

HRM Community Facilities Partnership Fund Review Form

Name of Organization (s):	
Funding Sector:	Year:

Level 1. Basic Eligibility	
<i>The applicant's eligibility is assessed by staff before a file is evaluated for project merit.</i>	
Application late Located outside geographic boundary of HRM Debt to HRM/Legal dispute Project is ineligible for funding consideration Application is incomplete Applicant withdrew Other (specify):	

Proceed to Level 2 of Review	Ineligible
------------------------------	------------

Provide Details of Reason for Ineligibility
--

Contact Record: Note the date of contact, name, and information requested.

Level 2. Project Merit

This section assesses the clarity of the proposal and the project's merit relative to program goals. Scores higher for tangible, measurable outcomes as compared to emotive or speculative claims.

Criteria	Score	Values
Scale of Economic Impact Regional Provincial National International	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3
Alignment with HRM Strategic Priorities Regional Plan Cultural Plan Economic Development Plan Immigration Plan Transportation Plan Inter-Governmental Relations	10	High (>4) = 10 Medium (3-4) = 6 Low (1-2) = 3
Project Readiness Project commences within 6-12 months; and/or Construction complete and facility operational within 12-24 months from date of funding	5	High (both) = 5 Medium (one) = 3
Partnerships and Collaboration Formal agreements	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3
Environmental Impact Sustainability in design and operation	5	High = 5 Medium = 1
Sector-Specific Impact Ability of facility/site to enhance profile and economic viability of a specific sector. For example, employment, exports, centre of excellence, retention of migrants and immigrants, small business, tourism etc.	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3
Innovation and Creativity Describe specific attribute(s):	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3

Project Merit: Sub-Total Score	/60 pts	
---------------------------------------	----------------	--

Level 3. Financial Stewardship

This section determines the type and/or degree of financial risk to HRM. Access to government and private funding varies significantly by sector: projects should be weighted accordingly ie. limited access to alternate funding scores higher.

Criteria	Score	Values
Project Sustainability Assessment of project financing. Ability of operator to sustain the facility independent of further HRM funding.	10	High (independent) = 10 Medium = 6 Low (dependent) = 0-3
Scale and Type of Municipal Financial Impact (Revenue and/or Cost Saving) Increase in HRM's tax base Reduction in HRM's capital or operating costs Incremental increase in HRM's operating revenue Alternate service delivery of municipal mandate	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3 None = 0
Project Financial Management Technical qualifications and experience Presentation of financial information	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3
Financial Diversification Share of project self-funded (30%-50%) = High Range/type of funding partners = High for sector with limited access to government funded programs Public vs private (private scores higher) = High for % of private	10	High = 10 Medium = 6 Low = 3
Financial Stewardship Sub-Total Score	/40pt	

Scoring Summary

Project Merit	/60pts
Financial Stewardship	/40pts
Total	/100pts
Rank	
Recommended Award	\$

Terms and Conditions of Funding. Specify measurable project outcomes

Recommend Decline. In point form, briefly explain why this project is not recommended for funding in this year's program

Reviewer's Name:

Tel:

Date of Review.

Individual ----- Team -----

-

Referral/Follow-Up. Feedback to applicant. Note type and date (letter, telephone call, meeting) or referral to other program.