**Farming in Protected Landscapes programme: Scoring**

**Introduction**

To determine whether a proposed application will deliver sufficient benefit to be supported, it should be judged against the assessment criteria below. Protected Landscapes can only score what is demonstrated in the content of the application.

The scoring process looks at four criteria; project outcomes, value for money, sustainability / legacy of projects and ability to deliver.

All projects funded must support the local priorities/management plans of the Protected Landscape in which they are being delivered. Applications should not progress if they do not support these priorities/plans.

Protected Landscape teams should ensure that when processing applications they are making appropriate due diligence checks against applications. Defra acknowledges that the Protected Landscapes are the delivery bodies for this programme and that the checks could result in a Protected Landscape body not being able to support an application at the current time, for instance if the authority is in dispute with the applicant on other matters.

**Scoring**

When assessing any project against the Project Outcomes scoring criteria, only the elements being directly funded through FiPL can be scored against.

The appropriate score should be circled for each criterion and the scores totalled up at the end to provide an aggregate score.

* 2: not demonstrated
* 4: one or more significant gaps in demonstration
* 6: some demonstration
* 8: shows good levels of assurance and demonstration
* 10: shows high levels of assurance and demonstration

Each criterion has been weighted.

1. Project outcomes (40%)
2. Ability to deliver (20%)
3. Sustainability / legacy of projects (20%)
4. Value for Money (20%)

**Decisions**

Projects should not be supported unless they achieve a score of at least 6 against each criterion to achieve the baseline minimum. This will ensure that all projects deliver a meaningful and worthwhile outcome and will ensure consistency across all Protected Landscapes.

Users should then use the aggregate score along with the weighting of each criterion to determine how to allocate resource between competing proposals which have passed the baseline minimum. A spreadsheet is attached in Annex T to support this.

This scoring template should be used by:

* The Protected Landscape officer making an initial judgement of the project prior to the Local Assessment Panel (all projects with a total fund request over £10,000 should be taken to the Local Assessment Panel regardless of this initial score)
* The Local Assessment making the final decision on projects to fund
* The Protected Landscape officer making funding decisions for projects with a total fund request of under £10,000

**Scoring Criteria**

1. **The project**

Projects should score highly, dependent on:

* the extent to which the project demonstrates that it is maximising the opportunity of the project to deliver outcomes across the themes of the programme
* the extent to which the project demonstrates that it will contribute towards the Protected Landscape’s management plan / priorities
* the extent to which the project demonstrates that it will deliver the outcomes of the programme:
	+ For Climate
		- more carbon being stored, sequestered or both
		- reduced flood risk
		- a better understanding among farmers, land managers and the public as to what different habitats and land uses can deliver for carbon storage and reduced carbon emissions
		- a landscape that’s more resilient to climate change
	+ For Nature:
		- a greater area of wildlife-rich habitat
		- greater connectivity between habitats
		- better management of existing habitats for biodiversity
		- increased biodiversity
	+ For People
		- more opportunities for people to explore, enjoy and understand the landscape
		- more opportunities for diverse audiences to explore, enjoy and understand the landscape
		- greater public engagement in land management, for example through volunteering
	+ For Place
		- enhancing or reinforcing the quality and character of the landscape
		- historic structures and features being conserved, enhanced or interpreted more effectively
		- an increase in the resilience of nature-friendly sustainable farm businesses, which contributes to a more thriving local economy (it must deliver this along with other outcomes)
* the extent to which the project maximises the opportunity to work with other farmers and land managers to deliver outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |

1. **Ability to deliver**

Projects should score highly if they:

* demonstrate clearly the resources available to enable delivery of the FiPL project to the required standard necessary to deliver the FiPL project outcomes.
* show the roles of those involved in the project, demonstrating how they will contribute to the project’s delivery
* demonstrate a clear capability to deliver the FiPL project in the timeframe required
* demonstrate that the steps taken to deliver the project are appropriate and achievable
* demonstrate how they will measure the progress of the project in meeting the intended FiPL outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |

1. **Sustainability / legacy of projects**

Projects should score highly if they:

* demonstrate that the project outcomes will have a lasting positive impact for the Protected Landscape and others once the programme of funding concludes
* demonstrate how the project will continue to maintain and build on the FiPL programme themes for the longer term.
* demonstrate an increase in sustainable farm business resilience

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |

1. **Value for Money**

A strong approach to delivering value for money should be demonstrated throughout the whole application.

Projects should only score highly if they:

* are the most cost-effective way of delivering the desired FiPL outcomes
* are able to justify the need for the bespoke purchase, where appropriate
* clearly demonstrate the project costs with evidence to support the costs (e.g., alignment to other Defra payment rates and with comparative quotes provided)
* demonstrate why FiPL is the most effective route to funding to achieve the project outcomes
* are seeking an intervention rate that is the minimum necessary to deliver the project outcomes.
* are making use of additional funding sources, such as match funding, where appropriate

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |