

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

## CEG program

### Grant Application Assessment Package 2020/21



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

PHCC project name:

#### Greening Farms

Greening the Peel-Harvey Landscape for farming, fodder and fauna

**Assessment meeting date and details:** 12.30 pm Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
Boddington Community Resource Centre, 20 Bannister Road, Boddington, Western Australia 6390

**Total available funding:** \$130,000

**Total funding requested:** \$211,467.54 + \$4,026.52 GST

**Total In-kind Contributions offered:** \$360,055.96

**Panel members:** Andy Gulliver, Marilyn Gray, Rob Summers, Darralyn Ebsary, Paddi Creevey

**Staff members:** Gene Turner, Melanie Durack, Paula Pownall, Megan Leroy

58 Sutton Street, Mandurah  
Western Australia 6210  
T: +61 8 6369 8800

[www.peel-harvey.org.au](http://www.peel-harvey.org.au)

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 (Gene or Mel) 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 Greening Farm (GF) 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><u>Eligible activities (as per CEG Guidelines):</u> All funded activities must be on-farm and contribute to sustainable agriculture within the Peel-Harvey Catchment.</p> <p>Eligible activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fencing of remnant vegetation, including watercourses</li> <li>• Managing remnant vegetation, such as environmental weed control, feral animal control, dieback disease management.</li> <li>• Planting or seeding of new areas to native vegetation or native fodder</li> <li>• Innovative pasture plantings/seeding</li> <li>• Enhancement of habitat associated with on-farm vegetation, rocky outcrops or other natural areas</li> </ul> <p><u>5-year outcomes from Greening Farms:</u></p> <p>Primary Outcome (5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2023, there will be increased awareness and adoption of land management practices that improve and protect the condition of soil, biodiversity and vegetation (Vegetation and biodiversity on farms)</li> </ul> <p>Secondary Outcome (4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2023, the implementation of priority actions is leading to an improvement in the condition of EPBC Act listed Threatened Ecological Communities (Eucalyptus Woodlands of the Western Wheatbelt, Banksia Woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain)</li> <li>• By 2023, there will be increased awareness and adoption of land management practices that improve and protect the condition of soil, biodiversity and vegetation (Reducing the risk of soil and nutrient loss from wind erosion and reducing the risk of soil and nutrient loss from hillslopes)</li> </ul>	<p>4–contributes to multiple project objectives</p> <p>3-meets project objectives</p> <p>2– somewhat meets objectives</p> <p>1– weak on objectives</p> <p>0– does not meet objectives</p>

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

	<p><b>2. Extent to which the on-ground works will improve, or contribute to, sustainable agricultural production.</b></p>	<p>4- significant impact on priority assets/threats            3 – addresses priority assets/threats            2- some impact on priority assets/threats            1- little impact on priority assets/threats            0-No impact</p>
<p><b>Criteria to be used by all assessment panels</b></p>	<p><b>3. Public-private benefit</b>            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>            (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>            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>            Does the site have a management plan such as a farm plan or Land for Wildlife Site Assessment? If there is an informal plan, then score as ‘somewhat’</p>	<p>2-Yes            1-Somewhat            0-No</p>
	<p><b>7. Ongoing management</b>            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>            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>            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</b> (where relevant)            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>

Table 3: ASSESSMENT TABLE												
	Project-specific criteria		Universal Criteria									
Application	1. Contribution to project objectives/ outcomes (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	2. Contribution to sustainable agricultural production (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	3. Public-private benefit (Score 2,1,0)	4. Relative ecological viability of site (Score 2,1,0)	5. Value for money (Score 3, 2,1)	6. Site plan (Score 2,1,0)	7. Ongoing management (Score 2,0)	8. Applicant's capacity to deliver (Score 2,1,0)	9. Innovation, outstanding or strategic (Score 2,0)	10. Partnerships or collective efforts (Score 2,0)	Total score	Comments
016_GF_AUS_2020_HW												
017_GF_BAT_2020_HW												
018_GF_CAV_2020_HW												
019_GF_CHA_2020_HW												
020_GF_DIX_2020_HW												
021_GF_MUN_2020_HW												
023_GF_ONE_2020_HW												
024_GF_PER_2020_HW												
025_GF_PIGS_CHA_2020_HW												
026_GF_PRI_2020_HW												
027_GF_SAL_2020_HW												
028_GF_WAT_2020_HW												
029_GF_WIT_2020_HW												
006_NUM_MEL_2020_HW												
030_GF_BAS_2020_SCP												
031_GF_BEN_2020_SCP												

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

Application	Project-specific criteria		Universal Criteria							Total score	Comments	
	1. Contribution to project objectives/ outcomes (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	2. Contribution to sustainable agricultural production (Score 4,3,2,1,0)	3. Public-private benefit (Score 2,1,0)	4. Relative ecological viability of site (Score 2,1,0)	5. Value for money (Score 3, 2,1)	6. Site plan (Score 2,1,0)	7. Ongoing management (Score 2,0)	8. Applicant's capacity to deliver (Score 2,1,0)	9. Innovation, outstanding or strategic (Score 2,0)			10. Partnerships or collective efforts (Score 2,0)
032_GF_BUT_2020_SCP												
033_GF_CAL_2020_SCP												
034_GF_FOR_2020_SCP												
035_GF_GRA_2020_SCP												
036_GF_HAM_2020_SCP												
037_GF_ITA_2020_SCP												
038_GF_KAU_2020_SCP												
039_GF_LEI_2020_SCP												
040_GF_McC_2020_SCP												
041_GF_McL_2020_SCP												
042_GF_PEA_2020_SCP												
022_GF_POU_2020_SCP												