

Panel member initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## CEG program – 2020/21

### Grant Application Assessment Package



**PHCC** Working Together  
Peel-Harvey Catchment Council

PHCC project name:

#### **Numbat Neighbourhood**

Supporting People to Protect the Vulnerable Noomat Wioo (Numbat, *Myrmecobius fasciatus*) in the wild Phase 1

Assessment meeting date and details:

9am Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020

Boddington Community Resource Centre Gallery, 20 Bannister Road, Boddington

Total available funding: \$102,000

(\$92,000: 2020/21 & \$10,000: 2021/22 - revegetation)

Total Funding Requested: \$93,072.18

(\$91,196.22 + \$1,875.86 GST component for those landholders not registered for GST)

Total In-kind Contribution Offered: \$108,296

Panel members

1. Eliza Dowling

2. Darralyn Ebsary

3. Claire Reid

Staff members

1. Mel Durack

2. Christine Townsend

Panel member initials: \_\_\_\_\_

**Prior to Independent Assessment Panel meeting, staff have:**

- 1) Checked applications are complete and include all necessary information.
- 2) Checked that applications are technically feasible and meet or exceed minimum standards (See Appendix 1 attached to the CEG Guidelines).
- 3) Noted which of the Peel-Harvey NRM Strategy Biophysical priorities listed in Table 1 are addressed by the project proposal. Most projects address at least one biophysical priority.

B1.1	Coordinated governance of Peel-Yalgorup Ramsar Site
B1.2	Improve the condition of wetlands and watercourses
B1.3	Protect wetlands and watercourses
B1.4	Protect groundwater quality and quantity
B2.1	Understand soil characteristics and risks
B2.2	Match land use and management to soil type and land capability
B2.3	Implement sound soil management practices and use land productively
B2.4	Support biosecurity practices
B3.1	Protect foreshores for their ecological and recreational values
B3.2	Protect near-shore habitat for productivity and biodiversity
B4.1	Protect terrestrial and aquatic natural areas
B4.2	Manage and reduce threats to biodiversity
B4.3	Restore ecological linkages
B5.1	Support water allocation planning and management
B5.2	Support land managers to manage water resources for multiple benefits

**Prior to Independent Assessment Panel meeting, Panel members are to:**

1. Review each project summary, and if necessary individual applications. All uploaded to Members page on PHCC website.
2. Score each project for Criteria 1 to 5, 9 and 10. Staff members will score for criteria 6,7 and 8.
3. Bring your scoring for each project along to the meeting, or of possible, provide scores to staff (Mel Durack) before the meeting.

**At the Independent Assessment Panel meeting:**

- 1) Each project will be scored according to a consensus score, as agreed by the panel members. For each project, a total score will be calculated based on the consensus scores for each criteria.

Panel member initials: \_\_\_\_\_

### Assessment criteria

The assessment criteria are provided in Table 2 with the scoring guide.

Prior to the meeting, panel members are to score each project for Criteria 1 to 5, 9 and 10.

Staff members will score for criteria 6,7 and 8. **Panel members are not required to score Criteria 6,7 and 8.**

**Table 2: Draft Standard assessment criteria and scoring guide**

	Assessment criteria	Scoring guide
Project specific criteria	<p><b>1. Contribution to Numbat Neighbourhood project objectives/outcomes</b></p> <p>These are the outcomes for the relevant NLP2 project or other project. How significantly will the proposed activities contribute to the wider project objectives/outcomes?</p> <p><b>Objectives:</b> <i>Objective 1 (Project): To conserve the listed Numbat, and other Threatened Species, through awareness raising and on-ground activities that reduce threats and increase and/or improve habitat.</i> <i>Objective 2 (Australian Government): Partner with the community and other groups to ensure the security of existing self-sustaining subpopulations of threatened species, focusing on the Numbat (Numbat Recovery Plan).</i></p> <p><b>Outcomes:</b> <i>Outcome 2: By 2023, the trajectory of species targeted under the Threatened Species Strategy, and other EPBC Act priority species, is stabilised or improved.</i></p> <p><b>Eligible Activities include:</b> <i>All funded activities must be undertaken within the Hotham Williams sub-catchment of the Peel-Harvey Catchment to develop and submit projects that concentrate on activities that remove threats, maintain, protect and/or enhance habitat of the threatened species including Numbats, Red-tailed Phascogale, Woylies, Chuditch, Malleefowl and Matchstick Banksia.</i> <i>Eligible activities to protect Threatened Species include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Fencing to increase habitat by protecting remnant vegetation including riparian vegetation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Revegetation (seeding or plantings) to improving habitat condition and extent.</i></li> <li>• <i>Fencing to remove threats such as stock and unmanaged human access.</i></li> <li>• <i>Feral animal control to remove threat of predation and threats to habitat, focus on cats and foxes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Feral animal control to remove threat of predation and threats to habitat, other – rabbits, feral pigs</i></li> <li>• <i>Weed control to removing threats to habitat.</i></li> <li>• <i>Disease control (such as dieback) to reduce threats to habitat and food sources.</i></li> <li>• <i>Installation of artificial structures to augment (increase) habitat.</i></li> <li>• <i>Connectivity between significant bushland patches.</i></li> </ul>	<p>4–contributes to multiple project objectives 3–meets project objectives 2– somewhat meets objectives 1– weak on objectives 0– does not meet objectives</p>

Panel member initials: \_\_\_\_\_

	<p><b>2. Extent to which application addresses priority threats to asset</b></p> <p><i>For the Numbat Project threats include stock (grazing), feral animal predation and feral animal habitat degradation, weeds, disease.</i></p>	<p>4- significant impact on priority threats 3 – addresses priority threats 2- some impact on priority threats 1- little impact on priority threats 0-No impact</p>
<p><b>Criteria to be used by all assessment panels</b></p>	<p><b>3. Public-private benefit</b></p> <p>Do the proposed activities deliver a sound public benefit?</p>	<p>2 – High 1- Moderate 0-Low</p>
	<p><b>4. Relative ecological viability of site or patch</b></p> <p>(Viability is high where the site is relatively large, compact in shape, in good condition, and/or may be part of an ecological linkage, such as a waterway)</p>	<p>2 – high patch viability/connectivity 1– moderate 0-Low/marginal</p>
	<p><b>5. Value for money</b></p> <p>Does the application include a significant landholder contribution? Value of the grant sought relative to the asset protected?</p>	<p>3-high (&gt;50%) 2-moderate (30 – 50%) 1-low (&lt;30%)</p>
	<p><b>6. Site management plan/farm plan/ Land for Wildlife/covenant/conservation zone</b></p> <p>Does the site have a management plan such as a farm plan or Land for Wildlife Site Assessment?</p>	<p>2-Yes 1-somewhat 0-No</p>
	<p><b>7. Ongoing management</b></p> <p>Landholder commitment to ongoing management</p>	<p>2 – Strong landholder management commitment 0 – little or no commitment</p>
	<p><b>8. Applicant’s capacity to deliver</b></p> <p>Rate the applicant’s capacity to deliver the proposed activities</p>	<p>2 – high 1-moderate 0-low</p>
	<p><b>9. Innovation, outstanding features or other strategic importance</b></p> <p>Is the project innovative or has any outstanding features not captured in other criteria? Does the proposal represent any other strategic benefits to Catchment or community?</p>	<p>2-Project is innovative, has outstanding features or is of other strategic importance 0-No</p>
	<p><b>10. Partnerships or collective efforts (where relevant)</b></p> <p>Does the proposal involve other groups or landholders/groups of landholders?</p>	<p>2- Yes - application involves partnerships or joint efforts with other landholders or groups 0-No</p>

Panel member initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Table 3: ASSESSMENT TABLE												
Application	Project-specific criteria		Universal Criteria								Total score	Comments
	Contribution to project objectives/ outcomes (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	Application addresses priority threats (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	Public-private benefit (Score 2,1,0)	Relative ecological viability of site (Score 2,1,0)	Value for money (Score 3, 2,1)	Site plan (Score 2,1,0)	Ongoing managem'nt (Score 2,0)	Applicant's capacity to deliver (Score 2,1,0)	Innovation, outstanding or strategic (Score 2,1, 0)	Partner-ships or collective efforts (Score 2,0)		
003a_NUM_HAR_2020_HW												
003b_NUM_HAR_2020_HW												
004_NUM_HAW_2020_HW												
005_NUM_KIC_2020_HW												
006_NUM_MEL_2020_HW												
007_NUM_MOO_2020_HW												
008_NUM_ONE_2020_HW												
009_NUM_PAU_2020_HW												
010_NUM_WAR_2020_HW												
025_GF_PIGS_CHA_2020_HW												