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Fact sheet - Evidence to support Applications

Where possible, all statements made in the Application should be supported by documentary evidence.

Evidence supplied should be commensurate with the size of the Project and the amount of funding being sought.

Competitive Applications use evidence to support responses to assessment criteria as well as responses to other questions in the Application, e.g. timeframes, costings and land ownership, etc.

**Evidence is most effective when it is:**

» relevant to the statements it is substantiating

» rigorous, credible and able to stand up to critical analysis

» recently created or compiled.

The use of quantitative and qualitative data that is sourced and as up to date as possible is strongly encouraged—for example population data sourced from the Queensland Government Statistician’s Office (QGSO) website: www.qgso.qld.gov.au/index.php, or the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Using consultants’ reports and local and/or state government plans and strategies as evidence is encouraged.

Evidence is most effectively used when it substantiates statements made in the Application or specifically identifies the proposed works. For example, an Applicant could write: ‘the consultant’s report identified the proposed project as the most cost-effective option to address the issue for the following reasons… (Refer to attachment X section/page XX)’.

**Documentary evidence may include:**

» studies and reports such as feasibility studies, option analyses, needs analysis, modelling, e.g. showing the costs and benefits of providing (or not providing) the infrastructure and/or service

» data or statistics showing community need, social inequality or demonstrating community disadvantage

» evidence of community concern or need such as petitions, letters, survey outcomes, copies of media reports

» results from community forums or focus groups

» police or incident reports regarding community safety

» maps showing the location of proposed infrastructure and identifying relevant features

» photographs showing the condition of existing infrastructure

» minutes or resolutions relating to the need or opportunity and/or to the specific infrastructure.

Where reports are used as evidence, they should be provided in full, or at least the relevant sections along with the cover and copyright pages. If documents are available online, hyperlinks can be provided instead.

If an older study is being used as evidence, Applicants must explain why it is still relevant and identify any additional work that has been done to provide more up-to-date information.

**When documentary evidence is provided to support statements, Applicants must reference it in their response and specifically identify the attachment name or number and the relevant section and page numbers. Failure to properly reference supporting evidence may result in supporting evidence not being considered during assessment.**

Using quantitative and qualitative information

Competitive Applications not only provide documentary evidence but also explicitly use the documents’ quantitative and/or qualitative information to enhance responses to questions.

For example, an Applicant could write:

*The 2020 ABC consultant’s report (Attachment 4: Sections 4 and 6) identified the proposed project as the most cost-effective option to address the issue for the following reasons…*

This approach makes it clear what information in the documents provided is to be considered, especially when the documents are very long or detailed.

Similarly, if a technical report is being used as evidence, Applicants should provide an explanation, in layman’s terms, of what the report demonstrates and how it relates to the Application.
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