



Community Asset Transfer Assessment Framework 2019

Purpose

The Community Asset Transfer Assessment Framework has been developed to provide officers with a consistent method of assessing Community Asset Transfer (CAT) proposals from eligible Third Sector organisations based in or working in Renfrewshire.

The Framework provides an assessment of the community benefits that a CAT proposal would deliver and its alignment with the Council's key priorities and Best Value guidance.

Criteria

The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 (referred to below as the 'CEA') provides that in determining a CAT Request, the Council must consider whether the proposal would promote or improve:

- Economic Development;
- Regeneration;
- Public Health;
- Social wellbeing;
- Environmental Wellbeing; or
- Reduce Socio-economic inequalities; or
- Any other benefits

These benefits align with the key priorities and objectives of the Renfrewshire Council Plan 2017-22 and the Renfrewshire Community Plan 2017-27 (listed below) and organisations must demonstrate how their proposals will deliver these outcomes.

Key Priorities

Renfrewshire Council Plan 2017-22	Renfrewshire Community Plan 2017-27
Reshaping our place, our economy and our future	Our Renfrewshire is:
Building strong, safe and resilient communities	thriving: maximising economic growth that is inclusive and sustainable
Tackling inequality, ensuring opportunities for all	well: supporting the wellness and resilience of our citizens and communities.
Creating a sustainable Renfrewshire for all to enjoy	fair: addressing the inequalities that limit life chances
Working together to improve outcomes	safe: protecting vulnerable people and working together to manage the risk of harm.

In assessing a proposal, the Council will also give due cognisance to the key elements of Best Value including: -

- Vision and leadership
- Effective partnerships and local community support
- Governance and accountability
- Use of resources
- Performance management
- Sustainability
- Equality

The Council will consider each application in terms of the benefits that can be derived for the local community. Each proposal will be measured against the foregoing legislative and Best Value criteria to assess the extent to which the proposal aligns with the Council's key priorities and objectives. A proposal that can be seen to contribute very significantly could score highly however, a proposal that cannot demonstrate alignment with a specific objective or outcome will be assigned a nil score for that measure. A proposal with a combined score of 52 (i.e. 40%) and above, will be deemed as having achieved the required threshold and will be considered for approval, although depending upon the particular circumstances of the application this may involve a conditional grant of approval.

Organisations seeking a reduction in the price of an asset will have to demonstrate the extent to which their proposal will add clear community benefit. The strength of the proposals will be considered against the financial implications of any decision both for short-term budget planning and long-term asset strategies. This will include the consideration of the current use of the asset and any consequent implications that could arise from the transfer of the asset.

The assessment framework will support this process by ensuring that any discount is proportionate to the value of the asset and the benefits that will be derived. A larger discount will require a stronger case to be made with an appropriate level of benefits demonstrated effectively

Renfrewshire Council Community Asset Transfer Assessment Framework CAT Panel Score 04 December 2020 Each measure should be scored on the following basis: Excellent 9-10; Good 6-8; Fair 4-5; or Poor 0-3.	Scoring Range
1. Alignment with CEA / Council Priorities (Max Score 60)	Score 0 – 10
1.1 Economic Development Strong proposals will promote inclusive growth and deliver good economic and cultural benefits, promote employment and lifelong learning skills.	6 Minimal economic development
1.2 Regeneration Strong proposals will empower communities and impact positively on the local community.	3 Minimal regeneration empowerment of communities
1.3 Public Health Strong proposals will foster community based services that respond to local need, promote diversity and life skills to improve health, poverty and active lifestyles.	3 Benefits restricted to service users – not RC residents/community.
1.4 Social Wellbeing Strong proposals will empower communities and provide opportunities for attainment and high quality care and support services for vulnerable children and adults.	3 Benefits restricted to service users – not RC residents/community.
1.5 Environmental Wellbeing Strong proposals will lead on local environmental management issues, support carbon management activities and encourage recycling and waste reduction.	4 Limited environmental impact.
1.6 Reduce Socio-Economic Inequalities or Other Benefit	4 Minimal impact albeit benefits to service users

Strong proposals will reduce inequalities and demonstrate financial sustainability to deliver good quality services and learning and development opportunities.	
2. Alignment with Best Value Themes (Max Score 70)	Score 0 – 10
2.1 Vision and Leadership Strong proposals will demonstrate a clear vision and plan for achieving the intended outcomes, ideally showing links to local or national priorities. Members of the organisation will have the relevant skills and experience to deliver the intended objectives.	5 Various activities proposed but limited in terms of developed proposal.
2.2 Effective Partnerships and Local Community Support Strong proposals will show how the organisation, and its partnerships, provide a collaborative approach with the local community to help ensure successful delivery of the intended benefits (may be through surveys, consultations, events etc).	5 Limited consultation with local CCs and wider partnership(s)
2.3 Governance and Accountability Strong proposals will demonstrate the organisation has structures, policies and leadership that support the application of good standards of governance and accountability. There will be transparency and feedback mechanisms that engage the local community and show continued involvement in project development.	8. Up-2-Us is a medium sized charity with c. 12 years experience, £1.5m turnover pa, 45 staff and a structured Board. Cash reserves of £500,000 are noted which can be used for unexpected set up costs and initial running costs.
2.4 Use of Resources Strong proposals will demonstrate a clear long-term plan for the use of the asset and how the organisation's effective management of resources (including staff, assets, and information) will contribute to the delivery of outcomes. Ideally, a medium to long term plan (5-10 years) will explain how these resources will be used, addressing issues such as maintenance of the asset and the funding requirements of the organisation (including any sources of funding already in place).	4. The Business Case document is not yet fully developed and references Big Lottery funding and Robertson Trust funding as well as Up-2-Us resources. However, 2.3 illustrates the scale of Up-2-Us. Note Offer of £350,000 compares to highest commercial offer of £525,000 (i.e. -33%)
2.5 Performance Management	6. Up-2-Us have developed a phased

<p>Strong proposals will show clearly how project outcomes will be measured and monitored. There will be a clear reporting process in place that informs the local community and key stakeholders of progress at all stages.</p>	<p>approach to the project illustrated in their Business Plan document.</p> <p>The charity is also registered with Companies House and OSCR.</p> <p>A 'reporting process' is not yet developed.</p>
<p>2.6 Sustainability</p> <p>Strong proposals will demonstrate how the project will be sustainable in the long term, having regard to the following five broad principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting good governance; • living within environmental limits; • achieving a sustainable economy; • ensuring a stronger healthier society; and • using sound science responsibly. <p>This may include demonstrating how the organisations future funding or self-financing arrangements are to be achieved, or how the project will have a positive impact on the natural environment.</p>	<p>6.</p> <p>Up-2-Us have developed a phased approach to the project illustrated in their Business Plan document.</p> <p>The charity is also registered with Companies House and OSCR.</p> <p>A 'reporting process' is not yet developed.</p>
<p>2.7 Equality</p> <p>Strong proposals will demonstrate that equality is embedded in the organisation's vision and strategic direction. The whole community will benefit from the proposals with different needs of the community having been considered in the development of the project. Evidence of positive impacts for specific equalities groups would also be outlined.</p>	<p>5</p> <p>Benefits restricted to service users – not RC residents/community.</p>
<p>Total Project Score (Maximum Combined Score 130):</p>	<p>62</p>
<p>Percentage Score:</p>	<p>48</p>
<p>Recommendation to Approve / Refuse:</p> <p>Refuse on the basis the community benefits to Renfrewshire communities do not balance against the financial opportunity cost.</p> <p>The applicant is in a financial position to purchase property commercially.</p>	

Assessment Framework Guidance:

Evidence	Overview	Score (%)
Very Strong	Governance and financial arrangements are strong and sustainable. Best Value characteristics are evidenced and contained throughout the overall approach. Related projected benefits are very robust and demonstrate value for money: suitability, effectiveness, prudence, quality, value and the avoidance of error and other waste	80 – 100%
Strong	Governance and financial arrangements are sound and sustainable. Best Value characteristics are in evidence in the proposal. Related projected benefits are demonstrated well and represent value for money.	60 – 79%
Moderate	Governance and financial arrangements are in place and acceptable. Best Value characteristics have been considered as part of the proposal. Related projected benefits are acceptable and could lead to value for money.	40 – 59%
Weak	Governance and financial arrangements are weak. Best Value characteristics are not well demonstrated in the proposal. Related projected benefits are not based on robust information and demonstrates questionable value for money.	20 – 39%
Poor	Governance and financial arrangements are poor. There is little evidence of Best Value characteristics in the proposal. Related projected benefits are ill defined and/or unrealistic and do not demonstrate value for money.	0 – 19%

Joe Lynch

Craig Thorpe

Frank Hughes

Alastair MacArthur

Fraser Carlin

Stuart Graham

Karen Anderson

John Trainer

Ken Gray

DRAFT