



## City / Managing Authority co-operation

### CASE STUDY:

## The Liverpool Neighbourhood Regeneration Programme (LNRP)

FIN-URB-ACT meeting  
Linz, 28 October 2009

Martin Eyres - Liverpool City Council  
tel: 00 44 151 233 2494  
e-mail: martin.eyres@liverpool.gov.uk



## Background

- The 2000-2006 Merseyside Objective One Programme included an allocation of circa €140m for a “Developing Communities” priority.
- Despite strong efforts the Managing Authority (Govt Office for the North West) was unable to secure sufficient quality proposals, and became concerned that the funding would either be not be used or have to be allocated elsewhere.
- GONW approached the 5 LAs in Merseyside to see how / if they might help



## Background



- Liverpool City Council developed a proposal whereby €50m Objective One funding would be devolved to the city from the Managing Authority
- The city council was then to pass this on to multiple community based applicants / projects
- The legal basis for delegation of funds was a grant funding offer letter for a project - it was not for a “programme” or “action plan”



## LNRP project



- LNRP was a €50m ERDF / ESF project plus €50m with match funding from Liverpool City Council - the match funding from the city council was by way of activity / spend
- In effect the SF money was matched at source (by LCC) which meant that the €50m SF could be allocated to LNRP projects without the need for the project to have match funding
- ERDF / ESF was then passed to circa 75 schemes



## LNRP project



- Outputs from LNRP project were collated by LCC (from the various LNRP projects) and reported collectively to Managing Authority
- For the record the LNRP project generated the following outputs:
  - 5,300 residents into employment
  - 2,400 residents into full time education
  - 2,300 residents secured new qualification
  - 30,900 beneficiaries



## Managing the project



- Multi level stakeholder group (LNRPG) was established - 10 community representatives and 10 city / public sector representatives
- Community representative remit was to identify activity that was required to meet identified needs of their community / neighbourhood area
- LNRPG role was to agree what activity would take place, at what level would it be delivered, how it would be delivered, and who would deliver it.



## Innovative aspects



- All funding was awarded to projects / activity as 100% grant with no requirement for the delivery organisations to provide match funding
- No bidding - all activity was “commissioned” by LNRPG
- Pre-qualification procedure for all potential delivery organisations -
  - OJEU compliant
  - Fast track tender process
  - Cross cutting theme compliant



## Innovative aspects (2)



- Outputs reported to Managing Authority at LNRPG project level and therefore it was possible to commission activity that did not generate ERDF outputs
- Two stage appraisal:
  - Technical appraisal (eligibility, cost, competence, value for money) by city council officers
  - Strategic appraisal (approach, understanding of local factors, past performance) by local community/neighbourhood partnerships
- LNRPG made recommendation, Liverpool city council Executive Board made final decision and awarded contract



## Other good practice



- Monitoring and Evaluation Team (based in the city council) to visit projects and undertake systems audits to identify compliance issues.
- Independent support team (employed by C&V sector) to build capacity and help schemes to resolve compliance issues.
- Enlightened approach by Managing Authority and willingness to work at the macro level - this overcame some of the perceived “obstacles” and enabled a genuinely bottom up approach to local area based regeneration