

Devolution Board

Proposed Prioritisation Criteria

Criteria for prioritisation and allocation of resources to deliver devolution activity

Background

Cornwall Council's Devolution Board has supported a review of the current devolution programme. The Council manages a range of projects and responds to other issues and has limited resources in terms of money and staff time to develop and deliver such proposals. Therefore it is suggested that resources are concentrated on projects that offer the greatest level of impact across the triple-bottom line (social, economic and environment) and are those which are most likely to be deliverable. A proposal should also be assessed against the priorities identified for the Council, i.e. its 'Strategic Fit'. Partners will need to demonstrate the local 'fit' for their proposal.

This assessment framework **will not decide** which projects should / should not be delivered, but it will list projects* in a form of **priority order** which will help to decide where resources should be concentrated.

It is of course worth remembering that all projects exist in a dynamic environment, a lot of which is outside of the Council's direct control and therefore the priority order and allocation of resources should be regularly reviewed by the Board. The Board will need to determine the frequency of any prioritisation review process and understand that changes to the order of any list will potentially attract both positive and negative feedback. It is proposed that this criteria will be published for transparency and openness and to assist communities in developing their proposals.

The benefits of prioritising in this way allow the workflow to be managed with closer monitoring of progress being possible on a smaller number of projects. The aim of this approach is to make more rapid progress on any given project.

*A project is considered to be a single item proposal in a location or could be a significant element of work within a place based package of work in a location

Programme Criteria

Understanding the Strategic Fit

Devolution proposals should be assessed to identify the extent which they align with identified strategic and local priorities for Cornwall. Key strategies against which proposals may be considered include: -

- Neighbourhood plans (adopted / emerging)
- Parish plans
- Community Emergency / Flooding plans
- Cornwall Local Plan
- Housing Strategy for Cornwall
- Strategic Economic Plan – Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly
- Employment and Skills Strategy
- Infrastructure Assessment to support Local Plan
- Town Allocations/Framework Documents and adopted Neighbourhood Plans
- Cornwall Council's Strategy 2015-2020 (Closing the Gap)
- Cornwall's Environmental Growth Strategy
- Localism Strategy
- Education Strategy
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Inclusion Strategy for Cornwall
- Sustainability Transformation Plan (NHS)

Understanding Deliverability

Projects should only be endorsed where there is a clear commitment from the local Council /organisation- i.e. budget commitment and/or an agreed and recorded resolution. Once this exists then a judgment needs to be made as to the capacity to deliver the service outcome.

The Submission of an Initial Proposal Form (IPF) which has received support from the Council's Strategic Devolution Group (SDG) will assist in making an assessment of deliverability.

Local Member support for a project, support evidenced in a parish or neighbourhood plan or evidence of community consultation and support will increase scores in this area.

The demonstration of an understanding of land ownership, ground conditions and the legal position on a proposal will also help to inform the score allocated to this area of assessment.

Understanding Social measures (People)

Service continuity / enhancement / improvement and local accountability

Project assessments should consider service continuity, enhancement and improvement. This could include:

- Is the current service continuing and/or subject to a reduction of standards now or likely in the near future that the proposal could address?
- Will the proposal result in the local community having a greater control over service standards?
- Will services be provided more efficiently / effectively than they are now?
- An assessment of the extent to which the project reduces deprivation and inequalities should be undertaken, with high marks allocated to projects which focus specifically on addressing issues associated with deprivation and the reduction of inequality i.e. 'Closing the Gap'.

Understanding Environmental measures (Place)

Projects should consider the degree to which a proposal sustains and/or enhances the quality of the environment. Projects that deliver on multiple service needs or outcomes will score more highly i.e. a place based package proposals where the proposal supports the continuing delivery of more than one service will be viewed favourably. Assessments should include:

- Provision of environmental growth e.g. new biodiversity opportunities, flood alleviation
- Delivering multiple service outcomes for the community i.e. Library, open space and toilets delivered in package approach.
- Improved street scene quality

Understanding Economic measures (Prosperity)

Value for Money

An assessment of the impact on identified budgets will be required. This will in particular look at projects that are helping to deliver already identified budgets savings e.g. libraries, public conveniences.

Value for Money – long term cost avoidance / opportunist

An assessment should also take account of any long term financial considerations (future cost avoidance etc) that are not currently considered. These could include:

- identified backlog maintenance
- future capital replacement costs – play equipment, car park resurfacing
- potential to draw in external funding

Employment / jobs / skills

The project should be assessed to consider:

- potential for local jobs / upskilling / training
- potential for local suppliers / SMEs

Scoring Matrix – Project name:

Date of assessment:

Score	0	1	2	3	4	5	Comments to support score given
Strategic fit and deliverability assessment							
Strategic Fit	No evidence of fit with any of the identified strategies	Reasonable fit evidenced with one identified strategy	Reasonable fit evidenced with more than one of the identified strategies	Excellent fit evidenced with one of the identified strategies	Excellent fit evidenced with more than one of the identified strategies	Excellent fit evidenced with the majority of identified strategies	
Score achieved							
Deliverability	No delivery plan, IPF, funding identified or group/council commitment in place. Serious barriers to delivery identified	No delivery plan in place, some barriers to delivery identified, some of which are major	Delivery plan in place, IPF supported but with some barriers to delivery identified, none of which are major	Delivery plan in place, IPF supported, group / council support evidenced with some barriers to delivery identified, none of which are major	Delivery plan in place, IPF supported, funding in place and evidence of group support for proposal with minor barriers to deliverability only	Detailed delivery plan in place, IPF supported, funding in place and recorded group commitment to proposal with no identified barriers to deliverability	
Score achieved							
People based assessment							
Impact on Service provision	The project has a negative impact on the provision of a service	The project will retain some service provision albeit at a lower level or standard than the current provision	The project seeks to safeguard the current level of service provision	The project seeks to extend the service provision in a limited way	The project seeks to extend the service provision in a substantive way.	The project seeks to deliver a service in a transformative way that adds value.	
Score achieved							
Impact on Deprivation and Inequalities (Closing the Gap)	The project increases deprivation and/or widens inequalities in Cornwall	The project does not impact on reducing deprivation and inequalities in Cornwall	The project has a minimal impact on reducing deprivation and inequalities within a specific area of	The project has a minimal impact on reducing deprivation and inequalities within multiple areas of	The project can close the gap in inequalities and/or deprivation within a specific	The project can close the gap in inequalities and/or deprivation within multiple areas of Cornwall	

			Cornwall	Cornwall	area of Cornwall		
Score achieved							
Place based assessment							
Enhancement of the local environmental quality	Proposal has a negative effect on local environmental quality	Proposal does not evidence any change to the quality of the local environment	Proposal makes a minimal improvement to the local environmental quality	Proposal provides a degree of improvement to the local environmental quality	Proposal provides a significant improvement to the local environmental quality	Proposal creates new/additional environmental growth.	
Score achieved							
Multiple service(s) outcomes	Proposal has a negative effect on service outcomes	Proposal has a limited positive effect on one service	Proposal has a limited effect on more than one service outcome	Proposal has a substantial effect on one service outcome	Proposal has a substantial effect on more than one service outcome	Proposal has a substantial effect on several service outcomes	
Score achieved							
Prosperity based assessment							
Economic enhancement (Jobs created, safeguarded and / or numbers of volunteers engaged)	No evidence provided to show that the proposal delivers economic enhancement i.e. the status quo	Proposal provides limited evidence of having a minor impact but identifies risks to doing so i.e. small increase in turnover dependant on having a good summer season	Proposal provides limited evidence of having a minor impact with no risks identified i.e. small increase in turnover as a result of increased local effort to capture a larger customer base	Proposal provides clear evidence supporting limited growth claims. i.e. the proposal will create a job(s) and / or use volunteers as a result of its delivery	Proposal provides clear evidence supporting a higher level of growth claim. i.e. the proposal will result in a number of new posts / increase in footfall and / or creates a number of volunteer opportunities	Proposal provides clear evidence supporting a significant level of growth. i.e. the proposal will result in a significant uplift in users and resulting income, a number of employment opportunities and /or larger numbers of volunteer opportunities	
Score achieved							
Value for Money	Significant negative return or very high level of financial risk	Minor negative return but with significant elements of financial risk	Break-even for with low or moderate levels of financial risk	Minor saving or commercial return on investment with low level of financial risk i.e saving up to	Medium level of saving, with low level of financial risk i.e.£1,000 - £5,000	Significant saving, with low levels of financial risk i.e saving in excess of £5,000	

				£1,000			
Score achieved							
Value for Money (future cost avoidance)	Negative future cost avoidance	Proposal does not demonstrate any future cost avoidance	Proposal identifies potential future cost avoidance but cannot evidence as such	Proposal evidences limited future cost avoidance	Proposal evidences a greater level of future cost avoidance	Proposal will provide substantial opportunity for future costs avoidance	
Score achieved							

Weighting

Scores for the different criteria above should be weighted to reflect their relative importance.

Deliverability is given the highest weighting of 2, as this is seen as the most important requirement for a successful proposal. Strategic fit is a fundamental requirement. When the system is being trialled, weightings could be adjusted to produce the appropriate relative significance of the different criteria.

Example Weighted Scores – Devolution Board

Once the project has been scored against each of the agreed five headline criteria, a weighted overall score should be produced, utilising the table below. The overall weighted score is out of 35 points and further work, including the trialling of the system, is required to understand the required thresholds for investment.

Criterion	Score (0-5)	Weighting (fixed)	Actual Weighted Score
Strategic Fit	3	1	3
Deliverability	3	2	6
People	3	1	3
Place	3	1	3
Prosperity	4	1	4
Total			19/30