

Monmouthshire Food Partnership Grants Scoring Criteria

Applicant name:

Final score and decision:

Project reference (for approved projects):

Higher-tier grant applicants answer all questions. Lower-tier grant applicants answer questions 1–10 only.

Question	Funding criteria	High (2) (Significant)	Medium (1) (Reasonable)	Low (0) (Insufficient)	Score	Comments
1) Which objectives?	Do not score this question (covered below in 'What? Pt. 1')	–	–	–	–	Do not score this question
2) New, repeat, or continuity?	Do not score this question (covered below in 'What? Pt 2')	–	–	–	–	Do not score this question
3) Where?	Do not score this question (included for information / covered below in 'Who will benefit?')	–	–	–	–	
4) When?	Deliverable in timeline?	Definitely	Possibly	Unlikely		
5) Who will benefit?	Does the project reach disadvantaged communities?	Definitely	Somewhat	Unlikely		
6a) What? Pt. 1	Does project meet objectives?	Clearly meets at least one objective	Some connection to at least one objective	Relevance to objectives is unclear or weak		
<i>Continue scoring only if project scores 2 or 1 in question 6a; a score of 0 in question 6a means project is not eligible for funding.</i>						

6b) What? Pt. 2	Is the proposal deliverable as presented?	Proposed activity is deliverable and desirable	Some concerns about deliverability and/or desirability	Proposed activity is undesirable and/or not likely to be deliverable		
7) Amount requested	Does the amount requested seem sensible?	Yes, reasonable and sufficient	Some concerns about budget	Budget seems too generous or too lean		
8) Who will run?	Resilience and chances of completion	Resilient organisation with back-up if project lead's circumstances change	Some evidence of back-up, but somewhat reliant on one individual	Heavily reliant on one individual; low resilience		
9) Partners on side?	Has the applicant confirmed that the proposed partners will participate?	-	- Yes partners on side OR - N/A, solo project	Partner participation necessary but not confirmed		
10) Skills and experience	Does the group/project lead have the skills and experience to deliver the project?	Yes, ample skills and experience relevant to the project	Some concerns about capacity and/or suitability for the project	Little or no relevant skills and experience		
11) Engagement	Will the applicant be able to reach and engage with their target audience?	Yes - applicant is already engaged with target audience and/or has a convincing engagement plan	Perhaps - some evidence of an engagement plan or existing relationships	Unlikely - little/no evidence of an engagement plan or existing relationships		
12) Diversity and inclusion	Does the project promote diversity and inclusion?	Yes - project has clear plan for ensuring diversity and inclusion	Somewhat - project is open to all but has no clear plan for ensuring diversity and inclusion	No - project does not obviously promote diversity and inclusion		

13) Success criteria	Will the project be able to demonstrate success?	Yes – project has measurable success criteria and a convincing plan for gathering relevant data	Perhaps – success criteria and monitoring proposals are defined, but with some lack of clarity	Unlikely – success criteria are poorly defined and/or monitoring proposals are unsatisfactory		
14) Double funding	If there is a risk of double funding/duplication, is the risk being managed	– Low risk, OR – Moderate risk with robust mitigations	Some risk / mitigations	– High risk, OR – Moderate risk with unconvincing mitigations		
Total (higher-tier grants)		(max. 23)	(max. 12)	(0)		
Total (lower-tier grants)		(max. 15)	(max. 8)	(0)		

Scoring bands: higher tier

0–11 Refused

12–23 Approved in principle; proceed to ranking

Scoring bands: lower tier

0–7 Refused

8–15 Approved in principle; proceed to ranking

General comments

Scorer name, signature, date