

COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER SCHEME (CATS): EVALUATION PANEL TEMPLATE

Property:
Community Body:

CATS Ref:

SUMMARY TABLE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDANCE	OPTIONS	SCORE
COMMUNITY PROPOSALS: EVALUATION WEIGHTED SCORE			0
UTILISATION: Does the project maximise the benefits and make best use of the asset in relation to the scale of the asset transfer, taking into account alternative potential uses and benefits?	<p>Very strong proposals will demonstrate that the project benefits will maximise the use of the asset. The proposals will deliver significant additional financial and non financial benefits in relation to the size of the asset transfer, compared to alternative proposed use of the site.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals will only make use of a small part of the asset, or will deliver limited benefits in relation to the overall scale of the asset transfer compared to alternative proposed uses of the site.</p>	Low / Medium / High	0
ASSET TRANSFER REQUEST: FINAL EVALUATION SCORE			0

OUT OF 20
Max score:
low =20
medium = 40
high = 60
OUT OF 20/40/60

EVALUATION TABLE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDANCE	IMPACT (tick relevant box)						WEIGHTED SCORE
		Critical negative impact	Negative impact - potential to mitigate	Neutral / positive	BENEFITS			
0 - No evidence	1 - Very low				2 - Low	3 - Moderate	4 - Strong	5 - Very Strong
BENEFITS <i>Overall best value weighting</i> 1. Vision: To what extent do the overall vision for the project and the project outcomes contribute to Scotland's National Outcomes? 2. Financial: Will the project have an overall financial benefit on public sector costs and/or enhanced provision of public benefit? 3. Non-financial benefits: What is the impact of any non-financial benefits, including economic development, regeneration, public health, social wellbeing, environmental wellbeing, inequalities of outcome, any other benefits? 4. Equality: What evidence has the organisation provided of how it will take into account the different needs of the community, and what contribution will the project make to equalities outcomes?	50% <p>Very strong proposals will make a major contribution to several national outcomes, deliver transformational benefits to the community, with significant public benefit, and demonstrate clear evidence of benefits and steps it is taken to contribute to equalities outcomes.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals will make a limited contribution to national outcomes and have a small positive effect on community benefit. Proposals may receive a negative ranking if they are likely to impact on the communities capacity to deliver other activities, or have a negative impact on parts of the community.</p>							0
VIABILITY <i>Overall best value weighting</i> 5. Leadership: Is there a clear plan and leadership in place for achieving the project outcomes? 6. Governance and accountability: Are appropriate governance structures and policies in place, and what impact will they have on the viability of the project? 7. Use of Resources: Has the group identified all the resources required, such as funding, staff and volunteer resources with the appropriate skills, and are they sufficient to deliver the project? Has the group demonstrated that the resources are sustainable over the lifetime of the project? 8. Sustainability: Has the group set out evidence of how it the project will be funded in the longer-term, e.g. through future funding or self-finance, and what impact does this have on the long-term viability of the project? 9. Performance Management: How does the group propose to monitor and report on the achievement of the desired outcomes, including use of resources and delivery of outcomes?	30% <p>Very strong proposals will have clear plan, with leadership and other roles clearly identified, clear governance in place, evidence that the level of resources and community capacity is appropriate to the scale of the project, a longer-term plan and appropriate reporting and monitoring process.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals are likely to have show little evidence of their capacity to deliver the benefits identified. Proposals may receive a negative ranking if there is no governance in place, with no clear responsibility for delivery or a lack of resources and sustainability which is likely to lead to project failure, particularly where this may create a liability for the community or for the National Forest Estate.</p>							0

OUT OF 10
OUT OF 6

EVALUATION TABLE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SCORING GUIDANCE	IMPACT (tick relevant box)			BENEFITS					WEIGHTED SCORE	
		Critical negative impact	Negative impact - potential to mitigate	Neutral / positive	0 - No evidence	1 - Very low	2 - Low	3 - Moderate	4 - Strong	5 - Very Strong	WEIGHTED SCORE
<p>COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND WIDER PUBLIC BENEFIT</p> <p><i>Overall best value weighting</i> 10%</p> <p>10. Effective Partnerships: What partnerships are in place and what impact will they have on the delivery of the intended benefits?</p> <p>11. Local community support: What evidence has been provided of local community support and what impact will it have on delivery of the intended outcomes?</p> <p>12. Wider public support: What will be the impact of the project on wider public strategies and plans, including delivery of local development plans, and what are the benefits and impacts on communities, businesses or individual outwith the community represented by the community body submitting the asset transfer request?</p>	<p>Very strong proposals will have strong partnership contributing to delivery and enhancing the project benefits, clearly demonstrate strong community engagement and participation in the project, and contribute to wider public benefits such as the local development plan and other communities.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals will not have engaged with potential partners, will have evidence of community support but little active engagement and no evidence of contribution to any wider benefits.</p> <p>Projects may receive a negative ranking if they are likely to have a negative impact on local development plans, such as impeding planned developments, where there is evidence of community opposition to the proposals and/or the proposals will have a negative impact on the wider community such as displacing or disrupting existing local businesses or community activities.</p>									0	OUT OF 2
<p>MANAGEMENT OF SCOTLAND NATIONAL FORESTS AND LAND</p> <p><i>Overall best value weighting</i> 10%</p> <p>13. Contribution to management of Scotland's National Forests and Land: What impact will the project have on management of the national forests and land, and FLS statutory or contractual obligations as set out in its Framework, Corporate Plan and the Scotland's Forestry Strategy?</p> <p>14. Sustainable development: Will the proposals have a positive or negative environmental impact, and contribute to sustainable development? In the case of forests and woodland will the asset be managed in accordance with the principles of sustainable forest management (SFM), as set out in the UK Forestry Standard?</p>	<p>Very strong proposals will make a positive contribution to management of the National Forests and Land, and demonstrate clear evidence that that the asset will be contribute additionally to sustainable development, e.g. by obtaining SFM certification such as UKWAS.</p> <p>Low impact proposals will have no impact on management of the National Forests and Land, and demonstrate evidence that the asset will be managed sustainably, and that forests and woodland will continue to managed in compliance with the UK Forestry Standard.</p> <p>Proposals may receive a negative ranking if they will impact on FLS' ability to deliver its duties and key strategic objectives for management of the National Forests and Land, including legal, contractual obligations, and impact on programme budgets or that the project will not be sustainable, and if applicable, will not comply with the UK Forestry Standard.</p>									0	OUT OF 2
SCORE FOR PROPOSALS										0	OUT OF 20