



NAVIGATING UNCERTAINTY

Property Data-Centre Readiness Audit

Demo 04 - Is a site genuinely ready for compute infrastructure demand, or is it only marketed that way?

Report type	Domain	Demo entity
Data-centre readiness audit	Property / AI infrastructure	Demo entity: Westfield Power Corridor Site, a synthetic site marketed as data-centre-adjacent.
Status	Prepared for	Advice status
Synthetic demonstration report	Public website demo	Not legal, financial, valuation or investment advice

This document shows how a paid audit deliverable could be structured. Demo numbers are synthetic but written to show realistic decision support.

Contents

This report is intentionally compact. Each section is designed to give a client a clear reason to pay: structured evidence, useful interpretation, and practical monitoring actions.

Section	Page	What it shows
1	Executive dashboard	Readiness score, blockers and next decision gates.
2	Audit question and scope	Readiness testing rather than property marketing narrative.
3	Site readiness evidence	Grid, fibre, cooling, land, planning and fallback use.
4	Bottleneck analysis	What prevents the site from being data-centre-ready today.
5	Scenario and risk matrix	Approval, rejection, demand shock and fallback scenarios.
6	Recommendations and monitoring	Due diligence sequence and escalation thresholds.

Core audit question: Is a site genuinely ready for compute infrastructure demand, or is it only marketed that way?

1. Executive dashboard

Westfield is promising but not yet data-centre-ready. Fibre and land signals are supportive, but planning and grid capacity remain unresolved.

The key insight is bottleneck order: planning is the first gate, grid capacity is the second, and cooling/design feasibility is third.

Client decision: treat the site as a qualified infrastructure opportunity, not a confirmed data-centre asset.

Metric	Demo value	Reading	Implication
Readiness score	74/100	Promising but conditional.	Move to validation stage.
Planning gate	High risk	Permission and local constraints are unresolved.	Planning pre-review.
Grid gate	High risk	Actual capacity is not confirmed.	Technical validation.
Fallback value	Moderate	Industrial/logistics use protects downside.	Preserve optionality.

Main client insight: The key insight is bottleneck order: planning is the first gate, grid capacity is the second, and cooling/design feasibility is third.

2. Audit question and scope

Is a site genuinely ready for compute infrastructure demand, or is it only marketed that way?

- Synthetic site-readiness audit using infrastructure and property constraints.
- Focuses on screening and due diligence sequence.
- Excludes engineering design, environmental assessment, formal valuation and legal planning opinion.

3. Evidence register

The report separates evidence into views. The conclusion is stronger when different evidence layers point in the same direction; divergence becomes an audit finding rather than being hidden.

View	Demo evidence	Audit purpose	Weakness
Power	Grid proximity, capacity proxies, energy constraints	Tests core compute feasibility.	Capacity must be verified.
Fibre	Carrier presence, network corridor, redundancy	Tests digital infrastructure suitability.	Provider quality unknown.
Cooling	Physical site conditions, water/air constraints	Tests operational feasibility.	Requires engineering review.
Land	Site size, access, expansion potential	Tests development feasibility.	Title/legal constraints excluded.
Planning	Zoning, permissions, local sensitivity	Tests actionability.	Specialist review required.

4. Method and quality controls

The method is designed to be auditable: every conclusion should trace back to a source view, a preprocessing decision and a stated limitation.

Control	Demo check	Why it matters
Identifier alignment	Entities/sites/providers matched across views.	Prevents false divergence.
Windowing	Demo windows fixed before comparison.	Prevents cherry-picked movement.
Missingness	Unknown/private data marked as caveat.	Prevents false certainty.
Source hierarchy	Direct, proxy and inferred evidence separated.	Stops weak evidence becoming headline evidence.
Concordance	Views compared before conclusion.	Finds hidden disagreement.

Method principle: features build views; views build local structures; local structures build an auditable decision.

5. View analysis

This page is the main insight layer. It shows what each evidence view contributes and why the final conclusion is not based on one metric.

Power readiness

Grid proximity is favourable, but available capacity is not confirmed. This is a core unresolved assumption.

Fibre readiness

Connectivity signals are stronger than the average industrial site. Carrier diversity still needs confirmation.

Physical readiness

Land and access are supportive for phased development, but cooling and environmental constraints remain open.

Planning readiness

Planning is the largest blocker. Without local permission confidence, the data-centre narrative remains conditional.

6. Concordance, drift and risk

Concordance shows whether evidence views agree. Drift asks whether the structure is changing. Risk converts both into decision priorities.

Concordance matrix

Comparison	Relationship	Interpretation	Status
Fibre vs land	Agreement	Site has plausible digital infrastructure relevance.	Stable
Power vs readiness	Unresolved	Readiness cannot be confirmed without capacity evidence.	Flag
Planning vs opportunity	Constraint	Planning may override technical potential.	Flag
Fallback vs downside	Positive	Industrial/logistics fallback protects downside.	Stable

Risk heatmap

Risk	Severity	Likelihood	Why it matters	Control
Planning rejection	High	Medium	Could remove data-centre use case.	Planning pre-review.
Grid capacity failure	High	Medium	Compute use depends on available power.	Grid validation.
Cooling constraint	Medium	Medium	Design feasibility could weaken.	Engineering review.
Narrative overreach	Medium	High	Marketing may outrun evidence.	Use readiness score.

7. Recommendations

Recommendations are written as practical client actions. They identify what to do now, what to validate next and what to monitor later.

Priority	Recommendation	Reason	Owner / cadence
Immediate	Run planning pre-review before pricing upside.	Planning is first gate.	Planning advisor
Immediate	Request grid capacity evidence.	Power is second gate.	Technical advisor
30 days	Confirm fibre carriers and redundancy.	Connectivity needs evidence.	Infrastructure advisor
Quarterly	Track local data-centre demand and comparable deals.	Market support changes readiness.	Analyst

Monitoring triggers

Indicator	Cadence	Escalation trigger	Meaning
Readiness score	Monthly during diligence	Below 65 or above 80	Decision gate.
Planning status	Milestone	Constraint identified	Actionability.
Grid evidence	Milestone	Capacity confirmed/rejected	Core feasibility.
Comparable demand	Quarterly	Regional demand shifts	Market support.

8. Limitations and appendix

Limitations are part of the audit. The goal is not to remove uncertainty, but to make uncertainty visible and decision-relevant.

- All entities, scores and values are synthetic demo examples.
- No private client data, CV data or proposal content is included.
- The report is not legal, financial, investment, valuation, tax, security, engineering or regulatory advice.
- Any real paid audit would need source validation, client context and domain-specific review.

Glossary

Term	Meaning
View	An evidence layer such as market, usage, infrastructure, geography or risk.
Concordance	Agreement between evidence views.
Drift	Movement in structure, behaviour or risk over time.
Auditable report	A report where evidence, assumptions, limits and conclusions can be inspected.

Commercial value: the client is paying for a traceable evidence trail, not a generic opinion.