



**Community Asset Transfer Request
Summary Assessment Form**

Appendix 2

This paper provides a Summary of the Assessment Framework used to inform the recommendation on a Community Asset Transfer request.

Name of Organisation/Applicant	
Asset	
Date submitted	
Date of decision	
Ward	

Recommendation: Approve / Reject / Defer (delete as appropriate)	
Summary comments	
Final Decision	Approve / Reject / Defer (delete as appropriate)

Summary Grading	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Weak
1. Organisation Information				
2. Asset Information				
3. Type of request				
4. Community Proposal				
5. Support				
6. Financial Information				
7. Risk / Social Impact				

1. Organisation Information – includes governance and capacity to deliver
<input type="checkbox"/> Very Strong: Applicant has clearly evidenced that they are a robust and viable organisation with effective governance arrangements in place. <input type="checkbox"/> Strong: Applicant has provided adequate evidence that they are a robust and viable organisation with satisfactory governance arrangements. <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate: Applicant has evidenced some signs of being robust and viable and partial information provided on governance arrangements. <input type="checkbox"/> Weak: Applicant has shown no evidence of being robust and viable and no/little information has been provided on governance arrangements.

2.	Asset Information – includes asset status and proposed use
	Are these satisfactory?

3.	Type of request, payment and conditions
	<p>Ownership – are price, terms and conditions acceptable in principle?</p> <p>Lease - are price, terms and conditions acceptable in principle?</p> <p>Other rights - are price, terms and conditions acceptable in principle?</p>

4.	Community Proposal – includes project aims, community engagement and impact
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Very Strong: Full consideration has been given to the aims, objectives and vision with clear thought to the future direction of the proposal. The proposal provides, for example, a social/economic/environmental impact. Comprehensive evidence of need/demand provided including consultation, research and surveys.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong: Adequate description of aims, objectives and vision for the proposal. A good understanding of the community benefits including adequate evidence. Need/demand evidences including some consultation and research.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate: Limited description of the aims, objectives and vision for the proposal. Some understanding of the community benefit but not underpinned by substantive evidence. Some evidence of need/demand provided including limited consultation, research and surveys.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weak: Inadequate or no description of aims, objectives and vision for the proposal. Limited reference to community benefit and associated opportunities. No evidence of need/demand provided.</p>

5.	Support – includes stakeholder engagement and partnership working
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Very Strong: Applicant has clearly demonstrated links with relevant stakeholders and groups as well as strong local partnerships and community engagement. Evidence of joint responsibility for delivery of other projects/services.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong: Applicant has evidenced some partnership working arrangements. Relevant links with groups also evidenced along with strong community engagement activity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate: Applicant has demonstrated limited links with groups and community engagement activity. Some evidence of partnership working provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weak: No/poor evidence of community involvement. No/poor evidence of partnership working.</p>

6. Financial Information – includes fundraising, financial planning and management

- Very Strong:** Clear evidence that sufficient financial resources are/will be in place by the time of transfer and good resource planning for short/medium/long term sustainability demonstrated. Detailed, realistic and achievable income and expenditure, cash flow forecast provided along with a comprehensive contingency plan.
- Strong:** Evidence indicates that sufficient financial resources are/will be in place by the time of transfer and some resource planning has been demonstrated. Satisfactory income and expenditure and cash flow forecast provided. Some consideration has been given to contingency planning.
- Moderate:** Applicant has demonstrated there are some financial resources in place but all finances may not be available within the timeframe. There is limited evidence of resource planning. Basic income and expenditure and cash flow forecast included with limited consideration given to contingency planning.
- Weak:** Insufficient financial resources currently in place and unlikely to be ready within the timeframe. No evidence to demonstrate resource planning. No income and expenditure and cash flow forecast provided and no contingency plans outlined.

7. Risk/Social Impact – includes potential impact and barriers/challenges

- Very Strong:** Full evidence that applicant has in place the necessary capabilities to manage the asset. Considerable awareness of the potential impact of the transfer on others, and barriers/challenges clearly identified. Comprehensive information provided on the anticipated social benefit/impact of the transfer and how this will be measured.
- Strong:** Satisfactory evidence that applicant has the necessary capabilities to manage the asset. Sufficient awareness of the potential impact of the transfer on others with consideration given to potential barriers/challenges. Adequate information provided on the anticipated social benefit/impact of the transfer.
- Moderate:** Limited evidence to demonstrate capabilities to manage the asset. Some awareness of the potential impact of the transfer on others and consideration given to potential barriers/challenges. Minimal information provided on the anticipated social benefit/impact of the transfer.
- Weak:** Inadequate or no evidence of capabilities in place to manage the asset. Little or no awareness of the potential impact of the transfer on others or possible barriers/challenges identified. No social benefit/impact monitoring outlined.