

## TfN Board Meeting – Item 5: Economic Recovery Plan

### Appendix 1 – Proposed assessment framework

#### Assessment Objectives

Proposed interventions will be assessed using the following criteria.

Table 1

Ref	Tier One Assessment Criteria – against core objectives and assessment of deliverability Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Tier One assessment would be applied to all proposals.</li><li>Primary focus is on deliverability of schemes within proposed time period.</li><li>Assessment will stop at tier one if schemes are considered undeliverable by 2025 or for proposals on development work, by 2026/27.</li></ul>	Rating (4-point)
ST1	Does the intervention align with the STP vision and objectives?	
ST2	To what extent is there a risk that the intervention could act in opposition to any of the applicable STP policy positions?	
EC1	Does the intervention help support higher productivity, greater local and /or a more balanced northern economy, and greater net employment within the North?	
SU1	Would delivering the scheme support TfN and Government commitments for decarbonisation of transport?	
Deliverability Assessment Criteria		
AC1	Is the intervention anticipated to attract transport user, business user and political support, based on the nature of the intervention?	
AC2	Is the level of disruption which may be caused by the construction of the scheme likely to be acceptable to customers?	
DL1	To what extent is the scheme proposal in as much detail as is currently understood, constructible and viable. (Assessed based on the proposed delivery time frame to start on site before 2024/25 & for development work 2026/27)	
DL2	Are there significant external influences which could affect the viability or delay the scheme progressing (including DCO requirements)?	
DE1	Is there any inter-relationship between this intervention and another scheme which may not be in place, where this intervention should only be delivered after another in completed, in order to achieve the best outcomes?	
DE2	Is there any inter-relationship between this intervention and another scheme which may not be in place, where this intervention can only be delivered after another in completed, due to the technical dependencies between schemes?	
Potential outcomes of tier one assessment, aligns with core objectives and is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Deliverable by 2025 – proceed to tier two</li><li>Proposal is for accelerated development work, deliverable by 2026/27- proceed to tier two</li></ul> Not aligned with core objectives and/or not deliverable – remove from proposed programme of schemes		

## TfN Board Meeting – Item 5: Economic Recovery Plan

### Appendix 1 – Proposed assessment framework

Ref	Tier Two Assessment Criteria – more detailed assessment (only applied to schemes that progress from Tier One)	Rating (4-point)
ST3	Does the intervention address a significant current or future problem on the major transport network in terms of performance and/or resilience?	
ST4	Does the intervention present opportunities to support local strategies to support growth which will be in place by <b>2025 (for development work 2026/27)</b> (e.g. spatial and economic plans). How dependent are these on improved transport connections?	
ST5	Does the intervention align with national infrastructure schemes and priorities, which are expected to be in place by <b>2025 (for development work 2026/27)?</b>	
ST6	Does the intervention support the movement of freight, international connectivity, UK trade and investment?	
ST7	Does the intervention present opportunities for investment to align with the development of new technologies and/or complementary behaviour change programmes?	
ST8	Does the intervention present opportunities to improve the resilience of the north's transport network?	
EC2	Does the intervention help support higher productivity, through reductions in the cost of travel for businesses and/or increased economic agglomeration?	
EC3	Does the intervention help support greater local investment and/or a more balanced Northern economy?	
EC4a	Does the intervention help support greater labour market participation, and/or greater net employment within the North?	
EC4b <sup>1</sup>	Does the intervention have an immediate impact on increasing employment and at what scale e.g. 5-10 jobs, 10-50 jobs, 50+ jobs.	
SU2	Does the intervention have the potential to contribute towards improving conditions in areas where air quality is a significant concern?	
SU3	Could the scheme contribute towards a more inclusive, and better integrated sustainable transport network, including enhancing the potential for multi-modal journeys and active travel?	
SU4	Are there any potential environmental constraints identified which could stop the scheme being delivered before <b>2025 (for development work 2026/27)?</b>	
AF1	What is the scale of the whole life capital and operating costs? (Low / Medium / High / Very High)	
AF2	Is the scheme affordable during the period <b>2020-2025 &amp; for development 2020-27</b> when considered as an individual intervention?	
	<b>Tier two assessment to be used to gather further information on schemes, and to help develop a credible, but ambitious programme aligned with STP objectives and principles of the Northern Charter.</b>	

<sup>1</sup> This is an additional criteria not used for SDC2 sequencing, but would provide useful data to support a bid for Economic Recovery Plan funds.

## TfN Board Meeting – Item 5: Economic Recovery Plan

### Appendix 1 – Proposed assesement framework

#### Assessment Principles

Consistent with the SDC sequencing proposed schemes will be assessed against the tier one and tier two criteria using a qualitative four – point scale, following with the principles set out in table 2(To be used for schemes proposed for accelerated delivery by 2024/25) & 3

Table 2 - Assessment Principles

Objectives	Acceptability	Technical Feasibility – scheme delivery		Dependencies	Rating
Strongly supports objective	Strong user, business or political support	No third-party interfaces or statutory planning requirements identified at this stage	Scheme is constructible and viable before <b>2024/25</b> , with no associated risk	Scheme is not technically dependent on another scheme.	
Aligns with objectives	Some user, business or political support	Limited interfaces identified, with third parties likely to endorse proposals. No statutory planning requirements expected	Marginal risk, mitigation possible within usual structures	n/a	
Limited or negligible contribution to the objective	No/limited user, business or political support	Many third-party interfaces, but with clear definition. Potential for conflict but expected to be manageable. Statutory planning likely	Some significant risk, mitigation possible	Scheme is dependent on at least one of scheme, which is considered more than likely to be completed by 2025	
Potential hinders the objective	Likely to be opposed by some users, businesses or politicians	Significant and complex interfaces, across multiple third-party partners and organisations. High likelihood of conflict and need for negotiation. Statutory planning more than likely	Significant risk, no identifiable mitigation strategy at this stage	Scheme is dependent on at least one of scheme, for which delivery by 2025 is less than certain	

**TfN Board Meeting – Item 5: Economic Recovery Plan**  
**Appendix 1 – Proposed assesement framework**

Table 3 - Assessment Principles (Scheme feasibility / development only, and deliverable by 2026/27) – this is for assessment of proposals for accelerated work on business case development, for example this could include funding for onsite survey work.

Objectives	Acceptability	Technical Feasibility – scheme development		Dependencies	Rating
Strongly supports objective	Strong user, business or political support	Early feasibility work would have a strong likelihood of accelerating delivery of schemes	Scheme is constructible and <b>viable 2026/27</b> , with no associated risk	Scheme is not technically dependent on another scheme.	
Aligns with objectives	Some user, business or political support	Early feasibility work would potentially accelerate delivery of schemes	Marginal risk, mitigation possible within usual structures	n/a	
Limited or negligible contribution to the objective	No/limited user, business or political support	Early feasibility work would have little or no impact on bringing forward delivery of schemes	Some significant risk, mitigation possible	Scheme is dependent on at least one of scheme, which is considered more than likely to be completed by 2026	
Potential hinders the objective	Likely to be opposed by some users, businesses or politicians	Early feasibility work would have no impact on bringing forward delivery of schemes	Significant risk, no identifiable mitigation strategy at this stage	Scheme is dependent on at least one of scheme, for which delivery by 2026 is less than certain	