

# Sector Support Funding (SSF) Revenue Programme

## Criteria for Guidance for Applicants

### 1 Background

- 1.1 The SELEP Strategic Board (the Board) has approved the use of the Growing Places Fund (GPF) Revenue grant to fund a programme of works to support the sector focussed activities that are being undertaken on a pan-LEP basis and predominantly led by the SELEP working groups.
- 1.2 The Board agreed the programme of total funding available in each year would be up to £500,000 of revenue grants per annum for three financial years, beginning 2017/18.

### 2 Purpose

- 2.1 Since its inception, SELEP has enabled a number of sector based working groups that function across the LEP area. At time of writing those groups are:

- Coastal Communities
- Creative
- Housing
- Growth Hubs
- Transport and Infrastructure
- Rural
- Skills
- Universities
- Tourism
- Social Enterprise

These groups are subject to change and there are many other groups that are working across the SELEP area, focussed on sector or common issues on a more informal basis.

- 2.2 The working groups are made up of representatives of any number of different organisations who give their time on voluntary basis as the benefits of cross-working have been clear. However, as these groups have matured, it has become clear that there is additional work or projects that the group could put into place that would bring further benefits but finding funding for these projects is increasingly difficult.

- 2.3 When the GPF grant was originally awarded, a proportion of the fund was earmarked as revenue. The intention had been to transfer this revenue into a wider property fund; but as the decision was made to not take forward that fund; the revenue funding became available to be used elsewhere.
- 2.4 The purpose of the SSF is therefore to support one-off, discrete pieces of work of a pan-LEP nature with a sector focus that brings demonstrable benefits and has support across the LEP. All applications must meet the criteria detailed in section 3 and be submitted in line with the process in section 4.
- 2.5 An independent assessment of the bid will be completed against the eligibility criteria.
- 2.6 Further guidance on Value for Money can be found in Appendix 1 and copy of the application form can be found at Appendix 2.

### 3. Eligibility Criteria

- 3.1 All funding applications must meet the following eligibility criteria:

**Table 1 Eligibility Criteria**

Eligibility Criterion	Notes
Scope must be <b>pan LEP</b>	The project must be able to demonstrate impact in at least three of the SELEP federated areas, preferably all four
Federated areas must support the project	The project proposal must be discussed the SELEP lead officer/Director for every federated area impacted. Endorsement for the bid must also be sought from the relevant Federated Board of the lead Upper Tier Authority.
The outcomes must align with SELEPs overarching objective to <i>create the conditions</i> for increased <b>jobs and homes</b> , safeguarding existing jobs and raising skill levels	Given the low investment levels of this fund, it is not expected that the projects will directly deliver greater numbers of jobs and homes but applicants must be able to demonstrate how the project will be part of creating the conditions for greater numbers of jobs and homes
The project must align with the SELEP	Applicants should highlight which objective(s)

Eligibility Criterion	Notes
priorities as defined in the <b>Strategic Economic Plan</b>	that their project supports. If you are unable to identify an objective to align to, this would suggest your project is not suitable for this funding
The project must be for a discrete piece of work, not ongoing or business as usual (BAU) costs	This funding is project based, that is a stand-alone piece of work, with defined start and finish dates and clearly identified inputs and outputs.
Minimum application value is £25,000 and maximum application value is £200,000	Bids outside of this range will not be considered
Funding will be awarded as a grant to support <b>revenue</b> spending only	Capital bids will not be considered
Match funding of <b>30%</b> must be demonstrated	<p>Applicants must be able to evidence at least 30% of match funding at time of application. This match can be either cash or non-cash. The source of this match must be identified and other SELEP funding or SELEP resource (including SELEP working group time) <b>cannot</b> be submitted as match.</p> <p>The certainty of this funding contribution must be stated and evidence provided of the availability of the match funding contribution.</p> <p>The match funding should also be spent within the project timescales specified within bid application.</p> <p>Exception to the requirement for 30% match funding will only apply where evidence is provided of substantial follow on investment.</p>
Projects are expected to be a maximum of <b>12 months</b> duration. Exceptions will be considered on a case by case basis	Funding can be provided in more than one financial year if the 12 month period straddles two financial years
The project must demonstrate Value for Money and comply with the SELEP Assurance Framework	Further guidance on demonstrating Value for Money in a proportional manner can be found in Annex A
The project must be supported by a lead	A grant agreement will be implemented

Eligibility Criterion	Notes
County/Unitary Authority or equivalent	between SELEP and the lead upper tier authority. Other contracting routes will only be considered on an exceptional basis.

## 4. Process for Applications

- 4.1 The process that applicants need to follow is detailed below. Applicants should make contact with SELEP Secretariat before submitting an application to discuss their bid. In the first instance this should be via the SELEP lead for the relevant working group. If there isn't a working group for the particular sector focus of the bid, please use the general contact form [hello@southeastlep.com](mailto:hello@southeastlep.com) and the most suitable contact will respond.
- 4.2 Bidding Period: Table 2 below sets out the timetable for the first open call for projects in 2018/19. If the annual allocation is not fully depleted through the first call for project then a further call for projects will be launched until the annual funding has been fully allocated. The total allocation value for each year is £500,000. Information on the current value of funds available in each year can be found via your SELEP contact, on the website via this [link](#), or by emailing the Secretariat using the link above at 4.1.
- 4.3 During the Bidding Period, the opportunity to submit funding proposals will be advertised as an open call for projects on the SELEP website and Federated Board/Upper Tier Authority websites. Through this period, the project promoter must work with the relevant Federated Area to seek endorsement for the project and raise the profile of the project proposal with other Federated Areas. In the first instance, this engagement should be through contact with the relevant working group.
- 4.4 Bid Submission: all applications should be made using the application form at Annex B and submitted via the [hello@southeastlep.com](mailto:hello@southeastlep.com) email address, and your SELEP contact should be copied in.

**Table 2 Timescales for 2018/19 SSF Call for Projects**

Action	Deadline June Board 2018	Deadline September Board 2018	Deadline December 2018 Strategic Board	Deadline March 2019 Strategic Board

<b>Action</b>	<b>Deadline June Board 2018</b>	<b>Deadline September Board 2018</b>	<b>Deadline December 2018 Strategic Board</b>	<b>Deadline March 2019 Strategic Board</b>
Bid Submission	1 <sup>st</sup> June 2018	10 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	2nd November 2018	8th February 2019
Independent Review of bid by the SELEP Accountable Body	4 <sup>th</sup> - 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	w/c 13 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	w/c 5th November 2018	11th February 2019
Prioritisation by SELEP Directors Group	8 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	w/c 27 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	w/c 12th November 2018	w/c 25th February 2019
Strategic Board report to be published	21 <sup>st</sup> June 2018	20 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	29th November 2018	14th March 2019
<b>Strategic Board Meeting</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	28 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	7th December 2018	22nd March 2019

- 4.5 Independent Review: An independent review of the Business Case will be completed by the SELEP Accountable Body against the Eligibility Criteria set out in Table 1 and the requirements of the SELEP Assurance Framework. This review of projects is to ensure that the requirements of the SELEP Assurance Framework to ensure that all investments are independently evaluated are met. The appraisal will be proportionate to the value of the investment. If your project does not meet all of the eligibility criteria, it is not suitable for this funding. In this case, please discuss further with the SELEP Secretariat who may be able to help you identify other, more suitable funding sources.
- 4.6 Prioritisation: Should the call upon SSF exceed the amount of funding available, the funding bids will be prioritised in accordance with the criteria set out in Table 3 below. An initial technical prioritisation of the project will be led by the SELEP Directors Group, based on the outcome of the independent evaluation of bids and the assessment criteria. The outcome of this technical exercise, led by the SELEP Directors Group, will be presented to the SELEP Strategic Board or Investment Panel, if Strategic Board agree the delegation of authority, for endorsement and to inform the final decision making by the SELEP Managing Director. This technical prioritisation will be informed by the information presented within the Business Case submission.
- 4.7 The Directors Group will be provided with the outcome of the independent assessment and will be asked to support the prioritisation of the bids based on the criteria set out in Table 3 below. A one to 5 scoring assessment will be made for each funding bid based on the five criteria listed in Table 3,

based on the description which is most applicable to the project. The 1 to 5 scoring will be presented to the Strategic Board to support their consideration of the projects. A total score will not be provided as some of the prioritisation criteria, such as the projects deliverability, are likely to be more important than other criteria.

- 4.8 Approval: SELEP Strategic Board meets on a quarterly basis and the timing of Board meetings should be considered when you submit your application. The project application will be considered for endorsement by the SELEP Strategic Board, but the funding award will be made by the ELEP Managing Director under delegated responsibilities. Though the consideration of the project by the SELEP Strategic Board, the SELEP Accountability Board Chair will be sighted on the proposed award of funding owing to the Accountability Board Chair's responsibilities for ensuring value for money for all projects and programmes.
- 4.9 Post Approval: the grant will be paid to the recipient Upper Tier Authority for the Project by Essex County Council, who acts as Accountable Body for the SELEP. A grant agreement between the recipient and Essex County Council must be in place before any funds are transferred.
- 4.10 The funding is being transferred as a one off grant payment. Any increased to the cost of delivering the project must be managed locally.
- 4.11 Monitoring and Evaluation project sponsors will be expected to report on the progress of the project and to provide information to allow the evaluation of the effectiveness of the project. Again, this will be proportionate to the size of the investment made. The requirements of monitoring and evaluation will be included in the grant agreement and a template will be provided by the SELEP Secretariat. Project progress and impact, and any changes to project scope will be reported to the Board on a bi-annual basis. More detailed update reports or presentations about the projects may be sought from the Board.
- 4.12 All projects and all recipients must comply with the SELEP Assurance Framework and grant conditions. . It is strongly suggested that any potential applicant spends time familiarising themselves with the SELEP Assurance Framework before submitting any bid. The current Assurance Framework can be accessed [here](#).

**Table 3 Prioritisation of SSF bids**

Prioritisation Criteria	Evidence	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Strategic Fit</b>	The bid should give specific reference to the SELEP Strategic Economic Plan, SELEP objectives and set out how the project will meet these objectives.	Weak alignment with SELEP objectives.  Little or no reference to SELEP objectives  The intended objectives of the project are unclear.	The project objectives have been identified but little/no reference given to SELEP objectives.	The project objectives and SELEP objectives are stated but the links between the two are unclear.	Links between the project objectives and SELEP objectives have been provided.	Strong fit with SELEP objectives.  There are clear links made between the intended project objectives to SELEP objectives.
<b>Scale of the benefits</b>	The bid should set out the benefits related to the project. These benefits should be quantified where feasible to do so. Additional qualitative information can also be provided in support.  The project benefits should be specific to the SELEP area. Any geography within the SELEP area which will benefit from the project to a greater extent than others should be specified.  The timescales for these benefits being realised should be detailed.  Further advice on the value for money assessment is set out in Annex 1.	The bid has failed to provide evidence of the benefits of the project to the SELEP area.  The project is unlikely to represent high value for money**	The project benefits are stated but the timescales for these benefits being achieved is unclear and/or these benefits are unlikely to achieve high value for money**.	The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.  The timescales for these benefits being achieved is clearly stated.  The project is expected to present high value for money but a quantitative assessment of the benefits has not been feasible or there is uncertainty around the value for money assessment.	The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.  The timescales for these benefits being achieved is clearly stated.  High value for money has been demonstrated through a quantified.  The benefits will take a longer than 3 years to come to fruition.	The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.  High/very high value for money has been demonstrated through a quantified assessment of the project benefits.  Evidence has been provided to support this value for money assessment though quantitative data and/or benchmarking against other projects.  It is expected that these benefits will start to be realised within 3 years of SSF investment.
<b>Delivery</b>	The bid should include a detailed list of project milestones.  The approach to managing the	Limited information has been provided to demonstrate the deliverability of the project or to demonstrate that arrangements	A list of project milestones has been provided but limited information is included about the specific activities to be undertaken or project	A list of project milestones has been provided but limited information has been included about the specific activities to be undertaken	Project milestones have been provided, including details of the specific activities to be undertaken	Strong evidence that the project will be delivered and the proposed benefits of the project will be achieved.

Prioritisation Criteria	Evidence	1	2	3	4	5
	<p>project should be specified with a lead officer having been identified and the project governance arrangements having been defined.</p> <p>The bid should detail the project risks and dependencies.</p> <p>The approach to monitoring and evaluation of outputs, outcomes and benefits is set out</p>	<p>are in place to oversee the delivery of the project.</p> <p>The main project risks and/or project dependencies have not been identified.</p>	<p>milestones seem unrealistic relative to the timing of the SSF contribution.</p> <p>A project manager has been identified but the wider project governance arrangements are unclear.</p> <p>The main project risks and/or project dependencies have not been identified or high project risks have been identified.</p>	<p>The approach to the management of the project has been detailed, but required further development.</p> <p>Project risks and dependences have been identified but further consideration is required prior to the project commencing and/or mitigation action is required to address project risks owing to medium/high risks having been identified.</p>	<p>and indicative timescales for completion.</p> <p>A thorough approach has been taken to the consideration of project risks and dependencies.</p> <p>No high risks have been identified to project delivery, but some areas of medium risk have been identified.</p>	<p>Project milestones have been provided, including details of the specific activities to be undertaken and indicative timescales for completion.</p> <p>An approach to project governance has been defined.</p> <p>A thorough approach has been taken to the consideration of project risks and dependencies.</p> <p>No substantive project risks have been identified.</p>
<b>Rationale for SSF investment</b>	<p>The bid should explain other funding sources which have been considered and provide justification as to why SSF is required.</p>	<p>Limited justification as to why SSF is required.</p> <p>SSF is not considered to be the most appropriate funding source.</p>	<p>There is limited rationale for SSF investment over alternative funding sources.</p>	<p>A case is made for SSF investment but other funding options have not been explored.</p>	<p>Alternative funding options have been considered and the case is made for SSF investment.</p>	<p>Strong case is made for SSF investment.</p> <p>Evidence is provided that other funding opportunities have been considered but are not viable</p>
<b>Sector Support Fund available</b>		<p>There is insufficient SSF available to support SSF*</p>				<p>The there is sufficient SSF available to meet the SSF ask the project</p>

\*This criteria may be relevant in future rounds of SSF once the amount of SSF available has been depleted though previous funding commitments

\*\* If a project fails to demonstrate high value for money then the project will not be considered for investment





## Annex A – Value for Money Guidance

1. The Sector Support Funding (SSF) scheme is intended to provide low value revenue support to those key areas of SELEP work that are cross cutting across the SELEP Federated areas. This annex focusses on the requirement for all projects requesting investment to demonstrate Value for Money (VfM).
2. It is recognised that any VfM appraisal undertaken should be proportionate to the investment requested and be limited to a consideration of the public sector financial contribution. Bids made via the SSF programme will not be in excess of £200,000 and therefore will not be subject to a full economic appraisal that would be used to assess Local Growth Fund or Growing Places Fund projects, but project sponsors should take a best endeavours approach to monetise the benefits expected from the project and make a comparison to the investment requested to ensure that the benefits do exceed the cost of the project.
3. It is not expected that this level of investment would result in large economic benefits such as jobs or homes, but the investment MUST relate to some kind of output or outcome. As laid out in the criteria, projects submitted for funding should not be Business as Usual (BAU) type activity or to support operational costs. If you are struggling to identify direct outputs that are linked to your project it is likely that the costs are therefore operational/BAU and not applicable for funding.
4. Where outputs are identified, efforts must be made to translate these into financial terms. This could include the unlocking of further or additional funding, the bringing forward of financial benefits (such as the earlier realisation of fees/income or taxation such as Business Rates). Another example might be the avoidance of cost where a cross border piece of work can be undertaken thus preventing this being duplicated across the LEP.
5. Given the wide nature of the types of projects that are able to come forward it is difficult to provide definitive advice as to how benefits should be calculated, but the Secretariat can offer individual advice to any potential project sponsors. All calculations of benefit valuation should be provided as part of the application.
6. When benefits that can be directly linked to the SSF investment have been converted into financial terms – i.e. pounds sterling, they should be compared to the requested investment as a ratio. That is, benefits divided by costs. This will give a Benefit/Cost Ratio value. A high VfM project will have a BCR in excess of 2:1, a borderline project will have a BCR of 1.5:1, but will still be considered given the low financial value of the projects in projects where additional benefits are anticipated to demonstrate high value for money, but can't be readily quantified.

7. If your project does not meet the lowest BCR threshold of 1.5:1, and you believe this is due to the difficulty in converting benefits into financial terms, then please provide as much narrative around this as possible and an assessment will be made before a recommendation is made to Strategic Board.
8. SELEP is keen that a VfM assessment can be made in a light touch and proportionate way but in a way that ensures that any investment made by the Partnership gives benefit to the tax payer who ultimately funds these investments.