



**European Union**  
European Structural  
and Investment Funds

# **Cornwall Community Led Local Development (CLLD) Programme**

**Evaluation and Scoring Guidance**

**Call for Applications**

**P11 Support for Potential Entrepreneurs**

## Expression of Interest (EOI)

All applications will be assessed for eligibility before they can be considered. All eligible projects will be scored with a maximum score of 49. Projects scoring between **0 – 19** will be considered **Low Priority** and may be rejected. Projects scoring between **20 – 34** will be considered **Medium Priority** and projects scoring between **35 – 49** will be considered **High Priority**.

Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the EOI will not be scored but will be used to assess eligibility.

The Local Action Group reserves the right to invite projects to Full Application stage where they show elements of innovation, locally led solutions or sustainability, even if they have scored lower than other applications. All attempts will be made to ensure applying this discretion will not result in any duplication of provision or activity at the local level. All projects must demonstrate that their activity/delivery does not duplicate existing provision.

Scoring Selection Criteria	Description	Score
LSOAs	How well is the activity delivering benefit to the bottom 30%?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Local Development Strategy Priorities	How well does the project's activity contribute to the Priority identified?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Local Development Strategy Objectives	How well does the project fit with the Local Development Strategy?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Outputs	How clear in the link between the project's activity and outputs?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Rationale and evidence to support the proposal	How clearly does the project provide a rationale for why it is needed?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Partnership Working	Does the application demonstrate partnership working and that there is no duplication of provision?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)

Community Engagement	How well does the project engage with their target group(s) and/or how will the project provide benefits to the wider community?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Costs	Are the value for money and project outputs identified appropriate for the value of the grant requested?	Very Strong (7) Strong (5) Good (3) Weak (1) Inadequate (0)
Total		0 - 49

### Full Application (FA)

At the Full Application stage, applicants will be scored in a similar way to the EOI stage. Sections 1 – 4 are not scored but will be assessed for compliance on eligibility of costs, procurement processes, funding package and timescales. Funding Package and timescales are also assessed for suitability and acceptability against programme criteria and whether they will enable the project to be delivered as proposed.

The outcome of the analysis of Sections 1 – 4 will lead to one of the following outcomes:

- a. That the area concerned is fully compliant
- b. That, subject to the satisfaction of a condition of approval, the area will be compliant
- c. That the area is not satisfactory and the project should be rejected

The Full Application scoring scale is as follows. The maximum score for each Section will be 7 with a total maximum score of 91.

Score 0-12	Expectation is to recommend rejection
Score 13-36	Recommend to approve or reject as appropriate
Score 37-84	Expectation is to recommend approval

7	Fully addressed/assured – meets the requirement with additional assurance
5	Fully addressed/assured – meets the requirement
3	Partially addressed/assured – mostly meets the requirements with minor weaknesses in certain areas
1	Not addressed/assured at all – mostly fails the requirement with major weaknesses in certain areas
0	Not addressed/assured at all – fails to meet the requirement

Scoring Selection Criteria	Description	Score
LSOAs	How well is the activity delivering benefit to the bottom 30%?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Strategic Fit	Does the application demonstrate and evidence how the project will contribute to the strategic objectives, activities, outputs and results of the Local Development Strategy? Does it demonstrate added value to other activities in the LAG area while avoiding duplication?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Need for Grant and Displacement	Can the applicant demonstrate that research has been undertaken to support the need for the project and that there is local support? If there are any displacement issues have these been addressed? Does the applicant explain whether they have considered other sources of funding including mainstream funding and what would happen if they did not get all the CLLD funding requested?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Outputs & Value for Money	How clear is the link between the project's activity and outputs? Will the project contribute to the Local Development Strategy's outputs and results for ESF/ERDF and other local performance indicators? Are the value for money and project outputs identified appropriate for the value of the grant requested? Has the applicant clearly identified any indirect outputs/wider impacts from the project?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Deliverability	Can the applicant demonstrate an ability to ensure that delivery partners comply with the requirements of ESF/ERDF funding? Have they got all the required permissions/building regulations/licenses in place and has evidence been provided? Have all risks been identified and mitigation considered?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Financial Analysis	Has the applicant provided an appropriate budget breakdown with all	Fully with additional

	<p>eligible, appropriate and justified costs and do these show that there will be sufficient cashflow to cover expenditure prior to CLLD grant payment? Has the applicant provided evidence and status of its match funding for the duration of the project and copies of their management accounts/end of year accounts? Does the applicant have sound financial management systems in place, including an understanding of the importance of audit trails and an ability to ensure that delivery partners comply with the requirements of ESF/ERDF funding?</p>	<p>assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)</p>
Project Management & Control	<p>Does the applicant demonstrate that they have the relevant project experience, including adequate staffing, good governance and project/financial management capabilities? Can they demonstrate an ability to ensure that delivery partners comply with the requirements of ESF/ERDF funding?</p>	<p>Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)</p>
Cross Cutting Themes	<p>Has the applicant provided a comprehensive description of how the project is innovative and the extent to which a new idea or approach is being tested? Has the applicant considered how the project will contribute to the sustainable development principles of CLLD and do they have an up to date and relevant Sustainable Development policy? Have they provided a Sustainable Development Implementation Plan? Has the applicant taken into account the need to ensure that the principles of gender equality and equal opportunities are implemented at all stages of the project and do they have an up to date and relevant Gender Equality and Equal Opportunities policy?</p>	<p>Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)</p>
Exit Strategy & Legacy	<p>Has the project addressed how it will continue once CLLD funding ceases and how beneficiaries will be supported post project (e.g. business model, forward plan/strategy, funding options and legacy)?</p>	<p>Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1)</p>

		Fails (0)
Monitoring & Evaluation	Does the applicant demonstrate that the project's activities will be monitored and evaluated using appropriate recording systems and that the information can be shared with the LAG and Accountable Body for wider evaluation and audit purposes?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Rationale and evidence to support the proposal	Does the application demonstrate why the project is needed, why it is the preferred approach and which target groups/communities it will deliver to and benefit?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Partnership Working	Does the application demonstrate that the project is working in partnership with other local organisations, including VCSE, private and public partners and that its activities are complementary and don't duplicate existing or planned provision?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Community Engagement	Does the application explain how it will engage with the target group through all stages of the project and/or how the project will result in benefits to the wider community?	Fully with additional assurance (7) Fully (5) Partially (3) Mostly fails (1) Fails (0)
Total		0 - 91