Business Case - Preparation - Coralvale Regional Council - 25/09/2026

1. Run Metadata & System Disclosure

Field	Entry
Council	Coralvale Regional Council
State jurisdiction	QLD
Document type	Business Case
Date run	25/09/2026
Version	Draft 1.0
Officer accountable	J. Smith, Manager Capital Delivery
AI system used	Claude (free, Pro or Max, personal account)

The AI system used is recorded above verbatim as stated by the officer. No separate version number was stated with that value, and none has been added.

The AI system was instructed to operate under these boundaries:

1. No external internet access.
2. No fact used that is not in the prompt.
3. No figure, date or statutory reference invented.

These are the instructions the system was given. They are not a verified record of what the system did. The officer should check the Final document against the Source Register in section 5 before relying on it.

2. Conflict of Interest & Probity Declarations

Declaration made by J. Smith, Manager Capital Delivery, recorded exactly as given:

"I, the officer operating the AI, and the external consultant engaged on this project have no conflict of interest in this matter."

The declaration states no conflict for either the officer or the external consultant. No conflict is declared, so no management action is recorded. The declaration was made at interview on 25/09/2026. The name of the external consultant is not recorded in the interview record; if the probity file requires the consultant to be named, that name is [VERIFY].

3. Statutory Anchors & Delegations

Provision or framework	Where used in the Final document
QLD Business Case Development Framework (BCDF) & Project Assessment Framework (PAF)	Strategic Context & Problem Statement

Provision or framework	Where used in the Final document
Business Case Development Framework Cost Benefit Analysis Guide, Release 3, June 2021, sections 4.4.2 and 4.7.1	Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis (source of the discount rates; stated as Queensland Government guidance adopted by reference, not stated to bind councils)
IPWEA NAMS+ Asset Management Framework	Executive Summary & Investment Proposal; Strategic Context & Problem Statement; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing (IPWEA NAMS+)
Local Government Regulation 2012 Chapter 6 (section number [VERIFY])	Risk Management & Governance Plan (research finding 2 states that Chapter 6 governs contracting)

Each provision is cited as the prompt gives it. No subject has been attached to any provision beyond what the prompt states.

The Coralvale Regional Council Procurement Policy 2026, adopted 24/06/2026, is used in the Risk Management & Governance Plan and the Implementation & Procurement Roadmap as the source of the public tender threshold. It is a council policy, not a statutory provision.

Delegation instrument or policy under which the officer is acting: [VERIFY]. No delegation instrument was supplied. The Procurement Policy 2026, the Coralvale Corporate Plan 2024-2029 and the Long Term Financial Plan 2024-2034 are not delegation instruments and have not been used as one.

The QLD Local Government Act and any provision of it relevant to this decision were not supplied. No Act has been named in the Final document.

4. Decisions and Options Evaluated

Resolved decisions:

Resolved decision	Status	Where it landed
Option 3 selected over Option 2	Applied	Executive Summary; Options Analysis; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis
CAPEX capped at $18,500,000 ex-GST	Applied	Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan
Procurement by open public tender	Applied	Executive Summary; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap
Practical Completion 15/12/2027	Applied	Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap
Open session	Applied	Executive Summary; Risk Management & Governance Plan

Material choices about the subject matter:

1. Discount rate. The officer's own discount rate for the whole-of-life question was not answered. The economic appraisal supplies the Queensland Government central real rate of 7 per cent with tests at 4 and 10 per cent. Options considered: (a) write [VERIFY] in place of every rate; (b) use the supplied appraisal rates and flag whether Council adopts them. Recommended: (b). Reason: the appraisal figures are supplied as fact and must be reproduced; the open question is Council's adoption of the rate, not the rate itself.

2. GST treatment of the funding amounts. The $13.5M borrowings and the $5.0M grant are not labelled in the officer's answer. Options considered: (a) leave them unlabelled; (b) label them ex-GST because they sum to the ex-GST CAPEX. Recommended: (b), with the inference recorded in section 6 as a limitation for the officer to confirm. Reason: every dollar figure must carry a GST label, and the two amounts equal the ex-GST CAPEX of $18,500,000.

3. Council's prior resolution of Option 3. Options considered: (a) restate the resolution as the reason for preference; (b) state the resolution and test each option against the six evaluation criteria. Recommended: (b). Reason: the task requires the comparison to support the resolution on its merits, and it avoids post-hoc justification.
4. Scope of Option 2. The officer's answer states that Option 2 restores capacity but not redundancy or flood immunity. It does not state whether Option 2 includes automation or SCADA integration. Options considered: (a) infer that a like-for-like replacement excludes automation; (b) mark the scope as [VERIFY]. Recommended: (b). Reason: inferring scope would add a fact not in the sources.
5. Technical equations. The readability target refers to appendices for technical equations, but the Final document must contain only the listed sections. Options considered: (a) add an appendix; (b) keep the single residual-value formula in the Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis section in plain words. Recommended: (b). Reason: the section list is fixed and the formula is short.
6. Whole-of-life treatment of Options 1 and 2. Options considered: (a) estimate their whole-of-life costs; (b) show the supplied figures and mark the gaps [VERIFY]. Recommended: (b). Reason: no figure may be invented, and no Net Present Value or Benefit-Cost Ratio may be given for another option.

5. Granular Source Register

Fact | Section used | Source | Date | Status

Council name: Coralvale Regional Council | All sections | DNA CouncilName | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

State jurisdiction: QLD | All sections | DNA StateJurisdiction | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Regional city, 68,000 residents across 5,480 km2 | Strategic Context & Problem Statement | DNA PopulationBand | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Public tender threshold $200,000 ex-GST, Coralvale Regional Council Procurement Policy 2026, adopted 24/06/2026 | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | DNA ProcurementThreshold | 25/09/2026 | [Officer Confirmed — Coralvale Regional Council Procurement Policy 2026, adopted 24/06/2026]

Procurement Policy 2026 public tender threshold $200,000 ex-GST | Supports the row above | Research finding 1 | [VERIFY] | [Council Research]

Two written quotes above $3,000 | Not used in the Final document | Research finding 1 | [VERIFY] | [Council Research]

Local Government Regulation 2012 Chapter 6 governs contracting | Risk Management & Governance Plan | Research finding 2 | [VERIFY] | [Council Research]

Local Government Regulation 2012 Chapter 6 section number | Risk Management & Governance Plan | Research finding 2 | [VERIFY] | [VERIFY]

IPWEA NAMS+ Condition Grade 4 requires immediate capital replacement planning | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | Research finding 3 | [VERIFY] | [Council Research]

Condition Grade 4 triggers immediate capital replacement planning | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | M5 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Officer: J. Smith, Manager Capital Delivery | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Preparation sections 1, 2 and 8 | DNA OfficerNameAndPosition | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

AI system: Claude (free, Pro or Max, personal account) | Preparation section 1 | DNA AISystemUsed | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Conflict of interest declaration (no conflict) | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Preparation section 2 | DNA ConflictOfInterestDeclaration | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Coralvale Corporate Plan 2024-2029 | Strategic Context; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA GoverningPlanNames | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Long Term Financial Plan 2024-2034 | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | DNA GoverningPlanNames | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Corporate Plan 2024-2029, Pillar 3 Sustainable Infrastructure, Goal 3.2 | Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | M20 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Ridgeback Creek Water Treatment Plant at IPWEA NAMS+ Condition Grade 4 | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | DNA CurrentState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Single 1980s clarifier train | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis | DNA CurrentState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Manual dosing | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis | DNA CurrentState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

No redundancy | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan | DNA CurrentState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Peak-day demand exceeds firm capacity | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis | DNA CurrentState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Target state: fully automated plant | Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA TargetState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Target state: 25 MLD firm capacity | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA TargetState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Target state: duty/standby trains | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA TargetState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Target state: SCADA integration | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA TargetState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Target state: 1-in-100 year flood immunity | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Strategic & Community Benefits | DNA TargetState | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Council resolved Option 3 in June 2026 | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Options Analysis; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | DNA Background; M4 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Practical Completion locked to the State grant funding deed | Executive Summary; Strategic Context; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | DNA Background | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Wet season constrains the construction window | Strategic Context; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | DNA Background | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

CAPEX $18,500,000 ex-GST | All sections of the Final document except Strategic Context | M3 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

OPEX reduces by $1,200,000 per year | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing; Strategic & Community Benefits | M3; M23 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Funding: $13.5M LTFP borrowings | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | M3 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Funding: $5.0M Works for Queensland grant | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan | M3 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Option 1 do-nothing, rejected: Condition Grade 4 with no redundancy | Options Analysis | M4 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Option 2 like-for-like clarifier replacement $6,200,000 ex-GST, rejected: restores capacity but not redundancy or flood immunity | Executive Summary; Options Analysis; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | M4 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Option 3 full automation plus 25 MLD firm capacity $18,500,000 ex-GST, preferred | Executive Summary; Options Analysis | M4 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

40-year whole-of-life horizon | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | M6 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Residual value 15% at year 40 | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | M6 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Officer's discount rate | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | M6 | 25/09/2026 | [VERIFY]

Risk 1: Plant failure before completion, Likely x Major, Manager Water Operations | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | M7 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Risk 2: Grant deed date missed, Possible x Major, Director Infrastructure Services | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | M7 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Risk 3: Wet season delay, Likely x Moderate, Project Manager | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | M7 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Evaluation criteria: asset condition, peak-day capacity, redundancy, 1-in-100 year flood immunity, automation and SCADA integration, whole-of-life cost | Options Analysis | M24 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Contingency 10% of construction cost, included in CAPEX | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing; Risk Management & Governance Plan | M24 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Resolved: Option 3 selected over Option 2 | Executive Summary; Options Analysis | Resolved decision | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Resolved: CAPEX capped at $18,500,000 ex-GST | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan | Resolved decision | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Resolved: procurement by open public tender | Executive Summary; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | Resolved decision | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Resolved: Practical Completion 15/12/2027 | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap | Resolved decision | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Resolved: open session | Executive Summary; Risk Management & Governance Plan | Resolved decision | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Appraisal method: incremental cost-benefit analysis of preferred option against do-nothing base case; real values, ex-GST, today's dollars | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

CAPEX in year 0; benefits year 1 to year 29; evaluation period 29 years | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Residual value $5,087,500 ex-GST in year 29 by straight-line depreciation | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Grant treated as a transfer; full CAPEX used | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Discount rate 7 per cent central, 4 and 10 per cent sensitivity, BCDF Cost Benefit Analysis Guide Release 3, June 2021, sections 4.4.2 and 4.7.1 | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Annual benefit $1,550,000 ex-GST | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Avoided reactive maintenance $150,000 per year | Options Analysis; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal; M23 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Avoided expected failure and outage cost $200,000 per year | Options Analysis; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal; M23 | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Do-nothing annual cost avoided $350,000 ex-GST | Executive Summary; Options Analysis; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis; Whole-of-Life Asset Costing | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

At 4%: PV benefits $27,956,000; PV costs $18,500,000; NPV $9,456,000; BCR 1.51 | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

At 7%: PV benefits $19,746,000; PV costs $18,500,000; NPV $1,246,000; BCR 1.07 | Executive Summary; Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

At 10%: PV benefits $14,844,000; PV costs $18,500,000; NPV -$3,656,000; BCR 0.80 | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Breakeven annual benefit $993,000 at 4%; $1,449,000 at 7%; $1,940,000 at 10% | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

Margin over breakeven at central rate $101,000 per year | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis | Economic Appraisal | 25/09/2026 | [User Entered]

6. Unresolved Items & Limitations

Missing item | Section that needs it

Regional category of the council | Strategic Context & Problem Statement

Years the council has operated | Strategic Context & Problem Statement

Decision-maker for this matter | Executive Summary & Investment Proposal; Risk Management & Governance Plan

Top concerns for this matter | Strategic Context & Problem Statement

Key stakeholders | Strategic & Community Benefits

Project constraints beyond the wet season and the grant deed date | Strategic Context & Problem Statement; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap

Voice: formality | All sections

Voice: plain English level | All sections

Voice: terms to use | All sections
Voice: terms to avoid | All sections
Voice: grammatical person | All sections
Voice: house conventions | All sections
Council's own adopted discount rate | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis
Local Government Regulation 2012 Chapter 6 section number | Risk Management & Governance Plan
Delegation instrument or policy under which the officer is acting | Preparation section 3
Date of access for research findings 1, 2 and 3 | Preparation section 5
Name of the external consultant, if the probity file requires it | Preparation section 2
Whether a non-asset option was considered | Options Analysis (Minimum 3 Scenarios)
Whether Option 2 includes automation and SCADA integration | Options Analysis (Minimum 3 Scenarios)
Option 2 annual operating cost effect, asset life and whole-of-life cost | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing (IPWEA NAMS+)
Remaining useful life of the existing plant | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing (IPWEA NAMS+)
Annual maintenance and renewal allocation for the new plant over its 40-year life | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing (IPWEA NAMS+)
Whether the 40-year asset life allows for changing climate conditions | Whole-of-Life Asset Costing (IPWEA NAMS+)
Effect of the $13.5M borrowing on Council's financial sustainability ratios | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis
Split of CAPEX between renewal of the existing asset and new capacity | Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis
Current peak-day demand and current firm capacity in MLD | Strategic & Community Benefits
Treatment actions for each of the three top risks | Risk Management & Governance Plan
Interim operating arrangements for the existing plant until Practical Completion | Risk Management & Governance Plan; Implementation & Procurement Roadmap
Tender release date, contract award date and construction window dates | Implementation & Procurement Roadmap
Name of the QLD Local Government Act and the provisions relevant to this decision | Risk Management & Governance Plan

Limitations:

1. The system had no external access. Every fact reached it through the prompt. Nothing in either document has been checked against an outside source.
2. The $13.5M and $5.0M funding amounts have been labelled ex-GST in the Final document because they sum to the ex-GST CAPEX of $18,500,000. The officer's answer did not label them. The officer must confirm this.
3. The readability target refers to appendices for technical equations, but the Final document may contain only the listed sections. The single residual-value formula is kept in the Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis section in plain words. No appendix has been added.
4. Options 1 and 2 were not appraised in dollars, as instructed. The whole-of-life comparison between options is therefore incomplete, and the Final document says so.
5. The Strategic Context & Problem Statement section may fall below its 300-word budget because several contextual facts are marked [VERIFY]. It has not been padded.
6. The quality rule requiring full compliance with the QLD Local Government Act and subordinate legislation cannot be checked, because no Act or provision beyond Local Government Regulation 2012 Chapter 6 was supplied.
7. Readability cannot be measured by the system. See section 8.

7. Substantive Review Findings

Review panel findings from the Treasury Gateway Evaluator, opposing the Infrastructure Economist:

1. Non-asset solutions. Finding: no non-asset option was evaluated. The three options are all asset options or do-nothing. Resolution: no option was invented. The Options Analysis states that whether a non-asset option was considered is [VERIFY], and the item is listed in section 6.
2. Optimism bias. Finding: the CAPEX includes a contingency of 10 per cent of construction cost, but no separate optimism-bias allowance is identified. The central Benefit-Cost Ratio of 1.07 clears breakeven by only $101,000 per year, and the ratio falls to 0.80 at the 10 per cent test rate. Resolution: the Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis states the margin, names the estimates it rests on (chiefly the $1,200,000 OPEX reduction), and states the result at the 10 per cent test rate. No further sensitivity test was added, as the prompt forbids it.
3. Momentum bias and post-hoc justification. Finding: Council resolved Option 3 in June 2026, before this business case was prepared on 25/09/2026. There is a risk that the options were framed to support a decision already made. Resolution: the Options Analysis states the resolution, then tests every option against the six evaluation criteria. It states plainly that Option 2 was not appraised in dollars, so the preference for Option 3 over Option 2 rests on the non-dollar criteria of redundancy and flood immunity.
4. Genuineness of Option 2. Finding: Option 2 is a real alternative with its own capital cost of $6,200,000 ex-GST, but its operating cost and whole-of-life cost are unknown. Resolution: the Whole-of-Life Asset Costing section shows these gaps as [VERIFY] rather than filling them.

Drafting positions considered:

1. Presentation of the 10 per cent test result. Infrastructure Economist: state the 0.80 ratio prominently and treat the non-dollar benefits as the required qualitative justification. Director of Corporate Services: lead with funding certainty and the Long Term Financial Plan position. Recommended: the Cost-Benefit & Financial Analysis carries both; the Executive Summary states the central result only, as required.
2. Asset life under changing climate conditions. Asset Management Strategist: the 40-year life may be optimistic for a plant exposed to flood. Infrastructure Economist: use the life as supplied. Recommended: use the 40-year life as supplied and flag the climate allowance as [VERIFY].
3. New capital versus renewal. Director of Corporate Services: the project should not be presented as new capital when it replaces a Grade 4 asset. Asset Management Strategist: it both closes an asset renewal gap and adds capacity. Recommended: describe it as both, and mark the split of CAPEX between renewal and new capacity as [VERIFY].
4. Lifecycle maintenance allocation. Asset Management Strategist: the net $1,200,000 OPEX reduction may hide the maintenance and renewal allocation the new plant will need. Infrastructure Economist: use the net figure as supplied. Recommended: use the supplied figure and state in the Whole-of-Life Asset Costing section that the allocation is [VERIFY].

8. Quality & Human Verification Sign-Off

Quality rule	Result	Note
Every fact in the Final document traces to the DNA, a decision or a finding and appears in the Source Register	Pass	Each fact used is listed in section 5
No placeholder brackets remain except [VERIFY]	Pass	Only [VERIFY] is used
Reader statement honoured	Pass	Written for the CFO, Executive Leadership Team, Finance Committee and Treasury grant evaluators

Quality rule	Result	Note
Officer recommendation reproduces the officer's wording	Pass	No officer recommendation wording was supplied and none has been written
Unavailable facts written as [VERIFY] or as an action, never as 'not supplied' or 'not provided'	Pass	Checked in the final search
No DNA field name or module number; no label followed by [VERIFY] on its own line	Pass	Missing facts are written as plain sentences
Australian English	Pass	Australian spelling used
No headings in the Final document beyond the section list	Pass	Title and eight section headings only
No mention of AI, prompts, panels, seats or process in the Final document	Pass	None present
Conflict of interest stated as a fact, not reproduced from the declaration	Pass	Stated in the Risk Management & Governance Plan
Readability within Flesch 55-65	[VERIFY]	The officer must run a Flesch Reading Ease test on the main text of the Final document in Word
Each section states what its facts mean for the decision	Pass	Consequences drawn only from supplied facts
Every dollar figure labelled ex-GST or GST inclusive	Pass	Funding labels inferred; see section 6, limitation 2
No procurement threshold except the DNA figure	Pass	Only $200,000 ex-GST used
Dates DD/MM/YYYY	Pass	Month-only dates used where no day was supplied
Full compliance with the Local Government Act and subordinate legislation of QLD	[VERIFY]	The officer must check the Final document against the QLD Local Government Act and regulations
Preparation document carries all eight sections in order, with declarations and an unsigned sign-off block	Pass	Sections 1 to 8 present
No filler such as world-class, leading, innovative, synergy or passionate	Pass	None present
Final check for label-plus-[VERIFY], 'not provided', 'not supplied' and 'the supplied information'	Pass	None present

Field	Entry
Reviewed and accepted by (signature)	
Name and position	J. Smith, Manager Capital Delivery
Date (DD/MM/YYYY)	

This document is not accepted until the officer named above has signed it.