

## APPENDIX D

<b>Name of CTB making the asset transfer request:</b>		
<b>Land to which this asset transfer request relate:</b>		
<b>Validation date:</b>		
<b>Date of assessment:</b>		
<b>Assessed by:</b>		
<b>Projects Objectives</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Assessment</b> Score 1-5 (1-Weak, 5-Very Strong)
<b>Do the project objectives meet the Single Midlothian Plan objectives?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the economic circumstances gap</li> <li>• Reduce the gap in learning outcomes</li> <li>• Reduce the gap in health outcomes</li> <li>• Reduce carbon emissions in Midlothian to net zero by 2030</li> </ul>		
<b>Value to relevant authority in existing use of asset?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feasibility and cost of relocation of services elsewhere</li> <li>• Potential revenue savings arising from transfer</li> </ul>		(if high value to Council score 0, no or little value 5)
<b>Value for alternative use/redevelopment</b>		(if high value to Council score 0, no or little value 5)
<b>Value for proposed and other community benefits</b>		

<b>Level of community benefits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of community served</li> <li>• Nature of benefits to be delivered</li> <li>• Community need/demand for the services</li> </ul>		
<b>Likelihood that benefits will be delivered over a 5 year period</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strength of organisation</li> <li>• Sustainability of business plan/project</li> <li>• Sources and level of funding support</li> </ul>		
<b>Impact of project failure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To surrounding local environment</li> <li>• To reputation of the parties</li> <li>• To the service users'/relevant authority's objectives</li> </ul>		<b>If the impact of project failure is high, it scores 0.</b>
<b>7 Best Value themes</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Score 1-5 (1-Weak, 5-Very Strong)</b>
<b>Vision and Leadership – does the organisation have in place a clear vision and plan for what it will do to contribute to the delivery of improved outcomes for Scotland?</b>		
<b>Effective Partnerships – does the organisation have a collaborative approach to the challenges that communities face?</b>		
<b>Governance and Accountability – can the organisation demonstrate structure, policies and leadership behaviours?</b>		
<b>Use of resources – how does the organisation demonstrate effective management of all resources to deliver on outcomes?</b>		
<b>Performance management – does the organisation have robust arrangements in place to monitor and report on outcomes?</b>		
<b>Sustainability – what is the organisation doing to contribute to sustainable development?</b>		

Equality – has the organisation taken consideration of an embedded equality issues into its strategy?		
---	--	--

<b>Recommendations:</b>	•
<b>Conditions:</b>	•

<b>Score</b>	<b>Overview of evidence</b>
<b>5, Very strong</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance and financial arrangements are strong and sustainable</li> <li>• Best Value characteristics are evidenced throughout the overall approach</li> <li>• Related project benefits are very robust and demonstrate value for money</li> </ul>
<b>4, Strong</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance and financial arrangements are sound and sustainable</li> <li>• Best Value characteristics are in evidence in the proposal</li> <li>• Related projected benefits are demonstrated well and represent value for money</li> </ul>
<b>3, Moderate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance and financial arrangements are in place and acceptable</li> <li>• Best Value characteristics have been considered as part of the proposal</li> <li>• Related projected benefits are acceptable and could lead to value for money</li> </ul>
<b>2, Weak</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance and financial arrangements are weak</li> <li>• Best Value characteristics are not well demonstrated in the proposal</li> <li>• Related projected benefits are not based on robust information and demonstrate questionable value for money</li> </ul>
<b>1, Poor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance and financial arrangements are poor</li> <li>• There is little evidence of Best Value characteristics in the proposal</li> <li>• Related projected benefits are ill defined and/or unrealistic and do not demonstrate value for money</li> </ul>