



Instructions

Introduction

The London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) is inviting local authorities to submit an application form for consideration and evaluation by the LWARB.

Proposers are required to complete an application form.

Evaluation Criteria

Each application form shall be evaluated against the Evaluation Criteria as set out within tab 'Full Evaluation Methodology' of this workbook.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will be undertaken using the methodology and scoring system set out within tab 'Full Evaluation Methodology' of this workbook.

Flats Recycling Programme - Full Evaluation Scoring Methodology



Project Viability													
Core Criteria	LWaRB Criteria Drivers	Sub criteria	Total Points available per Core Criteria	Score awarded for sub criteria	Weighting	Overall Points achieved	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3	Score = 4	Score = 5	N/A
Value for Money													
1. Tonnage Diversion	LWaRB is only willing to fund projects that will divert waste from landfill to recycling.		A combined score will be allocated for VFM made up equally of 1. and 2.										
		Waste diverted per LWaRB £ invested over first 4 years											
2. Carbon Dioxide	LWaRB is only willing to fund projects that mitigate the impacts of climate change.												
		CO2 diverted per LWaRB £ invested over first 4 years											
Project Viability													
3. Type of flat	LWaRB wishes to fund proposals that target flat dwellings, specifically: • Purpose built flats, • Flats in converted properties (generally to mean over 8 households in one building) • Flats in commercial buildings (inc. flats above shops)		5		1	0							
		Does the proposal target flats specifically detailed within the LWaRB guidance to bidders.	5	0			Proposal does not target specified flats					Proposal targets specified flats	
4. Demonstration of partnership	LWaRB recognises the value of working with partners where appropriate. It is not a prerequisite that local authorities work in partnership with other local authorities, however those seeking funding will be strongly encouraged to develop delivery partnerships and could be assessed more favourably if this demonstrates significant additionality.		5		1	0							
		To what extent does the project propose appropriate partnerships which will add value to the project?	5	0			Partnership working not considered	Partnership working considered, but not implemented.	N/A	Partnership working fully intergrated into the project	N/A	Partnership working fully intergrated into the project and evidence of its benefit evidenced.	
5. Rationale for funding	LWaRB wishes to understand the rationale for the funding requested		5		1.5	0							
		What level of funding is required from LWaRB as a percentage of the total funding requirement?	1.25	0			N/A	100% of the funding is to come from the LWaRB	Between 50% and 99% of the funding is to come from the LWaRB	Between 21% and 49% of the funding is to come from the LWaRB	Between 11% and 20% of the funding is to come from the LWaRB	Between 1% and 10% of the funding is to come from the LWaRB	N/A
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated the rationale for the amount and composition of funding requested?	1.25	0			The project proposer has provided no rationale for the amount of funding sought.	N/A	N/A	The project proposer has demonstrated the rationale for the amount of funding.	N/A	The project proposer has demonstrated the rationale for the amount of funding and this is supported by the 4 year financial model.	
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated that the project would not be deliverable without support from LWaRB?	1.25	0			The project proposer provided no evidence that the project could not be delivered without support from the LWaRB.	N/A	N/A	The project proposer has partially demonstrated that the project could not be delivered without LWaRB funding.	N/A	The project proposer has fully demonstrated that the project could not be delivered without LWaRB funding.	
		What type of funding is being sought from LWaRB? The maximum LWaRB will fund is 80% capital and 20% revenue.	1.25	0			Funding is outside the maximum 80/20 ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Funding is within the maximum 80/20 ratio.	
6. Deliverability of the scheme	LWaRB wishes to understand the deliverability of the scheme		5	0	1.5	0							
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated the rationale for the specific project proposed? i.e. why the scheme proposed for funding has been chosen. Based on best practice from elsewhere, trial results and evidence to support this?	1.25	0			The project proposer has provided no rationale for the project.	N/A	N/A	The project proposer has demonstrated the rationale for the project, but this has not been supported by evidence.	N/A	The project proposer has demonstrated the rationale for the project, and it has been clearly evidenced.	
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated that the proposed solution is deliverable? i.e methodology for how the scheme will be delivered, collection capacity etc..	1.25	0			The proposer has provided no evidence on the deliverability of the proposals	N/A	N/A	The proposer has provided some evidence on the deliverability of the proposals	N/A	The proposer has provided strong evidence on the deliverability of the proposals	N/A
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated and evidenced how they will monitor and evaluate the project?	1.25	0			The proposer has provided no demonstration or evidence of E&M	N/A	N/A	The proposer has provided some demonstration and evidence of E&M		The proposer has provided strong demonstration and evidence of E&M	
		To what extent has the project proposer demonstrated that project timescales (project plan) is reasonable and that the project is deliverable by 31/3/12?	1.25	0			No evidence has been provided which demonstrates the reasonableness of the proposed project plan	Limited evidence has been provided that the project plan is reasonable and/or the evidence contains significant flaws	Evidence has been provided that the project plan is reasonable but the evidence contains significant flaws	N/A	Evidence has been provided that the project plan is reasonable but the evidence contains minor flaws	Evidence has been provided which demonstrates that the proposed project plan is reasonable	N/A

Flats Recycling Programme - Full Evaluation Scoring Methodology



Project Viability													
Core Criteria	LWaRB Criteria Drivers	Sub criteria	Total Points available per Core Criteria	Score awarded for sub criteria	Weighting	Overall Points achieved	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3	Score = 4	Score = 5	N/A
7. Commitment of Local authority and housing partner support	LWaRB wishes to understand the level of senior local authority support for the project and as a minimum requests official support from senior officers i.e. Assistant Director or Member.		5	0	1	0							
		To what extent is there evidence presented to show that member approved has been obtained?	1	0			No evidence presented to show member approval for the service.	N/A	N/A	Evidence provided of in principle approval from members.	N/A	Evidence provided of full approval from members.	
		To what extent is there evidence presented to show that on going budget for the proposal has been approved by senior officers (with appropriate delegated authority)/members for a minimum period of 4 years?	1	0			No evidence presented to show ongoing budget support for the service.	N/A	N/A	Evidence provided of in principle approval of on going budget from senior officer/members for 4 years.	N/A	Evidence provided of full approval of on going budget from senior officer/members for 4 years.	
		To what extent has the sponsor provided evidence of housing provider support?	1	0			No evidence provided of housing provider support	N/A	N/A	Evidence provided of in principle approval from housing organisation.	N/A	Evidence provided of full senior officer support from housing provider.	
		To what extent does the proposal evidence commitment of project management resources appropriate to deliver the project?	1	0			No evidence of commitment of appropriate PM resources.	N/A	N/A	Partial evidence of commitment of appropriate PM resources.	N/A	Full evidence of commitment of appropriate PM resources.	
		If external funding is being used to support the project finances, to what extent does the project proposer provide evidence of commitment of this?	1	0			No evidence of commitment of external funding.	N/A	N/A	Partial evidence of commitment of external funding.	N/A	Full evidence of commitment of external funding.	
8. Consideration of materials markets	LWaRB wishes to understand the level of consideration given to materials markets to support the materials being collected as part of this project.		5	0	1	0							
		To what extent has the project proposer considered materials markets?	5	0			The project proposer has failed to give any consideration to markets required to deliver the project	N/A	N/A	The project proposer has given partial consideration to markets required to deliver the project	N/A	The project proposer has given full consideration to any markets required to deliver the project and has these secured.	N/A
9. Consideration of procurement process	LWaRB wishes to understand the level of consideration given to the procurement process required for the delivery of the project.		5	0	1	0							
		To what extent has the project proposer considered the procurement process required to deliver the project?	5	0			The project proposer has failed to give any consideration to procurement process required to deliver the project	N/A	N/A	The project proposer has given partial consideration to any procurement process required to deliver the project	N/A	The project proposer has given full consideration to any procurement process required to deliver the project	N/A
10. Communications Plan	LWaRB wishes to understand the level of consideration given to the communications plan required to deliver the project?		5	0	1	0							
		To what extent has the project proposer considered the communications plan required to deliver the project? What activities will the project proposer undertake to ensure their project is clearly communicated to residents, particularly where there maybe language barriers.	5	0			The project proposer has failed to give any consideration to a communications plan required to deliver the project	The project proposer has given partial consideration to a communications plan required to deliver the project and has provided an outline plan.	N/A	The project proposer has given full consideration to a communications plan required to deliver the project and has provided an outline plan, but has not discussed it with Recycle for London.	N/A	The project proposer has given full consideration to a communications plan required to deliver the project and has provided a comprehensive plan and has discussed it with Recycle for London	N/A
Total Score:						0							

If a zero score is received for any criteria then the project will not be considered for funding.