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1 Executive Summary

1.1 Background and purpose

{Provide a description of the purpose of the site visit and the areas to be reviewed}. Include a summary of project details and adjustments

Table 1: Summary of project details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Original Risk Profile</th>
<th>Revised Risk Profile</th>
<th>Refer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Project Costs Assessment Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Project Plan and Capability Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Financial Sustainability Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Funding Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall risk rating is revised from ? to ? out of a possible score of 9. The risk profiles relating to Stage ? and Stage ? have been adjusted following additional information obtained during the site visit. The revised risk rating is based on the following factors:

- {provide details of why the risk rating has been revised}.

1.2.2 Implementation Score: Revised from ? to ?

The Implementation Score relates to the likelihood the project will be successfully implemented. This score of ? indicates that {most of the attributes of an excellent proposal are met}. The revised score is based on:

- {provide details of why the score is been given}

1.2.3 Ability to Deliver Score: Revised from ? to ?

The Ability to Deliver Score relates the likelihood the project team and/or organisation will achieve the project outputs. The revised score of ? indicates that {all the attributes expected of an excellent proposal are met and there may be an instance where an attribute is outstanding}.

- {provide details of why the score is been given}

1.3 Conclusion

Based on the above information, we do/do not consider there to be sufficient justification for the IAG to recommend this application to proceed to the next phase of the assessment process.
2 Results of site visit

2.1 Project Costs Assessment Review

The objective of this stage is to assess whether the applicant/project:

- Is limited to seeking one-off capital expenditure;
- Is not for debt servicing;
- Is for future and not retrospective expenditures; and
- Utilizes economical rates to cost the project components.

From the information provided, the Independent Assessment Team determined that the Project Costs overall risk is revised from [High to Moderate].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Original risk rating</th>
<th>Revised risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs Assessment Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- {provide details of why the score is been given}
2.2 Funding Review

The objective of this stage is to assess whether the applicant/project:

- Has achieved significant financial support from the community; and
- Has exhausted all other reasonable channels for alternative funding.

From the information provided, the Independent Assessment Team determined that the Funding overall risk rating is revised from [High to Moderate].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Original risk rating</th>
<th>Revised risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{provide details of why the score is been given}

Table 4: Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Funding</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{provide details of funding sources}