DD2705 Appendix B
CPP Exemplar Application Appraisal Process

Appraisal scoring criteria

Project and strategic objectives	40%
Description of project	10%
Expanding London's public realm	10%
Increasing authorship and representation in built environment	10%
Addressing climate and ecological emergencies	10%
Deliverability	**30%**
Team, management, collaboration	10%
Milestones and funding	10%
Risks	10%
Value for money	**30%**
Deliverables	10%
Leveraging in additional funding and support to deliver CPP Strategy	10%
Legacy and evaluation	10%

Appraisal scoring guidance
This approach has been developed based on previous Good Growth Fund appraisal structure and guidance.

Section 1 – Project & Strategic Objectives (40%)

What is it they want to do, where are they planning to do it, and what is the rationale for the project? The best applications will show a good fit with the aims of CPP and will have clearly defined outputs and outcomes. The application should demonstrate an understanding of the target community and place and the extent to which proposed delivery meets their needs. Can they deliver high-quality provision/activities and outcomes? What sort of contribution will they make to strategic objectives of expanding public realm, increasing authorship and representation in the built environment and addressing climate and ecological emergencies?

1. Expanding the public realm
We want to see projects that are creating open, high quality, connected and inclusive public spaces, high streets and green and blue spaces. These should be child-friendly and safe for women, girls, and gender-diverse people. The project should also nurture welcoming social and cultural infrastructure, managed by public and private partners.

2. Strengthening representation and authorship in physical regeneration
We want to see projects that are delivering projects for and with the communities they serve, particularly people from Black and minoritised communities, and younger and older Londoners; and making the relationship-building and capacity-building outcomes the focus and driver of innovation in the area.

3. Addressing the climate and ecological emergencies
Strengthening London's climate resilience and tackling environmental inequalities, with resource-conscious approaches such as encouraging a circular economy.

- Is this a suitable CPP project?
- How well does the application meet the fund objectives?

- Has the applicant demonstrated an understanding of the context?
- What is the market failure rationale, and why this response?
- Have they recognised wider opportunities and where there is local enthusiasm and the desire to work together?
- Is there something innovative or exemplary proposed?

Section 2 - Deliverability (30%)

How can we be confident that the project will be a success? Applications should have a clear plan, underpinned by evidence of relevant capacity and skills in the team to deliver on time and budget. Exemplary projects will include an indication of effective collaborative working and/or the intention to work in partnership and the ability and resource to implement, manage, monitor and deliver the project on time and to the desired standard.

- Has the applicant convinced you they can deliver the project?
- Are milestones realistic?
- Do they own or have access to the site? Can they get access?
- Has all planning and preparation time been included?
- How secure is the match? Is borrowing likely to be secured?
- Has a reasonable narrative been provided about mitigating risks?
- Response to EDI template

Section 3 - Value for money (30%)

Does the project make optimal use of resources to achieve a high-quality result? Good applications should include a clear description that demonstrates all costs associated with the project have been identified. Are the outputs and outcomes proportionate to a project of this scale and does the project compliment other investment or regeneration happening in this area. Value for money is not just about achieving the lowest price; the greater weight will be given to the delivery of high-quality projects. In some instances, applications may not include detailed information on costing as a project may be in the development stage, so innovation and/or the social benefits of the project should be considered.

- Does the project make optimal use of resources to achieve outputs and outcomes?
- Are all costs associated with the project identified? Are they reasonable? Are they proportionate to the outputs/outcomes?
- Why is CPP exemplar funding needed? Would the project happen otherwise? What does CPP achieve? Is genuine match levered in?
- What is the long-term future for the project? Is there a legacy in place?
- How will they evaluate the impact of the intervention, and is there resource in place to do so?
- How is the project part of the long term CPP strategy?
- Is there strong case-making and secure match funding to support and deliver the CPP Strategy objectives?
- Social value template considered in this section.

Policy leads supporting appraisal of CPP exemplar applications

GLA & TfL Teams engaged for comments on applications:
- Regeneration & Growth Strategies

- Design Unit
- TfL Spatial & Growth Strategies
- Community Social Policy
- Transport & Environment
- Culture Creative Industry & 24 Hour London
- Economic Development

Policy leads were asked to provide written feedback on the applications, coordinated by a team lead. This feedback highlighted areas of strength, weakness and opportunities; and indicated where these overlap with other work undertaken in this geography or share similar themes. Access to the OPS applications was provided to the policy leads to review. An Excel comments tracker was shared with all policy leads, with each team contributing to their team's response. This collated their insights and perspectives as short commentary and was included into the appraisal-scoring Excel ahead of being shared with area officers to input scores.

Policy leads were invited to comment on all applications, though area officers signposted some teams towards applications that may be of relevance. Policy leads were welcome to share the invitation to comment within their team, where they were not already invited, but they were reminded that this was a competitive appraisal process, and all documentation was to be treated as confidential.