Community Led Local Development Small grants 26/27 Assessment Criteria Matrix			
Eligibility check	Applications must meet all eligibility requirements: • Not for profit or community led organisation (CICs ineligible) • Bank account in the organisation's name • Project is not a statutory service and does not replace or duplicate an existing service • Confirmation that the costs are not already funded through another source • Project can be delivered withing the CLLD timescales • Costs are revenue only and do not include any single item over £10,000 • Fair Work First Statement • Match funding (if relevant) is secured by the time of submitting this application • Quotes (if relevant) are submitted alongside this application • Statutory permissions and control of the asset (if relevant) are secured • Organisation primarily delivers activities aligned to the selected CLLD funding priority		**Pass/Fail** Fail = application not progressed Pass = carry out assessment as per criteria below
Criteria	**Green**	**Amber**	**Red**
Project Quality & Deliverability 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 issues in a way that is proportionate to the project?	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.	Project is broadly deliverable, but some details require clarification or minor risks remain. Some consideration of equalities is evident.	Project lacks clarity, has significant delivery risks, or demonstrates limited consideration of inclusion or accessibility.
Need, Engagement and Community Benefit 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?	Strong evidence of wider community benefit/need or demand, with appropriate community support or local knowledge. Clear public benefit aligned to the selected priority.	Some evidence of wider community benefit/need, but limited detail or weaker linkage to priority outcomes.	Limited or unclear evidence of wider community benefit/need.

Alignment with Funding Priorities Does the project and/or organisation clearly contribute to the selected Funding Priority? Are the selected outcomes relevant? Is the alignment clearly explained in the application?	The organisation clearly contributes to the selected funding priority. Outcomes are relevant.	The organisation broadly contributes to the selected funding priority. Outcomes are generally relevant.	Weak or unclear alignment with the selected funding priority. Outcomes are unclear.
Climate Resilience & Environmental Sustainability 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? Where impacts are limited, has the applicant provided a reasonable explanation?	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.	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.	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.
Value for Money 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? Level of benefit in relation to the level of investment	High level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested. Costs are reasonable and proportionate.	Costs are broadly reasonable. Medium level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested.	Low level of benefit in relation to the level of grant requested. Costs are poorly justified.
Organisational sustainability & Additionality Has the applicant demonstrated how the grant will improve the sustainability of the organisation? Will the funding help maintain or strengthen delivery of activities linked to the selected CLLD priority? Is there evidence that the organisation will continue to deliver community benefit beyond the grant period? Are organisational Reserves/balances reasonable in context? Has the applicant explained why CLLD funding is needed?	Funding will clearly maintain or strengthen the organisation's ability to deliver community benefit. The applicant has demonstrated a clear need for funding and shown how the grant will support continued community benefit against the selected priority.	Some sustainability rationale is provided, however the longer-term benefit to the organisation and/or continued delivery of priority-related activity is not fully demonstrated.	No evidence that community benefit will be sustained. Sustainability question not adequately answered. Insufficient evidence that the funding will support delivery of continued community benefit or priority outcomes.