Appendix B: SPF Open Call Project Approval Process

1. Project proposals are submitted via the Open Call process for which the application window closes at midday on Friday 18th August.

2. An assessment panel will be formed of members of Cardiff Council's Shared Prosperity Fund Team, including the Outcome Delivery Officer, Project Commissioning Officer, and Partnership Delivery Manager.

3. The assessment panel will carry out the initial stages of assessment for all applications, including due diligence and scoring.

4. Due diligence is carried out on all applications via an initial screening process to ensure applicant eligibility by checking:

   a. Legal status of the lead applicant
   b. Financial standing of the lead applicant
   c. Registered status of the lead applicant
   d. Organisational competence of the applicant/s

5. All eligible applications are assessed using a thorough scoring process that builds on the existing process used to score projects funded as part of the Year 1 Spend Plan approved by Cabinet in November 2022.

6. The scoring process assesses proposals against seven core metrics:

   a. Alignment with Cardiff Council's Stronger, Fairer, Greener Strategy
   b. Alignment with the Cardiff Public Services Board Wellbeing Strategy
   c. Alignment with UK Government Shared Prosperity Fund Criteria
   d. Alignment with SPF Programme
   e. Funding Detail and Value for Money Assessment
   f. Project Deliverability and Community Capacity Building
   g. Demonstration of Additionality relative to Existing Provision

7. Each core metric is scored between 0-10 to give a maximum score of 70 and a minimum score of 0. Proposals can score either 0, 2, 5, 7, or 10 for each metric; a project must meet all of the criteria listed for a score to achieve it. The categorisation of these totalled scores is outlined in the table below. Once projects are scored, they will be ranked according to score and will require a minimum score to progress.

8. NOTE THAT PROJECTS WILL NEED TO FIT WITHIN THE AVAILABLE FUNDING PROFILE AND ALIGN WITH THE REGIONAL INVESTMENT PLAN. SUBSEQUENTLY, ALL APPROVALS WILL BE SUBJECT TO FUNDING.

Maximum Score	Outcome
49 - 70	Approve bid*
35 - 48	Approve bid but with conditions*
21 – 34	Reject bid but consider if it could be held on shortlist if improvements identified
0 – 20	Reject Bid

subject to availability of funding

9. Applications that are approved will be subject to engagement from key partners and colleagues to ensure there is no duplication of existing provision, that the proposal will deliver additionality, and represents value for money. Any similar schemes operating in other authority areas should be identified to consider efficiencies of scale and opportunities for partnership working across local authorities and across the Cardiff Capital Region.

10. Following consultation, approved projects will then be aligned with the Shared Prosperity Fund programme spend profile. The SPF Team may contact applicants to query the funding detail at this stage and progress applications on the basis that:

    a. Spend should fit within Cardiff's SPF local investment plan
    b. Spend should fit within the capital and revenue allocations available
    c. Spend should fit within the annual allocations available

11. The project team will also liaise with applicants where there is an identified opportunity to collaborate as part of the delivery of the proposed project. This will include partner organisations outlined in the Delivery Programme.

12. A recommendation will be made by the Cardiff SPF Team to the Assistant Director of Communities and Housing to allocate funding to the ratified project proposals.

DUE DILIGENCE SCREENING   *Regarding:*

Q1: Is the Bid from:

	Tick		**Yes or No**		
Consortium		Lead provider clearly identified:		*If Y go to Q2*	**If N, need to clarify**
Single Entity		*If Y go to Q2*			

Q2: Is the Bid from / Lead Provider in:

	Tick		**Notes**
Local authority			
Private sector			
Voluntary sector/charity		*If yes to any, Bidder is eligible, go to Q3*	
HE Institution			
FE College			
Other Public Sector			
Other		**Need to verify**	

Q3: Has the status of the Bidder/Lead Provider been verified?

	Verification	**Name**		**Date**		**Date**
Company Registration No.	Companies House checked by:		On:		Registered since:	
Charity Registration No.	Charities Commission checked by:		On:		Registered since:	
Website:	Checked by:		On:			

Q4: Have the accounts of the Bidder/Lead Provider been verified:

	Name		**Date**		**Approved/Not approved**
Latest set of accounts obtained by:		On:		Forwarded to accountant on:	
Financial standing checked by:		On:		Outcome:	
Overheads 15% checked by:		On:		Outcome:	
Capital/revenue split checked by:		On:		Outcome:	

	Yes or No	**Details:**		**Notes**
Q5. Is there any match funding identified?				

Q6: Any known issues from funding/working with this Bidder/Lead Provider in the past? Yes or No? *If Yes, detail below*

Applicant Information

Criteria	Assessment Y / N /NA	If Y or N/A – Pass; If N – Fail
Project proposal will be delivered by a legally constituted organisation that can receive public funds.		
If organisation has previously received funding from the Council, there were no issues with their management of funding or engagement (check SAP)		
Involvement of Councillors/officers has been identified		
Application received on time and signed/approved by Committee/Board Member or Service Director		
All required supporting documents received and approved		

1. Alignment with Cardiff Council's Stronger, Fairer, Greener Strategy

Score	Classification	Supporting Definition
10	Excellent response	• Full and clear alignment to the themes of Stronger, Fairer, Greener • Project delivers an identified commitment
7	Good response	• Some alignment to the themes of Stronger, Fairer, Greener • Project aligned with / supports an identified commitment
5	Average response	• Reference is made to the Strategy without further detail. • Project however does generally meet the objectives of the Strategy.
2	Poor response	• No real identification of alignment to the strategy. • Project does not meet the objectives of Stronger, Fairer, Greener Strategy
0	Unacceptable response	• No link to Stronger, Fairer, Greener Strategy

2. Alignment with the Cardiff Public Services Board Wellbeing Strategy

Score	Classification	Supporting Definition
10	Excellent response	• Contributes to four or more of the progress measures
7	Good response	• Contributes to three of the progress measures
5	Average response	• Contributes to two of the progress measures
2	Poor response	• Contributes to one of the progress measures
0	Unacceptable response	• Contributes to none of the progress measures

3. Alignment with UK Government Shared Prosperity Fund criteria

Score	Classification	Supporting Definition
10	Excellent response	• Clearly aligned with one or more of the SPF interventions. • A number of relevant outputs and outcomes clearly identified. • No duplication of existing delivery.
7	Good response	• Substantially aligns with one of the SPF interventions. • A few relevant outputs and outcomes identified. • No duplication of existing delivery.
5	Average response	• Generally aligns with one of the SPF interventions. • At least one relevant output identified. • At least one relevant outcome identified. • No duplication of existing delivery.
2	Poor response	• Does not align with any of the SPF interventions. • No relevant outputs and outcomes identified. • Duplicates existing delivery.
0	Unacceptable response	• An unanswered response, or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfil the requirement in any way. • Project represents a duplication of existing provision.

4. Funding Detail and Value for Money Assessment		
Score	**Classification**	**Supporting Definition**
10	Excellent response	• Clear and detailed identification of all funding requirements including split of capital and revenue, and annual requirements. • Calculations correct with clear and evidenced value for money. • Project delivered entirely by an organisation/s external to the local authority.
7	Good response	• Broad funding requirements identified including split of capital and revenue, and annual requirements. • Calculations correct with value for money demonstrated. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation with a clear demonstration of community capacity building.
5	Average response	• Some identification of total funding requirements (either no split between capital/revenue or no split between years identified) • Calculations correct with value for money not evidenced but discernible. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation or a capital project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
2	Poor response	• No clarity of funding requirements; no split of capital and revenue, or annual requirements. • Value for money not evidenced and not discernible. • Project largely delivered by local authority with minimal partnership involved or a capital and revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
0	Unacceptable response	• An unanswered response, or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfil the requirement in any way. • Calculations are not correct and value for money not evidenced and not discernible. • Revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.

5. Funding detail and value for money assessment		
Score	**Classification**	**Supporting Definition**
10	Excellent response	• Clear and detailed identification of all funding requirements including split of capital and revenue, and annual requirements. • Calculations correct with clear and evidenced value for money. • Project delivered entirely by an organisation/s external to the local authority.
7	Good response	• Broad funding requirements identified including split of capital and revenue, and annual requirements. • Calculations correct with value for money demonstrated. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation with a clear demonstration of community capacity building.
5	Average response	• Some identification of total funding requirements (either no split between capital/revenue or no split between years identified) • Calculations correct with value for money not evidenced but discernible. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation or a capital project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
2	Poor response	• No clarity of funding requirements; no split of capital and revenue, or annual requirements. • Value for money not evidenced and not discernible. • Project largely delivered by local authority with minimal partnership involved or a capital and revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
0	Unacceptable response	• An unanswered response, or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfil the requirement in any way. • Calculations are not correct and value for money not evidenced and not discernible. • Revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.

6. Project deliverability and community capacity building		
Score	**Classification**	**Supporting Definition**
10	Excellent response	• Project deliverer has experience and/or expertise in the area in which the project is concerned. • Lead-in time and timetable proposed is realistic for project set-up and ongoing delivery. • Project delivered entirely by an organisation/s external to the local authority.
7	Good response	• Lead-in time and timetable proposed is realistic for project set-up and ongoing delivery. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation with a clear demonstration of community capacity building.
5	Average response	• Lead-in time and timetable proposed is realistic for project set-up and ongoing delivery. • No identification of feasibility studies or ongoing review of delivery. • Local authority listed as a delivery partner but project lead by an external organisation or a capital project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
2	Poor response	• Lead-in time and timetable proposed is not realistic for project set-up and ongoing delivery. • No identification of feasibility studies or ongoing review of delivery. • Project largely delivered by local authority with minimal partnership involved or a capital and revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.
0	Unacceptable response	• An unanswered response, or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfil the requirement in any way. • Revenue project solely delivered by the local authority with no partnership element.

7. Demonstration of additionality relative to existing provision		
Score	**Classification**	**Supporting Definition**
10	Excellent response	• Project demonstrates clear delivery of added value that produces clear additionality in terms of new cohorts, geographies, or expansion.
7	Good response	• Project demonstrates broad delivery of added value that produces some additionality in terms of new cohorts, geographies, or expansion.
5	Average response	• Project demonstrates limited delivery of added value that produces limited additionality in terms of new cohorts, geographies, or expansion.
2	Poor response	• No added value clearly identified.
0	Unacceptable response	• An unanswered response, or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfil the requirement in any way. • Project represents a duplication of an existing provision.

Maximum Score	**Outcome**
49 - 70	Approve bid*
35 - 48	Approve bid but with conditions*
21 – 34	Reject bid but consider if it could be held on shortlist if improvements identified
0 – 20	Reject Bid

Subject to availability of funding