

## UKSPF Proposal Assessment

### Stage 1: Gateway Criteria

Criteria	Assessment
1. Project proposal will be delivered (including all expenditure incurred) within the timescale set out on the call	<p><b>Pass/Fail</b></p> <p>Projects must pass criteria 1 &amp; 2 to be considered for selection. Failure to adequately demonstrate one or more of these criteria will result in project rejection.</p>
2. Project proposal will be delivered by a legally constituted organisation that can receive public funds	

Criteria	Assessment
3. Project proposal responds to a need and priorities identified in the UKSPF Investment Plan and specification provided.	<p><b>Pass/Fail/Partial</b></p> <p>Where the project could proceed with amendments, it will be considered to partially pass gateway criteria.</p>
4. Project proposal does not duplicate other national or local provision and does not conflict with national policy	
5. Project proposal will be delivered in line with subsidy control requirements	

### Stage 2: Scoring

Criteria 1: Strategic Case		
Sub criteria	Example evidence of meeting the criteria.	Assessment
	<p><i>This is non-exhaustive and other evidence may be provided and considered as part of the assessment.</i></p>	

<p>Level of contribution to local needs and priorities set out in the call and UKSPF Investment Plan.</p>	<p>As a minimum, projects will need to articulate how they demonstrate strategic fit in line with the detail set out in the call and UKSPF Investment Plan.</p> <p>For example, projects to articulate how they will address the specific needs of the intended Tees Valley beneficiaries of the service provided where applicable.</p> <p>Projects need to articulate how they fit within the wider economic strategy for the Tees Valley. Projects are likely to score higher where they directly address a priority set out in the UKSPF investment plan and/or respond to a challenge identified in the call</p>	<p>Each sub criteria is given a mark out of 5. These are summed with equal weighting.</p>
<p>The extent to which the project delivers added benefit, responds to evidence of need and will address potential duplication with existing or planned activity.</p>	<p>As a minimum, projects will need to articulate how they deliver added benefits, respond to evidence of need and how they will avoid duplication with existing or planned activity.</p> <p>Projects are likely to score higher where they clearly demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• added value;</li> <li>• the key issues/gaps with the existing arrangement;</li> <li>• their knowledge of complementary activity and how they will align with or address any potential duplication.</li> </ul>	
<p>Adequate risk register, identifying constraints and dependencies.</p>	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a robust project risk register that is reviewed and updated regularly;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify any constraints that have been placed on the proposal, including any external conditions that could impact on deliverability;</li> <li>Specify any dependencies or inter-dependencies outside the scope of the proposal upon which successful delivery is dependent.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

Criteria 2: Economic Case		
Sub criteria	Example evidence of meeting the criteria.	Assessment
	<i>This is non-exhaustive and other evidence may be provided and considered as part of the assessment.</i>	
Evidence of options analysis and demonstration of rationale for the preferred option	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail what options for delivery were considered and why they were discounted;</li> <li>Include a strong justification for the preferred option.</li> </ul>	Each sub criteria is given a mark out of 5. These are summed with equal weighting.
Value for money assessment including consideration of any match funding or revenue generation if applicable	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they include the following (as appropriate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optimisation of costs and benefits, including outputs, outcomes and impacts;</li> <li>Match funding;</li> <li>Leverage/follow on investment;</li> <li>Revenue generation;</li> <li>Identify and justify variable costs for specific activities that address beneficiary need.</li> </ul>	

Criteria 3: Commercial Case		
Sub criteria	Example evidence of meeting the criteria.	Assessment
	<i>This is non-exhaustive and other evidence may be provided and considered as part of the assessment.</i>	
Describes appropriate commercial arrangements (where applicable)	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe clearly how any procurement will be undertaken including as appropriate sub- contracting, partnership consortium management or collaboration arrangements (or why these are not appropriate);</li> <li>• Provide details of how social value will be secured if any procurement will be undertaken;</li> <li>• Describe what consideration has been given to any legal implications and risk transfer involved.</li> </ul>	Each sub criteria is given a mark out of 5. These are summed with equal weighting.
Describes Subsidy Control position	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a robust justification under the Subsidy Control act 2022</li> </ul>	

Criteria 4: Financial Case		
Sub criteria	Example evidence of meeting the criteria.	Assessment
	<i>This is non-exhaustive and other evidence may be provided and considered as part of the assessment.</i>	

Detailed costs and funding	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they (to be considered where applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide realistic cost values compared to alternative/similar programmes;</li> <li>• Detail the lifetime costs of the project;</li> <li>• Include a quarterly profile;</li> <li>• Provide a detailed financial breakdown by activity.</li> </ul>	Each sub criteria is given a mark out of 5. These are summed with equal weighting.
----------------------------	--	--

Criteria 5: Management Case		
Sub criteria	Example evidence of meeting the criteria.	Assessment
	<i>This is non-exhaustive and other evidence may be provided and considered as part of the assessment.</i>	
Delivery arrangements, management and implementation	<p>Projects are likely to score higher where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail robust project delivery arrangements;</li> <li>• Demonstrate a track record in delivering similar projects;</li> <li>• Demonstrate the capacity to deliver.</li> </ul>	Each sub criteria is given a mark out of 5. These are summed with equal weighting.

Marks will be given to each sub criteria on the following basis:

Points	Evaluation Criteria
0	Does not meet the requirement, has provided no relevant information or evidence to support the response.
1	Poor response that provides little or no assurance of the applicant's relevant ability, understanding, skills and resource. No relevant evidence to support the response.
2	Below average response which provides minor reservations of the applicant's relevant ability, understanding, skills and resource. Very little evidence to support the response.

3	Satisfactory demonstration by the applicant of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, and resource. Sufficient evidence to support the response.
4	Good demonstration by the applicant of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, and resource. Good quality of evidence to support the response.
5	Excellent response that provides above average demonstration by the applicant of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, and resource. Excellent quality of evidence to support the response, with clear demonstration of added value

### Supporting documentation

Documentation	Included? Y/N	If Yes – Satisfactory?	If Not included or unsatisfactory – condition of funding?
Equality Impact Assessment			
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan			
Communication Plan			
Quality marks held (where applicable)			

Where there are more projects is a greater request for funding than resources available under a call, TVCA will apply the above scoring to prioritise projects.