

Table 3 Prioritisation of SSF bids

Prioritisation Criteria	Evidence	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Fit	The bid should give specific reference to the SELEP Strategic Economic Plan, SELEP objectives and set out how the project will meet these objectives.	<p>Weak alignment with SELEP objectives.</p> <p>Little or no reference to SELEP objectives</p> <p>The intended objectives of the project are unclear.</p>	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.	<p>Strong fit with SELEP objectives.</p> <p>There are clear links made between the intended project objectives to SELEP objectives.</p>
Scale of the benefits	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The timescales for these benefits being realised should be detailed.</p> <p>Further advice on the value for money assessment is set out in Annex 1.</p>	<p>The bid has failed to provide evidence of the benefits of the project to the SELEP area.</p> <p>The project is unlikely to represent high value for money**</p>	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**.	<p>The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.</p> <p>The timescales for these benefits being achieved is clearly stated.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.</p> <p>The timescales for these benefits being achieved is clearly stated.</p> <p>High value for money has been demonstrated through a quantified.</p> <p>The benefits will take a longer than 3 years to come to fruition.</p>	<p>The benefits to the SELEP area are clearly stated and these benefits are aligned with SELEPs strategic objectives.</p> <p>High/very high value for money has been demonstrated through a quantified assessment of the project benefits.</p> <p>Evidence has been provided to support this value for money assessment though quantitative data and/or benchmarking against other projects.</p> <p>It is expected that these benefits will start to be realised within 3 years of SSF investment.</p>
Delivery	<p>The bid should include a detailed list of project milestones.</p> <p>The approach to managing the project should be specified with a</p>	Limited information has been provided to demonstrate the deliverability of the project or to demonstrate that arrangements are in place to oversee the	A list of project milestones has been provided but limited information is included about the specific activities to be undertaken or project milestones seem unrealistic relative	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 and indicative timescales for	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>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>delivery of the project.</p> <p>The main project risks and/or project dependencies have not been identified.</p>	<p>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>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>
Rationale for SSF investment	<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>SFF 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>
Sector Support Fund available		<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