

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)					Weighted Score (max 99 available)		
Project Title / Town: East Cams - Ely CCTV Network Expansion					MINIMUM PASS IS 74 MARKS (75%)		79.0
Name: Hewdon Consulting Date: 04.01.21		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria					
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting	Mark - Edit	Total	
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	Ely's ageing CCTV infrastructure is cited as an obstacle to delivering a safe city environment with a thriving 'day and night-time' economy. This project extends the impact of the City Council's planned 27 camera upgrade by providing a further 12.	2	x 2	=	4.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	Project aims to complete by early summer 2022. Its delivery should be a relatively straight forward Council procurement led exercise.	2	x 2	=	4.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Costs are provisional estimates based on Phase 1 costings. The timetable for delivering the project is now clearly set out through until Q1 22/23.	1	x 3	=	3.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Match funding seems to be in place, locations identified. A relatively modest procurement led project with limited delivery risks.	3	x 3	=	9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	No target outputs have been provided. The applicant has stated this project will strengthen community cohesion and support the local economy by improving community safety and protecting the City's business community. However as public monies are being spent suitable performance measures should be agreed.	5	x 1	=	5.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	This project is in the masterplan which has a good fit with CPIER	5	x 3	=	15.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	Wider public benefit project with no state aid issues envisaged based on the current proposals.	1	x 2	=	2.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	Top level costings only, effectively creating a budget for the project within which it must be delivered. The applicant has now confirmed that the City Council will cover the revenue costs.	3	x 2	=	6.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	A match of 55% match is being provided from the City council.	4	x 3	=	12.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	As stated above, limited information has been provided to support VFM. The project has good leverage when compared to others supported under this grant scheme. It is strongly supported locally and will compliment the other projects the market towns programme has funded in Ely.	5	x 3	=	15.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assessment 3. Risks identified and explained	No risk register was provided as should be a condition of funding if supported. The intention is to deliver the project within the budget available, which will mean cut backs should costs increase following procurement.	2	x 2	=	4.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.		Approve at the request amount of £120,000 subject to the following conditions: 1. Letter from the City of Ely Council confirming they have approved this application. 2. Agreement of suitable performance measures with which to measure the project's impact. 3. Confirmation that City of Ely Council will underwrite any future capital or revenue shortfall. 4. Submission of a risk register using the CPCA's supplied template.	Total Score			79.0

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)				Weighted Score (max 99 available)		
Project Title / Town: East Cambs - Ely Town Centre Capital Investment Fund				Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)		75.0
Name: Howdon Consulting Date: 04.01.21		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria				
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting	Mark - Edit	Total
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	Application is based on funding urgent interventions to stem the blight on COVID-19 on the towns high street. Project aims to encourage local residents and visitors to eat and shop locally to return its vibrancy.	2	x 3	= 6.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	Planned expenditure is to run to March 22.	2	x 3	= 6.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Good level of detail provided on the objectives and management of the grant scheme, though the proposal has yet to be signed off by the Council's Finance and Assets committees. Grant scheme terms/application criteria/governance may therefore change from that submitted in the application and supporting papers.	1	x 3	= 3.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Project will be subject to further development if approved, particularly on its governance, application process and identification of potential applicants.	3	x 3	= 9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	No target outputs have been provided. Application states that local businesses/trade will benefit but no target values have been set.	5	x 2	= 10.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	The masterplan fits with the LIS and CPIER and this project will enable progress on the masterplan to be monitored	5	x 3	= 15.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	The grant scheme requires further detailed state aid consideration. The applicant is quite right in stating that this needs to be reviewed on a case by case basis, but gives no detail of the state aid assessments that will be undertaken on each project to ensure they comply with current subsidy control rules. Even small grants could face legal challenges if not seen to be administered fairly and checks made on eligibility for grant aid.	1	x 2	= 2.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	No detail is given on how this £100k figure has been arrived at and whether any project management is included. Draft guidance for the fund was provided but is now understood to be out of date with no rationale is given for the new 100% intervention rate was selected over a more normal 50%.	3	x 2	= 6.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	No match funding is to be sought. Despite the example application stating the funding would make a maximum 75% contribution to each supported business, the Council subsequently confirmed they intend to make awards of up to 100% to eligible businesses.	4	x 1	= 4.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	As stated above, limited information has been provided to support VFM with the project offering no leverage. However it is strongly supported locally and will compliment the other projects the market towns programme has funded in Ely.	5	x 2	= 10.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assessment 3. Risks identified and explained	No risk register provided.	2	x 2	= 4.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.		Approve at the request amount of £100,000 subject to the following: 1. Submission of suitable economic measures on which to assess the performance of the business support grant such as number of businesses supported, jobs created. 2. Submission of suitable state aid advice for the grant fund and a Risk Register. 3. Confirmation of the that Fund has been approved by the Council's Finance and Assets committee with a copy of the final Grant scheme terms/application criteria/and governance arrangements.	Total Score		75.0

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)					Weighted Score (max 99 available)			
Project Title / Town: East Cams - Ely Street Furniture Upgrades					Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)			74.0
Name: Hewdon Consulting Date: 16.06.21		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria						
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting	Mark - Edit	Total		
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	This is a programme of urgent actions that have been assessed by the local authority to improve the appearance of Ely Town Centre by introducing new and improved facilities to improve vitality and vibrancy post-pandemic.	2	x 3	=	6.0	
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	Programme of works should be completed by March 2022, subject to contractor availability and prevailing weather conditions during the delivery of the works	2	x 3	=	6.0	
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Limited detail is given on precisely what the monies will be spent on - stated in the application as 'identified important shortfalls in street improvements'. Nor is it clear why a 3rd tranche of funding is needed above the £210k already invested by the CPCA.	1	x 1	=	1.0	
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Street Works appear to be ready to start with the project being delivered by the County Highways contractor. Match funding seems to be in place, locations identified. A relatively modest procurement led project with limited delivery risks.	3	x 3	=	9.0	
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	No target outputs have been provided. The applicant has stated this project will encourage visitors to visit the city, and protect economic activity (jobs and income) but offered no measurable targets. If supported suitable performance measures should be agreed.	5	x 2	=	10.0	
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	This project is in the masterplan which has a good fit with CPIER	5	x 3	=	15.0	
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	Wider public benefit project with no state aid issues envisaged based on the current proposals.	1	x 3	=	3.0	
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	No costs estimates provided though the applicant has stated these will be provided shortly. If supported this should be a condition of any funding award.	3	x 2	=	6.0	
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	No match funding	4	x 1	=	4.0	
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	As stated above, limited information has been provided to support VFM with the project offering no leverage. However it is strongly supported locally and will compliment the other projects the market towns programme has funded in Ely.	5	x 2	=	10.0	
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assesment 3. Risks identified and explained	No risk register provided	2	x 2	=	4.0	
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.		Approve for the request amount of £124,000 subject to the following conditions: 1.Submission of costs estimates detailing the works to be supported via this application. 2. Agreement of suitable performance measures with which to measure the project's impact. 3. Submission of a risk register using the CPCA's supplied template.	Total Score			74.0	

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)					Weighted Score (max 99 available)			
Project Title / Town: East Cambs - Soham Agritech Business Centre					Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)			72.0
Name: Hewdon Consulting Date: 16.06.21		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria						
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting	Mark - Edit	Total		
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	The application is based on the opportunities stemming from Soham's historically strong farming-based economy and the emerging job opportunities from Cambridgeshire's strong agri-tech industry.	2	x 2	=	4.0	
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	The project is expected to be completed by Summer 2022. However the Planning position is currently unclear. The application assumes that the project will not need planning consent as a temporary building – if it does this will add 8 to 12 weeks.	2	x 2	=	4.0	
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Acquisition and build of the log cabin style building should be relatively straight forward to deliver, however procurement of building and groundworks, planning, connection of services and fit out are all in early stages of development...pending confirmation of funding.	1	x 2	=	2.0	
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Though the end beneficiary is NIAB, the applicant was submitted by East Cambs DC. The legal relationship between them was not made clear in the application. If supported it is suggested that this be transferred to NIAB in order to make them party to the grant conditions.	3	x 2	=	6.0	
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	50 Full time job equivalents are claimed to result from this project along with 2 apprenticeships. If supported it is recommended that further detail is provided from NIAB to ensure these are additional to other CPCA funding awards.	5	x 3	=	15.0	
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	Historical link between Soham and its declining farm-based economy due to the gradual mechanisation and reduction in job opportunities is well made. As is the need to rebalance this loss by putting Soham at the heart of Cambridgeshire's agri-tech industry.	5	x 2	=	10.0	
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	NIAB have apparently sought legal council and have written to the CPCA, though this was not included with their application. If supported, an appropriate state aid (subsidy control) report is needed.	1	x 2	=	2.0	
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	No detailed costings was provided. If supported, NIAB should be asked to provide evidence of an appropriate tender exercise and provide a guarantee that they will meet any costs over run.	3	x 2	=	6.0	
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	No match funding	4	x 1	=	4.0	
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	As stated above, the project claims to support 50 new jobs, but offers no leverage. As stated above, if these jobs can be validated as being solely attributable to this funding award then the project would represent good VFM.	5	x 3	=	15.0	
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assessment 3. Risks identified and explained	No risk register provided	2	x 2	=	4.0	
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.	Conditional approval for the requested amount of £145,000 subject to the following conditions: 1. Resubmission of the application with NIAB as the applicant. 2. Submission of evidence of Subsidy Control (state aid) compliance. 3. Submission of a detailed cost break down along with details of a tender process with at least three quotations sought. 4. Confirmation that all project revenue costs and any capital cost overrun will be met by NIAB.		Total Score			72.0	