

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Score
Strategic fit	1. Level of contribution to local needs articulated in relevant local plans and with evidence of local support.	5
	2. Level of contribution to an articulated investment priority set out at sections 3.2 to 3.5 in the prospectus.	5
	3. The extent of contribution to net zero objectives, as set out at section 3.1.1 of the prospectus, or wider environmental considerations (not applicable to employment support interventions).	5
	4. The extent to which the project can inform the UK Shared Prosperity Fund through transferable learning or opportunity to scale up for local partners and UK government.	5
	5. The extent to which the project demonstrates innovation in service delivery	5

Deliverability, effectiveness, and efficiency	1. That it can be delivered as proposed by March 2022 with realistic milestones identified.	5
	2. Project risks have been identified and are adequately mitigated, including project-level management controls.	5
	3. The applicant sets out an efficient mode of delivery, taking account of the level of innovation proposed and will operate at an appropriate scale. This shall include an assessment of value for money taking account of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the level of contribution to programme outputs for funding sought • the amount of match funding or leverage proposed to maximise impact (not applicable to employment interventions). 	5
	4. That the project would not proceed without funding or could only be delivered on a smaller scale.	5
	5. An effective monitoring and evaluation strategy has been identified for the project.	5

Totals:

Strategic fit	25
Deliverability, effectiveness, and efficiency	25
Strategic fit	100%
Deliverability, effectiveness, and efficiency	100%
Band	

1
2
3
4
5

Project 1	Score	Project 2
Rationale and risks	Score	Rationale and risks
[Text]	1	[Text]
[Text]	2	[Text]
[Text]	3	[Text]
[Text]	4	[Text]
[Text]	5	[Text]

[Text]	3	[Text]
[Text]	3	[Text]
[Text]	4	[Text]
[Text]	4	[Text]
[Text]	4	[Text]

15
18

60%
72%

Etc..	
Score	Rationale and risks
1	[Text]
2	[Text]
2	[Text]
4	[Text]
5	[Text]

3	[Text]
3	[Text]
4	[Text]
4	[Text]
4	[Text]

14
18

56%
72%