



European Union



The Scottish Government

Riaghaltas na h-Alba

EUROPE & SCOTLAND

European Regional Development Fund
Investing in a Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Future

Eligibility and Assessment Scoring Forms

Green Infrastructure Fund

Guidance for Applicants

July 2016



Disclaimer

Applicants should be aware that as the Green Infrastructure Fund is a new programme, the guidance will be reviewed as the programme evolves and therefore may be subject to change. The European Union and Scottish Ministers reserve the right to amend the National Rules and SNH reserves the right to amend the published guidance during the period of the programme. Decisions to fund Operations will be based on the availability of funding, how well the project matches the Green Infrastructure Fund priorities and its contribution to outcomes as part of the whole Strategic Intervention. These priorities may change during the course of the Strategic Intervention to take into account gaps in meeting priorities in previously funded Projects and not to fund at all. The Scottish Government reserves the right not to award any support at all under this programme.

Version Control

Date	Issue	Status	Author	Authorised by
24/02/16	V1	Draft	FS	ZK
26/02/16	V1	Final	FS	ZK
01/07/16	V2	Final	FS	ZK

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Screening Checklist – on receipt of application	3
Table 1 – Screening Checklist	3
3. Eligibility Checklist – on successful completion of Screening Checklist	6
Table 2 – Eligibility Checklist	6
4. Application Assessment Scoring Form	8
Table 3 – Deliverability	9
Table 4 – Impact	11
Table 5 – Outcomes	14
Table 6 – Horizontal themes	21
5. Scrutiny Panel – information and recommendation forms	27
Table 7 - Operation Information	27
Table 8 - Funding Round Information	27
Table 9 - Managing Authority Evidence	28

1. Purpose

This document contains the Screening and Eligibility checklists and the Assessment and Selection form. It is in four sections:

- Screening checklist;
- Eligibility checklist;
- Assessment and Selection Scoring Form;
- Scrutiny Panel information and recommendation forms.

These forms will be used to assess and select the projects which will be recommended to SNH's CEO for funding through the Green Infrastructure Fund. Applicants are encouraged to refer to them whilst preparing their applications. Thinking about how your application will be assessed and scored will help you decide what to tell us about in your application, and how to present the information.

Note to Green Infrastructure Fund assessors: Please note that this document is for guidance purposes only. The actual forms to be used for assessment will be saved as separate files and will be supplied directly to assessors by the Green Infrastructure Fund team. Do not use this document to record scores allocated to applications to the Green Infrastructure Fund.

2. Screening 1 Checklist – on receipt of application

After the application deadline, this form will be used by the Green Infrastructure Fund Administrator to check that each application is complete and valid before it is allocated to an assessment panel. **All six questions must be answered 'yes' for the application to proceed to the next stage.**

Table 1 – Screening Checklist

	Screening 1	Yes / No	Note capturing why/why not met
1	Was the application form received before or on the deadline?		
2	Is the application form complete?		
3	Has the application form been signed and dated by someone within the applicant organisation with the authority to do so?		
4	Has the applicant ticked the box to confirm their eligibility to apply?		
5	Has the applicant submitted a diagram showing their organisational structure? This applies to all applicants except local authorities who do not need to submit a diagram.		
6	Has the applicant confirmed that they have read and understand the National Rules by ticking the appropriate box?		

Checklist of mandatory supporting documents

When an application is received, the Green Infrastructure Audit and Compliance Officer will check that all the mandatory supporting documents have been received. To allow this to be done easily and efficiently, please number each of your supporting documents corresponding to the list below and use the following naming convention.

GIF APP ID – applicant – project name - number and name of supporting document (this should be as specified on the checklist) - date

You must provide all the mandatory supporting documents. If you believe that you do not require to submit any of them you must state which they are and explain why on the application form.

You can submit supplementary supporting documents but only if you consider that they are relevant to your application and will assist us in assessing your project. You must list these in the box provided and tell us why you want us to see them. Please refer to these directly in the relevant section of the application form, number (following on from the mandatory list) and name them using the following naming convention:

GI APP ID – applicant – project name – number and name of supporting document – date

Please think carefully about which supplementary supporting documents you are going to send us. They should provide us with information that we would not obtain from any other part of the application and should strengthen your application to the Green Infrastructure Fund. Any supplementary supporting documents which are not listed and named using the naming convention will not be considered part of your application and will not be used in assessing it.

Mandatory Supporting Documents checklist

	Screening 2	Yes/no	Comments
1	Financial annex		
2	Detailed costings		
3	Confirmation of VAT status of your organisation		
4	Map - PDF		
5	Map – ESRI shapefile		
6	Project Action Plan including timescales and milestones		
7	Design drawings to RIBA stage 3		
8	Risk management plan and risk register		
9	Risk assessment		
10	Data and Information management compliance statement		
11	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan		
12	Communications and marketing strategy including Communication Plan with timescales		
13	Project Profile		
14	Community engagement plan		
15	Equalities Impact Assessment and Equalities Action Plan		
16	Procurement policy including tender procedures/policy or tender documentation		
17	Evidence that match funding is in place/has been applied for		
18	Evidence of all necessary permissions (planning, licences etc.)		
19	Equal opportunities policy		

20	Environmental Sustainability Policy		
21	Protected and Vulnerable groups Policy		
22	Social inclusion policy		
23	Recruitment policy (if 100% post holders included)		
24	Job description and person specification (if 100% post holders included)		
	Have all the necessary supporting documents been supplied?		

2. Eligibility Checklist – on successful completion of Screening Checklist

This form is to be used by individual members of the Green Infrastructure Fund Assessment Panel and the Moderator to check that the application is complete and valid. **All questions must be answered ‘yes’ for the application to proceed to the assessment stage.**

Table 2 – Eligibility Checklist

	Application Form Q. No.	Eligibility Requirement	0=No 1=Yes	Note why/why not met
Applicant Information				
1	7.1	Has the applicant demonstrated that they have the necessary skills and sufficient administrative and financial capacity to carry out the proposed projects? <i>(N.B. by necessary skills we need to be assured that the organisation has demonstrated at least one of the following: they have a track record in delivering the activities in the project and achieving results; they have experience of delivering large projects; they have a successful track record in managing Structural Funds. Please capture in the note column why the applicant organisation meets this criteria.)</i>		
Financial information				
2	4.1	Are the total eligible costs in excess of £650k?		
3	4.1	Is the grant requested £250k or more?		
4	4.1	Is the intervention rate requested no more than 40% of eligible costs for LUPS areas and 50% for H&I areas?		
5	4.5	Will the match funding for the project either be confirmed or identified and expected to be confirmed before any Green Infrastructure Fund authorisation to start is given?		
6	4.5	Are the match funding sources eligible? (i.e. does not include other EU or in-kind contributions or private/commercial funding)		
7	Part 3	Has the applicant confirmed that the physical works associated with the project are new (excluding any eligible pre-contract costs)? (i.e. will not have started prior to offer of funding.)		
8	5.14	Has the applicant demonstrated that all other funding options have been explored and convinced us that the projects cannot and will not proceed without the GI funding requested?		
9	8.1.2	Has the applicant confirmed that public procurement procedures and rules (European Union and Scottish Government) will be adhered to and regulatory requirements complied with?		

About the application				
10	Part 3	Has the applicant demonstrated that activities will start within a reasonable timescale following award and be complete by December 2018?		
11	Part 3	Does the application benefit an urban settlement in Scotland of over 10,000 population? (<i>state settlement size</i>)		
12	5.13	Does the area of the application fall within or benefit areas within the most deprived 15% of SIMD		
13	Part 5	Is the application for creation or development of capital works (not maintenance)?		
14	Part 5	Are all the activities and costs for which the applicant is requesting funding eligible? (NB We can allow minor elements up to 10% ineligible)		
15	5.11/5.12	Has the applicant demonstrated that the projects and activities contribute to an identified need through appropriate masterplanning, charette, local and regional plans, policies and/or strategies?		
16	5.12	Has the applicant provided evidence that there is a local demand for the project?		
17	9.11	Has the applicant demonstrated innovation or innovative techniques in the Scottish context in development of the proposal, planned activities, implementation or monitoring and evaluation?		
Competency				
18	5.7	Has the applicant demonstrated that branding/publicity requirements will be complied with?		
19	8.2	Has the applicant evidenced that State Aid Rules have been fully considered and that State aid tests will be met?		
20	6.10	Has the applicant demonstrated that monitoring and evaluation requirements will be complied with?		
21	6.8	Has the applicant demonstrated long term sustainability and maintenance plans for the projects?		
22	5.15	Has the applicant demonstrated that the projects are additional (i.e. non-statutory, not a condition of planning consent)		
Scoring				
		Overall, how well does the application meet the GISl eligibility criteria? (Score out of 21)		
		Should the application progress to the assessment stage? (NB Only applications scoring full marks on eligibility and which have enclosed all the necessary mandatory supporting documents will progress UNLESS THERE IS A CLEAR REASON WHY A PROJECT SCORING LESS THAN FULL MARKS SHOULD PROGRESS.)		

3. Application Assessment Scoring Form

This form will be used by individual members of the Green Infrastructure Fund Assessment Panels to assess and score eligible applications.

Applications scored using this form must have checked all 'yes' boxes on the Green Infrastructure Fund Eligibility checklist. If an application fully meets the **Eligibility Criteria** it can then be assessed and scored against the **Assessment Criteria** as follows:

1 Deliverability

- Project costs and match funding;
- Project planning (delivery action plan, timescales, milestones);
- Ownership and permissions;
- Applicant competency and track record;
- Maintenance and legacy;
- Monitoring and evaluation;
- Compliance;
- Risk management;
- Added value;
- Synergies;
- Risk management.

2 Impact

- Community engagement;
- Benefits;
- Communications, publicity and stakeholder engagement;
- Contribution to Strategic Intervention;
- Delivery against outcomes;
- Contribution to Horizontal themes;
- Evidence of need;
- Need for grant;
- Added value;
- Innovation.

3 Outcomes

4 Horizontal themes

The criteria will be scored using the following scale:

- 0 = no evidence / not stated
- 1 = weak (no clear evidence)
- 2 = clear (relevant evidence provided)
- 3 = strong (strong evidence provided)

N.B. For some of the questions, a score of zero will preclude the application from progressing any further. It is clearly indicated in the tables where this is the case.

This table assesses how well the proposed project will be delivered by scoring the Applicant's track record and plans for delivery.

Table 3 – Deliverability

	Key questions	Scoring definitions	Application form section/ question	Score 0-3	Comments and justification
Competency of the Applicant					
1.	How strong is the applicant's track record in delivery of this kind of operation i.e. large projects (min £500k), EU funded or otherwise?	0 = no evidence / not stated 1 = weak (no clear evidence) 2 = clear (relevant evidence provided) 3 = strong (strong evidence)	Part 7, Q7.3		
2.	How good is the applicant's plan for delivery with milestones and are the delivery timescales realistic? Are the milestones clearly tied to the financial projections for the project?		Part 6		
3.	How robust are the applicant's plans identifying, monitoring, managing and reporting on risk?		Part 7, Q7.4/7.4.1		
4.	How well has the applicant identified and proposed mitigation for all of the risks associated with the application?		7.4.1		
5.	How well will the applicant evidence compliance with EU requirements and be prepared for audit?		Part 7		
Competency of the Applicant – Financial Management Experience					
6.	How experienced is the applicant in delivering European Funding or equivalent large projects – minimum £500,000 eligible costs	0 = no evidence / not stated 1 = weak (no clear evidence) 2 = clear (relevant evidence provided) 3 = strong (strong evidence)	Part 7		

Project costs					
7.	How well has the applicant specified milestones which are clearly tied to the financial projections for the project?	0 = no cost explanation 1 = some cost justification 2 = considerable evidence of planned costs 3 = firm, time bound quotes and contingencies	Part 4/ supporting documents		
8.	How well have the costings been confirmed and justified (e.g. on the basis of quantity surveyor reports, recent similar projects, quotes etc)?		Part 9, Q9.12		
Match funding					
9.	How close is the applicant to securing match funding – will it be secured by the time funding is awarded?	Degree of match funding secured: 0 = no match funding secured 1 = 1-49% of match funding secured 2 = 50-75% or more of match funding secured 3 = 100% of match funding secured	Part 4, 4.4/4.5		
Land ownership					
10.	Does the Applicant own the land or if the land is leased is the term of the lease for a long enough term to allow the site to be continued to be used for the approved purposes beyond the term of the grant and the auditable period?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence of identifying or addressing issues 2 = ownership and tenure issues identified and addressed 3 = site is owned and/or land tenure permits work	Part 5, 5.3		
Permissions					
11.	Has sufficient evidence been provided that all the necessary permissions are in place, or will be in	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence of requirements or no timescales 2 = need for permissions	Part 5, 5.4		

	place, in time to allow the project to start on the proposed start date?	identified and timetabled 3 = no permissions needed or all permissions in place			
Maintenance and legacy					
12.	How well does the application demonstrate clear plans for the maintenance of the site and legacy of the project and for funding associated costs?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited detail that efforts will seek to continue/maintain 2 = clear strategy but with uncertainty 3 = commitment to management plan and on-going funding/resource	Part 5, 5.8		
Total Score for this section (max 36)				/36	

Do any questions score 0 or 1?

Question	Comments

The score for the following section, which assesses the Impact that the project will have will be multiplied by 3.

Table 4 – Impact

	Key questions	Criteria	Application form section/ question	Score	Comments and justification
Evidence of Need					
1.	How convincing overall is the evidence provided for the need for the application?	0 = no evidence 1 = single relevant source 2 = more than one relevant source 3 = more than one relevant source and of	Part 9. Q9.4, 9.5		

		clearly addresses SIMD criteria			
2.	How strong is the evidence for strategic support for the application?		Part 9, Q9.5		
3.	How strong is the evidence for demand and support for the work this project will do at community level?		Part 9		
4.	How well does the application show how the project will contribute to local and regional plans and strategies including development plans, strategic drainage and flood management plans, local biodiversity and access strategies and social and economic development plans?		Part 9, Q9.5		
5.	How well has the application demonstrated the need for the ERDF grant?		Part 9. 9.7		
6.	How well has the applicant evidenced added value i.e. additional outputs, increased number of participants, overall improvements to the quality of activity etc?	0 = no evidence / not stated 1 = weak (no clear evidence) 2 = clear (relevant evidence provided) 3 = strong (strong evidence)	Part 9, Q9.8		
7.	How well does the applicant evidence synergy with competitive funds (e.g. ETC, EAFRD, EMFF, Horizon 2020, SRDP) or other Strategic Interventions / projects / improvements to the project locality? e.g. providing new		Part 9. 9.9		

	services to disadvantaged individuals to overcome barriers to employment, education or training				
8.	How well does the project work alongside other known EU funded initiatives in the area? Are there any risks attached?				
Ecosystem services					
9.	How well will the project address ecosystem service deficits?		Part 9, 9.10		
Innovation					
10.	How innovative is the application (in a Scottish context)?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	Part 9, 9.11, supporting documents		
Communications, publicity and stakeholder engagement					
11.	How well developed are the applicant's plans for communication and publicity regarding their project, its role in the Green Infrastructure Strategic Intervention and ERDF funding?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence of plans 2 = clear evidence of plans 3 = strong evidence of plans	Part 6, 7.5		
12.	How strong are the applicant's plans for engaging with communities during the project?		Part 9, 9.2, supporting documents		
Monitoring and Evaluation					
13.	How robust is the application's framework for reporting the process, outputs and results and impact of the project?		Part 7, 7.1		
14.	How well will the project's plans for monitoring and		Part 9, 9.12		

	evaluation help to tell a compelling story about the achievements of the project and allow lessons to be learned from it?				
	Total (max 78)				
	Score			<i>78</i>	This score will carry a weighting of *3 for the total score
	Total Score for this section			<i>234</i>	

Do any questions score 0 or 1?

Question	Comments

Table 5 – Outcomes

Note that applications do not have to address all outcomes, but should seek to deliver a broad suite of outcomes and address identified need

	Key questions	Criterion	Application form section / question	Score	Comments and justification
Biodiversity, nature and ecosystems					
15.	How well does the application slow or reverse the loss, degradation or fragmentation of habitats	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	Section D, 10		
16.	How well does the application improve ecosystem value, restoring habitat and creating wildlife corridors?		10		

17.	Does the application improve the quality of place and local environment through better quality green infrastructure?		10		
18.	How well does the application identify and prioritise action for invasive non-native species and their pathways, control or eradicate priority species, including addressing the possibility that increasing connectivity/permeability of habitats may increase the risk of INNS?		10		
	Total (max 15)				This score will carry a weighting of *4 for the total score
	Score			/60	

Environmental regulation, flooding and climate change

19.	How well does the application address water quality, flooding and flooding-related problems?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	10		
20.	How well does the application contribute to improving the ecological status (particularly water quality and physical condition) of a water body (defined as a body of water forming a physiogeographical feature)?		10		
21.	How well does the application improve or protect soils?		10		
22.	How well does the		10		

	application reduce pollution, including from excess nutrients, to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity?				
23.	How well does the application make use of innovative (in a Scottish context) climate adaption or mitigation techniques?		10		
	Total (max 15)				This score will carry a weighting of *3 for the total score
	Score			/45	
Community engagement and Participation					
24.	How well does the application increase access to or between areas of greenspace?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	10		
25.	How well does the application increase access to a wider range of greenspace types?		10		
26.	To what extent has the community had the opportunity to influence, inform or even lead the design, implementation, management and use of their green infrastructure so that improvements deliver what the community wants and needs?		10		
27.	How well developed are the applicant's plans in terms of commitment to on-		10		

	going engagement with the local community?				
28.	To what extent will the application give practical support to communities to help design and develop their activities?		10		
29.	To what extent does the application increase opportunities for cultural events and activities?		10		
30.	How well will the application address application interpretation of the place and space?		10		
31.	How well does the application respect, promote and develop the local culture?		10		
32.	How well does the application address anti-social behaviour or exclusion from greenspace?		10		
33.	How well does the application seek to empower communities?		10		
34.	How well will improvements in GI improve access to greenspace for all members of the community?		10		
35.	How well does the application provide space and opportunity for local food production in an urban area, such as allotments, community gardens and orchards?		10		
36.	How well does the application help people increase people's awareness of the value of		10		

	biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably?				
37.	How well does the application integrate and reflect the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of local communities?		10		
38.	How well does the application increase capacity for formal skills development (i.e. training for which participants receive some form of accreditation)?		10		
	Total (max 45)				
	Score			/42	
Increasing place attractiveness and competitiveness					
39.	How well does the application create or improve accessible multifunctional greenspaces in areas of identified greenspace deficiency?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	10		
40.	Does the application address currently vacant and derelict land that is causing a detriment to the local community?		10		
41.	Does the application improve the attractiveness of the place as somewhere to live and work?		10		
42.	How well have the third sector been engaged in the development of the applications?		10		
43.	How well does the application increase attractiveness to investors or place		10		

44.	How well does the application maintain or increase job opportunities?		10		
45.	How well will the application increase visitor numbers - both locally and from other communities and from different groups, reflecting the protected characteristics?		10		
46.	How well does the application increase opportunities for formal and informal outdoor learning?		10		
47.	Does the application involve or provide opportunity for increased volunteering and/ or skills development, training or learning through green infrastructure and the natural environment?		10		
48.	To what extent does the application increase number of intermediary bodies using greenspace for skills development?		10		
	Total (max 30)				
	Score			/30	
Improve health and wellbeing					
49.	To what extent does the application aim to benefit areas with low levels of physical activity (e.g. identified using the Active Scotland Household Targeting Tool)?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	10		
50.	To what extent will the application improve health and		10		

	well-being by promoting participation and improving the quality of greenspace close to where people live?				
51.	How does the application bring greenspace closer to patients, both day patients and longer-stay patients, and/ or increase access for healthcare staff?		10		
52.	How does the application aim to improve mental health through improved access to greenspace?		10		
	Total (max 12)				This score will carry a weighting of *3 for the total score
	Score				
	Total (max 36)			36	
53.	How well does the contribution towards outcomes match with the needs identified?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence			
	Score (max 3)				
	Total Score for outcomes section (max 216)			/216	

Table 6 – Horizontal themes

Environmental sustainability					
54.	To what extent does the application consider environmental impact – particularly the ways in which the project contributes to the enhancement or protection of the environment and seeks to minimise negative impacts (such as pollution)?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	11.1.2		
55.	How well does the application consider local sourcing – particularly support for local sourcing initiatives and activities aimed at diversification within the local economy as well as the efficient use of local public transport and local community transport services?		11.1.2		
56.	To what extent does the application not only consider what Environmental Sustainability policies, procedures and resources will be in place, but also explain how these will make		11.1.2		

	a positive difference?				
57.	How well does the application demonstrate how their proposed projects will fully comply with the Public Bodies Duty, outlined in Part 4 of the climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009.		11.1.2		
	Total (max 12)				This score will carry a weighting of *2 for the total score
	Score			/24	
Social Inclusion					
58.	To what extent does the application target areas of in the most deprived 15% of SIMD and areas that have limited access to good quality greenspaces?	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	11.1.2		
59.	How well does the application outline any potential barriers to access to participation, how these have been identified and how the Project intends to overcome these barriers		11.1.2		
60.	To what extent will the project create opportunities for people to meet and interact socially?		11.1.2		

61.	How well does the proposal outline how the project will aim to reduce inequalities between the least advantaged communities and the rest of society?		11.1.2		
	Total (max 12)				This score will carry a weighting of *2 for the total score
	Score			/24	
Equal opportunities					
62.	To what extent does the application have a particular focus on one or more of the nine protected characteristics? https://www.gov.uk/discrimination-your-rights/types-of-discrimination	0 = no evidence 1 = limited evidence 2 = clear evidence 3 = strong evidence	11.1.3		
63.	To what extent does the application focus on the needs of identified target groups and does the way the greenspace is planned, managed and used support and enable their involvement?		11.1.3		
64.	How well does the application explain how the project has taken account of, and reflected, the diverse needs of		11.1.3		

	the target group(s) in the development and delivery of all activities?				
65.	How well does the application outline any potential barriers to access to participation? Consider how they have these been identified, and how will the project overcome these barriers?		11.1.3		
66.	To what extent does the application ensure that engagement of female participants is considered to develop more balanced gender equality in land-based skills, including considering the particular needs of lone parents?		11.1.3		
67.	To what extent will the project increase physical activity levels by providing places for play, exercise and sport, particularly for girls and women?		11.1.3		
68.	How well does the application increase participation in training and volunteering opportunities by		11.1.3		

	disabled or older people and ensure that there is equal opportunity to access and increase participation in greenspaces?				
69.	To what extent does the application involve representatives from different racial or religious groups in the local area, to ensure that the green infrastructure established helps to break down barriers between communities and offer opportunities to reflect local cultures?		11.1.3		
70.	To what extent does the application offer young people opportunities to engage in projects for training, apprenticeships, skills development and volunteering?		11.1.3		
71.	How well does the application consider how possible discrimination (including unconscious discrimination) will be addressed? How well will the		11.1.3		

	activity planned, and the way it is to be delivered, contribute to eliminating discrimination and how well have processes been put in place to tackle discrimination if it occurs?				
72.	How well does the application not only consider what Equal Opportunities policies, procedures and resources will be in place, but also explain how these will make a positive difference?		11.1.3		
	Total (max 33)				
	Score			/33	
	Total Score for the Horizontal themes section (max 81)			/81	

Total Scores

	Total possible score	Score	Number of questions scoring 0 or 1
Deliverability	42		
Impact	72		
Outcomes	216		
Horizontal Themes	81		
Total Score	411		

Notes:

- Minimum total score for funding is likely to be around 300-350, but this will be determined by the Scrutiny Panel and be affected by the number and quality of applications.

- Applications scoring 0 or 1 for any of the *Deliverability* or *Impact* questions are unlikely to receive funding.

4. Scrutiny Panel – information and recommendation forms

This summary information will be provided to the Scrutiny Panel in relation to each application

Table 7 - Project Information

Operation Information		
1	What is the total eligible cost of the application?	
2	What is the cost per hectare of the application?	
3	How does it rank (score) against other applications in this round?	
4	Which outcomes does it deliver? How does it contribute to the Strategic Intervention?	
5	What is the evidence of need? Does the planned activity adequately address the evidence of need?	
6	How does it relate geographically to other applications in this round (or previous rounds where applicable)?	
7	How does it contribute to delivery of Horizontal Themes?	
8	Are applications for monitoring, evaluation and reporting sufficiently robust?	
9	Will publicity and communications help to promote the project, the value of investment in green infrastructure and EU investment?	
10	What added value will the project achieve? To what degree does it complement other green infrastructure operations or other strategic activity?	
11	Does it demonstrate innovation?	
12	Are there any significant risks associated with the application?	
13	How well will the risks associated with the project be managed?	

This summary information will be provided to the Scrutiny Panel in relation to all of the applications received in a single application round

Table 8 - Funding Round Information

Funding Round Information		
1	What is the total eligible cost of the applications?	
2	What is the total ERDF funding requested?	
3	Which outcomes do the applications deliver? Are there any significant gaps or biases?	
4	What is the geographical spread? Are there any	

	significant gaps or biases?	
5	Which grouping of applications gives the highest score and is affordable?	
6	Are there any reasons why this group of projects should not be taken forward to the Managing Authority (e.g. limited geography, limited outcome delivery)?	
7	If yes to question above, which applications are recommended and why?	

Questions for the Scrutiny Panel to answer in making their recommendation to the SNH's CEO for approval.

Table 9 – Evidence for CEO Approval

Evidence for CEO Approval		
1	Has due process been followed?	
2	Has the assessment process been transparent and are the scores logical?	
3	Do you agree with the proposed cut-off point in the scores for funding?	
4	Are the risks identified acceptable (with or without mitigation)?	
5	Do you agree with the recommended set of applications?	
6	Reasons for recommendation	
7	Contribution to Strategic Intervention Outcomes	
8	Evidence of need	
9	Added value	
10	Contribution to Horizontal Themes	
11	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting	
12	Publicity and communications	

Published: July 2016

Scottish Natural Heritage
Great Glen House
Leachkin Road
Inverness IV3 8NW

www.snh.gov.uk



Scottish Natural Heritage
Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba

All of nature for all of Scotland
Nàdar air fad airson Alba air fad