ARGYLL & BUTE COUNCIL

FULL BUSINESS CASE APPRAISAL WEIGHTING AND SCORING MATRIX

DEPARTMENT Community Services and D & I **SERVICE** Community & Culture and Roads & Amenity Services

PROJECT **Toilet Block and Car Park at Carradale Harbour**

Assessment	Features of Strong Projects	Features of Weak Projects	Issues to Consider	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Impact: The project will make explicit contributions to the Council's plans and strategies and will ensure compliance with external requirements				**Max. 10 Min. 0**		
Impact on Corporate Plan	Clear links to corporate plan that demonstrate how the project will contribute to strategic objectives.	Links are not clear and the relationship to strategic objectives is vague.	To encourage active and caring communities. To encourage a growing sustainable economy in Argyll & bute. Etc.	9	3.000	27.00
Impact on Service Plans	Clear links to service plans that demonstrate how the project will contribute to service priorities.	Links are not clear and the relationship to service priorities is vague.	What service priorities does this impact on? e.g. Streetscene; performance culture; recycling.etc.	5	0.400	2.00
Impact on Area Plans	Clear links to area plans that demonstrate how the project will contribute to area priorities.	Links are not clear and the relationship to area priorities is vague.	What Area priorities does this affect? e.g. Rothesay waterfront/centre; Helensburgh town centre; Jura transport initiative; Dunoon marine gateway; Oban action plan; etc.	9	0.400	3.60
Impact on Corporate Strategies	Clear links to identified corporate strategies that demonstrate how the project contributes to these.	Links are not clear and the contribution of the project is vague.	Consider relationship with:- Asset Management Strategy; ICT Strategy; Customer First Strategy; Transport Strategy; Any other overarching Council strategy.	9	0.400	3.60
Impact on Carbon Management Plan	Clear links to identified Carbon Management Plan that demonstrate how the project contributes to the Plan.	Links are not clear and the contribution of the project is vague.	Identifies improvements to assist in the achievement of Corporate targets to reduce carbon footprint	9	0.400	3.60
Impact on Compliance with Legal and National Priorities.	Compliance and national priorities clearly identified and the relationship of the project clearly demonstrated.	Vague reference to compliance issues and national priorities without specific identification of relationships.	Sustainability; Equality; Health & Safety; Environmental etc.	9	0.400	3.60
Affordability: The project is an acceptable and prudent financial investment for the Council and the Council can sytain the ongoing running costs.						
Capital costs are affordable	Net capital costs are low.	Net capital costs are high.	Points awarded on scale basis: Net cost less than £100k = 10 pts £100k to £250k = 9 points; £251k to £500k = 8 points ; £501k to £750k = 7 points ; £751k to £1m =6 points; £1 to £1.5m = 5pts; £1.5m to £2m = 4pts: £2m to £2.5m = 3pts; £2.5m to £5m = 2pts; £5m to £10m = 1pt; Over £10m. = 0 pts.	10	1.00	10.00
Ongoing revenue costs are affordable	Net revenue costs are low	Net revenue costs are high.	No impact on revenue costs equals 5 points. Increase by 1 point for every 10% decrease in revenue costs. Decrease by 1 point for every 10% increase in revenue cost.	10	1.00	10.00
External funding leveraged by the project	Significant external funding levered in	No external funding levered in.	No external funding equals 0 points. Increase of 1 point for each 10% of external funding i.e.41-50% of external funding equals 5 points.	0	0.50	0.00
Deliverability: The project can be delivered successfully.						
Timescales for delivery	The timescale for delivery is clearly stated and is acceptable.	The timescale for delivery is not clearly stated or is unacceptable.	Land acqisition; planning permission; environmental issues; level of staff input; tendering requirements.	8	0.42	3.36
Management arrangements to deliver project	The management arrangements for the project are clearly stated and are acceptable.	The management arrangements for the project are not clearly stated or are unacceptable.	Project Manager and Project Team identified and named. Extent of discussions with all parties involved	8	0.42	3.36
Residual/knock on consequences	The residual or knock on consequences of the project are clearly stated and are acceptable.	The residual or knock on consequences of the project are not clearly stated or are unacceptable.	Is the project self contained to one service? Have impacts on other services been identified and discussed?	7	0.41	2.87

Risk: Progressing the project does not expose the Council to unacceptable risk.						
What are impact risks	The risks of not making the intended impact as outlined above have been identified and are assessed as limited.	The risks of not making the intended impact as outlined above have not been identified or are assessed as significant.	What risks have been identified? How has this been carried out - is it a robust process? Are the risks significant or unpredictable?	9	0.25	2.25
What are delivery risks	The timescale, management arrangements and residual or knock on consequences have been robustly constructed and the related risks are clearly identified and are limited.	The timescale, management arrangements and residual or knock on consequences have only been compiled on a vague basis or not clearly identified or there are significant or unpredictable risks.	What risks have been identified? How has this been carried out - is it a robust process? Are the risks significant or unpredictable?	9	0.25	2.25
What are affordability risks	Robust estimates of capital and revenue cost have been made and external funding is secured. Risks have been clearly identified and assessed.	Only preliminary estimates of capital and revenue cost have been made and external funding is anticipated rather than secured. No clear assessment has been made of the financial impact of risks.	What risks have been identified? How has this been carried out - is it a robust process? Are the risks significant or unpredictable?	10	0.25	2.50
Risk Management arrangements	Robust strategies and arrangements to identify, manage and control risk developed.	No clear arrangements to manage risk	Has the approach to risk management been documented? Does it appear robust?	9	0.25	2.25
What are the risks of not proceeding with the project.	An assessment of these has been made and evidenced and there is significant risk of not proceeding with the project.	No assessment made or only vague references or limited risk of not proceeding with the project.	Have the risks been specified? What process has been used to identify them? Has this risk been assessed robustly?	8	0.25	2.00
Total Score (Maximum=100)						84.24

ARGYLL & BUTE COUNCIL

ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC BOARD

FULL BUSINESS CASE RATING

PROJECT **Toilet Block and Car Park at Carradale Harbour**

			Matrix Score
1	Executive Summary		
		Brief statement of what is proposed.	N/A
2	Impact on Council Plans		
		Corporate Plan	
		Service plans	
		Area Plans	
		Corporate Strategies	
		Carbon Management Plan	
		Compliance with National and Legal Priorities.	43.40
3	Affordability		
		Capital Costs	
		Ongoing Revenue Costs	
		External Funding	20.00
4	Deliverability		
		Timescales for deliverability	
		Management arrangements to deliver project	
		Residual/knock on consequences	9.59
5	Risk		
		Impact risks	
		Delivery risks	
		Affordability risks	
		Risk Management arrangements	
		Risk of not proceeding with project	11.25
	Total Matrix Score		84.24
Rating			

Calculation of Rating:

4 = matrix score of 80-100%
3 = matrix score of 70-79%

2 = matrix score of 60-69%
1 = matrix score of less than 60%

Comments

Add any comments on the rating of the project.

Prepared by: Peter Cupples

Reviewed by: