# **UK Shared Prosperity Fund – Flintshire Stage 1 Scoring & Assessment Template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Information** | | |  |
| Project Reference: |  | |  |
| Project Name: |  | |  |
| Applicant Organisation: |  | |  |
| **Gateway Criteria** | | | |
| 1. Is the application from an organisation eligible to receive UK SPF support? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Will the project be completed by 31st December 2024? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Does the project address one of the investment priorities identified in the UK SPF Prospectus? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Is the project strategic? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Does the project have a value in excess of £250,000? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Is it a large capital or infrastructure project? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Has the applicant demonstrated that the project will not duplicate other local, regional or national provision? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Is the project assessor aware of any duplication of provision? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Does the project demonstrate that it will directly address, and have a meaningful impact on, the local priorities identified in the SPF workshop consultation | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Has the project sufficiently demonstrated that it complies with Subsidy Control principles and requirements? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| 1. Have any other issues been identified that would preclude the project from being implemented effectively or that would create a significant risk to the Council? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |
| ***Projects must pass all gateway criteria to be considered for selection. Failure to adequately demonstrate one or more of these criteria may result in project rejection.*** | | |  |
| **Does the project meet the gateway criteria?** | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Selection Criteria** | |
| **Section 1 – Strategic fit with local priorities and evidence of local need** |
| ***1. How well does the proposal contribute to local needs and priorities identified in relevant local plans and strategies?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where they:   * Demonstrate how they will address a current gap in provision or an identified need * Reference how activities are relevant to local plans and strategies * Refer to any market research, needs analysis or local statistics to support the project * Provide evidence from any pilot projects or previous activity to demonstrate sufficient need and demand |
| **Comment:** |
| ***2. Does the proposal demonstrate that it is new or that it complements and aligns with existing activity?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where:   * They can demonstrate how they can confirm and evidence that there is no duplication * Existing delivery partners have indicated that there is no duplication with existing provision * They complement or add value to existing activity and provision |
| **Comment:** |
| ***3. What evidence is there of local support?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where they:   * Refer to any local consultation or engagement exercises and explain how this has influenced the development of the project * Demonstrate clear support from local partners and stakeholders and explain how they have been engaged * Explain the roles of local partners and stakeholders in project implementation |
| **Comment:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2 – Capability** |
| ***Does the applicant organisation demonstrate its ability to effectively deliver the project?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where the applicant organisation (and any delivery partners):   * Have the necessary skills and experience in delivering a project of this size and scale * Have a proven track record of administering significant funding regimes and programmes * Have the required resources (staff, organisational, operational, financial) and expertise * Have the capacity and capability to manage the project as described |
| **Comment:** |
|  |
| **Section 3 – Deliverability** |
| ***Are the project timescales and budget realistic and achievable?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where:   * They are deliverable within the stated timescale * The delivery milestones are realistic and achievable * They represent an efficient mode of delivery * The project budget is realistic and has been calculated on sound evidence * It will operate at an appropriate scale and the management, administration and overheads costs are proportionate to the activity and project delivery costs * Any retrospective costs are relevant and appropriate to project delivery |
| **Comment:** |
|  |
| **Section 4 – Value for Money** |
| ***Will the project deliver significant achievements and results for the local area?*** |
| Projects are likely to score higher where:   * They can provide an element of cash match funding * The stated outputs and outputs reflect project activities and are achievable * The project costs are proportionate to proposed outputs, outcomes and beneficiaries * The projects have the potential to make a significant and meaningful contribution to Flintshire’s priorities * Is it clear that the projects would not proceed, or could only be delivered on a smaller scale without UK SPF support |
| **Comment:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Score** | | |
| **Section** | **Maximum Score** | **Project Score** |
| 1.1 | 15 |  |
| 1.2 | 5 |  |
| 1.3 | 15 |  |
| 2 | 10 |  |
| 3 | 15 |  |
| 4 | 10 |  |
| **TOTAL** | **70** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessor’s Recommendation:** | | | | |
| Comment: | | | | |
| Progress ☐  Reject ☐ | |  | | |
| Completed by: |  | | Date: |  |
|  |  | | Date: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Economic Recovery Group Recommendation:** | | |
| Comment: | | |
| Progress ☐  Reject ☐ | |  |
| Date of meeting |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Local Authority Decision:** | | | | | |
| Comment: | | | | | |
| Approve ☐  Reject ☐ | |  | | | |
| Completed by: |  | | Cabinet Member | Date: |  |
|  |  | | Chief Officer | Date: |  |