

COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER SCHEME (CATS): EVALUATION PANEL TEMPLATE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORING GUIDANCE	NEGATIVE IMPACT		POSITIVE IMPACT						WEIGHTED SCORE	
			Critical	Potential to mitigate	No evidence 0	Very low 1	Low 2	Mod-erate 3	Strong 4	Very Strong 5		
BENEFITS		<i>Overall best value weighting 50%</i>										
1. Vision	To what extent do the overall vision for the project and the project outcomes contribute to Scotland's National Outcomes?	<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.</p> <p>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>										
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?											
VIABILITY		<i>Overall best value weighting 30%</i>										
5. Leadership	Is there a clear plan and leadership in place for achieving the project outcomes?	<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.</p> <p>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>										
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?											
											TOTAL	10 OUT OF 10
											TOTAL	6 OUT OF 6

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND WIDER PUBLIC BENEFIT

Overall best value weighting 10%

10. Effective Partnerships	What partnerships are in place and what impact will they have on the delivery of the intended benefits?	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. 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. 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.		
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?			
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?			

								5	2
TOTAL									2 OUT OF 2

MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST ESTATE

Overall best value weighting 10%

13. Contribution to management of the NFE	What impact will the project have on delivery of the Strategic Directions for the NFE, and any FES statutory or contractual obligations?	Very strong proposals will make a positive contribution to the management of the NFE, and demonstrate clear evidence that that they will be managed sustainability, e.g. by obtaining appropriate SFM certification such as UKWAS. Low impact proposals will have no impact on the management of the NFE, and demonstrate evidence that forests and woodland will continue to managed in compliance with the UK Forestry Standard. Proposals may receive a negative ranking if they will impact on FES ability to deliver its duties and key strategic objectives for management of the NFE, including legal, contractual obligations, and impact on programme budgets or that the project will not comply with the UK Forestry Standard.		
14. Sustainable development	Where applicable, will the proposals have a positive or negative environmental impact, and 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?			

								5	2
TOTAL									2 OUT OF 2

No of questions 4

20 OUT OF 20

UTILISATION	Does the project maximise the benefits in relation to the scale of the asset transfer?	Very strong proposals will demonstrate that the project benefits will maximise the use of the asset and deliver significant financial and non financial benefits in relation to the size of the asset transfer. 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.
--------------------	--	--

	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
				3	60
TOTAL					OUT OF 60