

Challenge Fund for the Management of Woodlands In and Around Towns

Scoring Sheet Guidance Note

Section 1 – Procedure

1. The **Woodland Officer** should fill in the scheme name and reference number.
2. The **Woodland Officer** is then to complete the ‘Eligibility’ section to ascertain the scheme satisfies the minimum eligibility criteria. If any of the answers are ‘NO’ the scheme is ineligible for WIAT Challenge Funding.
3. The **Woodland Officer** is to complete the assessment box against each question in the *General, Social, Environmental* and *Value for Money* sections. These assessments should reflect the WO’s judgement as to how the scheme addresses the theme of each question and thus how well the proposal fulfils the aims of the challenge as set out in the challenge fund leaflet? Section 2 details the questions and gives examples of assessments that would relate to lower and higher quality schemes. Assessments relating to each question should extend to no more than about 50 words.
4. The **Woodland Officer** should then fill in the pen picture to inform the judges about the merits / shortfalls of the scheme. This section should be no more than about 200 words in length.
5. The **Woodland Officer** should then complete the finance details in the ‘Ranking of Proposals’ section, as follows:

<i>(To be completed by Woodland Officer)</i>	
Total cost of project (£)	£
Total grant payable under SFGS (including WIAT)	£
Total eligible match funding from parties other than FCS	£
% FCS contribution to the project through SFGS (including WIAT.)	%

6. The scoring sheet should then be passed to the **Judges**.
7. The **Judges** should read the Proposal, the Woodland Officer’s assessments and Pen Picture, and they should then score the proposal against each question giving a value from 0 to 10. A proposal would score 0 against a given question where the Woodland Officer’s assessment and the proposal document demonstrated that the theme of the question had *not* been addressed. A proposal would score highly, i.e. 8 to 10, where the Woodland Officer’s assessment and the proposal document demonstrated that the theme of the question had been *fully addressed*. Read section 2 below for examples of statements that would relate to low and high scoring proposals. Preference should be given to schemes where the value for money is well demonstrated and arguments are logically and rationally presented in the proposal document.
8. **Judges** should then total the scores in the ‘Ranking of Proposals’ section and return scores to Panel Secretary (AP Jarrott, Ops Manager, Central Scotland Conservancy.)

Management Plans - Special Note:

Applications for SFGS / WIAT CF assistance in the preparation of Urban Woodland Management Plans should be judged using the same scoring form and the procedure outlined above. In these cases Woodland Officers’ assessments will be especially important in guiding the Judges’ scoring. Woodland Officers should Assess the proposals against each question by making a judgement as to the potential and likelihood of the management plan to recommend actions that will address the theme of each question.

Section 2 – The Questions

General

1. Has a holistic approach to the management of the woodland under ownership been demonstrated?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

No adequate survey of all the woodland under the ownership has been completed. Extent of the ownership is uncertain and poorly mapped. A piecemeal approach is apparent.	The woodland has been well surveyed with an agreed methodology. A comprehensive management plan is planned or exists. The application appears rational in the context of the ownership and a piecemeal approach is not apparent.
--	--

2. Do threats to the woodland exist and have they been identified and mitigated against?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The woodland is already well managed and provides the maximum benefit to the local community. WIAT / SFGS input would simply replace an existing, apparently sustainable, commitment.	The woodland is under-managed and the proposed inputs would enhance economic, environmental and social outputs. Its current poor condition impacts negatively on the urban environment (e.g. harbours fly-tipping, rubbish etc.) The proposed operations represent part the beginning of a sustainable process as identified in the management plan.
---	--

Social

3. To what extent is the woodland integrated within an urban area?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The woodland is within the 1km buffer zone but is poorly accessed by the local population due to irreconcilable factors (e.g. it is 'landlocked' by a motorway / river?).	The woodland is/could be easily accessed by the local population. It is accessible from large deprived residential areas.
---	---

4. To what extent does the proposal improve opportunities for access, recreation, health and fitness?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Minimal. The proposal includes limited opportunities for enhanced access and healthy outdoor recreation. The proposed operations do not meet the identified stakeholder demand, or the demand has been inadequately researched / demonstrated. There has been no consultation with local health providers.	A significant interest has been demonstrated locally through widespread consultation for enhanced recreational facilities. The proposals are exactly in line with the clearly identified demand and they may include the provision of quality circuits for prescribed health walks or similar benefits designed in consultation with the NHS.
--	---

5. At what level do the proposals involve the local community?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Local communities participate superficially and only as consultees at the application stage. No attempt has been made to identify or consult ethnic or other minority groups.	The application is made by a community group who has security of tenure over the woodland. Additionally, considerable research has been done to identify all potential user groups, including minority groups, and these have been involved in the planning process.
---	--

6. To what extent does the proposal encourage people to learn about woodlands and their management?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Community involvement is minimal and no structure has been identified for future educational involvement.	The community is heavily involved in the planning and delivery of the proposals. Schools have been consulted and will benefit by utilising the improved woodland environment for education. Volunteers are expected to be trained for and involved in the ongoing management.
---	---

7. To what extent do the proposals benefit socially excluded communities?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

There are no deprived areas locally.	The woodland is located in a deprived area as defined by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.
--------------------------------------	--

8. What evidence of stakeholder support do the proposals demonstrate?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Statutory consultees are lukewarm. Numerous amendments have been requested and the proposals are thought now to be the minimum acceptable. The local community at best acquiesces to the proposals.	The proposals have been driven by the community / NGOs with full support from statutory consultees.
---	---

Environmental

9. To what extent does the proposal protect and improve the biodiversity of the woodland?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The proposal does little to enhance the biodiversity of the woodland. It is questionable whether the proposal may be in conflict with this objective, for example by encouraging excessive access into sensitive areas. The proposal does not include works to maintain or enhance sensitive or designated areas (SSSIs etc), and it does not contribute to National HAPs, SAPs or Local Biodiversity Action Plans.	The woodland is a designated environment (SSSI, cSAC etc). The proposals, linked to the management plan, enhance and protect the sensitive areas, create opportunities for expansion of key habitats (linked to the National HAPs, SAPs or the LBAP) and the potential for conflict between the proposal's aims has been identified and mitigated against. There is also evidence that the proposal will contribute to the deliverance of a Forest Habitat Network.
---	---

10. To what extent does the proposal improve the landscape, cultural heritage or local distinctiveness of the site?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

This has been poorly demonstrated. There is no obvious landscape improvement or reference to cultural heritage or local distinctiveness and the proposals are not linked to adjacent urban development. Little thought has been given to internal or external woodland edge design.	This has been well demonstrated through the use of perspectives etc. The plans will clearly enhance the local urban environment and should provide a more attractive setting for future development. The proposals are consistent with Community Woodland Design Guidelines and recognise and enhance the cultural heritage value or local distinctiveness of the site.
---	---

Value For Money

11. To what extent does the proposal appear cost effective?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 18 to 20)

There has been little justification for very high WIAT top-up funding over normal SFGS Standard Costs. The reasons for this extra funding are not apparent and no comparative quotations have been submitted as supporting evidence.	The proposals seem to deliver benefits at realistic costs. Either little top up funding is required or the operations are more complex than would normally be expected. The woodland's size / location justifies very significant additional expenditure over the standard costs and good evidence has been supplied.
--	---

12. To what extent does the proposal provide value for public money?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 18 to 20)

Little additionality. The proposal will achieve little public benefit above that normally expected from the SFGS standard operations but is asking for significant WIAT Top Up funding.	Either little top up funding is required or the proposals will deliver very significant benefits to a very large population.
---	--

13. To what extent are the proposals supported by partnership funding?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 18 to 20)

There is no partnership funding currently in place.	There is partnership funding in place from various sources including local community funds. The partnership funding represents a significant proportion of the overall proposal budget and the FCS contribution is less than 75% overall.
---	---