**Appendix B - Proposal Evaluation Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Fair Funding ReviewProposal Evaluation Form** |
| Name of proposal |   |
| Proposed by |   |
| Proposal produced on |   |
| Any useful links |   |
| General description |
| *To include commentary on how needs and resources are reflected.*  |
| Key strengths |
|   |
| Key weaknesses |
|   |
| Simplicity and transparency |
| Number of formulae |   |
| Services covered by the formulae |   |
| Number of cost drivers used in total |   |
| Does the model calculate final allocations transparently? (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) |   |
| Is the proposed model easy to explain to a member of the public? (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) |  |
| *Comments* |
| Completeness |
| Does the needs assessment account for all relevant types of authority? (y/n) |   |
| Is there a resources adjustment calculation for each authority or a deliberate exclusion of a resources adjustment? (y/n/ not applicable) |   |
| Are there exemplifications available for all local authorities covered by the Fair Funding Review? (y/n) |   |
| *Comments* |
| Credibility and future proofing |
| Data used is up-to-date (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| Data used is easy to update in the future (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| It is clear if and where judgement has been used and the reasons for doing so (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| There is little judgement in the system(1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| Data is not subject to historic fluctuations (1 - strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| Model considers ways to future-proof the system (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) |   |
| *Comments*  |
| Data used in the model cannot be affected by council policy decisions (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) |  |
| *Comments* |
| Number of positive answers on completeness (out of 3) |  |
| Average score |   |
| Criteria scoring '2' |   |
| Criteria scoring '1' |   |
| *Comments on potential incentives that the model will provide (positive and perverse)* |
| *Any further comments* |
| Distributional impact |
| Maximum percentage reduction for any one authority |   |
| Maximum percentage increase for any one authority |   |
| Authority type | Highest percentage change | Lowest percentage change | Average percentage change |
| Shire countiesShire districtsEnglish unitariesMetropolitan districtsLondon boroughsFire and rescue authoritiesGreater London AuthorityCombined authorities |  |  |   |
| Authority region | Highest percentage change | Lowest percentage change | Average percentage change |
| LondonSouth EastSouth WestNorth EastNorth WestEast MidlandsWest MidlandsYorkshire and HumbersideEast of England |  |   |   |
| Conclusion |
| *Final general comments* |
| Suitable for discussion at Leadership Board and Executive? (Yes/No) |   |
| *If no, comments on what could be improved* |
| Reviewed by |   |