

APPENDIX A: LAHF ASSESSMENT CRITERIA



Stage 1. GATEWAY CRITERIA

| Criteria | Pass | Fail |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Criteria 1: Application signed, fully completed, and returned on time | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 2 (1.1): Registered Provider Status | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 3 (1.3): Economic and Financial Standing* | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 4 (1.4): Economic and Financial Risk* | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 5 (1.5): Prior Contract Performance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 6 (1.6): Policies | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 7 (1.6): Liability Insurance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Criteria 8 (1.7): Ability to Deliver Funding Objectives | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**These will also be assessed via due diligence checks*

Applications that fail any criterion cannot progress to Stage 2: Scoring.

For the questions which have been assessed as partial, progress to Stage 2. Scoring will be allowed with justification from the Assessor.

STAGE 2. SCORING

The maximum score for each question is 5, based on the scoring framework below, but some are weighted through the multiplication of the assigned score. For example, a score of 5 weighted by a factor of 4 will equal a total score of 20. The maximum score and multiplication weightings are shown on the application form in the dark grey box to the right of each question.

SCORING FRAMEWORK

| Score | Assessment | Description |
|--------------|------------------------------|---|
| 0 | <i>Unacceptable</i> | <i>Response to the question is unacceptable or no response received. Does not give the Fund confidence in the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract.</i> |
| 1 | <i>Poor/Weak Response</i> | <i>Inadequate detail provided or some of the answer not directly relevant to the question. Is supported by none or a weak standard of evidence in several areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract.</i> |
| 2 | <i>Below Expectations</i> | <i>Limited information provided, and/or a response that is inadequate or only partially addresses the question giving rise to concern about the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract.</i> |
| 3 | <i>Satisfactory Response</i> | <i>Acceptable response in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance. Is supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence in most areas but a few areas lacking detail/evidence giving rise to some concerns about the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract.</i> |
| 4 | <i>Good Response</i> | <i>Comprehensive response in terms of detail and relevance to the question and supported by good standard of evidence. Gives the Fund confidence in the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the Fund's requirements.</i> |
| 5 | <i>Very Good Response</i> | <i>As Good, but to a better degree in terms of precision and relevance. Is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the Fund a high level of confidence in the ability of the bidder to deliver the contract. <i>May exceed the Fund's requirements in some respects, for example, added value such as integration/synergy with other projects.</i></i> |

Scores will be awarded low to high based on the framework and within the scoring range for each question.

Part 2. Project Details on the application form will be scored out of 105 (once the weighting has been applied).

Part 3. Quality Assurance on the application form will be scored out of 60 (once the weighting has been applied).

The total score for applications will be out of 165 (= Part 2. score + Part 3 score).

| Part 2 – Project Details | | Max. Score | Weighting |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------|------------------|
| 2.1 | Details of other relevant projects/delivery performance | 5 | X2 |
| 2.2 | Description of proposed delivery method | 5 | X2 |
| 2.3 | How will the proposed delivery method support/deliver programme outputs | 5 | X2 |
| 2.4 | How will you use funding allocation to maximise output delivery | 5 | X5 |
| 2.5 | Output and Cost Profile | 5 | X5 |
| 2.6 | Delivery Programme and Milestones | 5 | X5 |
| Sub-total for Part 2 | | 30 | 105 |
| Part 3 – Quality Assurance | | | |
| 3.1 | Ensure tenants will receive a high-quality experience | 5 | X2 |
| 3.2 | Processes to ensure outputs and outcomes are achieved | 5 | X3 |
| 3.3 | Associated risks and activities proposed to mitigate risk | 5 | X2 |
| 3.4 | Robust management practices in place | 5 | X5 |
| Sub-total for Part 3 | | 20 | 60 |
| Total | | 50 | 165 |

STAGE 3. MODERATION

The LAHF Grant funding will be awarded to the applicant with the highest score.

Where applications tie on scores, further moderation criteria will be applied as detailed in Stage 4, or applicants may be invited to discuss/negotiate their total project outputs and proposals.

Nottingham City Council reserves the right to not award the grant funding if determined or funding/council circumstances change.

NOTIFICATION OF INVITATION TO BID OUTCOME

Once the outcome of the assessment process has been notified to all applicants, organisations can request feedback on their applications and scoring.