

Criteria	Description	Score	Requirement
<b>Evidence led</b>	The proposed project is based on the best industry and sectoral knowledge; recognised good practice; and, addresses a demonstrated gap or improvement need.	Excellent	There is excellent and clear evidence that the project is based on best practice principles and assertions are backed up with multiple reliable data sources and verified by peer review or external organisation. E.g. options appraisals (either peer reviewed or carried out with ZWS). In the case of a new or innovative project, a clear rationale and/or assumptions are provided to underpin anticipated impacts, with external verification of efficacy. Sets out achievable projections, how these were devised, and demonstrates clear monitoring mechanisms for these projections.
		Good	There is good and clear evidence that the project is based on best practice principles and assertions are backed up with evidence such as public consultations, pilots/trials, Waste DataFlow evidence, waste compositional analysis, detailed calculations; with a clear and verifiable methodology demonstrated, or benchmarked against other local authorities. In the case of a new or innovative project, a rationale and/or assumptions are provided to underpin anticipated impacts. The application sets out achievable projections, how these were devised and demonstrates generally clear monitoring mechanisms for these projections.
		Acceptable	There is some evidence that the project is based on best practice principles, but it provides limited evidence specific to the authority or outcomes of how the aspirations/assertions would be achieved. There is some information on monitoring but it is unclear how these relate to the stated projections.
		Poor	There is little evidence provided to show that the project demonstrates best practice and little or no reliable data included to back up assertions.
		Not acceptable	There is no evidence of how project would demonstrate best practice or how project is achievable.
<b>Impact &amp; Transformation</b>	The proposed project will support significant shifts in performance locally, regionally, or nationally in terms of recycling performance, waste prevention or reuse.	Excellent	The application provides evidence that the project it is likely to divert over 4,000 tonnes material for recycling or re-use OR to achieve a 3% or greater increase in local recycling rate OR the project is likely to result in carbon savings of over 2,000 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e.
		Good	The application provides evidence that the project is likely to divert between 1,000 and 4,000 tonnes material for recycling or re-use OR to increase local recycling rates by between 2% and 3% OR the project is likely to result in carbon savings of between 500 and 2,000 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e.
		Acceptable	The application provides evidence that the project is likely to divert between 250 and 999 tonnes material for recycling or re-use OR to increase local recycling rates by between 1% and 2% OR the project is likely to result in carbon savings of between 100 and 499 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e.

Scoring Band Descriptors

Recycling Improvement Fund

	<p>The proposed project is focused on high carbon impacts through increasing the capture of priority materials such as food waste, garden waste, plastics and textiles, and the adoption of new and low carbon technologies.</p>	<p>Poor</p>	<p>The application provides evidence that the project is likely to divert up to 250 tonnes material for recycling or re-use OR to increase local recycling rates by up to 1% OR the project is likely to result in carbon savings of up to 100 tonnes CO2e.</p>
		<p>Not acceptable</p>	<p>The application provides no evidence is provided of likely material diversion as a result of this project and no evidence is provided of likely carbon savings as a result of this project.</p>
<p><b>Strategic &amp; Collaborative</b></p>	<p>The project shows alignment with current and future policy developments and local, regional or national priorities. The project also considers any broader impacts.</p> <p>The project adopts a partnership approach in developing and delivering projects across key stakeholders and/or across multiple authorities - where opportunity allows.</p>	<p>Excellent</p>	<p>The project is fully aligned with the Household Charter and Code of Practice and the investment being sought is predominately directly linked to enabling that alignment. The project takes a strategic approach to designing and implementing operational change to align services with the Household Charter and Code of Practice.</p> <p>The project is also fully aligned with current and future policy and takes into consideration the impacts of future policy changes up to 2025 e.g., 2025 targets, Landfill Ban, DRS, Packaging EPR. All elements of the project are aligned with local and national waste policy and no foreseeable changes will impact on the project's long term success.</p> <p>In the case of a new or innovative project it is highly likely that the project's concept, methodology and/or design could be replicated or adapted, in part or in full, for use by other LAs/partnerships. Circular Economy principles and any potential social benefit (jobs, skills) are clearly demonstrated in the project proposal.</p> <p>The application fully addresses the potential for collaboration. Where there is potential for collaboration, the project demonstrates and evidences partnership between local authorities and/or other organisations/third sector partners, having provided copies of, for example, contracts, agreements, terms of reference, or letters with the application. Otherwise, explanation is provided as to why collaboration is not appropriate or possible.</p>

Scoring Band Descriptors

Recycling Improvement Fund

		<p>Good</p>	<p>The application and project demonstrate alignment with current policy, however, the investment being sought is not predominately or directly linked to enabling alignment with the Household Charter and Code of Practice. It considers the longer term national policy landscape and targets set. The project addresses operational issues whilst assisting with strategic planning. In the case of a new or innovative project there is potential that the project's concept, methodology and/or design could be replicated or adapted, in part or in full, for use by other LAs/partnerships. There is evidence of consideration given to collaboration within the application. Where there is potential for collaboration, the project shows some collaboration between local authorities or other organisations, however, full details of collaboration and resulting benefits is not provided. Explanation is provided as to why collaboration is not appropriate or possible.</p>
		<p>Acceptable</p>	<p>The application and project demonstrate alignment with current policies and there is broad alignment with some elements of future policy. The project disproportionately directs investment into addressing operational issues rather than assisting in strategic planning or alignment with the Household Charter and Code of Practice. In the case of a new or innovative project there is limited potential that the project's concept, methodology and/design could be replicated or adapted, in part or in full, for use by other LAs/partnership. There is no evidence of collaboration in the application. However, the project would not benefit from a more collaborative approach. Explanation is provided as to why collaboration is not appropriate or possible.</p>
		<p>Poor</p>	<p>The project shows limited consideration of, and/ or doesn't include evidence of investigation of opportunities for strategic alignment with current or future policy. There is no evidence of consideration being given to collaboration and the project could be improved by adopting a partnership approach.</p>
		<p>Not acceptable</p>	<p>The project goes against local or national policy or moves away from alignment with existing policy e.g. not aligned with Household Charter &amp; Code of Practice. The project does not demonstrate any evidence of consideration of collaboration and should not go ahead without reconsidering partnership opportunities to improve the application.</p>

<b>Feasibility</b>	The project is deliverable and well planned; the application demonstrates due diligence, planning, strong project management and targeted communication of infrastructure changes; it is also practicable within the timeframes.	Excellent	The project is deliverable and evidence is provided to demonstrate that it is well-planned and the timeframes are practicable, well thought through and realistic. The application demonstrates due diligence, planning, strong project management and targeted communication of infrastructure changes; there are no foreseeable issues with implementing the project or achieving its goals within the proposed timeframes (which are evidenced through achievable milestones). Full details are provided on budgets and how ongoing costs will be met to ensure the long term sustainability of the project. Full details of contingency arrangements for long-term delivery have been included, for example property growth or waste/recycling quantity increases.
		Good	The project is deliverable and evidence is provided that it is well-planned and it is likely that it could be practically delivered within the timeframes set out. The application demonstrates due diligence, planning, project management and communication of infrastructure changes. There are potential issues with implementing the project within proposed timeframes however these have been clearly identified and mitigations detailed (e.g. buffers / additional time built in). Some detail is provided on how ongoing costs will be met to ensure the long term sustainability of the project. Contingency arrangements for long-term delivery have been included, for example property growth or waste/recycling quantity increases.
		Acceptable	The project may be deliverable and evidence is provided within the application that it is adequately well-planned, including some elements of communication needs, however, the timeframes provided present concerns regarding practicability, being overly ambitious and therefore slippage is likely. Only limited details are provided on mitigation measures/contingencies should slippage occur. There is limited information provided on contingency arrangements for long-term delivery, for example property growth or waste/recycling quantity increases.
		Poor	The project is unlikely to be deliverable and little evidence is provided in the application that it is well-planned, with no evidence of communication needs being considered; the timeframes set-out are considered unlikely to be practicable and highly likely to be subject to slippage. No details are provided on mitigation / contingency measures should slippage occur. No details are provided on contingency arrangements for long-term delivery.
		Not acceptable	The application provides very limited, or no, evidence to determine whether the project is deliverable or practicable. The project timeframes are highly likely to be unachievable. No details are provided on contingency arrangements for long-term delivery.

<b>Additionality</b>	The proposed project is one which, for reasons of scale, timing, or perceived risk, may not otherwise be progressed or would take significantly longer without grant funding.	Excellent	The application provides a full explanation and supporting evidence, that, due to scale, timing or perceived risk, the full project will not go ahead without RIF funding and/or implementation would be significantly delayed. Details are provided of other sources of funding already investigated and it is clear that these are unavailable.
		Good	The application provides an explanation and supporting evidence that, due to scale, timing or perceived risk, the project is unlikely to go ahead in its full form without RIF funding, and/or implementation would be significantly delayed - the majority of the project is highly likely to require funding for the project to progress. Some details have been provided of other sources of funding already investigated and the details show that these are unavailable.
		Acceptable	The application provides some evidence to suggest that, due to scale, timing or perceived risk, elements of the project are unlikely to progress without RIF funding and/or would be significantly delayed. There are few details provided that other source of funding have already been investigated; the details provided do not fully demonstrate that the project couldn't go ahead without RIF funding.
		Poor	The application states that project will not go ahead in its full form, or that substantial elements of it will not go ahead and/or it would be significantly delayed, without RIF funding, however, no clear justification has been provided and there is no evidence of having explored other funding options.
		Not acceptable	The application provides no information on the importance of the fund to its viability and/or the project has a strong likelihood of going ahead regardless of RIF funding, i.e. the business case demonstrates significant revenue savings will be achieved through the project, which would mean the proposed project could be self-funded.
<b>Acceptability</b>	The project fits within the regulatory and planning frameworks, is acceptable to both local decision-makers and stakeholders and aligns with the scope of the fund.	Excellent	All aspects of the project are fully within the scope of the fund. The application outlines all regulatory and planning approvals required from local decision-makers and stakeholders. The application provides full details on current status, timelines, and provides full confidence that the necessary permissions will be granted for the project to progress.
		Good	All aspects of the project are within scope of the fund. The application outlines some regulatory and planning approvals required from local decision-makers and stakeholders. It provides some details on current status, timelines, or likelihood of necessary permissions being granted and gives sufficient confidence that the necessary permissions will be granted for the project to progress.

Scoring Band Descriptors

Recycling Improvement Fund

		Acceptable	The majority of the project is within the scope of the fund. The application provides limited information on regulatory and planning approvals required from local decision-makers and stakeholders. It provides only limited detail on current status, timelines, or likelihood of necessary permissions being granted and greater clarity may be required to give confidence that the necessary permissions will be granted for the project to progress.
		Poor	Few aspects of the project are within scope of the fund. It is not clear from the application which, if any, regulatory and planning approvals, from local decision-makers and stakeholders, are required or if any have been sought. The application does not provide detail on current status, timelines or likelihood of necessary permissions being granted and therefore gives little confidence that they will be granted and that the project will progress.
		Not acceptable	The project does not fall within the scope of the fund. There are no details provided of regulatory or planning approvals, these are highly likely to be required for the project to progress and without them the project will not progress.