
2017 SPORTS CAPITAL PROGRAMME

SCORING SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

SUMMARY OF SCORING & WEIGHTING FOR 2017 SCP

Criteria 1 Likelihood of increasing participation and/or improving performance (weighting 7)

Score	Comment
1	The proposed project should have a minor impact on participation/performance
2	The proposed facilities should noticeably increase participation/performance
3	The proposed facilities should significantly increase participation/performance and the application provides good quality information on what groups will use the facility, how the facility will be managed and the encouragement of disadvantaged groups

Criteria 2: Sharing of facilities (weighting 4)

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 one 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 5) (*note: score to be allocated automatically according to Pobal Deprivation Index*)

0	Project is not in a disadvantaged area
1	Project is located in a marginally disadvantaged area
2	Project is located in a disadvantaged area
3	Project is in a very or extremely disadvantaged area

Criteria 4 Technical merits of the project (weighting 4)

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
2	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.
3	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

Criteria 5 Level of own funding available (weighting 5)

Points	<u>Not Disadvantaged (Index greater than -5)</u>	<u>Marginally Disadvantaged (index -5 to -10)</u>	<u>Disadvantaged (index from -10 to -20)</u>	<u>Very or Extremely Disadvantaged (index below -20)</u>
1	5%-20% of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 13%-20% of project cost	Disadvantaged area 5%-9% of project cost	Very or extremely disadvantaged area 5%-9% of project cost
2	21%-35% of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 20%-29% of project cost	Disadvantaged area 10%-15% of project cost	Very or extremely disadvantaged area 10%-15% of project cost

3	35%+ of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 30%+ of project cost	Disadvantaged area 15%+ of project cost	Very or Extremely Disadvantaged area 15%+ of project cost
---	----------------------------	--	---	---

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”**

Criteria 6 Level of Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years (weighting 4)

Score	Comments
0	More than €200,001 in Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
1	€100,001 - €200,000 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
2	€50,001 - €100,000 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years
3	€0 - €50,000 Sports Capital Programme funding received in the past 10 years

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR STAFF ASSESSING 2017 APPLICATIONS

- **No meetings are to be arranged by any official** with applicants in relation to the 2017 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” 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)

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 grantee is '13 Ballisodare St' and the scheme is '2014 Sports Cap'. The total project cost is € 270,000.00. The funding source table lists 'Clann Credo' (Borrowings, €150,000.00) and 'All Bank' (Savings, €119,632.00). 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	
All Bank	Savings	€119,632.00	

Total Amount of Own Funding: € 169,632.00
 Amount of Own Funding: € 70,933.08
 Amount Sought: € 200,000.00
 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 €200,000 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 LOCALS APPLICATIONS FROM NON-LOCAL 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
 - 6-8 lane synthetic running tracks
 - provincial rugby team facilities
 - league of Ireland soccer clubs and FAI training centres
 - GAA county grounds and centres of excellence (potentially 1 of each per county)
 - local authority projects seeking more than €150,000 (if a LA project seeking more than €150,000 is for a club that would not be considered a regional facility the amount sought should be reduced to €150,000 and the project should be considered a local project)
 - 3rd Level Colleges
 - 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 an applicant has not used the template and instead provided their own format for supporting documentation these should be considered invalid.

1. 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. 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, check the document library for the organisation. If the document is not there either, assume that the system failed to force the applicant to provide it and they should be contacted to provide it within 5 working days. This only applies to compulsory documents.

The same 5 working day 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 to the IT Unit who may be able to assist.

If applicants have uploaded the wrong document(s) in error these should be considered invalid unless the correct document was uploaded elsewhere in the application process.

Summary of Supporting Documents

Quotation/estimate of the cost of your project	Compulsory for all applications
Proof of own funding	Compulsory for all applications
Evidence of Planning Permission/ Planning Application or Evidence that planning permission is not required	Optional
Licence Agreements between groups as Evidence of sharing of facilities	Compulsory for all school, Education and Training Boards and 3 rd level college applications.
Evidence of Ownership of site	Compulsory for all applications for capital works where the organisations have chargeable title to their land
Evidence of Access to Site	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 €25,000 for capital works.

The principal reasons application are deemed invalid include:-

1.1. Insufficient quotations/estimates submitted

At least one professionally prepared 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 only those aspects should be considered invalid.

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 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 can be considered but it should not receive any marks for the quotation under technical merits of the project.
- 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

1.2. 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. Balances from multiple bank accounts are acceptable as are prize bonds (if accompanied by a recent letter confirming that they are still held). 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/3rd Level Colleges** must provide a letter from their finance officer/accountant 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.

1.3. Insufficient own funding?

For all 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.

1.4. 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 €25,000 or less only.

2014 and 2015 templates dated on or after 24/11/16 are acceptable. 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 2017 Sports Capital Programme” the template can still be accepted provided all other information is provided.

1.5. 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
- Security fencing, ball stop netting and goal posts
- Hurling walls / handball alleys
- Building or refurbishment of dressing rooms, showers and toilets
- Building or refurbishment of sports halls and gyms
- Modifications to sports facilities to improve access for people with disabilities.

- Non-personal sports equipment including gym equipment, lawn mowers and defibrillators. Anything set in the ground (such as goal posts) is not considered equipment.
- Any other capital projects that are clearly sporting in nature and that will increase participation in sport or improve performance (see definition above)

The SCP does not fund:

- Private and/or commercial operations (see notes below)
- 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 or where contracts have already been signed
- 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 3rd level colleges that are not made jointly with at least one sports club (see separate section on schools, ETB and 3rd level colleges applications)
- The repayment of loans
- The purchase of land or buildings

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

1.6. Work on project already started

If it is clear from the application that work has started on the project or a contract was signed **before** the application was submitted, 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) or if the organisation has begun to draw down a previous grant towards this project. Where possible applicants should be given the benefit of the doubt.

1.7. 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.

1.8. School/College/ETB application or Joint Applications without licence agreement

Schools, ETBs and 3rd 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 are provided 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.

1.9. Private/Commercial Organisation

SCP funding is focused on community sports where the maximum number of people can participate. The Department may deem any organisation that places excessive restrictions on membership or usage as a private organisation and therefore not eligible for SCP funding. **Any organisation that operates a membership committee or where members must be nominated by current members can be considered private.**

Before ruling out an application for this reason, the following parts of the application form will be checked:

- **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 is a private club.
- **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.

In relation to consideration if an applicant is commercial the fee structure for members should be examined, along with any response to the 3 sections of the application form above. Simply charging for use of a facility does not indicate that an organisation is commercial but the charges should not be prohibitively high for the facilities on offer.

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

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

1.10. 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. 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.**

1.11. Routine Maintenance

The SCP does not fund routine maintenance of facilities. This is especially applicable with respect to the routine maintenance of facilities 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 last payment of the previous grant.

1.12. 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
- 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 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 status should be set to **“Assessed by Initial Assessor – Valid”**
- if the reviewer finds an application valid the application status should be set to **“Assessment Reviewed – Valid”**

2. Assessment Criteria and Scoring

If an application meets the minimum requirements it is assessed against the 6 assessment criteria as follows:

- i. For all criteria an application is given a mark of 0-3 based on how well it meets each of the criteria.
- ii. This mark is then automatically multiplied by the weighting for that criteria giving a score for that criteria (the weightings of the criteria are determined based upon the importance of the criteria).

- iii. The CRM system will also add a standard comment for each score for each criteria as previously set out. If 80% or more of own funding is by way of a loan the own funding score is to be reduced by 1 as set out. **Officers can add to the standard comments if necessary.**
- iv. The score for all criteria are then added up to give a total assessment score.

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.

The only other input from the assessor is to record an overall comment. This should be based on the assessment criteria and score or reason(s) the application is invalid.

2.1. Likelihood of increasing participation and/or improving performance (weighting 7)

Scores are awarded under this heading as follows:

- 1 point if the facility will not add greatly to the facilities of the organisation. This should be assessed based on a combination of the population of the surrounding area, the amount of facilities owned by the organisation and the priority of the works involved. Low priority works include:
 - Security fencing in small towns and rural areas
 - ball stop netting (for applications from non-hurling and non-Gaelic games clubs/organisations)
 - Dugouts
 - Upgrades to existing changing rooms/showers toilets
- 2 points available for higher priority proposed facilities compared to existing facilities. This should be assessed based on a combination of the facilities owned by the organisation and the priority of the works involved. High priority works include:
 - multi-use games areas and mini-pitches
 - Artificial sports pitches, tracks, courts
 - Natural grass sports pitches, tracks and courts (including pitch drainage)
 - Floodlighting
 - Security fencing in urban areas only
 - Hurling walls / handball alleys
 - Building of dressing rooms, showers and toilets
 - Building of sports halls and gyms
 - Ball stop netting (for applications from hurling and Gaelic games clubs/organisations)
 - Non-personal sports equipment
- 1 point for the overall quality of the application. This will be based on the information provided in the project summary (page 1) and on page 2 (what groups will use the facility,

how the facility will be managed, will the project improve female participation and will it encourage disadvantaged groups). Groups that clearly explain the impact of the proposed facilities on participation/performance, how they will manage the facility, how they will attract people from disadvantaged groups and list several other groups that will use the facility can earn a point on this criteria.

2.2. Sharing of Facilities (weighting 4)

- 0 points if they mention sharing on the form but do not back it up with a formal licence agreement
- 0 points if they provide a licence agreement that does not meet the requirements as set out.

NB if a school/college/ETB provides a licence agreement that does not meet these criteria the application should be considered invalid as a “School/College/ETB application not meeting requirements”

- 1 point if a suitable licence agreement shows that the facility is shared, or proposed facility is to be shared, with one other sports group/club/school
- 3 points if suitable licence agreement(s) are provided showing that the facility is to be shared with at least 2 other groups.

2.3. Level of socio-economic disadvantage in the area (weighting 5)

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:

Pobal index score	Assessment score
Greater than -5 (not disadvantaged)	0
-5 to -10 (marginally disadvantaged)	1
-10 to -20 (disadvantaged)	2
Less than -20 (very or extremely disadvantaged)	3

2.4. Technical Merits of the Project (weighting 4)

Applicants will earn points under this criteria as follows:

- **2 points available for Planning Permission**
 - Score 2 if planning permission has been acquired or the template signed by the local authority or technical supervisor to show that it is not needed
 - Score 1 if applied for and evidence is provided
- **1 point available for quotations (including applications for equipment only)**
 - 0 points if quotation(s) is basic or with no breakdown of the elements of the project

- 1 point if quotation(s) is detailed and clearly sets the cost of each part of a project

2.5. Level of own funding available (weighting 5)

Applicants are marked for own funding on a grading level according to the percentage of **total project costs** they are providing from own funding. The following rules are to be applied:

Points	<u>Not Disadvantaged</u> (Index greater than -5)	<u>Marginally Disadvantaged</u> (index -5 to -10)	<u>Disadvantaged</u> (index from -10 to -20)	<u>Very or Extremely Disadvantaged</u> (index below -20)
1	5%-20% of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 13%-19% of project cost	Disadvantaged area 5%-9% of project cost	Very or extremely disadvantaged area 5%-9% of project cost
2	21%-35% of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 20%-29% of project cost	Disadvantaged area 10%-14% of project cost	Very or extremely disadvantaged area 10%-14% of project cost
3	35%+ of total project cost	Marginally Disadvantaged area 30%+ of project cost	Disadvantaged area 15%+ of project cost	Very or Extremely Disadvantaged area 15%+ of project cost

Where the own funding is almost entirely (i.e. more than 80%) comprised of a loan, each of the scores above should be reduced by 1 mark.

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.

If a Local Authority, ETB or 3rd Level College has provided a letter from their finance officer/accountant confirming that the required own funding is in place, without specifying an amount of funding they should be assumed to meet the minimum required and receive 1 point.

2.6. Level of SCP funding received in the past 10 years (weighting 4)

Assessors use the CRM system to determine levels of SCP funding allocated in the past 10 years to the applicant. Whether or not this funding has been drawn down is not relevant for the purposes of this criteria

Scoring under this criteria is on a sliding scale as follows:

Level of Previous SCP funding in the last 10 years	Score
€0 - €50,000	3
€50,001 - €100,000	2
€100,001 - €200,000	1
€200,001 +	0

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 <J:\CAPITAL\17 SCP\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.

Recommendations on Allocations

A total of €30 million will be allocated under the 2017 round of the programme. Depending on the level of regional/national applications received, an amount will first be set aside for such applications (TBC – but likely to be in the region of €4m). The remaining balance (likely to be in the region of €26m) will then be divided by county on a per capita basis using the latest census data. A limited amount (circa 10%) of the total funding available to each county will also be set aside for equipment only applications. This is due to the fact that it is more difficult for these applications to score as highly as capital applications as they cannot obtain marks for planning permission and such allocations can also spread the benefits of the SCP to a wider group of organisations.

Once the initial assessment is completed the assessor will rank projects by score and add recommended allocations and grant purposes on the system. In deciding on the recommended allocations, the assessment score should be the primary determinant in deciding which applications should be allocated funding and the level of same. Once all applications in a county are initially scored however, some adjustments can be made to take into account the following:

- Ensuring a geographical spread of projects within each county;
- Ensuring an appropriate spread of projects between rural and urban areas within each county; and
- Ensuring there is a spread of projects among different sports

Where such adjustments are made and result in a different prioritisation of the projects to be funded, the assessor will prepare a short note for file outlining the reasons why any such alterations were made. This note will be reviewed by a second officer.

Any project being funded should be given enough funding to make at least one part of the project feasible. Assessors and reviewers may use their discretion in deciding the purpose for which a grant is allocated. For example, there is no point in funding gym equipment when funding is not being provided to build the gym that will house it.

All allocations will be reviewed by a second official.

Once the above process is complete, the list of recommended allocations will be sent to the Ministers for final agreement and sign-off.
