

Early Intervention, Prevention & Community Capacity Fund

Project Approval - Outline Information



Doing things better



This paper seeks a decision from Corporate Board as to whether the project summarised below addresses a problem which is to be allocated resources from the Early Intervention, Prevention & Community Capacity Fund.

1. Project Information

Project Title

Funding Required:

Which type of funding resource is being requested:

- Permanent Funding
- One-off/time limited funding – Whole Project
- One-off/time limited funding – Pilot/Proof of Concept

Project Sponsor:

Signed:

Finance:

Signed:

2. Purpose of the Project

The purpose of projects must be to address specific issues that one or more parts of WCC face.

Describe the issue that this project is seeking to address.

How will the project contribute to solving the issue you have described?

E.g. reducing waiting lists, diverting people from X service, moving delivery capacity from X to Y etc.

How will the project deliver early intervention, prevention or community capacity?	
--	--

Which strategic objectives will the project address? You may select more than one. Place A Y in the right hand column to indicate you selection/s.	Please tick all which apply:
• Support our most vulnerable and disadvantaged children reducing the need for children to become, or remain looked after.	
• Support Warwickshire residents to take responsibility for their own health and wellbeing and reduce the need for hospital or long term health care	
• Support the most vulnerable & disadvantaged adults in Warwickshire to enjoy life; achieve & live independently	
• Work with communities to reduce crime and disorder and promote safety across Warwickshire	
• Attract economic investment and maximise the rate of employment, business growth and skill levels in Warwickshire	
• Manage and maintain Warwickshire's transport network in a safe, sustainable and integrated way	
• Support communities and businesses to develop the digital skills and tools they need in an increasingly digital economy	
• Increase reuse, recycling and composting rates and reduce household waste across Warwickshire	
• Support and enable children and young people to access a place in high quality education settings.	
• Make it easy for customers to access our information and services so they have a positive experience of our services	
• Put our resources in the right place to support the Organisation's priorities and balance the books	
• Develop our work force so that it has the right skills and capabilities to get the job done	
• Pursue leadership excellence and high performance at all levels	
• Manage demand and reduce cost through innovative and effective service redesign.	

How will the project impact on the selected strategic objectives?	
How does the project fit with partner's strategies? (if applicable)	
How will you measure the success of the project?	

3. Risks and Dependencies	
<p>What are the main risks that could go wrong with the project and how will you mitigate against them?</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial risks such as viability and sustainability - Risks to revenue/savings, staffing and external funding 	
What are the risks of not doing the project?	
<p>What other WCC interests/services or partner strategies need to be in place or aligned to for the project to be successful?</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal Implications 	

4. Timescale – Estimate for Project Completion

Proposed Start date:		Approximate duration in months:	
----------------------	--	---------------------------------	--

5a. Expected Financial Benefits of the Project

Description of Benefit	How will the benefit be measured	YR1 £'000	YR2 £'000	YR3 £'000	Confidence (%)

5b. Expected Non-Financial Benefits of the Project

Description of Benefit	How will the benefit be measured	YR1	YR2	YR3	Confidence (%)

6. Estimated resource commitment required for project completion

	Total required	
	£	FTE
Staffing Costs		
• Fixed Term		
• Consultants		
Other costs - Please provide breakdown:		
•		
•		
•		
Gross Cost		
Other Funding Contributions (e.g. match funding from other sources) – Please provide breakdown:		
•		
•		
•		
Net Cost		
Please provide details of the other costs and contributions/match funding		

Have all those business units providing capacity from within existing resources agreed to the proposal? (Y/N)	
Have all those business units that are part of the bid for additional resources agreed the level of resources being requested? (Y/N)	

7. How does this project relate to existing service capacity and funding?

8. How will you ensure the resulting outcomes are sustainable after the initial project/pilot? How will capacity be built during the life of the project in order to ensure its sustainability?

9. What are the likely political/reputational implications of the project? How have these been assessed?

10. What are the likely organisational implications of the project? How have these been assessed?

11. What are the likely environmental implications of the project? How have these been assessed?

Supplementary Document(s) Available

Document Title	Short Description only (do not embed documents)

Following sections to be completed by representative of the Gateway Support Group

Outcome of Assessment

Recommendation for Revenue Gateway Group/Corporate Board

Evaluation Criteria for the Early Intervention, Prevention & Community Capacity Fund

	Basis of Evaluation		Assessment Criteria
1	Project aspirations, overall benefits and governance (These are essential requirements - Response is 'Yes' or 'No' to each question)	1.1	Is the description of the project clear?
		1.2	Does the project meet the funding criteria?
		1.3	Does the project demonstrate all legal requirements can be met and/or are considered?
		1.4	Are any tax implications for the authority fully covered?
		1.5	Does the bid demonstrate that there is a sufficient level of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver the project?
		1.6	Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?
		1.7	Within an overall programme e.g. grants to community groups, is there sufficient information about how individual projects would be decided/agreed?
		1.8	Is a project timeline from approval, through implementation to full delivery of the expected benefits included?
2	Alignment with the organisation's strategic objectives (15% Weighting)	2.1	How directly does the proposal align with the organisation's strategic objectives?
		2.2	How closely does the proposal fit with partner's strategies?
3	Financial viability (30% Weighting)	3.1	What is the level of risk when considering the financial plans robustness, viability and sustainability?
		3.2	To what extent are the details of the investment required clear and fully costed?
		3.3	How great is the potential financial return on investment?
		3.4	Are there any future savings from the project and, if so, have they been quantified? How long is the payback period?
		3.5	If the return on investment is not likely to produce cash savings e.g. it may be from studies that show benefits to society that are costed up, what is the societal return on investment?
		3.6	To what extent does the project lever in partner/external contributions? If so, how certain are they and what are any terms and conditions?
		3.7	To what extent does the proposal demonstrate that risks have been considered, evaluated and mitigating actions planned

	Basis of Evaluation		Assessment Criteria
		3.8	Within an overall programme, e.g. grants to community groups, how clear is it as to how individual projects would be decided/agreed?
		3.9	Are any knock on impacts on revenue/savings, staffing, external funding risk identified and, if identified, is it clear how they will be managed?
		3.10	Is it clear how financial sustainability will be achieved beyond the timescales of any funding allocated?
		3.11	Have the estimated costs to WCC if the pilot is to be rolled out county wide been considered?
4	Community Capacity and Well Being (45% Weighting)	4.1	Is it clear how the project will enhance or improve individual/community well being within Warwickshire?
		4.2	Which sectors of the community and individuals will benefit from the project?
		4.3	What specific benefits will the project bring to the individuals/community and is there clarity on how these will be measured?
		4.4	What will be the long term impact on the individual/community?
		4.5	Have we engaged and involved individuals and community stakeholders in developing the proposal?
		4.6	What evidence do you have that there is demand for this project?
5	Political, organisational and environmental impact (10% Weighting)	5.1	Political implications
		5.2	Organisational impact
		5.3	Environmental impact
			Total Score (out of 100)

	Basis of Evaluation		Assessment Criteria
		Scoring	Please score each section out of 5
		5	Meets criteria excellently: robust & comprehensive evidence submitted, affordable
		4	Meets criteria well: minor concerns, but evidence submitted indicates criteria well-matched
		3	Meets criteria adequately: matches criteria in some areas, but concerns over some aspects
		2	Meets criteria less than adequately: does not match criteria in key areas: e.g.: economic
		1	Meets criteria poorly: fails to match criteria, or give details across all aspects of the proposal
		0	Does not meet the criteria

Capital Investment Fund Scheme Evaluation Criteria

Warwickshire's communities and individuals are supported to be safe, healthy & independent

20% - delivery of the strategic objective

30% - community impact, partnership working and innovative service delivery

40% - achieveability, quality of evidence base, rational evaluation and challenge of options, financial viability and risk

10% - political, social and environmental impact

Warwickshire's economy is vibrant and supported by the right jobs, training and skills and infrastructure

20% - delivery of the strategic objective

30% - economic benefit and the likelihood of the project delivering growth, partnership working

40% - achieveability, quality of evidence base, rational evaluation and challenge of options, financial viability and risk

10% - political, social and environmental impact

Making the best use of available resources: delivery of savings/generation of income

20% - alignment with the organisation's other strategic objectives

70% - achieveability, quality of evidence base, duration of required investment, rational evaluation and challenge of options, financial viability and risk

10% - political, social and environmental impact

Assessment Framework: Warwickshire's communities and individuals are supported to be safe, healthy & independent

Basis of Evaluation and Weighting		Assessment Criteria
Project aspirations, overall benefits and governance (These are essential requirements and not scored)	1.1	Is the description of the project clear?
	1.2	Does the project meet the criteria for capitalisation?
	1.3	Does the project demonstrate all legal requirements can be met and/or are considered?
	1.4	Are any tax implications for the authority fully covered?
	1.5	Does the bid demonstrate that there is a sufficient level of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver the project?
	1.6	Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?
	1.7	Within an overall programme, e.g. start-up loans for small businesses, is there sufficient information about how individual projects would be decided/agreed?
	1.8	Is a project timeline from approval through implementation to full delivery of the expected benefits included?
Alignment with the organisation's core outcome (20%)	2.1	How directly does the proposal fit with the core outcome?

Community impact, partnership working and innovative service delivery (30%)	3.1	<p>Which objective(s) does the project deliver and how well is this evidenced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support our most vulnerable and disadvantaged children reducing the need for children to become, or remained looked after • Support Warwickshire residents to take responsibility for their own health and wellbeing and reduce the need for hospital or long term health care • Support the most vulnerable & disadvantaged adults in Warwickshire to enjoy life; achieve & live independently • Work with communities to reduce crime and disorder and promote safety across Warwickshire
	3.2	What specific benefits will the project bring to the community and is there clarity on how these will be measured? Are baseline (i.e. pre-intervention) data available? Will impact of this intervention be easily separable from other factors?
	3.3	What is the balance between short and long term impacts? How long will the community wait to see an impact?
	3.4	Are there any internal or external factors upon which the outcomes of this project are dependent and how have the risks of these contingencies been addressed?
	3.5	What degree of innovation is supported by the project? How much have existing service delivery assumptions been challenged in the options appraisal?
	3.6	What are the consequences of the project not progressing?
	3.7	Have we engaged and involved community stakeholders in the decision making process? What evidence is provided that there is demand for this project from local residents, employees or businesses?
	3.8	What degree of partnership working does the project involve or support?

Financial viability (40%)	4.1	To what extent are the details of the investment required clear and fully costed? Is the level of contingency appropriate?
	4.2	What is the level of risk when considering the plan's robustness, viability and sustainability? What assumptions are made and what evidence is provided to support them? Has sensitivity analysis been undertaken? How are risks to be mitigated?
	4.3	Are there consultation requirements resulting from the project's proposals, and are these reflected in the project timeline, risk matrix and cost contingency?
	4.4	Does the project lever in partner/external contributions? If so, how certain are they and what are any terms and conditions? If the external funding is withdrawn how will the scheme proceed?
	4.5	Will the project have an impact on the revenue budget (in the bidding and any other Service) and has this been fully assessed and funded?
Political, social and environmental impact (10%)	5.1	Political implications
	5.2	Social impact
	5.3	Environmental impact

Assessment Framework: Warwickshire's economy is vibrant and supported by the right jobs, training and skills and infrastructure

Basis of Evaluation and Weighting		Assessment Criteria
Project aspirations, overall benefits and governance (These are essential requirements and not scored)	1.1	Is the description of the project clear?
	1.2	Does the project meet the criteria for capitalisation?
	1.3	Does the project demonstrate all legal requirements can be met and/or are considered?
	1.4	Are any tax implications for the authority fully covered?
	1.5	Does the bid demonstrate that there is a sufficient level of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver the project?
	1.6	Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?
	1.7	Within an overall programme, e.g. start-up loans for small businesses, is there sufficient information about how individual projects would be decided/agreed?
	1.8	Is a project timeline from approval through implementation to full delivery of the expected benefits included?
Alignment with the organisation's core outcome (20%)	2.1	How directly does the proposal fit with the core outcome?
Economic benefit and the likelihood of the project delivering growth, partnership working (30%)	3.1	<p>Which objective(s) does the project deliver and how well is this evidenced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attract economic investment and maximise the rate of employment, business growth and skill levels in Warwickshire • Manage and maintain Warwickshire's transport network in a safe, sustainable and integrated way • Support communities and businesses to develop the digital skills and tools they need in an increasingly digital economy • Reduce household waste and increase reuse, recycling and composting rates across Warwickshire • Support and enable children and young people to access a place in high quality education settings

	3.2	How well can we assess the net impact of the scheme compared to what would happen without the funding? Are baseline (pre-intervention) data available? Will impact of this intervention be easily separable from other factors?
	3.3	What is the balance between short and long term impacts? How long will the Council wait to see an impact?
	3.4	Are there any internal or external factors upon which the outcomes of this project are dependent and how have the risks of these contingencies been addressed?
	3.5	What degree of innovation is supported by the project? How much have existing service delivery assumptions been challenged in the options appraisal?
	3.6	What are the consequences of the project not progressing?
	3.7	Have we engaged and involved community stakeholders in the decision making process? What evidence is provided that there is demand for this project from local residents, employees or businesses?
	3.8	What degree of partnership working does the project involve or support?

Financial viability (40%)	4.1	To what extent are the details of the investment required clear and fully costed? Is the level of contingency appropriate?
	4.2	What is the level of risk when considering the plan's robustness, viability and sustainability? What assumptions are made and what evidence is provided to support them? Has sensitivity analysis been undertaken? How are risks to be mitigated?
	4.3	Are there consultation requirements resulting from the project's proposals, and are these reflected in the project timeline, risk matrix and cost contingency?
	4.4	Does the project lever in partner/external contributions? If so, how certain are they and what are any terms and conditions? If the external funding is withdrawn how will the scheme proceed?
	4.5	Will the project have an impact on the revenue budget (in the bidding and any other Service) and has this been fully assessed and funded?
Political, social and environmental impact (10%)	5.1	Political implications
	5.2	Social impact
	5.3	Environmental impact

Assessment Framework: Making the best use of available resources - delivery of savings/generation of income

Basis of Evaluation and Weighting		Assessment Criteria
Project aspirations, overall benefits and governance (These are essential requirements and not scored)	1.1	Is the description of the project clear?
	1.2	Does the project meet the criteria for capitalisation?
	1.3	Does the project demonstrate all legal requirements can be met and/or are considered?
	1.4	Are any tax implications for the authority fully covered?
	1.5	Does the bid demonstrate that there is a sufficient level of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver the project?
	1.6	Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?
	1.7	Within an overall programme, e.g. start-up loans for small businesses, is there sufficient information about how individual projects would be decided/agreed?
	1.8	Is a project timeline from approval through implementation to full delivery of the expected benefits included?
Alignment with the organisation's core outcomes (20%)	2.1	How well does the proposal align with the Economic vibrancy and Supported communities outcomes?

Achievability, quality of evidence base, duration of required investment, rational evaluation and challenge of options, financial viability and risk (70%)	3.1	<p>Which outcome(s) does the project deliver and how well is this evidenced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easy for the customers to access our information and services so they have a positive experience of our services • Put our financial resources in the right place to support the Organisation's priorities • Develop our work force so that it has the right skills and capabilities to get the job done • Pursue leadership excellence and high performance at all levels • Reduce demand and cost through innovative and effective service redesign
	3.2	Does the project provide savings or revenue income to the organisation? What is the Return on Investment? Has a Net Present Value been calculated? Does the period for payback make the scheme worthwhile when taking into account the time value of money?
	3.3	What assumptions are made and what evidence is provided to support them? Has sensitivity analysis been undertaken to establish any risks to deliverables? How are these risks being mitigated?
	3.4	How well can we assess the net impact of the scheme compared to what would happen without the funding? Are baseline (pre-intervention) data available? Will impact of this intervention be easily separable from other factors?
	3.5	Will the project have an impact on the revenue budget (in the bidding and any other Service) and has this been fully assessed and funded?
	3.6	Does the project lever in partner/external contributions? If so, how certain are they and what are any terms and conditions? If the external funding is withdrawn how will the scheme proceed?
	3.7	What are the consequences of the project not progressing?
	3.8	Are there consultation requirements resulting from the project's proposals, and are these reflected in the project timeline, risk matrix and cost contingency?

Political, social and environmental impact (10%)	4.1	Political implications
	4.2	Social impact
	4.3	Environmental impact

Assessment Framework: Supplementary questions for returning schemes

Basis of Evaluation and Weighting		Assessment Criteria
Financial viability (supplemental)	4.6	Is there a full explanation of the reasons for additional costs which were unplanned and unfunded in the original proposal?
	4.7	Have alternative options for funding additional costs or changing the scope of the project to maintain costs at the level of the original budget been considered, and is the rationale for further funding from the Council clearly justified? Has an option to stop the project been assessed?
	4.8	What is the risk of further unplanned costs? Does the bid specify who is accountable for managing the risk going forward, for both revenue and capital costs?