

**Community Led Local Development  
Small grants 26/27  
Assessment Criteria Matrix**

<p><b>Eligibility check</b></p>	<p>Applications must meet all eligibility requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not for profit or community led organisation</li> <li>• Bank account in the organisation's name</li> <li>• Project is not a statutory service and does not replace or duplicate an existing service</li> <li>• The activity is new or expanded, not already funded elsewhere</li> <li>• Delivery of the project within 6/7 months</li> <li>• Costs are revenue only and do not include any single item over £10,000</li> <li>• Fair Work First Statement</li> <li>• Match funding (if relevant) is secured by the time of submitting this application</li> <li>• Quotes (if relevant) are submitted alongside this application</li> <li>• Statutory permissions and control of the asset (if relevant) are secured</li> </ul>			<p align="center"><b>Pass/Fail</b></p> <p>Fail = application not progressed Pass = carry out assessment as per criteria below</p>
<p><b>Criteria</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Green</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Amber</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Red</b></p>	
<p><b>Project Quality &amp; Deliverability</b> Are the project activities clearly described and achievable within the timescale? Is the delivery approach proportionate to the size of the grant? Are any key risks identified and are they manageable? If relevant, are permissions, asset control or arrangements realistic and likely to be in place? Has the applicant demonstrated appropriate consideration of equality</p>	<p>Clear, well-defined project that is ready to deliver. Risks are minimal or well understood. Equalities and accessibility have been appropriately considered and addressed in a proportionate way.</p>	<p>Project is broadly deliverable, but some details require clarification or minor risks remain. Some consideration of equalities is evident.</p>	<p>Project lacks clarity, has significant delivery risks, or demonstrates limited consideration of inclusion or accessibility.</p>	

<p>issues in a way that is proportionate to the project?</p>			
<p><b>Need, Engagement and Community Benefit</b>          Has the applicant explained why the project is needed?          Is there evidence of need appropriate to the size and nature of the project?          Is there evidence of local insight, community experience, consultation or engagement?          Is it clear who will benefit and how?          Does the project avoid duplication of existing services or provision?</p>	<p>Strong evidence of need or demand, with appropriate community support or local knowledge. Clear public benefit aligned to the selected priority.</p>	<p>Some evidence of need and benefit, but limited detail or weaker linkage to priority outcomes.</p>	<p>Limited or unclear evidence of need or public benefit.</p>
<p><b>Alignment with Funding Priorities</b>          Does the project clearly respond to the aims of the Funding Priorities?          Are the outcomes relevant and measurable?          Is the alignment clearly explained in the application?</p>	<p>Project clearly aligns with the selected funding priority and delivers relevant and measurable outcomes.</p>	<p>Partial alignment with the priority. Outcomes are relevant but not strongly articulated.</p>	<p>Weak or unclear alignment with the selected priority.</p>
<p><b>Climate Resilience &amp; Environmental Sustainability</b>          Has the applicant explained how climate resilience or environmental sustainability has been considered?          Is this consideration relevant and proportionate to the type and scale of project?          Does the explanation relate to the project itself and/or the organisation's wider activities?</p>	<p>The application clearly explains how climate resilience and/or environmental sustainability has been actively considered in the design of the project and/or the organisation's wider activities. This consideration is relevant, proportionate, and meaningful for the type and scale of activity proposed.</p>	<p>The application demonstrates some consideration of climate resilience or environmental sustainability, either at project level or organisational level, but this is limited in depth, detail or clarity. The link to the project or wider activities is reasonable but not fully developed.</p>	<p>The application shows limited or no evidence that climate resilience or environmental sustainability has been considered in relation to the project or the organisation's wider activities, and no clear explanation is provided as to why this is not applicable.</p>

<p>Where impacts are limited, has the applicant provided a reasonable explanation?</p>			
<p><b>Value for Money &amp; Additionality</b>          Are the costs reasonable and proportionate to the activities proposed?          Is the budget clear and understandable at a high level?          Are quotes provided where relevant and appropriate?          Has the applicant explained why CLLD funding is needed?          Would the project proceed without grant support, or only at a reduced scale or quality?          Are organisational Reserves/balances reasonable in context?</p>	<p>Costs are reasonable and proportionate. Project would not proceed without CLLD funding or would be significantly reduced. High level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested.</p>	<p>Costs are reasonable. Some elements may proceed without funding but overall impact depends on the grant. Medium level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested.</p>	<p>Poor value for money or project likely to proceed anyway at similar scale. Low level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested.</p>