

From site evidence to a useful project brief.

A demonstration of how a scoped human-review engagement could be organised.

This is not a commissioned or human-reviewed site report.

No actual property has been reviewed. No utility response, client result, approval or engineering sign-off is represented. The example explains a proposed approach; it is not professional advice about a site.

The fictional starting brief

A developer is considering a regional data centre and wants to understand the investigations needed before committing to land. The project assumptions below are deliberately illustrative.

Facility request: 5 MW total, including overhead

Cooling: dry heat rejection

Connectivity: 10 Gbps and two planned physical routes

Available electrical capacity: not established

Water and carrier commitments: not established

These figures are planning inputs. They are not evidence that any real site can support this project. No location, legal parcel or site control is asserted.

The proposed service

CAD \$7,500: a source-reviewed site report plus **25 hours of Driftwood design consultation and concept work, additional to report preparation.** One agreed site footprint, one project profile and one consolidated report revision form the proposed baseline. All scope, milestones, taxes and commercial terms require written agreement.

Turn a map signal into a question someone can answer.

Power proximity

Review action: A nearby mapped line may justify an enquiry. A reviewer would check source age and scope, then frame the load and target date for the utility.

Decision still open: A project-specific utility response establishing the relevant capacity, route, allocation, cost and timing remains required.

Carrier coverage

Review action: Two provider names do not prove two physical routes. A review would identify common conduits, crossings and upstream dependencies to ask about.

Decision still open: Carrier engineering must establish actual bandwidth, diversity and delivery commitments.

Water and cooling

Review action: Dry cooling removes the modelled evaporative makeup assumption; it does not remove domestic, fire-water or all design dependencies.

Decision still open: Designers and service authorities must establish actual demands, supply, permissions and discharge needs.

The development footprint

Review action: A parcel under a pin can be only part of a marketed site. The intended footprint, access and land-control position must be stated.

Decision still open: The developer and appropriate advisers must confirm title, access, permissible use and approval requirements.

Make the next decision more concrete.

A real scope might compare access arrangements or a staged development approach. These are **illustrative decision topics only**, not layouts, designs or recommendations for a real property.

Teaching option A - define the first phase.

Set out the first-phase demand, service corridor questions and space assumptions for possible expansion. Investigate whether a confirmed service arrangement could support the operating model.

Teaching option B - stage the investigation.

Resolve site control and the most consequential service uncertainties before committing more design effort. Identify which evidence could change the investment decision.

Proposed allocation - confirm at kickoff

3 hours - Project brief

6 hours - Constraints workshop and service brief

10 hours - Early concept options

4 hours - Design brief and next-stage scope

2 hours - Review and handoff

Total: 25 hours, additional to report preparation. The balance between meetings and design production is agreed in writing. Concept revisions use the agreed consultation allowance. The allocation is a proposed plan, not a promise of particular drawings or outcomes.

Leave with a brief. Know what remains open.

A suitably scoped real engagement would provide:

- An executive decision brief separating known facts, project assumptions and unresolved questions.
- An evidence register with source references, dates, spatial scope and limitations.
- The agreed concept outputs, with their design assumptions and preliminary status visible.
- A prioritised action register naming the responsible party, evidence needed and decision dependency.
- One consolidated report revision, plus a proposed scope for any subsequent investigation or design work.

Scope agreement comes first

Milestones depend on agreed inputs and team capacity. Utility, carrier, municipal and specialist response times are outside Driftwood's control. No third-party response or approval is guaranteed.

Utility studies, permit applications, title opinions, surveys, geotechnical work and construction-ready or sealed designs require separate scopes. Third-party licences, specialist fees, travel and applicable taxes are addressed in the written agreement.

No completed professional work is represented in this example.

A real report would name its actual preparer/reviewer and record the checks performed. This teaching document contains no fabricated review, signature, authority response or resolved utility commitment.

Explore the proposed engagement and real automated examples:

[Atlas by Driftwood - Site Feasibility & Concept Design](#)

[Atlas examples](#)