**Strategic Funding Programme**

**Appraisal Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 (fail)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Type of proposal | Cap Ex proposal delivery – signpost to alternative funding  *e.g. Technology installation project* | Local / single partner proposal with benefits restricted to partner/specific geographical location  e.*g. Geographically specific project* | Collaborative proposal - multiple Partners / Stakeholders or cross Hub delivery  *e.g. Proposal developed within a multi-stakeholder working group* | Delivers relevant knowledge leadership and strategic learning opportunity  *e.g. Common interest Study/research* | Hub capacity Building capacity/ capability/  expertise within the Hub  *e.g. Hub delivery workstream* |
| Fit with Hub Strategic Priorities | No clear link to or mismatched Hub strategic priority themes – out of scope activity  e*.g. Innovation activity, flood attenuation project.* | Indirect links to one of four strategic priority themes – Tier 2 scope (local delivery)  *e.g. Local Policy/Strategy document* | Indirect links to one of four strategic priority themes Tier 1 scope (local delivery)  e.g*. Local Strategy delivery* | Strong links to one or more four strategic priority themes, Hub branded, regional delivery - Tier 2 scope  *e.g. White paper* | Strong links to one or more Strategic priority themes, Hub branded, regional delivery - Tier 1 scope  e.*g. Technology Feasibility study* |
| Fit with core aims of Hub MOU | Does not clearly deliver aims of MOU | Supports a local delivery plan within Hub area | Raises the profile of the Hub with stakeholders and increases engagement which may lead to other beneficial activity | Actively supports a programme of knowledge exchange and learning to influence policy/strategy | Supports the increased delivery/commercial investibility of local net zero projects |
| Impact/beneficiaries | Proposal is likely to have minor impact. No beneficiaries identified | Low level impact with limited application beyond a few beneficiaries within the immediate area of influence. | Direct impact is likely to be focussed on a few direct beneficiaries but with opportunities to share findings more widely | Presents a reasoned case that investment is likely to result in wide-ranging, indicative impacts for several beneficiaries | Strong evidence that the investment will result in wide-ranging, tangible impacts for several beneficiaries |
| Benefits/outcomes | Few/ unidentified benefits | Unquantified and highly localised/specific benefits identified | Indicative benefits/outcomes leveraged across multiple partner areas | A range of indicative benefits/outcomes leveraged across Hub area | A range of clearly identified benefits/outcomes leveraged across the Hub area |
| Value for Money | Unclear cost breakdown and poor BCR. No match. | Estimated costs that appear high/may be highly variable.  May include match/no match | Estimated costs that appear reasonable but may be variable. May have no match or in-kind match only. | Clear cost breakdown based on benchmarking/ experience. Proportionate to impact. May also include some match. | Clearly identified and evidenced costs, proportionate to impact/benefit. May also include significant match. |
| Demand | Unclear demand | Has identified an opportunity but demonstrates limited understanding of demand | Has identified an opportunity and provides some anecdotal evidence of demand | Provides anecdotal evidence of demand based on experience/benchmarking | Identifies clearly quantified/ qualified evidence of demand |
| Option Appraisal | Has not clearly explored delivery options | Options appraisal only explores do more/do less variations of proposed project and does not explore alternative routes to achieving goals. | Options appraisal explores 2-3 routes to delivering goals. Some limited discussion of rationale. | Options appraisal explores 2-3 routes to delivering goals with clear rationale | Thorough options appraisal undertaken to explore best route to delivering goals. Several options explored with clear rationale. |
| Management | No clear management arrangements or plan in place for mobilisation | Identifies how project might be managed but requires confirmation and a plan for resource mobilisation. | Plan to put management arrangements in place and mobilise project | Management arrangements are established with plan for mobilisation | Management arrangements are established with resource in place to deliver |
| Dependencies | Significant dependencies / not clearly deliverable | Several dependencies - deliverable in 1yr+ | Small number of key dependencies - deliverable in future months | Limited dependencies - deliverable in the near future | No significant dependencies - immediately deliverable |
| Risks | No risk register/ risk assessment | Limited risk register supplied / clear gaps. Some significant risks may be identified | Basic risk register supplied. Some risks identified, some mitigated. A few higher level risks may be identified | Comprehensive risk register supplied. Most risks identified and mitigated. 1-2 higher level risks may be identified. | Comprehensive risk register supplied. Risks clearly identified with appropriate mitigations. No significant risks. |