Scoring Criteria for all Capital Schemes 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14

| 1. Financial | Score |
|---|------------|
| Capital Funded | |
| Schemes that are fully self financing on Capital will automatically | 100 |
| proceed for inclusion in the draft capital programme for consideration | |
| by COG. | |
| Schemes which are 75% funded | 75 |
| Schemes which are 50% funded | 50 |
| Schemes which are 25% funded | 25 |
| Schemes which are 0% funded | 0 |
| Revenue Funding | |
| Schemes that are fully financing on <u>revenue</u> | 100 |
| Schemes which are 75% funded | 75 |
| Schemes which are 50% funded | 50 |
| Schemes which are 25% funded | 25 |
| Schemes which are 0% funded | 0 |
| 2. Corporate, Social, Economic, Political Priorities | |
| Fully contributes to Council objectives | 100 |
| Partially contributes to Council objectives | 75 – 25 |
| Does not Contribute to Council Objectives | 0 |
| 3. Deliverability | |
| High (no preconditions – ready to go) | 100 |
| Medium (up to two pre conditions) | 50 |
| Low (e.g. land, acquisition, planning, demolition) (more than two pre conditions) | 25 |
| 4. Commitments | |
| Low (same or no additional commitments compared to present) | 100 |
| Medium (some additional requirements but not totally new) | 50 |
| High (requires as to Maintenance staffing, claw back, reviews etc) | 0 |
| 5. Consequences of Exclusion | |
| Risk to services or budgets of scheme if not undertaken or a | |
| requirement to meet legislation (e.g. change in housing benefits | |
| systems requiring new software or need to meet costs from downsizing) | |
| | |

| High | 100 |
|---|-----|
| Medium | 50 |
| Low | 0 |
| 6. Impact on Environment | |
| Substantial reduction in Carbon footprint | 100 |
| Moderate reduction in Carbon footprint | 50 |
| Little or no impact on Carbon footprint | 0 |
| | |
| Total Score | |