Apologies It was my mistake that I couldn’t find the documents which you had sent to us.

[NCC]

-------------------------------
From: [DfT]
Sent: 09 September 2015 10:27
To: [NCC]
Cc: [DfT]; [NCC]
Subject: RE: Norwich NDR BRP and MEP

xxxx,

Many thanks I can confirm I have received the files.

Regards

xxxx

[DfT]

-------------------------------
From: [NCC]
Sent: 09 September 2015 10:16
To: [DfT]
Cc: [DfT]; [NCC]
Subject: Norwich NDR BRP and MEP

xxxx/xxxx

Can you confirm you have received the files sent this morning please. I have check my records and these were part of the funding bid submitted on the 7th of August 2015 received by xxxx on the same date, therefore there is no reason from NCC why you should not have had these files.

Regards

xxxx

[NCC]

-------------------------------
From: [DfT]
Sent: 08 September 2015 16:16
To: [NCC]
Cc: [DfT]
Subject: RE: DRAFT Norwich NDR BRP and MEP
We previously sent some comments and feedback on the proposed monitoring and evaluation plan for the above scheme. As indicated, we would be grateful if you could consider the feedback and re-submit the monitoring and evaluation plan in light of the comments below to ensure it fully meets the requirements of fuller evaluation set out in the monitoring and evaluation framework. Grateful if you could let me know when we can expect to receive an updated version of the plan.

Regards

[DFT]

From: [DFT]
Sent: 03 July 2015 17:18
To: [NCC]
Cc: [DFT]
Subject: FW: DRAFT Norwich NDR BRP and MEP

Many thanks for your comprehensive, detailed and helpful monitoring and evaluation plan which covers a great deal of useful ground and outlines your evaluation approach well. Your plan has been reviewed against the standards and requirements set out in the ‘Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Local Authority Major Schemes’. Based on your scheme size and type you are expected to undertake fuller evaluation. I have outlined below some comments and feedback on different aspects of your MEP which we hope you will be able to address to meet the requirements of fuller evaluation set out in the framework.

Data collection
* A baseline will be formed before construction. Traffic monitoring evidence will be gathered from the ‘DCO Examination’ (see page 38). Grateful if you could provide further information concerning what monitoring data has been covered here and how reliable and comprehensive it is.

Economic Evaluation
* The plan helpfully sets out clear logic maps and research questions in relation to impact and economic evaluation. It is worth emphasising that the scheme was identified for fuller evaluation because the evidence would help fill key evidence gaps about the impacts on dependent development. I think the plan would benefit from drawing out a little more clearly how robustly the economic evaluation methodology will be able to assess the success of NNDR as a dependent development scheme, i.e. in delivering changes to employment, land use, land values and housing levels.

Impact Evaluation
* Attributing observed changes to the scheme is a central consideration for fuller evaluation. We note a ‘theory of change’ evaluation approach has been applied and four logics maps produced to show the causal effects. Whilst this approach may provide helpful insight into causal pathways we would be grateful for a clearer justification as to why the theory of change approach proposed is the most appropriate for the size and scope of this scheme. For example, how robust is the evaluation evidence provided by this analysis?
The limitations of this approach (which are essentially qualitative) are not made clear and a quasi-experimental approach using comparison areas as a counterfactual have been ruled out mainly based on cost. The indicative total cost of the NNDR evaluation is £100,600 with £43K for the impact evaluation.

The theory of change approach could be substantially improved through the addition of some form of counterfactual analysis. If this approach has been considered and rejected it would be helpful to see what comparison areas you have considered and the type of analysis that would have been possible from this.

Counterfactuals could be constructed in a number of ways: for example a) for similar parts of the network that have not been subject to improvement or for areas close to the funded scheme that are not directly affected by the scheme. More simply, appropriate area wide averages could be used to provide a very basic counterfactual. We would be grateful if you could give further consideration to how counterfactual analysis might be applied to the impact evaluation of NNDR.

The logic mapping highlights the scheme objectives and what to expect in terms of changes in observed outcomes. However the chosen monitoring metrics in Table 3.4 do not appear to cover the full range of indicated outcomes from the logic maps. Can you clarity how the impact evaluation will also assess impact on road safety and air quality indicators? How will the potential for increased cycling and walking be evaluated? Table 3.4 could be strengthened by indicating how the various data collections methods will be used to answer the research questions.

Table 3.7 implies a link between the impact evaluation and employment and housing development. Grateful if you could clarify what quantitative data are used in the impact evaluation to assess the wider economic impact of the scheme? (i.e. effects on employment/housing?). Impacts on the economy do not appear to be considered in the research questions in Table 3.4?

How will any unintended impacts of the scheme be evaluated?

Process Study

The process evaluation should provide a useful study of the context of the scheme build and examination of how the scheme was implemented and delivered. We note detailed stakeholder analysis will occur at the baseline stage, Section 3.3. could be strengthened by exploring with stakeholders not simply how the implementation context has changed but also why. Drawing out the effectiveness of quality assurance methods during build would also be helpful.

Further detail would be appreciated in Section 3.3 on the methodology for the process study. How systematic will the data collection process be? How will the scores be derived from the monitoring reports?

If you are able to re-submit the monitoring and evaluation plan in light of the above comments we will be pleased to have a further review. If you have any questions or other concerns please feel free to contact me.

Best Regards

[DfT]
From: [NCC]
Sent: 01 July 2015 09:26
To: [DfT]
Subject: FW: DRAFT Norwich NDR BRP and MEP

Dear xxxx

As per your email, please see email below sent on the 17th June, if you could confirm receipt it would be appreciated

KR

xxxx

From: [NCC]
Sent: 17 June 2015 13:18
To: [DfT]
Subject: DRAFT Norwich NDR BRP and MEP

Dear xxxx

Further to the earlier email from [NCC] today to your colleague [DfT] please find attached an updated draft version of the NDR MEP and BRP for your comment. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate in contacting me.

Yours sincerely

[NCC]