top 10% most deprived wards in 2000. One of Easton's seven LSOAs (St Marks Road) sat within the top 10% most deprived of all LSOAs in England for 2004. The same LSOA still sat within the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in 2007, although its rank has dropped.
- Filwood ward was in the top 10% most deprived wards nationally in 2000. In both the 2004 and 2007 Index, six of Filwood's eight LSOAs sit within the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in England.
- Lawrence Hill ward was in the top 10% most deprived wards in England in 2000. In both the 2004 and the 2007 Index, six of the ward's seven LSOAs sat within the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in England.

¹⁰ Rank of all 8,414 wards in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 8,414 the least.

¹¹ Rank of all 32,482 LSOAs in England. A rank of 1 indicates the most deprived ward, and 32,482 the least.

¹² A change in rank indicates only a change in extent of deprivation *relative to all other LSOAs in England*. It does not necessarily indicate any actual change in extent of deprivation in any given area therefore, as fluctuations in rank are dependent upon all 32,482 LSOAs against which ranks are made.

¹³ The word "relative" is used throughout this commentary; see footnote 4. Any claims about reduced levels of deprivation must be interpreted with caution as such.

- Windmill Hill ward sat just outside of the top 10% most deprived wards in England in 2000. It includes one LSOA, Marksbury Road, which sits within the top 10% most deprived LSOAs nationally, in both the 2004 and 2007 Index. It is worth noting also, that all eight LSOAs in Windmill Hill dropped in ranking.
- In 2007 in the whole of Bristol, just four LSOAs sit within the worst 1% of all LSOAs nationally, for the overall IMD (there were five in 2004). Two of these are in the Objective 2 Area (one of these is located in Filwood, and one in Lawrence Hill). Only 1 LSOA is in the worst 1% in both 2004 and 2007: Easton Road in Lawrence Hill, which remains the worst LSOA in Bristol.
- In 2004, 17 of the total 37 LSOAs (approx. 46%) in the Objective 2 Area sat within the top 10% most deprived LSOAs in England. In 2007, 16 sat within the top 10% (approx. 43%).

3. Out of Work Benefits

Figure 3 below indicates the change in total proportions of the WAPG claiming various Out of Work benefits, in Bristol and the Objective 2 area.

Figure 3: Out of Work Benefits Claimants in the Objective 2 Area, 1999 - 2008

Indicator	August 1999 Objective 2 Ward Proxies	February 2008 Objective 2 Ward Proxies	August 1999 Bristol	February 2008 Bristol
Total Out of Work Benefits Claimant rates**	26.0	19.6	14.6	12.1
Incapacity Benefit Claimant Rates	11.2	11.3	7.2	7.6
Lone Parents claiming benefit rates	6.2	4.2	3.3	2.3
Job seekers	7.3	3.3	3.6	1.8
Other income related benefits	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.4

**Claimant rates have been calculated by dividing the total number of claimants by the total WAPG in the Objective 2 Ward Proxies (using population data as outlined in Figure 2). The resulting figures have been multiplied by 100 to give percentages.

Source: Nomis, October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright reserved, 2001

Figure 3: Points of Note:

- The total of the WAPG claiming Out of Work Benefits has dropped in the Objective 2 wards, by 6.4%. This compares favourably with the picture in Bristol as a whole, where a drop of 2.5% was observed.
- When breaking down the picture of those on Out of Work Benefits, the greatest fall in numbers of claimants (as a proportion of the total WAPG) in the Objective 2 area, was seen for Lone Parents; where a drop from of 2%, from 6.2% to 4.2% was seen. This again compares favourably to the picture in Bristol as a whole, where a drop of 1% was seen (although it should be noted that, in 2008, rates of claimants were still greater in 2008, at 4.2%, than in Bristol, at 2.3%).

Percentage Out of work benefits for Objective 2: Change August 1999 to February 2008

Another way of looking at the Out of Work Benefits data, is to examine the percentage change, between Aug-99 and Feb-08, in the number of individuals claiming out of work benefits. This is shown in Figure 4 below.

The green entries indicate that the area is doing better than Bristol; i.e. that the percentage of benefits claimants has seen a more significant reduction in the Objective 2 ward proxies, than in Bristol as a whole.

Figure 4: Percentage Change in Out of Work benefits claimants for the Objective 2 Area

Area	Percenta						
	Ashley	Easto	Filwood	Lawrence	Windmill	Obj 2	Bristol
statistical group - job seekers	-53.3	-43.3	-51.8	-29.5	-54.3	-45.0	-42.5
statistical group - incapacity benefits	7.9	19.4	21.3	38.0	11.2	21.8	22.1
statistical group - lone parents	-29.7	-24.7	-12.3	-5.4	-35.6	-18.3	-19.1
statistical group - others on income related	-25.0	-47.4	-28.6	-20.0	-27.3	-28.6	-28.7
Out of Work Benefits	-22.9	-14.0	-5.7	7.0	-18.6	-9.0	-5.0

Source: Nomis October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright reserved

Figure 4: Points of Note:

- In the Objective 2 Area overall, the proportion of Out of Work Benefits claimants has reduced by almost 9% of the 2001 rate, over the given time period. This is considerably higher than Bristol as a whole; 5%.
- In Objective 2 and Bristol, the greatest percentage change is for JSA claimants; a drop of 45% of the 2001 rate was seen in 2006 in the Objective 2 area. Similarly in Bristol the drop was of 42.5%.

4. Employee and Business Composition by Sector

Figures 5 and 6 look at the business units (total numbers and composition by sector), in the Objective 2 Area.

Figure 5: Total number and proportion of Business Units by sector, Objective 2 Area

Indicator	Total number of units in Objective 2 Area, 2001	Total number of units in Objective 2 Area, 2006	Total proportion of units in Objective 2, 2001	Total proportion of units in Objective 2, 2006
1 & 2 : Agriculture and fishing (SIC A,B); Energy and water (SIC C,E)	<21 Units	<21 Units	<0.5%	<0.5%
3 : Manufacturing (SIC D)	260	230	8.76	7.62
4 : Construction (SIC F)	180	160	5.98	5.20
5 : Distribution, hotels and restaurants (SIC G,H)	880	800	29.78	26.38
6 : Transport and communications (SIC I)	130	110	4.35	3.78
7 : Banking, finance and insurance, etc (SIC J,K)	1000	1120	33.89	37.16
8 : Public administration, education & health (SIC L,M,N)	270	330	9.03	10.87
9 : Other services (SIC O,P,Q)	230	270	7.88	8.82
Column Total	2950	3020		

Source: Nomis October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright Reserved

Figure 6: Business Units in Objective 2 as a proportion of Bristol

Indicator	2001	2006
Number of business units in Objective 2 as a proportion of total business units in Bristol	17.30	17.39

Source: Nomis October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright Reserved

Figures 5 and 6: Points of Note:

- The sectors of Agriculture and Fishing, Manufacturing, Construction, Distribution and Transport have all seen a drop in numbers of business units between 2001 and 2006, in the Objective 2 Area. Banking, finance and insurance; public administration, education & health, and other services, have all seen an increase in numbers of units over the time period.
- The sector seeing the greatest percentage growth in the Objective 2 area over the time period, is Banking, finance and insurance; showing an increase from 33.9 to 38.7%.
- The total business units in Objective 2 as a proportion of all business units in Bristol, has remained fairly constant over the time period, increasing by just 0.1% between 2001 and 2006.

Figure 7: Employees (total numbers and composition), Objective 2 Area

Source: Nomis October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright Reserved

Indicator	Total number of employees, 2001	Total number of employees, 2006	As a proportion of all employees in Bristol, 2001	As a proportion of all business in Bristol, 2006
1 & 2 : Agriculture and fishing (SIC A,B); Energy and water (SIC C,E)	<21 Units	<21 Units	<1.5%	<1.5%
3 : Manufacturing (SIC D)	4500	3500	9.77	7.63
4 : Construction (SIC F)	3200	1700	6.96	3.62
5 : Distribution, hotels and restaurants (SIC G,H)	7200	8200	15.57	17.71
6 : Transport and communications (SIC I)	4400	4200	9.58	9.02
7 : Banking, finance and insurance, etc (SIC J,K)	13500	16600	29.16	35.98
8 : Public administration, education & health (SIC L,M,N)	10700	9700	23.23	20.97
9 : Other services (SIC O,P,Q)	2400	1900	5.09	4.04
Column Total	46200	46200		

Figure 8: Employees in Objective 2 as a proportion of Bristol

Source: Nomis October 2008, ONS Crown Copyright Reserved

Indicator	2001	2006
Number of Employees as a proportion of total employees in Bristol	20.12	20.62

Figures 7 and 8: Points of Note:

- The total number of employees in the Objective 2 Area has remained constant over the time period 2001 – 2006.
- The sectors within which these employees work has varied slightly over the time period, with an approximate 6% increase in employees in the Banking, finance and insurance sector. The greatest percentage drop was for Construction, which dropped from 6.96% to 3.62% of total employees in the Objective 2 Area.
- The total number of employees in Objective 2 as a proportion of all employees in Bristol, has remained fairly constant over the time period, increasing by just 0.5% between 2001 and 2006.