

---

# **2018 SPORTS CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

## **SCORING SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES**

## SUMMARY OF SCORING & WEIGHTING

### Criteria 1 Likelihood of increasing participation and/or improving performance (weighting 3)

Score	Comment
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The positive impact of this project on participation or performance is not clear.</li> <li>Membership fees are relatively high</li> <li>The area is well served with facilities</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a minor impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>The applicant/area has a good range of facilities</li> <li>Membership fees are relatively high.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a minor impact on participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>The applicant/area has a good range of facilities already</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>The applicant/area has a good range of facilities</li> <li>The membership fees are relatively high.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>The applicant/area has a good range of facilities already</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>The applicant/area has a limited range of facilities already</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>The area/applicant has good facilities</li> <li>The membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>The membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>The area/applicant has good facilities</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups.</li> <li>The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> <li>The area/applicant has good facilities.</li> <li>Membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups given.</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> <li>• The area/applicant has good facilities</li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a basic level of facilities</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a basic level of facilities</li> <li>• Membership fees are modest</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> </ul>

**Criteria 2: Sharing of facilities (weighting 5)**

Score	Comment
0	Sharing mentioned in application but no licence agreement provided / licence agreement provided does not meet requirements of the SCP (see appendix 3 of guide to making an application).
1	Licence agreement provided which shows sharing with 1 other group
3	Licence agreement(s) provided which shows sharing with at least 2 other groups

**Criteria 3 Level of socio-economic disadvantage in the area (weighting 7)  
(note: score to be allocated automatically according to Pobal Deprivation Index<sup>1</sup>)**

Score	Comments
0	Pobal index above 10
1	Pobal index of deprivation of 1 to 10
2	Pobal index of deprivation of 0 to -5
3	Pobal index of deprivation of -6 to -10
4	Pobal index of deprivation of -11 to -20
5	Pobal index of deprivation -21 or below

**Criteria 4 Technical merits of the project (weighting 3)**

Score	Comments
0	Quotation(s) is basic or with no breakdown of the elements of the project.
1	Quotation(s) is detailed and clearly sets out cost of each part of project or planning permission has been applied for
3	Planning permission has been acquired or the template signed by the local authority or technical supervisor to show that it is not needed but quotation(s) is basic with no breakdown of the elements of the project, or good quotations and planning permission has been applied for or the project consists of equipment only with no detailed breakdown of the equipment being sought
5	Planning permission has been acquired or the template signed by the local authority or technical supervisor to show that it is not needed and quotation(s) is detailed and clearly sets out cost of each part of project or the project consists of equipment only with a detailed breakdown of the equipment being sought

<sup>1</sup> For more details of on the Pobal Index see <https://www.pobal.ie/launch-of-2016-pobal-hp-deprivation-index/>

### Criteria 5 Level of own funding available (weighting 1)

Points	Pobal Index above 10	Pobal Index 1 – 10	Pobal Index 0 to -5	Pobal Index -6 to -10)	Pobal Index -11 to -20	Pobal Index below -21
<b>0</b>	<14 % or 14%-16.99% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan	<10% or 10% - 11.99% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan	<8% or 8%-9.99% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan	5%-6.49% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan	5%-5.99% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan	5%-5.49% but a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan
<b>1</b>	14% - 15.99%	10% - 11.99%	8%-9.99%	5%-6.49%	5%-5.99%	5%-5.49%
<b>2</b>	16% - 17.99%	12% - 13.99%	10%-11.99%	6.5%-7.99%	6%-6.99%	5.5%-5.99%
<b>3</b>	18% - 19.99%	14% - 15.99%	12%-13.99%	8%-9.49%	7%-7.99%	6%-6.49%
<b>4</b>	20% - 21.99%	16% - 17.99%	14%-15.99%	9.5%-10.99%	8%-8.99%	6.5%-6.99%
<b>5</b>	22% - 23.99%	18% - 19.99%	16%-17.99%	11%-12.99%	9%-9.99%	7%-7.99%
<b>6</b>	24% - 25.99%	20% - 21.99%	18%-19.99%	13%-14.99%	10%-10.99%	8%-8.99%
<b>7</b>	26% - 27.99%	22% - 23.99%	20%-21.99%	15%-17.49%	11%-11.99%	9%-9.99%
<b>8</b>	28% - 29.99%	24% - 25.99%	22%-23.99%	17.5%-19.99%	12%-12.99%	10%-10.99%
<b>9</b>	30% - 31.99%	26%-27.99%	24%-25.99%	20%-22.49%	13%-13.99%	11%-11.99%
<b>10</b>	32% - 33.99%	28% - 29.99%	26%-27.99%	22.5%-24.99%	14%-15.99%	12%-12.99%
<b>11</b>	34% - 35.99%	30% - 31.99%	28%-29.99%	25%-27.49%	16%-17.99%	13%-13.99%
<b>12</b>	36% - 37.99%	32% - 33.99%	30%-31.99%	27.5%-29.99%	18%-19.99%	14%-14.99%

<b>13</b>	38%+	34%+	32%+	30%+	20%+	15%+
-----------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Where the own funding is almost entirely (i.e. more than 80%) comprised of a loan the score should be reduced manually by 1 and the following wording can be added – **“a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan”**

Local Authorities to be scored the way same as all other projects.

**Criteria 6 Level of Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years (weighting 3)**

Score	Comments (includes grants allocated in or after 2009)
0	More than €250,000 in Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
1	€200,000 - €249,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
2	€160,000 - €199,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
3	€130,000 - €159,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
4	€100,000 - €129,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
5	€80,000 - €99,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
6	€65,000 - €79,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
7	€50,000 - €64,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
8	€35,000 - €49,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
9	€25,000 - €34,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
10	€15,000 - €24,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
11	€10,000 - €14,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
12	€5,000 - €9,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
13	€0 - €4,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years

**Score to be halved where applicant has more than €100,000 in outstanding grants dating to four years ago or earlier.**

## PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR STAFF ASSESSING 2018 APPLICATIONS

- **No meetings are to be arranged by any official** with applicants in relation to the 2018 Programme while the assessment process is on-going.
- Day-to-day work, in particular work on the payment of grants, FOI and PQs and non-compliance, must also be prioritised during the assessment period.
- **ETB applications.** Several ETBs span more than one county. In these cases the application is being considered for the county in which the project is located and not where the head office of the ETB is located. This information is collected on the application form and the view used for reviewing will list the project location county.
- Regular assessment meetings of staff in SCP Division will be used to discuss any issues that arise during the assessment period. **This manual may be updated during the assessment period as required.**

### *Withdrawal of applications*

- Applicants may withdraw their application but this must be done in writing by the club contact. These requests should be attached to the application record in CRM and the application status changed to “withdrawn by applicant” and not deleted.
- Ordinary sports clubs and organisations are only allowed to make one application each. If such organisations are also party to a joint application they should be contacted and asked which application they wish to have considered. If they choose the joint application, the application status of their own application should be changed to “withdrawn”. If they choose to have their own application considered their participation in the joint application should be removed which may result in the joint application being invalid in the case of a school, college or ETB if there are no other parties to the application.

### *Re-Check Organisation Information*

- Check that the registration information provided by the organisations is correct and amend accordingly – i.e. correct NGB, correct organisation type and correct sport.
- Check that all previous allocations are correctly associated with the organisation. Organisations may have used different versions of their name in the past:
  - Irish/English versions
  - acronyms/fully spelled out versions (FAI vs Football Association of Ireland)
  - St./Saint/St
  - the use of the word “The” at the start of the name (The Football Association of Ireland vs Football Association of Ireland)



- Where multiple applications have been submitted for one site or for a single group of users the applications may be considered together as follows:
  - Where 2 capital applications are submitted for the one sports facility eg. One from the owner and one from a tenant/licensee/user, only the application from the owner should be considered.
  - Where different user groups apply for equipment that will not be used by the other group they can be considered separately – eg if the badminton club apply for nets and the basketball club apply for hoops they can be considered separately but if both groups applied for gym equipment, only one is considered.
  - Where an organisation has 2 sites and has registered twice (once in its own name and once in the name of a related body) only one application can be considered. Eg club X is applying for works to the main pitch and a related junior club wants to apply for works to the training pitch, only the parent application can be considered. Where this occurs cancelling the registration of the sub-unit should be considered.

## USE OF THE MAXIMUM VALID GRANT FIELD

The maximum valid grant box is found on the application form just below amount sought – see below.

The screenshot shows a 'Grant Application' form for 'CAS-40598-K7D9V0'. The form includes fields for 'Estimated Start up for project in months' (7), 'Total Project Cost' (€ 270,000.00), and 'Planning Permission Reference Number' (12426). A 'Funding Source' table lists 'Clann Credo' (Borrowings, €150,000.00) and 'AIB Bank' (Savings, €19,632.00). At the bottom, the 'Total Amount of Own Funding' is € 169,632.00, and the 'Amount Sought' is € 300,000.00. The 'Maximum Valid Grant' field is circled in red and is currently empty.

Name	Funding Source Type	Amount	Comments
Clann Credo	Borrowings	€150,000.00	
AIB Bank	Savings	€19,632.00	

Total Amount of Own Funding	€ 169,632.00	Amount Sought	€ 300,000.00
Amount of Own Funding	€ 70,933.08	Maximum Valid Grant	€

This is to be filled in for all applications to take into account minimum own funding and any invalid elements of an application as follows:

1. Where the amount sought is higher than project cost minus minimum own funding: **max valid grant** is project cost minus minimum own funding with a limit of €150,000 and €300,000 for local and non-local projects respectively.
2. Where there are invalid parts to an application: **max valid grant** is project cost of eligible elements of a project minus minimum own funding

3. Where applicants have not sought the maximum possible grant and there are no invalid elements: **max valid grant** is amount sought
4. Where applicants have not sought the maximum possible grant and there are invalid elements: **max valid grant** is the total of valid elements minus min own funding or the original amount sought if this is lower (having invalid elements to an application cannot increase the max possible grant).

## SPLITTING LOCAL APPLICATIONS FROM NATIONAL/REGIONAL APPLICATIONS

Applications are firstly divided into 2 categories:

- Locals:
  - local sports clubs
  - community groups
  - schools (primary and secondary)
  - Education and Training Boards (ETBs)
  - local authority facilities seeking €150,000 or less
- National/Regional
  - national centres of excellence for one or more sport (e.g.: national rowing centre, national stadium for boxing)
  - 6-8 lane synthetic running tracks,
  - county and/or regional centres of excellence,
  - Local Authority projects seeking between €150,000 and €300,000
  - Sports facilities at 3rd Level Colleges and
  - Applications from National Governing Bodies of Sport.

Local applications are then divided by county and all applications for a single county are assessed by a single member of staff to ensure consistency and fairness of assessment. All assessments are reviewed by a second official.

All national/regional applications are assessed by the national/regional team.

## USE OF TEMPLATES

In many cases applicants are required to use the templates supplied to provide supporting documents. If a grantee has clearly answered every question from a template but not used the templates provided, this can be accepted.

## CHECK VALIDITY

The first stage of the Department's assessment process is to examine whether the application meets the minimum requirements of the Programme. This stage is primarily an examination of supporting documentation. In examining documents please follow the instructions in the sections below on **Missing Supporting Document** and **Giving Applicants a Second Chance**.

If the application does not meet the minimum requirements it is not assessed further and is marked invalid with the reason(s) recorded on the assessment sheet. In each case an explanation of the reason(s) is to be given in the comments section.

### ***Missing Supporting Documents***

The OSCAR portal requires applicants to provide certain minimum documentation. If the mandatory documentation is not with the application, assume that the system failed to force the applicant to provide it and they should be contacted and asked to provide it within 2 weeks. This only applies to compulsory documents.

The same 2 week time frame should be offered to applicants where documents supplied cannot be opened (provided they are of one of the prescribed formats PDF, GIF, JPG, JPEG, TIF, TIFF, BMP, PSD and PSPIMAGE). If a document cannot be opened, please send it to the IT Unit who may be able to assist.

### ***Summary of Supporting Documents***

<b>Quotation/estimate of the cost of your project</b>	Compulsory for all applications
<b>Proof of own funding</b>	Compulsory for all applications
<b>Evidence of Planning Permission/ Planning Application or  Evidence that planning permission is not required</b>	Optional
<b>Licence Agreements between groups as Evidence of sharing of facilities</b>	Compulsory for all school, Education and Training Boards and 3 <sup>rd</sup> level college applications.
<b>Evidence of Ownership of site</b>	Compulsory for all applications for capital works where the organisations have chargeable title to their land
<b>Evidence of Access to Site</b>	Compulsory for all applications for capital works where the organisation does not have title to their land. Applicants can only apply for a maximum of €50,000 for capital works.

### ***Giving Applicants a Second Chance***

In the first stage of the assessment process all applications are validated. If any shortcoming is identified (e.g. incorrect/missing document) the applicant will be contacted and given the opportunity to rectify the shortcoming by a specified 2 week deadline. If the issue has not been

satisfactorily addressed within the stipulated timeframe, the application shall be deemed invalid and can receive no further consideration.

In CRM the 2<sup>nd</sup> chance facility involves the following steps:

1. In the invalid application go to the **Details of Revised Documents Requested** section.
2. Fill in the **reason revised documents needed** field with details of why the documents supplied were deficient.
3. Tick the box **Revised Documents required**
4. Tick the relevant boxes for the **revised documents required** to make the application valid.
5. **Save and close** – the system will automatically set a **deadline date** and change the application status to **Revised Documents Requested**
6. CRM will automatically generate an email to the applicant with the details above and they will also receive a text message informing them that an important email has been sent to them.

### ***Insufficient quotations/estimates submitted***

At least one quotation or pre-tender estimate must be uploaded for all aspects of the works being applied for. This can be one or more documents but must cover everything being applied for. The following types of documents are acceptable as quotes:

1. An estimate prepared by a technical supervisor (typically an engineer, quantity surveyor or architect)
2. A quote from a contractor/supplier
3. Extract from a catalogue/website (for equipment only)

Assessors should be reasonable in the interpretation of any quotes/estimates provided and allow them once it appears that a proper effort has been made. If an applicant fails to provide a quote for some aspects of a project, they should be given a second chance to upload this document as set out above. If they fail to provide the quote during the second chance period only the aspects covered by the original quote should be considered valid.

### **Guidelines on dealing with cases where quotations do not match information provided in application:**

- If the **quotation cannot be matched to the application information in any way** an assessor can consider making the application invalid eg the application is for equipment but a quotation is provided to lay a pitch.
- **Quotes should include VAT.** If quotes are silent on VAT, the applicant can be given the benefit of the doubt and no VAT needs to be added.
- Applications should also be allowed in the case of **equipment applications where the project cost is less than the value of quotations.** The rationale here is that, unlike a capital project with a fixed cost, the project can go ahead if less equipment is ordered.

- In the case of **applications for capital works, where there is only one part to the project (1 pitch) and the quotation is greater than the project cost** the project cannot be considered.
- If the **total project cost is greater than the quotations** the applicant cannot be considered for a grant higher than the quotation amount minus minimum own funding

### ***Evidence of own funding not provided in the correct format***

Only the following can be accepted as evidence of own funding

- **Bank Statements** at least one bank statement from a financial institution or the GAA Development Fund – the closing balance on the most recent statement will be used to assess the amount of own funding available towards the project. It must be possible to associate the name on the bank statement with the applicant name. Balances from multiple bank accounts are acceptable as are prize bonds. If the application is a valid joint application, balances from statements from all the applicants can be pooled. Screen shots of bank statements are acceptable if they contain all of the required information.
- **Loan Offer.** A financial institution must fill out and stamp the template loan offer letter. Social finance companies such as Clann Credo may provide loan offers as long as they use the template. Loans from the GAA development Fund are not acceptable.
- **Local Authorities/ETB/3<sup>rd</sup> Level Colleges** must provide a letter confirming that the required own funding is in place.

Promises of funding from developers, benefactors, letters or statements from NGBs (other than the GAA Development Fund) or projections of fundraising etc. are not acceptable.

### ***Insufficient own funding***

For local authorities the minimum amount of own funding is 30% of the project costs. For all other projects the minimum amount of own funding required is 5% of the project cost.

As the OSCAR application form will force applicants to enter at least the minimum amount of own funding, this stage of checking is to determine if documents provided meet the minimum level required.

If applicants claim a higher amount of own funding on the application form than shown in the statements/loan offers, the own funding available should be reduced to the level for which evidence is shown for the purposes of scoring the application. If the evidence shows higher own funding available, the figure used on the application form should be used as some of the funding in the bank may be unavailable for the project due to other commitments.

### ***Title/Access requirements of the SCP not satisfied (freehold / leasehold / letter from landlord)***

There are only 2 ways for applicants to satisfy the title/access requirements of the 2017 SCP:

1. The completed Template to Satisfy the Title Requirements of the Sports Capital Programme.
2. The completed Template for Landlord to confirm continued access to site/property – for capital allocations of €50,000 or less.

If the solicitor has not ticked the box beside “ I have read the sections on site ownership in the guide to making applications under the 2018 Sports Capital Programme” the template can still be accepted provided all other information is provided. The title template is acceptable if it is signed and dated but missing the stamp of the solicitor.

### ***Insufficient sporting content***

A proposed project can have insufficient sporting content for either of two reasons:

- The organisation has no involvement in sport e.g. a heritage centre, a band etc.
- The organisation is involved in sport but the proposed project has no sporting content (see list below of facilities that are not funded)

To determine if a project has sufficient sporting content, the definition of sport used by the Council of Europe can be used to guide:

*“all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organised participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental well-being, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels.”*

### **The SCP funds:**

- Natural grass sports pitches, tracks and courts (including pitch drainage)
- Floodlighting
- Artificial sports pitches, tracks, courts and multi-use games areas
- Fitness studios
- Security fencing, ball stop netting and goal posts
- Hurling walls / handball alleys
- Walking/jogging tracks
- Building or refurbishment of dressing rooms, showers and toilets
- Building or refurbishment of sports halls, gyms or fitness studios
- Modifications to sports facilities to improve access for people with disabilities.
- Non-personal sports equipment including gym equipment<sup>2</sup>, lawn mowers and defibrillators.
- Any other capital projects that are clearly sporting in nature and that will increase participation in sport or improve performance (see definition above)

---

<sup>2</sup> . All gym equipment funded must be accessible to people with disabilities <http://www.dttas.ie/sites/default/files/publications/corporate/english/sports-capital-programme-guide-accessible-gym-equipment/sports-capital-programme-guide-accessible-gym-equipment.pdf>.

## **The SCP does not fund:**

- The development of the National Sports Campus.
- Running or Operational costs
- Viewing stands
- Car parks, roads or landscaping
- Children's Playgrounds
- Bars, kitchens, sleeping accommodation, offices or other parts of a project that have little or no sporting content
- Projects (or elements of projects) where work has already commenced.
- The building or renovating of swimming pools
- Routine maintenance (including the resurfacing of artificial pitches funded by the SCP in the last 10 years)
- Applications from schools, ETBs and 3<sup>rd</sup> level colleges that are not made jointly with at least one sports club (see separate section on schools, ETB and 3<sup>rd</sup> level colleges applications on page 5)
- The repayment of loans
- The purchase of land or buildings
- Items that could be considered to relate more to leisure rather than sporting pursuits.

Eligible elements of an application can be considered for funding even if other elements of the project are ineligible.

### ***Work on project already started***

If it is clear from the application that work has started on the project, that element of the application cannot be considered. This information could be contained in the project summary or the supporting documents (eg if an invoice is uploaded instead of a quote) Where possible applicants should be given the benefit of the doubt.

### ***Application for Personal equipment only***

In the case of an equipment application, it must be for sports equipment that would realistically be expected to remain in the club's ownership. Equipment cannot include consumables (ice packs, bandages) and must be of a nature that will last 5 years. Applications for personal equipment alone, such as sports gloves, shoes/boots or personal protective clothing (groin guards and gum shields) are invalid. Team jerseys etc are acceptable.

### ***School/College/ETB application or Joint Applications without licence agreement***

Schools, ETBs and 3<sup>rd</sup> Level Colleges may only apply for funding **jointly** with local sports clubs or community groups and must provide evidence of this sharing by way of formal legal agreements that will allow local clubs and/or the local community to use the proposed facilities throughout the year when it is not being used by the school/college/ETB itself. Letters from patrons/school board agreeing to share facilities are not acceptable. When examining licence agreements the

overarching consideration should be: does the licence agreement show a genuine sharing of facilities?

Licence agreements should demonstrate genuine sharing of facilities by including most or all of the following elements:

- The name and/or address of the facility to be shared
- Names of all the groups that are party to the agreement – including a signature of a representative of each group
- The responsibilities of each of the parties to the agreement for example: insurance, liability, maintenance, cleaning
- Details of any times when the facility is available to each party and any access arrangements
- Any limits on the purposes for which the facility can be used
- Any joint management arrangements – management boards, financial contributions and any joint bank account
- Charging/funding arrangements for the use of the facilities – including who sets fees or rent and who pays them
- Any dispute resolution arrangements or forfeiture clause
- Any period for which the licence is effective –this should be open ended or for a minimum of 15 years

**If an applicant lists more than 1 organisation joined to their application but the registration details of only one other organisation or only one other organisation is covered in any licence agreement the application can still be assessed as a joint application.** The scoring for sharing should reflect the fact that only 1 organisation is joined and any bank statements from non-registered organisations should not be considered.

**If there is any doubt as to whether or not a licence agreement shows a genuine commitment to sharing, the application should be discussed with management and/or at the regular assessment meetings.**

### ***Commercial Organisations or those that restrict membership/access***

SCP funding is focused on community sports where the maximum number of people can participate. The Membership page of the application form was introduced to help identify organisations where SCP funding should be prioritised. These are organisations that:

- are run on a not-for-profit basis
- that are owned and run on behalf of the members
- that charge modest annual membership fees
- that do not charge once-off entrance fees
- that are affiliated to the relevant National Governing Body of Sport
- sports clubs and organisations that are open to new members.
- where full-membership is not restricted to a particular group (eg: a particular company's employees or members of a particular trade or profession)



Before ruling out an application as commercial or having restrictive membership or access, the following consideration will apply:

- Invalid if the applicant did not confirm that the club is run on a not-for-profit basis
- Invalid if the organisation is not open to new members
- It is not a requirement that an organisation be affiliated with their NGB (obviously schools and community groups do not have an NGB). IN the case of clubs where an NGB clearly exists, funding will be prioritised towards clubs in the same county which are affiliated to the NGB unless a strong case for non-affiliation is provided.
- Membership fees and once-off entrances fees will be examined after all applications have been submitted and guidance in relation to what fees are acceptable for different sports and locations will issue at that stage
- **How do you plan to make the facility available?** If the answer is “club members only” and there are severe restrictions on becoming a member then this could be considered evidence that the club restricts membership or access.
- **What sports or groups will benefit significantly from and will use this facility?** If this section does not list any groups other than club members this could be considered as evidence that the club may be private.
- **How do you plan to encourage disadvantaged groups and people to use your proposed facility?** If an applicant makes it clear that the favourable usage charges apply to the unemployed, retired or other disadvantaged groups, the application could be considered non-private.

If there is a doubt as to whether or not an application is Commercial or has restrictive membership, the case should be discussed with management and/or raised at the regular assessment meetings. In general, if there is still uncertainty, the applicant should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Restrictions on membership or access can also be taken into account in the scoring of applications or in making decisions on allocations.

**Any applications being ruled out on these grounds should be reviewed by an AP or the PO.**

### **Organisations currently banned from applying under the SCP**

A limited number of clubs are prohibited from applying for funding due to previous cases of non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the SCP. Assessors should check the list under [J:\CAPITAL\Administrative\Non-Compliance\Non-compliance\\_status\\_report\\_CONFIDENTIAL.xlsx](J:\CAPITAL\Administrative\Non-Compliance\Non-compliance_status_report_CONFIDENTIAL.xlsx). Please discuss any such cases with the AP and/or PO prior to marking an application as banned. **Information on applicants that are banned should be treated as highly sensitive and should not be divulged to anyone outside of the section or the club contact.**

### ***Routine Maintenance***

The SCP does not fund routine maintenance of facilities. This is especially applicable with respect to the routine maintenance of facilities previously funded by the SCP as grantees are obliged to maintain facilities and keep them in sporting use for a period of 15 years.

Given that the typical life span of artificial pitches is 10 years, the Department will consider funding maintenance only after 10 years since the previous pitch was put in place – calculated as the date of the second last payment of the previous grant.

### **Other**

Use this if there is any other non-specified reason the application should be considered invalid and use the comments box to provide specific details of why the application cannot be considered for funding.

Examples of such reasons are:

- Organisation is not eligible to be considered for an SCP grant eg: hospital, army barracks, facility is not located in the Republic of Ireland –these organisations should have their registration reviewed and if they are found to be ineligible for SCP funding they should have their registration cancelled.
- the application is for works to a swimming pool which is not covered by the SCP.

**All invalid applications will be reviewed by another officer.**

## **RECORDING THE OUTCOME OF THE ASSESSMENT**

The application status field in CRM should be used to record the outcome of the assessment process as follows:

- if the initial assessor finds an application invalid due to incorrect or incomplete documentation being submitted the applicant should be given a second chance as set out in **“Giving Applicants a Second Chance”** above.
- if after the initial assessment and/or any second chance the assessor finds an application invalid the application status should be set to **“Assessed by Initial Assessor – Invalid”**
- if the reviewer finds an application invalid the application status should be set to **“Assessment Reviewed – Invalid”**
- if the reviewer validates an application which was initially assessed as invalid, the application status should be reset to **“Submitted”** and the reviewer should inform the initial assessor of the need to assess and score the application
- if the initial assessor finds an application valid, the application should be scored and the status should be set to **“Assessed by Initial Assessor – Valid”**. The assessor should also input an overall comment. This should be based on the assessment criteria and score or reason(s) the application is invalid.

- if the reviewer finds an application valid the application status should be set to **“Assessment Reviewed – Valid”**

### ***Assessment Criteria and Scoring***

The criteria and weightings are designed to favour projects that will increase participation, are from disadvantaged areas, are from organisations that have not received significant funding in the past and that are most likely to proceed quickly.

**All assessments will be reviewed by a second officer.**

#### **Criteria 1 Likelihood of increasing participation and/or improving performance (weighting 3) –**

To be assessed manually based on the comments below. If you are considering awarding a mark of zero it may be appropriate to rule the application invalid on the grounds of insufficient sporting content.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The positive impact of this project on participation or performance is not clear.</li> <li>• Membership fees are relatively high</li> <li>• The area is well served with facilities</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a minor impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a good range of facilities</li> <li>• Membership fees are relatively high.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a minor impact on participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a good range of facilities already</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a good range of facilities</li> <li>• The membership fees are relatively high.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a good range of facilities already</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a noticeable impact on participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a limited range of facilities already</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project</li> <li>• The area/applicant has good facilities</li> <li>• The membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance given the details of the project.</li> <li>• The area/applicant has good facilities</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups.</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> <li>• The area/applicant has good facilities.</li> <li>• Membership fees are relatively high</li> </ul>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups given.</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> <li>• The area/applicant has good facilities</li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a basic level of facilities</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project should have a major impact on participation especially among disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• The applicant/area has a basic level of facilities</li> <li>• Membership fees are modest</li> <li>• The project is located in or serves a disadvantaged area or group or is focused on people with disabilities.</li> </ul>

Scores 9 to 12 should only be awarded where the project is located in a disadvantaged area (Pobal index below -5), or largely serves a disadvantaged area or is **primarily** of benefit of People with disabilities or mental health issues. Examples would include:

1. the applicant is an organisation the deals with People with Disabilities such as Paralympics, Irish Wheelchair association or a Special Olympics group,
2. a licence agreement has been uploaded showing the facility will be shared one or more of the groups listed at 1 above
3. the majority of the project is focused on improving access (both physical environment access or equipment for disability sport)
4. where the applications is made by or jointly with a group the targets mental health issues – men’s shed, head strong etc.

## **Criteria 2: Sharing of facilities (weighting 5)**

This criterion will be scored automatically and the job of the assessor and reviewer is to check that the application information and the supporting documentation accurately reflect the score awarded.

Score	Comment
0	Sharing mentioned in application but no licence agreement provided / licence agreement provided does not meet requirements of the SCP (see appendix 3 of guide to making an application).
1	Licence agreement provided which shows sharing with 1 other group
3	Licence agreement(s) provided which shows sharing with at least 2 other groups

**Criteria 3: Criteria 3 Level of socio-economic disadvantage in the area (weighting 7) (note: score to be allocated automatically according to Pobal Deprivation Index<sup>3</sup>)**

After the application period has ended Pobal will provide the Department with the Pobal Index of Deprivation score for every application. Applications receive the assessment score from the table below based on their Pobal index value:

Score	Comments
0	Pobal index above 10
1	Pobal index of deprivation of 0 to 10
2	Pobal index of deprivation of 0 to -5
3	Pobal index of deprivation of -6 to -10
4	Pobal index of deprivation of -11 to -20
5	Pobal index of deprivation -21 or below

---

<sup>3</sup> For more details of on the Pobal Index see <https://www.pobal.ie/launch-of-2016-pobal-hp-deprivation-index/>

#### **Criteria 4 Technical merits of the project (weighting 3)**

This criterion will be scored automatically and the job of the assessor and reviewer is to check that the application information and the supporting documentation accurately reflect the score awarded.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
0	Quotation(s) is basic or with no breakdown of the elements of the project.
1	Quotation(s) is detailed and clearly sets out cost of each part of project or planning permission has been applied for
3	Planning permission has been acquired or the template signed by the local authority or technical supervisor to show that it is not needed but quotation(s) is basic with no breakdown of the elements of the project, or good quotations and planning permission has been applied for or the project consists of equipment only with no detailed breakdown of the equipment being sought
5	Planning permission has been acquired or the template signed by the local authority or technical supervisor to show that it is not needed and quotation(s) is detailed and clearly sets out cost of each part of project or the project consists of equipment only with a detailed breakdown of the equipment being sought

### Criteria 5 Level of own funding available (weighting 1)

Points	Pobal Index above 10	Pobal Index 0 – 10	Pobal Index 0 to -5	Pobal Index -6 to -10)	Pobal Index -11 to -20	Pobal Index below -21
1	14%-15.99%	10% - 11.99%	8%-9.99%	5%-6.49%	5%-5.99%	5%-5.49%
2	16% - 17.99%	12% - 13.99%	10%-11.99%	6.5%-7.99%	6%-6.99%	5.5%-5.99%
3	18% - 19.99%	14% - 15.99%	12%-13.99%	8%-9.49%	7%-7.99%	6%-6.49%
4	20% - 21.99%	16% - 17.99%	14%-15.99%	9.5%-10.99%	8%-8.99%	6.5%-6.99%
5	22% - 23.99	18% - 19.99%	16%-17.99%	11%-12.99%	9%-9.99%	7%-7.99%
6	24% - 25.99%	20% - 21.99%	18%-19.99%	13%-14.99%	10%-10.99%	8%-8.99%
7	26%-27.99%	22% - 23.99	20%-21.99%	15%-17.49%	11%-11.99%	9%-9.99%
8	28% - 29.99	24% - 25.99%	22%-23.99%	17.5%-19.99%	12%-12.99%	10%-10.99%
9	30% - 31.99	26%-27.99%	24%-25.99%	20%-22.49%	13%-13.99%	11%-11.9%
10	32% - 33.99	28% - 29.99	26%-27.99%	22.5%-24.99%	14%-15.99%	12%-12.99%
11	34%-35.99%	30% - 31.99	28%-29.99%	25%-27.49%	16%-17.99%	13%-13.99%
12	36% - 37.99%	32% - 33.99	30%-31.99%	27.5%-29.99%	18%-19.99%	14%-14.99%
13	38%+	34%+	32%+	30%+	20%+	15%+

This criterion will be scored automatically and the job of the assessor and reviewer is to check that the application information and the supporting documentation accurately reflect the score awarded.

Where the own funding is almost entirely (i.e. more than 80%) comprised of a loan the score should be reduced manually by 1 and the following wording can be added – **“a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan”**.

Local Authorities to be scored the same as all other projects as they do not provide a bank statement it should be assumed that they have the 30% own funding required.

Where the own funding is almost entirely (i.e. more than 80%) comprised of a loan the score should be reduced manually by 1 and the following wording can be added – **“a high proportion of the own funding is by way of a loan”**

If part of a project is ineligible, the % of own funding available should still be put against the complete project cost. For example: a club in a non-disadvantaged area applies to build a gym at a cost of €100,000 and to equip it for €50,000 – total project cost is €150,000. They have €25,000 own funding but do not provide a quotation for the equipment. They can be considered for the capital element of the project only and will receive 1 point as they have 16% of the total project cost in own funding.

### **Criteria 6 Level of Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years (weighting 3)**

This criterion will be scored automatically and the job of the assessor and reviewer is to check that the application information and the supporting documentation accurately reflect the score awarded.

Score	Comments (includes grants allocated in or after 2009)
0	More than €250,000 in Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
1	€200,000 - €249,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
2	€160,000 - €199,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
3	€130,000 - €159,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
4	€100,000 - €129,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
5	€80,000 - €99,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
6	€65,000 - €79,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
7	€50,000 - €64,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
8	€35,000 - €49,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years



9	€25,000 - €34,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
10	€15,000 - €24,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
11	€10,000 - €14,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
12	€5,000 - €9,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
13	€0 - €4,999 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years

**Score to be halved where applicant has more than €100,000 in outstanding grants dating to four years ago or earlier.**

## **Procedure for Staff Reviewing Applications**

1. Check invalids first
  - a. If invalid after review change application status to **“Invalidated after review”**
  - b. If you believe that that that application is valid change the **application status** to **“submitted”** and inform the initial assessor that the application needs to be assessed and scored
  - c. Check that you agree with the **overall comments**
2. Checking valid application
  - a. Should they have been invalid?
  - b. Is the scoring accurate?
  - c. Is the maximum valid grant box filled in and/or accurate?
  - d. Change **application status** to **“Assessment reviewed – valid”**
  - e. Check that you agree with the **overall comments**
3. When all valid and invalid applications have been checked, the assessor should undertake a final check to ensure that every application from that county has been dealt with i.e. that all are either **Assessment reviewed – valid** or **Invalidated after review** and check that the number of applications matches the table on [application review tracker.xlsx](#). If the number of applications does not match, check if any applications have been moved to or from the list of non-local projects.

**This document will be updated to include a section on how allocations are to be made once decision have been made in this regard.**