**Scoring Matrix for Stage 2 Applications under Part 5 – Community Empowerment (S) Act 2015**

 **Name of applicant:**

**Asset being applied for:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Score** | **Comments**  |
| **Section A – About the Proposal**A.1 - Are the aims and objectives of the proposal clearly defined? |  |  |
| A.2 - Has the organisation described what services and community benefit they will deliver and explained why they are required? |  |  |
| A.3 - Has the organisation described the demand/need for services and why they require the asset to deliver? |  |  |
| A.4 - How does the proposal compare with similar services being delivered in the same area? What is the additionality/displacement?  |  |  |
| A.5 – Have they described their experience of delivery the services? |  |  |
| A.6 – Are there similar projects in the area? What will this add? |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section B – Wider support and wider public support** B.1 - Has the applicant organisation demonstrated that there is sufficient demand for the proposal and sufficient support from the local community? This should be based on widespread consultation of those who would be served by the asset as well as support from community partners.* How have they engaged?
* Do they have sufficient support (not just from members but from the wider community?
 |  |  |
| B.2 - Evidence of stakeholder consultation is required including details of who was consulted, how, what the response was etc. |  |  |
| B.3 - Partnerships - Has the organisation provided details of any partnership arrangements required to deliver the proposal successfully? |  |  |
| B.4 – Has the organisation received any advice or support or sought assistance in developing their application? |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section C - Impact/ Benefits**C.1 - Assess whether agreeing to the request would be likely to:promotes or improve: * Economic development
* Regeneration
* Public health
* Social well-being
* Environmental well-being
* Reduce inequalities
 |  |  |
| C.2 – Have they demonstrated how they will take into account the differing needs of the community and demonstrate how they will reduce inequalities? Note any practical, physical or financial barriers to accessing services and how they will address these for all sections of the community. |  |  |
| C.3 – Regarding the Services being provided – how will this reduce public sector costs of providing the same or similar services in the area? |  |  |
| **Section D – Organisational Viability**D.1 -Has the organisation demonstrated that they have experience of managing an asset? Demonstrated awareness of relevant legislation? |  |  |
| D.2 – Demonstrate previous experience of delivering the community benefit? Provide examples. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| D.3 - Has the organisation provided details of individuals who have the skills and experience to take forward the proposal and run and manage the asset? This should include details of the individual skills and experience. |  |  |
| D.4 - Has the organisation demonstrated they have clear governance and decision making procedures for managing the asset and delivering the services e.g. there needs to be a clear process for making decisions including who will be responsible for booking rooms, dealing with site problems, compliance with legal issues such as health and safety. |  |  |
| D.5 - Has the organisation demonstrated they have a clear understanding as to what is required in relation to managing an asset? E.g. insurance, maintenance of the building, boilers, firefighting equipment and electrical items, EPC, legionella testing etc. |  |  |
| D.6 - Has the organisation provided details of the monitoring arrangements to be put in place to ensure the project delivers its key objectives?Eg what evaluated, when, how and what will be done with the outcome (published?) |  |  |
| **Section E – Financial Information** E.1 - Has the applicant organisation provided their projected income and expenditure and **cash flow forecasts**? Have they demonstrated there is sufficient projected cashflow to show the proposal is financially viable? |  |  |
| E.2 – What funding has been obtained so far? Eg for surveys, feasibility study? |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| E.3 – What discussions has the organisation had with potential funders? State the outcome of those discussions and what funding is realistic. |  |  |
| E.4 – What other sources of funding have been identified? Eg donations, fundraising. What reserves do they have and what is their reserves policy? |  |  |
| E.5 - Have they identified resources for long term sustainability? Future funding or self-financing arrangements. |  |  |
| E.6 – What overall benefit will there be to public sector costs? Try to quantify the community benefit in financial terms. |  |  |
| **Section F – Property** **F.1 Rental - not scored**F.2 - If the organisation seeks a discount then the benefit of the request should be proportionate to the value of the asset and the level of discount. Has the discount been justified?  |  |  |
| F.3 – Has sufficient consideration been given to property costs? How will these be met? Any funding available? |  |  |
| F.4 – Is the asset currently used or occupied by the Council or another? State any investigations and the outcome of any discussions with current users/occupiers. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **G. Local and National Outcomes**G.1 - Consider how the proposed benefits of the asset transfer request will contribute to achieving the Council’s outcomes or to national outcomes more generally. |  |  |
| G.2 - Consider how the proposal will impact on the Council’s own delivery of services. |  |  |
| G.3 - To what extent does the proposal contribute to local or national priorities? Produce a clear plan for achieving intended outcomes (ideally showing links to local or national outcomes),  |  |  |
| **H - Other information** |  |  |

**Assessment Scoring Matrix**

**To assess proposed use and financial arrangements for the asset. Must be proportionate and appropriate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| -2 | Has negative impact on the Councils activities |
| -1 | Has negative impact on existing provision/ existing benefit |
| 0 = Poor | Little or no response in regards to the submission with ill defined unrealistic ambitions  |
| 1 = Weak | The submission contains only minor detail and is not based on robust information  |
| 2 – Moderate  | The submission provides a level of detail which enables understanding with acceptable projected benefits  |
| 3 = Strong | The submission provides sufficient evidence that the issue has been taken into account with sound, sustainable Best Value characteristics  |
| 4 = Very Strong  | The applicant has included all issues in the submission and has provided additional information which enables detailed understanding with strong and sustainable Best Value characteristics with robust related project benefits  |