

PROJECT: Improvements to Barmore Road/Garvel Road Junction, Tarbert

			Matrix Score
1	Executive Summary		
		Brief statement of what is proposed.	N/A
2	Impact on Council Plans		
		Corporate Plan	
		Service plans	
		Area Plans	
		Corporate Strategies	
		Carbon Management Plan	
		Compliance with National and Legal Priorities.	45.20
3	Affordability		
		Capital Costs	
			13.00
		Residual/knock on consequences	10.84
5	Risk		
		Impact risks	
		Delivery risks	
		Affordability risks	
		Risk Management arrangements	
		Risk of not proceeding with project	11.25
	Total Matrix Score		80.29
Rating			

Calculation of Rating:

- 4 = matrix score of 80-100%
- 3 = matrix score of 70-79%
- 2 = matrix score of 60-69%
- 1 = matrix score of less than 60%

Comments

Add any comments on the rating of the project.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

Assessment	Features of Strong Projects	Features of Weak Projects	Issues to Consider	Score Max. 10 Min. 0	Weight	Weighted Score
Impact on Corporate Plan	Clear links to corporate plan that demonstrate how the project will contribute to strategic objectives.	Links are not clear and the relationship to strategic objectives is vague.	To encourage active and caring communities. To encourage a growing sustainable economy in Argyll & Bute. Etc.	10	3.000	30.00
Impact on Service Plans	Clear links to service plans that demonstrate how the project will contribute to service priorities.	Links are not clear and the relationship to service priorities is vague.	What service priorities does this impact on? e.g. Streetscene; performance culture; recycling.etc.	10	0.400	4.00
Impact on Area Plans	Clear links to area plans that demonstrate how the project will contribute to area priorities.	Links are not clear and the relationship to area priorities is vague.	What Area priorities does this affect? e.g. Rothesay waterfront/centre; Helensburgh town centre; Jura transport initiative; Dunoon marine gateway; Oban action plan; etc.	10	0.400	4.00
Impact on Corporate Strategies	Clear links to identified corporate strategies that demonstrate how the project contributes to these.	Links are not clear and the contribution of the project is vague.	Consider relationship with:- 3he .6 (p w)-3.1 (i)4.6 (t)-0.9 (h:)-1 (-)-7.4 ( 9 (h:)-1 (-)-7.4 (			(00)]TJ EMC.7 ( 381.9601 T92 57.e)d1 (e how

Capital costs are affordable	Net capital costs are low.	Net capital costs are high.	Points awarded on scale basis: Net cost less than £100k = 10 pts £100k to £250k = 9 points; £251k to £500k = 8 points ; £501k to £750k = 7 points ; £751k to £1m =6 points; £1 to £1.5m = 5pts; £1.5m to £2m = 4pts: £2m to £2.5m = 3pts; £2.5m to £5m = 2pts; £5m to £10m = 1pt; Over £10m. = 0 pts.	8	1.00	8.00
Ongoing revenue costs are affordable	Net revenue costs are low	Net revenue costs are high.	No impact on revenue costs equals 5 points. Increase by 1 point for every 10% decrease in revenue costs. Decrease by 1 point for every 10% increase in revenue cost.	5	1.00	5.00
External funding leveraged by the project	Significant external funding levered in	No external funding levered in.	No external funding equals i5 points			

What are delivery risks	The timescale, management arrangements and residual or knock on consequences have been robustly constructed and the related risks are clearly identified and are limited.	The timescale, management arrangements and residual or knock on consequences have only been compiled on a vague basis or not clearly identified or there are significant or unpredictable risks.	What risks have been identified? How has this been carried out - is it a robust process? Are the risks significant or unpredictable?	9	0.25	2.25
What are affordability risks	Robust estimates of capital and revenue cost have been made and external funding is secured. Risks have been clearly identified and assessed.	Only preliminary estimates of capital and revenue cost have been made and external funding is anticipated rather than secured. No clear assessment has been made of the financial impact of risks.	What risks have been identified? How has this been carried out - is it a robust process? Are the risks significant or unpredictable?	9	0.25	2.25
Risk Management arrangements	Robust strategies and arrangements to identify, manage and control risk developed.	No clear arrangements to manage risk	Has the approach to risk management been documented? Does it appear robust?	9	0.25	2.25
What are the risks of not proceeding with the project.	An assessment of these has been made and evidenced and there is significant risk of not proceeding with the project.	No assessment made or only vague references or limited risk of not proceeding with the project.	Have the risks been specified? What process has 1D 93 >>BDC 3.1 (as-d [(l)4.6 (id [(l)4.6 (i)4.6 (m)-15.1 (i)4.6 (t)-0.9 (ed r)-7.5 (i Qdi)4.6 (ng-0			