

# Loved and Wanted Fund assessment framework

Guidance on how applications are assessed

## Key information

Publication type: Funding prospectus

Publication date: Wednesday 17 September 2025

## Contents

[Overview](#)

[Scoring process](#)

[Due diligence](#)

[Scoring EOI applications](#)

[Checking eligibility](#)

[Assessing scored questions](#)

[Scoring matrix](#)

[Panel review and moderation](#)

[Holistic review](#)

[Scoring Stage 2 applications](#)

[Assessing scored questions](#)

[Applying added points](#)

[Panel review and moderation](#)

[Due diligence and impartiality checks](#)

[Next steps](#)

## 1. Overview

As outlined in the [fund guidance](#), the Loved and Wanted Fund has a two-stage application assessment process.

First, all applicants must submit an [Expression of Interest \(EOI\) application](#) by **Sunday 19 October 2025 at 11:59 pm** to be considered for a grant.

The top-scoring applicants will be invited to submit a **Stage 2 application**. Selections at this stage will determine who receives a funding award. We will carry forward a maximum of 45 proposals to Stage 2 for approximately **15 awards**. This is to keep the odds of receiving an award at 1 in 3 or better.

This page outlines our approach to assessing applications received at each stage.

## 1.1 Scoring process

All applications will be reviewed by a panel of Greater London Authority (GLA) staff, who will assess project quality and alignment with the programme objectives:

- Officers from within the GLA Community Engagement team will carry out initial checks to verify that the applicant meets the [eligibility requirements](#), before sharing the EOI with scorers.
- Each application will be assessed by two independent scorers. Where a conflict of interest arises, the application will be passed to a different scorer.
- Scorers will mark applications against set [criteria](#) on a [5-point scale](#) and may apply additional [points for added value](#).
- There will be a panel meeting week commencing Monday 10 November where scorers will moderate marks and decide which applications should be taken forward to Stage 2.

## 1.2 Due diligence

We will use separate due diligence assessments to ensure organisations are in good financial standing and have robust governance arrangements in place. Where a proposal would be delivered collaboratively, applicants must also have well considered partnership agreements.

**We will use Spotlight, an automated due diligence service provided by the UK Government Cabinet Office.** This compares the data you provide with various databases, such as Companies House, to ensure the validity of applications. Spotlight does not perform any automated decision-making. As part of its fraud checking and prevention capabilities, Spotlight may also share data with government bodies, including government departments, arm's-length bodies and local authorities. The authorisation for processing this data is outlined in the Cabinet Office's [privacy notice for Spotlight](#).

**We will also verify that applicants brought forward to Stage 2 operate within strict impartiality standards.** This means they uphold non-party political engagement and communication and cross-party representation, informed by charity and electoral law. We will not fund organisations that are directly connected to a specific politician, political party or campaign, without adequate explanation to demonstrate how they remain impartial despite this.

## 2. Scoring EOI applications

There are three steps to the first stage of the application assessment:

1. Checking eligibility
2. Assessing scored questions
3. Panel review and moderation

These steps progress an EOI from initial eligibility screening through to scoring (marking) and moderation.

## 2.1 Checking eligibility

Officers from within the GLA Community Engagement team will carry out an initial check to verify that the applicant fully meets the [eligibility requirements](#). Where an applicant does not meet all eligibility requirements, they will be notified, and their application will not be considered for funding.

Table 1: Eligibility requirements

Criteria	Steps
1. Is the lead applicant a <b>civil society sector organisation</b> (a voluntary, community, arts and culture or faith-based organisation)?	If yes, proceed to 2. If no, reject on this basis.
2. Does the organisation have one of the following <b>legal structures</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Registered charity</li><li>○ Charitable incorporated organisation</li><li>○ Community interest company</li><li>○ Other not-for-profit company limited by guarantee (e.g. social enterprises)</li><li>○ Community benefit society (CBS)</li></ul>	If yes, proceed to 3. If no, reject on this basis.
3. Does the organisation operate from a <b>known, visible space</b> that is open to Londoners? Do they rent, own, or have formal written permission to operate out of this space until March 2028?  The venue they operate needs to be visible, open and known to local people. There can be a plan to grow this visibility across the grant programme.	If yes, proceed to 4. If no, reject on this basis.
4. Has the organisation operated in the <b>same local area for the past 5 years</b> ?	If yes, proceed to 5. If no, reject on this basis.

Criteria	Steps
5. Does the organisation have a <b>UK bank or building society account</b> with at least two unrelated signatories into which the grant could be paid?	If yes, proceed to 6. If no, reject on this basis.
6. Was the organisation's <b>annual turnover between £100k and £10m</b> in the 2024/25 financial year?	If yes, proceed to 7. If no, reject on this basis.
7. Does the applicant <b>work with and/or within different communities</b> impacted by financial hardship, social exclusion or structural inequalities and are they <b>willing to work across communities of faith</b> ?	If yes, assign to scorers. If no, reject on this basis.

## 2.2 Assessing scored questions

**The scoring criteria** are the factors we use to assess all applications and decide which best align with the goals of the Loved and Wanted Fund. There are **eight scoring criteria**.

Whilst the EOI form has eight scored questions, these questions do not directly correspond to each criteria. Instead, your responses to some questions may provide evidence to support multiple criteria. In the EOI form, the scoring criteria are noted below each question to indicate which criteria we're looking for in strong responses.

Table 2: Scoring criteria

Criteria	Indicators
<b>1. Rooted in the community</b>  Understands the local people and place as well as their own positioning.	<b>Local knowledge:</b> Shows a strong understanding of who is in their neighbourhood and the shared resources and values within it. Along with this, demonstrates an understanding of local needs.  <b>Representative:</b> Demonstrates that staff and/or board reflect the diversity of the local area.  <b>Embedded:</b> Evidences that their organisation and its work are integrated into the local 'ecosystem' and/or 'social fabric' and trusted by local people.

Criteria	Indicators
<p><b>2. Proven track record</b></p> <p>Demonstrates existing impact on social cohesion.</p>	<p><b>Relevant experience:</b> Shows experience of working to strengthen community relations and/or address barriers to Londoners' participation in community life.</p> <p><b>Sees big picture:</b> Understands the complexities of working across communities, especially where socioeconomic, ethnic and faith backgrounds differ.</p> <p><b>Delivers impact:</b> Shows strong impact of current work on social cohesion.</p>
<p><b>3. Broad reach and effective engagement</b></p> <p>Responsibly reaches and empowers diverse communities.</p>	<p><b>Broad reach:</b> Already supports multiple communities who face barriers to feeling loved and wanted, working from within or alongside them to build voice and agency.</p> <p><b>Effective engagement:</b> Demonstrates effective methods of engaging people across the local area. They work in a way that encourages community participation and respects different voices and needs.</p> <p><b>Co-designed offer:</b> There is a plan to work alongside local people to design and co-deliver impactful activity. This includes space to adapt offer to meet emerging needs or, where they exist, the complex needs of specific groups of Londoners.</p>
<p><b>4. Collaborative capacity</b></p> <p>Committed to working in partnership for systems change.</p>	<p><b>Existing partnerships:</b> Has existing partnerships and relationships with wider civil society and faith sector, locally and regionally, and actively participates in relevant networks. It also has a clear plan to expand partnerships, including with (inter)faith organisations that will support reach and impact at scale.</p> <p><b>Realistic plan for cross-sector collaboration:</b> Articulates how they would work with the GLA and/or local authority to build relationships and improve Londoners' access to the services that address inequalities.</p> <p><b>Clear role in systems change:</b> They articulate the clear role they play in improving social cohesion. This acknowledges the value they bring to the larger system of actors in their local area and in London.</p>

Criteria	Indicators
<p><b>5. Alignment with the Loved and Wanted campaign</b></p> <p>Values-led, with the vision and visibility to amplify the message of the Loved and Wanted campaign.</p>	<p><b>Values-led:</b> The organisation champions Loved and Wanted values (unity and togetherness, respect, belonging, value of diversity) in its work and would be an effective ambassador for the Mayor's campaign.</p> <p><b>Contributes to campaign:</b> It is clear how the organisation will contribute to the communications and public relations aspects of the Loved and Wanted campaign, working to amplify the positive message it sends to Londoners.</p>
<p><b>6. Strength of proposed Loved and Wanted offer</b></p> <p>Evidence on social cohesion has been used to design a creative offer, capable of delivering results for all Londoners in the local area.</p>	<p><b>Evidence based and creative approach:</b> Outlines a compelling vision for re-designing and/or enhancing current provision to achieve the objectives. The outputs they propose clearly address both social connection and access to services.</p> <p><b>Results driven:</b> There is a clear method in place to measure the results of all funded activity. Impact has been considered in terms of engagement and reach, potential to improve social cohesion, and effect on the local system.</p> <p><b>Accessible to all:</b> There is a clear plan to reach more local people (from different communities) through the Loved and Wanted offer. Where appropriate, this includes a consideration of any accessibility requirements for those who may participate.</p>
<p><b>7. Programme plan and management</b></p> <p>There are the resources, capacity and planning in place to deliver a realistic set of outputs across the fund.</p>	<p><b>Clear plan:</b> It is clear how the applicant would deliver their proposed offer, and they have included key milestones and dates. Roles of all partners are clearly identified and, where this relationship is formalised, is a partnership agreement in place.</p> <p><b>Realistic:</b> The proposed scope and timing of activities is well considered and realistic. Where requested, risks have been identified across the course of the programme, alongside mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Sustained resources and capacity:</b> Processes are in place to protect resources and capacity to deliver across (and perhaps beyond) the life of the programme. There are plans in place to ensure continuity amidst staff and/or volunteer turnover. This includes both resources and capacity for delivery of the Loved and Wanted offer, in addition to those needed for participation in the larger grantee network.</p>

Criteria	Indicators
<p><b>8. Budget</b></p> <p>Costs are outlined clearly and with budget lines being proportionate, realistic and fair.</p>	<p><b>Balanced (adds up):</b> The budget clearly aligns with all costs associated with the activities and resources mentioned in the project plan, as well as staff and/or volunteer costs or other relevant costs. Costs are eligible and overheads do not exceed 30% of the total grant amount.</p> <p><b>Proportionate:</b> The amount of funding requested reflects the size of the community being reached, geographic scope of delivery, and methods used to engage communities.</p> <p><b>Realistic:</b> The budget is specific, well researched and realistic, given the local context. It is suitable for the work being delivered in the programme's timescale.</p> <p><b>Fair:</b> Staff salaries are in line with the London Living Wage.</p>

### 2.2.1 Scoring matrix

The scoring matrix shows our marking scheme – we use this to quantify how well an application meets each scoring criterion. Each of the 8 scoring criteria are marked from **0 to 5**.

Table 3: Scoring matrix

Mark	Descriptor	Rationale
<b>0</b>	Unacceptable	The response <b>does not meet the requirements</b> of the criterion, or <b>insufficient information</b> has been provided so the scorer cannot assess performance.
<b>1</b>	Poor (Strong reservations)	Based on the information provided, there are <b>strong reservations</b> about the applicant's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, or resources in relation to this criterion. There is <b>little or no evidence</b> to support the response.
<b>2</b>	Some reservations	The applicant has demonstrated some ability, but <b>there are reservations</b> about their understanding, experience or skills in relation to the criterion – or <b>organisational resources seem inadequate</b> to fully deliver in this area.
<b>3</b>	Meets requirements	The applicant has demonstrated the <b>relevant</b> ability, understanding, resources and skills to deliver the requirements of the criterion. Where claims are made, they are <b>supported by evidence</b> .
<b>4</b>	Good	The applicant has demonstrated <b>above average</b> ability, understanding, experience, skills and resources required to deliver against the criterion. The organisation's background and/or proposed offer would provide <b>potential added value</b> , and there is <b>compelling evidence</b> to support this.
<b>5</b>	Exceptional	The applicant has demonstrated <b>exceptional, relevant</b> ability, understanding, experience, skills and resources to deliver in this area. The organisation's background and proposal evidence both the <b>strong potential to add value</b> and a <b>commitment to continuous improvement</b> in the criterion under consideration.

After they are scored, each application will have received **a mark out of 40 total points** (up to 5 points for each of the 8 criteria). This is the initial overall score. Scorers then submit this score for panel review and moderation.

## 2.3 Panel review and moderation

At a panel meeting **week commencing Monday 10 November**, scorers will discuss applications in the round and moderate marks. This process ensures fairness in assessment and mitigates against the risk that personal variations in marking lead to systematic down-marking of otherwise strong proposals. Together, scorers will make final recommendations for the proposals brought to Stage 2 on the basis of adjusted overall scores.

### 2.3.1 Holistic review

Drawing from the pool of top-scoring applications, officers from within the Community Engagement team will assemble a final pool of 30 to 45 applications to take to Stage 2.

This final pool will be selected to ensure:

- **geographic balance** (e.g. inner, outer London and pan-London coverage)
- **broad reach** (positively impacting on a range of Londoners)
- **representation of 'beneficiary' groups** (seeking to ensure that, collectively, the 15 venues reach Londoners from different ethnic, social and faith backgrounds).

## 3. Scoring Stage 2 applications

The scoring process works slightly differently at Stage 2. This is because we ask for a greater level of depth from question responses. In the Stage 2 application, we include questions on topics that are not explored at EOI stage, such as match funding and long-term legacy.

There are four steps in the Stage 2 assessment:

1. Assessing scored questions
2. Applying added points
3. Panel review and moderation
4. Due diligence and impartiality checks

The assessment will be carried out directly by Engagement Team officers. This will include the staff who oversee the grants programme.

### 3.1 Assessing scored questions

As with EOI assessment, Stage 2 application review will involve marking scored responses against the [scoring criteria](#). There remain **40 marks available** for the overall initial score (up to 5 marks for each of the 8 criteria).



## 3.2 Applying added points

An **additional 9 points** are available on the basis of added value at Stage 2. These assessments are made on the basis of responses provided to questions around project legacy, match funding, and collaboration.

The corresponding points will be awarded if, in the scorer's view, the applicant's proposal demonstrates added value in any of the following areas:

Table 4: Points for added value

Points awarded	Area of added value	Awarding basis
<b>3</b>	<b>Long-term legacy</b>  The organisation's proposal would deliver a compelling, long-term legacy for social cohesion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If yes, award 3 points</li></ul> The legacy must be clearly articulated, evidenced, and sustained after funding ends.
<b>2 to 3</b>	<b>Match funding</b>  There is a financial commitment from other secure and reputable sources to support the applicant's proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Up to 20% match</b>, award 2 points</li><li>• <b>21 to 30% match</b>, award 2 points</li></ul> We will cap match funding at 30%. This is to ensure organisations can deliver at least 70% of their work with the amount provided through the Loved and Wanted Fund.
<b>3</b>	<b>Interfaith working</b>  The proposed programme would enable different faith groups in the local area to work together.	 If the programme of work brings together a partnership consisting of bodies representing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>2 different faiths</b>, award 1 point</li><li>• <b>3 different faiths</b>, award 2 points</li><li>• <b>4 or more different faiths</b>, award 3 points</li></ul>

Scorers will recommend these points be added, submitting total added-value marks alongside their initial overall score (out of 40).

## 3.3 Panel review and moderation

Scorers will come together to review and moderate scores. Scores may be adjusted where one reviewer has marked more harshly (or leniently) than the others. Final adjusted scores will be used to select the 15 proposals for funding.

## 3.4 Due diligence and impartiality checks

All grantees must undergo a **financial due diligence assessment**, performed by the GLA's Finance team, prior to receipt of funding.

Before these checks, an initial due diligence assessment and impartiality check will be carried out by Engagement Team officers.

These checks are carried out on a pass/fail basis. This means that where applicants are found to be in violation of our standards around financial, governance procedures or impartiality, we cannot fund them. Instead, the next highest scoring application will be brought forward for consideration.

## 4. Next steps

All applicants will be notified of their EOI outcome by **Friday 14 November 2025**.

Those who have been successful at EOI stage will be invited to submit a Stage 2 application. This will be sent to applicants in a Word document via email.

Applicants will have four weeks to finalise and submit their Stage 2 application. We will select up to 15 proposals for funding at this final stage. **All applicants who submit a Stage 2 application will receive written feedback, regardless of outcome.**

Decisions to award grant funding are made as part of a formal process and cannot be appealed.

As a reminder, you must not rely on the GLA's support until:

- you have been invited to complete a Stage 2 application and submitted that (separate) form
- you have been formally notified, in writing, that your Stage 2 application has been successful
- your authorised signatory (or signatories) has executed and returned a funding agreement.

Have questions about this process? Please email our team at [civilsociety@london.gov.uk](mailto:civilsociety@london.gov.uk). We're happy to chat!

[Back to table of contents](#)