

SEMLEP Local Growth Fund 2018 Prioritisation Framework

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Alignment						
Alignment of the Proposal to LEP Objectives Does the project make an active contribution to SEMLEP's Seven Priorities .	Impact	No alignment with strategic themes	Partial alignment with strategic themes	Limited contribution to one or more strategic theme	Strong contribution to one or more strategic theme	Substantial / transformational contribution to on one or more strategic theme
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Analysis / evidence provides partial support for claims made	Adequate analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Robust analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Compelling analysis / evidence provided supporting claims
Contribution to the UK Industrial Strategy	Impact	No alignment with UK Industrial Strategy	Partial alignment with UK Industrial Strategy	Limited contribution to the Five Foundations of Productivity and/or IS Grand Challenges	Strong contribution to one or more of the Five Foundations of Productivity and/or IS Grand Challenges	Substantial / transformational contribution to on one or the Five Foundations of Productivity and/or IS Grand Challenges.
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Analysis / evidence provides partial support for claims made	Adequate analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Robust analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Compelling analysis / evidence provided supporting claims
Contribution to the Local Industrial Strategy and emerging SEMLEP priorities	Impact	No alignment with emerging priorities	Partial alignment with emerging priorities	Limited contribution to the emerging priorities.	Strong contribution to one or more of the emerging priorities.	Substantial / transformational contribution to on one or more of the emerging priorities.
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Analysis / evidence provides partial support for claims made	Adequate analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Robust analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Compelling analysis / evidence provided supporting claims

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Contribution to the <u>Oxford Cambridge Corridor</u>	Impact	No alignment with Corridor priorities.	Partial alignment with priorities of the Corridor.	Limited contribution to the priorities of the Corridor.	Strong contribution to the priorities of the Corridor.	Substantial / transformational contribution to the priorities of the Corridor.
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Analysis / evidence provides partial support for claims made	Adequate analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Robust analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Compelling analysis / evidence provided supporting claims
Contribution to other relevant national policy (Where relevant, please specify)	Impact	No alignment with wider initiatives	Partial alignment with wider initiatives	Limited contribution to identified initiative.	Strong contribution to identified initiative.	Substantial / transformational contribution to identified initiative.
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Analysis / evidence provides partial support for claims made	Adequate analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Robust analysis / evidence provided supporting claims	Compelling analysis / evidence provided supporting claims
Assessment of Need / Demand						
Evidence of Need / Demand Evidence of which groups require the investment and scale of potential take up	Impact	No need for intervention / adequate alternative provision is available	Limited need for intervention	Need for intervention justified – but limited potential take-up	Need for intervention – good potential level of take-up	Need for intervention – substantial potential take-up
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Limited evidence of need	Evidence of future need provided, based on trend analysis	Evidence of future need provided, based on forecast analysis and/or basic market testing	Evidence of existing need provided supported by robust evidence (e.g. independent market assessment report / in-depth analysis of potential clients)

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of Market Failure Demonstrate why the project cannot proceed without public sector funding. <i>Refer to the SEMLEP overview of Market Failures</i>	Evidence	No information provided	Rationale to intervene outlined at a high level and/or no supporting evidence provided	Good rationale to intervene provided and/or limited supporting evidence provided.	Very good rationale for intervention provided and outline supporting evidence provided.	Substantial rationale for public sector intervention and evidence of the scale and nature outlined.
Options Assessment Demonstrate that alternative options have been considered and the proposed option is the most appropriate use of public funding.	Evidence	No options assessment provided.	High level options outlined, but no evidence of why the proposed option has been identified.	Reasonable consideration of project options and logical rationale for selection of preferred option is provided.	Detailed overview of project options and selection of preferred option based on Critical Success Factors or similar framework.	Quantified / monetised options appraisal provided, demonstrating the choice of preferred option.
Direct Economic Impacts Quantified direct impacts specified in the pro-forma <i>Assessment of 'reasonable', 'strong' and 'substantial' will be relative to other bids received.</i>	Impact	No impacts identified	Limited direct impacts and/or identified impacts do not align with SEMLEP priorities.	Identified impacts are reasonable and/or have potential for low levels of scheme additionality.	Strong level of impacts expected to be generated with medium-good levels of additionality.	Substantial direct impacts will be generated by the proposals. Net impacts will have a measurable impact on the SEMLEP region.
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Evidence provided is not Green Book compliant	Green Book compliant assessment, including consideration of net impacts, drawing on unverified assumptions. Calculations can be followed and replicated by the appraiser.	Green Book compliant assessment of net benefits, based on verified / established benchmarks and assumptions. Calculations can be followed and replicated by the appraiser.	Independent assessment of Green Book compliant assessment of net benefits, based on verified/established benchmarks and assumptions. Calculations can be followed and replicated by the appraiser.

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Wider Impacts Additional wider benefits associated with the investment <i>Assessment of 'reasonable', 'strong' and 'substantial' will be relative to other bids received.</i>	Impact	No wider impacts identified	Limited wider benefits identified and minimal alignment to LEP priorities.	Reasonable wider benefits identified and good alignment to LEP priorities	Strong wider benefits identified and strong alignment to LEP priorities	Substantial wider benefits identified with strong alignment to LEP priorities
	Evidence	No evidence provided	Impacts described in broad terms only.	Impacts identified in broad terms with some evidence of the intervention logic.	Specific impacts identified with some indication of the potential scale of contribution made by this project. Case supported by a qualitative description of the intervention logic.	Quantified wider impacts identified with robust supporting evidence and intervention logic (inc. verified / established benchmarks and assumptions).
Value for Money: Value of LGF Requested	Evidence	No rationale for level of LGF requested.	Rationale for level of LGF requested, but other funding sources are available.	Clear rationale for level of LGF funding, but availability of alternative sources has not been sufficiently explored.	Clear rationale for level of LGF funding and evidence that alternative funding sources have been explored and are unsuited to this investment.	Rationale for level of LGF requested is clear and no alternative funding is available.
Value for Money: BCR Ratio of benefits to public investment Impact assessment is based on BCR reported by applicant.	Impact	No VfM / BCR provided or poor VfM (BCR below 1)	Reasonable VfM (BCR above 1)	Good VfM (BCR above 2)	Very good VfM (BCR above 4).	Substantial VfM generated (not based on a pre-determined threshold, but high scoring proposals will be allocated this score).

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
<p>Evidence assessment will consider the appropriateness of the assumptions used.</p> <p>BCR to be considered for (i) SEMLEP / LGF contribution and (ii) total public cost.</p>	Evidence	No evidence provided	BCR provided with limited supporting evidence / calculations cannot be replicated and/or concerns over assumptions used to inform the assessment.	BCR provided with supporting evidence / possible to replicate VfM. There may be some concerns over the approach adopted / assumptions used, but these to not have a significant impact on the VfM assessment.	BCR provided with supporting evidence and calculations that can be replicated and are considered to be reasonable. High level optimism bias and sensitivity testing provided.	BCR provided with supporting evidence and calculations that can be replicated and are considered to be reasonable. Assessment considers in detail optimism bias and appropriate sensitivity tests (in line with Green Book guidance).
<p>Private Sector Leverage Ratio of private to public investment</p>	Impact	No private sector leverage identified	Modest private sector leverage identified (less than 10% of project cost)	Less than 25% private sector funding.	Less than 50% private sector funding.	Majority private sector funding (more than 50%).
Assessment of Deliverability						
<p>Project Funding Details of match funding</p>	Evidence	<p>Match funders not identified / funding gap greater than 20% of total project cost identified.</p> <p>Funding for revenue related activity is requested.</p>	Match funders identified, but less than 80% of the funding package will be secured on LGF approval	100% of funding sources are identified. On approval of LGF 80% of funding is expected to be in place and process for securing additional funding, in line with the project timetable, have been identified.	All required sources of funding are identified and are expected to be secured at time project approval would be granted.	All required sources of funding are identified and secured at time of the assessment.
<p>Project Costs Detailed project costs</p>	Evidence	No cost information provided.	High level cost information provided.	Detailed cost information provided, basis of cost estimates are unclear.	Detailed cost information provided with supporting evidence / assumptions.	Application is supported by independently verified cost assessment. Cost assumptions are clearly laid out.

Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Risk Assessment and Mitigation Consideration of project delivery risks, given delivery timescales including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding availability - Planning consents - Design and feasibility assessments - Additional risks 	Impact	No risks considered / identified	High level of risk that project will fail to deliver as outlined in its application. Limited mitigation in place.	Moderate level of risk to project delivery identified / some risk mitigation processes in place.	Based on the information provided, proposed risk mitigation activities and the proposed delivery timescales, the risks to delivery appear minimal	No substantive barriers to delivery identified given the information provided, the proposed risk mitigation activities and proposed delivery timescales.
Project Management Inclusion of a project management plan	Evidence	No project management structures identified	Limited information on management structures provided	Adequate information on management structure provided using untested approach.	Detailed information on management structures provided, Some activity will be new to the lead organisation, but strong capacity to deliver, within the project team.	Detailed information on management structure provided using established structures and processes that have demonstrated effective delivery of projects of this scope and scale.
Project Timescales The nature and scale of proposed activity in light of LGF timescales.	Evidence	No timescales identified and/or project not deliverable by March 2021.	Some timetable information provided but concerns over deliverability	Detailed delivery timetable provided. Potential risks around deliverability (i.e. key milestones are close to March 2021 and/or potential for slippage).	Detailed delivery timetable provided. Timescales appear realistic and project can be delivered within LGF timescales. Some delivery risks have been identified but appropriate mitigation strategies are in place.	Detailed delivery timetable provided. Timescales appear realistic and there are no apparent challenges to delivery within LGF timescales



Criteria	Score Type	Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
State Aid	Evidence	Significant concerns over state aid – must be addressed before project can proceed		Potential concerns over state aid not adequately addressed in pro-forma. Further legal advice required before project can proceed		No state aid concerns or all concerns adequately resolved in pro-forma (including seeking independent legal advice where required)