

**1) Criteria to be used to assess each proposal and the relative weighting/marks available to be awarded under each heading for each of the criteria**

- There are five headings, as follows:
  - A) Compatibility,
  - B) Commitment,
  - C) Collaboration,
  - D) Integration, and
  - E) Viability,
 with 100 marks available for each prior to weighting.
- There are ten criteria in total (i.e. two under each heading), with each criterion marked out of 50.
- Taking account of weightings, there are 1,000 marks in total available.

	<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Marks Available</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Compatibility</b>	<b>100 (out of 500)</b>	<b>x3 = 300</b>	<b>To evaluate the overall 'fit' of the proposal and the extent to which it will be transformational and relevant</b>
1	<b>Vision</b> Whether the proposal forms part of an overall vision and is likely to be instrumental in the achievement of transformational, place-based change.	50		To assess the scope of ambition, the likely scale of impact of the proposal and the difference it will make to an area.
2	<b>Relevance to NPF/NDP Outcomes</b> In particular, the <i>Compact Growth</i> outcome, to include a focus on enhanced 'liveability', quality of life, and capacity to build on existing assets, but also in relation to other outcomes in support of compact growth.	50		To assess compatibility with NPF/NDP national strategic outcomes (NSOs). While not necessary to identify relevance to all ten NSOs, it would be advantageous to demonstrably impact on more than one.
<b>B</b>	<b>Commitment</b>	<b>100 (out of 500)</b>	<b>x1.5 = 150</b>	<b>To evaluate financial and human resource inputs, the extent to which they will be catalysts for change and</b>

	Assessment Criteria	Marks Available	Weighting	Rationale
				<b>will ensure delivery</b>
3	<b>Leveraged Co-Funding</b> The extent of direct leveraged co-funding, which must be at least 25% of the value of the bid proposal, and for a joined-up approach from different sources that would enable investment that might not otherwise proceed in support of urban development to occur.	50		To assess the extent to which the Exchequer grant being sought will be matched by other funding sources and will be a catalyst to activate investment and development.
4	<b>Governance and Management</b> The nature of proposed project governance, to include monitoring and management arrangements, within and between the elements of the project bid team and the Department.	50		To assess the extent to which the proposal will be prioritised and resourced at the appropriate level to ensure transparent and accurate reporting and timely delivery.
<b>C</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<b>100 (out of 500)</b>	<b>x1.5 = 150</b>	<b>To evaluate joint working between bodies/sectors and/or areas/networks that will add value, ensure efficiency and broaden impact</b>
5	<b>Inter-Organisational</b> The extent of collaboration between public bodies and between public bodies and the private sector and/or community/voluntary sectors.	50		To assess the extent of co-ordinated investment and decision-making across multiple stakeholders that will add value and contribute to efficient delivery.
6	<b>Geographic/Networked</b> The extent of collaboration between different geographically-based bodies where there is potential to jointly address common/ complementary issues and/or to operate on a networked basis	50		To assess the extent of complementary investment and decision-making across geographic areas or networks that will broaden impact and avoid duplication.
<b>D</b>	<b>Integration</b>	<b>100 (out</b>	<b>x2 = 200</b>	<b>To evaluate the level of</b>

	Assessment Criteria	Marks Available	Weighting	Rationale
		of 500)		innovation and quality of regeneration and scope for co-ordinated local and regional development
7	<p><b>Tailored Innovation</b></p> <p>The extent to which proposals address, in an innovative and qualitative manner, specific urban issues, such as social disadvantage, economic change (may include Brexit), physical and/or environmental degradation, sustainable mobility and/or the legacy of rapid or unplanned growth.</p>	50		To assess focus on core urban regeneration issues, with a particular emphasis on tailored, innovative and qualitative solutions.
8	<p><b>Local and Regional Development</b></p> <p>The extent to which proposals co-ordinate with and/or contribute to evidence-based strategies for the social, economic and physical/environmental development, including in particular Regional Social and Economic Strategies and City/County Development Plans.</p>	50		To assess the extent to which proposals are integral to existing and/or new plans and strategies (Regional, Local, Sectoral) for growth and development.
E	<b>Viability</b>	100 (out of 500)	x2 = 200	To evaluate economic impact and project deliverability
9	<p><b>Leveraged Investment</b></p> <p>The extent of leveraging of wider, indirect private sector investment in the delivery of homes and/or commercial floorspace, the value of which must be at least 100% of the value of the bid proposal, together with any other leveraged investment not addressed under criterion 3</p>	50		To assess the wider economic/investment impact of the proposal, in line with NDP requirements.

	Assessment Criteria	Marks Available	Weighting	Rationale
	above, which may include employment and/or training/skills.			
10	<p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to deliver, the track record of project partners and their experience of similar projects.</li> <li>Whether planning consents or other approvals are required/secured.</li> <li>Level of procurement readiness.</li> <li>Any land ownership/ access/control issues.</li> <li>Full value for money assessment (cost-benefit or multi-criteria analysis) will be required in accordance with the Public Spending Code, but at minimum, a clear financial proposal with a realistic cost breakdown, that represents value for money in consideration of likely benefits and estimated economic impact, is sought at this stage.</li> </ul>	50		<p>To assess the likely prospects of deliverability of the proposal in terms of capacity, consents, procurement readiness, land issues and initial value for money appraisal.</p> <p>It is recognised that full cost-benefit assessment may not be feasible within the bid timelines. This may have an impact on whether a Proposal can be considered as Category A or Category B i.e. for full approval or for preliminary approval subject to further development.</p>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	

Score	Evaluation - Each criterion will be scored out 50.
0	<b>N/A</b> The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information
1-10	<b>Very Poor</b> The criterion is addressed in an unsatisfactory manner
11-20	<b>Poor</b> There are serious or inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion

21-30	<b>Fair</b> While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need to be corrected
31-40	<b>Good</b> The proposal addresses the criterion well, although some improvements possible
41-50	<b>Excellent</b> The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion and any shortcomings are minor.