

Farming in Protected Landscapes Programme: Scoring

Introduction

In order to assess whether an application will deliver sufficient benefit to be supported, the proposed application should be judged against the assessment criteria below.

The scoring process looks at four criteria; project outcomes, value for money, sustainability / legacy of projects and ability to deliver.

All projects funded must support the local priorities/management plans of the Protected Landscape in which they are being delivered. Applications should not progress if they do not support these priorities/plans.

Protected Landscapes should ensure that when processing applications they are making appropriate due diligence checks against applications. Defra acknowledges that the Protected Landscapes are the delivery bodies for this programme and that the checks could result in a Protected Landscape not being able to support an application at the current time, for instance if the authority is in dispute with the applicant on other matters.

Scoring

When assessing any project against the Project Outcomes scoring criteria, only the elements being directly funded through FiPL can be scored against.

The appropriate score should be circled for each criterion and the scores totalled up at the end to provide an aggregate score.

- 2: not satisfactory/not demonstrated
- 4: partially satisfactory/one or more significant gaps in demonstration
- 6: satisfactory/some demonstration
- 8: good/ shows good levels of assurance and demonstration
- 10: excellence/shows high levels of assurance and demonstration

Each criterion has been weighted.

- a) Project outcomes (40%)
- b) Value for Money (20%)
- c) Sustainability / legacy of projects (20%)
- d) Ability to deliver (20%)

Decisions

Projects should not be supported unless they achieve a score of at least 6 against each criterion to achieve the baseline minimum. This will ensure that all projects deliver a meaningful and worthwhile outcome and will ensure consistency across all Protected Landscapes.

Users should then use the aggregate score along with the weighting of each criterion to determine how to allocate resource between competing proposals which have passed the baseline minimum. A spreadsheet is attached in Annex T to support this.

This scoring template should be used by:

- The PL officer making an initial judgement of the project prior to the Local Assessment Panel (all projects with a total fund request over £5,000 should be taken to the Local Assessment Panel regardless of this initial score)
- The Local Assessment making the final decision on projects to fund
- The PL officer making funding decisions for projects with a total fund request of under £5,000

Essential criteria

Does the application support the priorities/management plan for the Protected Landscapes in which it is being delivered? (Must answer yes for project to proceed)

Y N

Has the applicant agreed that they will undertake a proportionate project evaluation (as agreed with your FiPL engagement lead) and feed into programme evaluation led by external evaluator as required? (Must answer yes for project to proceed)

Y N

Scoring Criteria

A) Project outcomes

This includes deliver under the four themes of Climate, Nature, People and Place and also fit with the Protected Landscape Management Plan. A good application should clearly demonstrate that the outcomes of the FiPL programme can be delivered through the proposed project.

Projects should be marked depending on how well they:

- Demonstrate deliverability to achieve the outcomes the FiPL programme is seeking to achieve with clear outputs demonstrated
- Demonstrate deliverability across one or more themes of the programme (Climate, Nature, People, Place)
- Make clear how the project outcomes will be achieved
- Makes a clear link to the PL Management Plan/Priorities
- Demonstrate an effective and useful evaluation approach

2	4	6	8	10
---	---	---	---	----

B) Value for Money

This includes demonstrating an efficient use of resources and cost-reasonableness. A well-rounded application should demonstrate that the project will deliver value for money. A strong approach to delivering value for money should be demonstrated throughout the whole application. Where projects demonstrate the use of match funding in delivery, they should be scored credibly for delivering Value for Money.

Projects which deliver value for money should:

- Demonstrate efficient use of resource by outlining their costs in detail and providing evidence in support of those costs
- Show cost-reasonableness
- Demonstrate deliverability
- Show intent to deliver worthwhile outcomes

2	4	6	8	10
---	---	---	---	----

C) Sustainability / legacy of projects

This includes demonstrating that benefits could be maintained once the programme funding concludes and may include the likelihood of behaviour change and increased capacity, as well as more tangible measures. Projects should be supported which will deliver benefits beyond the end of the programme of funding. The longevity of projects should be considered and rewarded where well demonstrated.

Projects which show clear links to sustainability should:

- Demonstrate that benefits could be maintained once the programme of funding concludes
- Demonstrate a holistic/whole farm approach and/or a collaborative approach with other farmers/land managers
- Demonstrate an increase in farm business resilience

2	4	6	8	10
---	---	---	---	----

D) Ability to deliver

This includes demonstrating the capability to deliver in the timelines required. Well-developed applications should make clear how the project will be delivered taking into account the resources required and time available for the project to be delivered.

Projects should score highly for project outcomes if they:

- Demonstrate clearly the resources available to enable good delivery
- Demonstrate a clear capability to deliver in the timelines required
- Show a clear understanding of the roles of those involved in the project

2	4	6	8	10
---	---	---	---	----