REDEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

PEOPLE | PLACES | POSSIBILITIES

STRONGER COMMUNITIES
BRIGHTER FUTURES

RI Funding Readiness Operating System

COMPLETE TOOLKIT

EVALUATE • PRIORITIZE • BUILD • MAINTAIN

- PROJECT PIPELINE
- PARTNERSHIPS
- CAPITAL READINESS
- COMMUNITY IMPACT

A PRACTICAL TOOL FOR BUILDING PREPARED COMMUNITIES, BANKABLE PROJECTS, AND LASTING IMPACT.

PLAN
ALIGN
FUND
DELIVER
TOGETHER.

REDEVELOPMENT IN ACTION.

IDEAS → PARTNERSHIPS → CAPITAL → THRIVING PLACES

Start Here: Funding Readiness Evaluation

Before using the full operating system, a community should evaluate readiness from three connected perspectives. Together, they answer two practical questions: Are we Funding Ready for the next milestone? Where are the gaps? This is an evidence-based self-evaluation, not a certification. The complete toolkit is then used to build and maintain the operating system behind current and future funding opportunities.

HOW TO USE THE EVALUATION
For each question, mark 0 = Not yet / unknown, 1 = Partially in place / informal, or 2 = Ready with current evidence. Record the evidence behind each answer. Use the category results and any blocking conditions to determine the community's current readiness and the gaps that must be carried into the complete toolkit.

01 APPLICATION READINESS

Can we respond credibly?

- Is the opportunity a clear fit with community priorities, applicant eligibility, and the next project milestone?
- Can we explain the need, scope, budget, schedule, intended benefits, and implementation approach with current evidence?
- Are the applicant, partner roles, approvals, match or leverage, and required attachments clear?
- Can the team make a disciplined go / no-go decision and assemble a credible request in the available time?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: ___ / 8 [ ] Material gap [ ] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

02 PROJECT READINESS

Can the work advance?

- Is the next fundable milestone clearly defined rather than only the total project vision?
- Are site control, eligibility, technical risks, critical unknowns, and major dependencies sufficiently understood?
- Is there a credible reuse, end-user, operator, or stewardship pathway supported by community and market evidence?
- Are governance, capacity, budget, procurement, cash flow, and delivery responsibilities in place?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: ___ / 8 [ ] Material gap [ ] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

03 SYSTEMS READINESS

Can momentum continue?

- Are community priorities and the project pipeline maintained between funding cycles?
- Do partners have defined roles, durable trust, clear handoffs, and a regular operating cadence?
- Is there a sequenced strategy for public, philanthropic, private, and flexible capital?
- Does the community maintain evidence, learn from decisions, and improve the next project?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: ___ / 8 [ ] Material gap [ ] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

THE FLOW

EVALUATE READINESS → SUMMARIZE THE GAPS → FRAME THE PROJECT / PIPELINE → BUILD THE EIGHT-COMPONENT SYSTEM → MAINTAIN FUNDING READINESS

Readiness Evaluation & Gap Summary

Use this page to record the evidence behind the three category evaluations, determine the community's current Funding Readiness, and summarize the gaps that the complete toolkit must address. The evaluation shows whether application, project, and systems readiness are supported by current evidence. The full tool then builds the conditions that are missing and connects them into a sustainable operating system.

0-3 MATERIAL GAP	4-6 PARTIALLY READY	7-8 READY WITH EVIDENCE
A significant condition is missing, unknown, or dependent on a last-minute effort.	Important elements exist, but evidence, ownership, or repeatability remains incomplete.	The category is functional for the current purpose and supported by current evidence.

CATEGORY	SCORE	EVALUATION	STRONGEST EVIDENCE	GAPS TO CARRY FORWARD
Application readiness	___ / 8	[ ] Gap [ ] Partial [ ] Ready		
Project readiness	___ / 8	[ ] Gap [ ] Partial [ ] Ready		
Systems readiness	___ / 8	[ ] Gap [ ] Partial [ ] Ready		

CRITICAL RULE • A community is Funding Ready for the current milestone only when all three categories are Ready with Evidence and no blocking condition remains unresolved. Eligibility, site control, delivery capacity, decision authority, or capital timing cannot be averaged away by a category score.

Overall Funding Readiness Determination

CURRENT POSITION	WHAT IT MEANS	WHAT TO DO NEXT
Not yet Funding Ready	One or more readiness categories has a material gap, or a blocking condition remains unresolved.	Carry the gaps into the complete tool and build the missing evidence, ownership, capacity, process, or capital pathway.
Partially Funding Ready	Important elements are in place, but one or more categories still depends on incomplete evidence, informal ownership, or one-time effort.	Use the complete tool to strengthen and connect the eight components so readiness becomes functional and repeatable.
Funding Ready for the current milestone	Application, project, and systems readiness are supported by current evidence and no critical blocker is unresolved.	Use the complete tool to verify the full operating system, integrate the components, and maintain a ready project pipeline over time.

Gaps to Carry into the Complete Tool

Capture the few gaps that must be resolved, the evidence or decision needed next, and the FROS components where the system-building work should begin. Every component will still be reviewed in the complete tool.

READINESS CATEGORY + GAP / UNKNOWN	EVIDENCE OR DECISION NEEDED NEXT	FROS COMPONENT(S) TO EXPLORE

1 | How to Use This Complete Toolkit

CORE DEFINITION
The RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ helps communities evaluate readiness, identify gaps, and build the evidence, ownership, capacity, processes, and capital pathways needed to advance current projects and maintain a funding-ready pipeline over time.

Begin with the three-category readiness evaluation and gap summary. Then frame the project or pipeline and complete all eight components. The gaps show where added attention is needed; the full tool builds and connects the durable operating conditions behind Funding Readiness.

Choose the Unit of Assessment

- One priority site or redevelopment project - the recommended starting point.
- A connected group of projects that must advance together, such as a district, corridor, industrial portfolio, or community redevelopment initiative.
- A community or regional project pipeline, when the purpose is to assess repeatable institutional readiness rather than one site.

Recommended Working Session

#	Step	What to Do
1	**Evaluate**	Complete the readiness evaluation; record the evidence, current position, and gaps.
2	**Frame**	Define the unit, purpose, stage, next fundable milestone, and pipeline context.
3	**Assess**	Assess current and target maturity across all eight components; record unknowns and dependencies.
4	**Build**	Complete the builders and operating products needed to close gaps and strengthen handoffs.
5	**Integrate**	Connect the outputs into governance, delivery, evidence, and capital pathways.
6	**Act**	Create an accountable 30/60/90-day plan focused on the next milestone.
7	**Maintain**	Reassess between funding cycles and keep the project pipeline current.

Evidence Before Judgment

Use current plans, inventories, agreements, site records, studies, budgets, meeting records, commitments, and named processes. Record unknowns explicitly. The full tool should show what is known, what is missing, who owns the next step, and what evidence will show progress.

Important Use Notes

- Complete all eight components. Use the evaluation and gap summary to identify where added depth or early action is needed - not which components can be skipped.
- Do not rely on one composite score. Use the evaluation, component evidence, operating products, ownership, handoffs, capital sequence, and action plan together.
- Funding Ready means the community can move a current project and maintain a credible pipeline for future opportunities - not merely produce a strong application.

2 | Readiness Process & Component Maturity

How the Readiness Evaluation and Full System Build Fit Together

1 | READINESS EVALUATION	2 | FRAME THE PROJECT / PIPELINE	3 | FULL SYSTEM BUILD	4 | MAINTAIN FUNDING READINESS
Evaluate application, project, and systems readiness; determine the current Funding Readiness position; and summarize the gaps supported by evidence.	Define the next fundable milestone, community purpose, accountable lead, current project stage, and the pipeline context in which the project must advance.	Assess all eight components, complete the builders, create operating products, resolve gaps, and integrate the evidence, ownership, capacity, process, and capital pathway.	Review the project pipeline, evidence, relationships, capacity, and capital pathway between opportunities so the system stays ready and continues to improve.

Full-Toolkit Component Maturity Scale

Level	Meaning
1 • Unformed	Work is largely reactive; ownership, evidence, or process is unclear.
2 • Emerging	Some elements exist, but they depend on individuals, one-time effort, or unresolved gaps.
3 • Functional	The component works for the current priority project with defined ownership, usable evidence, and connected handoffs.
4 • Durable	The component is repeatable across projects, regularly maintained, measured, and improved.

The Eight Components

#	Component	#	Component
01	Community Mandate & Intended Benefit	05	Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership
02	Visible Site & Project Pipeline	06	Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity
03	Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness	07	Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence
04	Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway	08	Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

Detailed definitions, evidence questions, operating products, and tools appear on each component worksheet.

> **MODEL DESIGN RULE**
> Community benefit is not a ninth component added at the end. It is the center of the operating system and a test applied across all eight components. Every team completes the full toolkit; the evaluation determines where the work starts and where added depth is required.

3 | Project or Portfolio Profile

Complete this page after the readiness evaluation and gap summary and before working through the eight components. Revisit it as the full toolkit clarifies the project, the pipeline, and the operating system.

Community / organization	
Project, site, or portfolio	
Location / geography	
Unit of assessment	[ ] One site/project [ ] Connected initiative [ ] Community/region portfolio
Project sponsor / accountable lead	
Current project stage	
Next decision or fundable milestone	
Assessment date	
Facilitator	
Participants / organizations	
Next review date	

Community Purpose & Intended Benefit - Initial Statement

In one paragraph, explain why the project should move, who should shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Next Fundable Milestone - Initial Statement

Define the next achievable phase or decision - not the total project vision.

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Is there a documented community need and credible redevelopment purpose?			
Who is affected, and how are they participating in vision, decisions, and stewardship?			
What environmental, health, economic, social, and civic benefits are intended?			
Who could be burdened, displaced, or excluded, and how will those risks be addressed?			
Are community commitments specific enough to track over time?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

B. PURPOSE, PARTICIPATION & COMMUNITY BENEFIT BUILDER

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

Use this page to clarify the project purpose, who must shape it, and the commitments that will define success.

COMMUNITY PURPOSE & BENEFIT STATEMENT	
Current condition / community challenge	
Credible redevelopment purpose	
People and groups most affected	
Intended environmental, health, economic, social, and civic benefits	
Potential burdens, displacement, or exclusion risks	
Specific commitments that should be tracked	

Stakeholder & Power Map

Stakeholder / Group	Affected How?	Influence / Authority	Needed Role	Engagement / Accountability Method

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Community purpose statement				
Stakeholder and power map				
Community benefit commitments				
Engagement and accountability plan				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Does the community maintain a current inventory of sites and projects?			
Are projects prioritized using transparent criteria?			
Is each project assigned a stage, accountable owner, and next milestone?			
Are related infrastructure, housing, workforce, or community projects visible?			
Can leaders explain why one project should advance before another?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

B. SITE & PROJECT PIPELINE BUILDER

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

Build a current, shared portfolio view and identify which projects should advance first - and why.

PRIORITY SITE & PROJECT INVENTORY

Site / Project	Purpose / Benefit	Stage	Accountable Owner	Next Milestone	Critical Blocker	Related Projects / Dependencies

Transparent Priority Scoring Matrix

Adapt the criteria and weights. Use the same criteria for every candidate project and document the evidence behind each score.

Priority Criterion	Weight	Project A	Project B	Project C
Community benefit and strategic alignment				
Site control / eligibility / technical feasibility				
Reuse demand and end-user pathway				
Capacity and partner readiness				
Capital timing and leverage potential				
TOTAL / PRIORITY DECISION				

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Site/project inventory				
Readiness-stage ladder				
Priority scoring matrix				
Portfolio dashboard				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who owns or controls the site, and is access available for necessary work?			
Are applicant, site, and activity eligibility understood for likely funding sources?			
What is known - and unknown - about contamination, liability, and cleanup needs?			
Are zoning, utilities, infrastructure, title, and physical constraints documented?			
What technical decision or study is required next?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

B. SITE READINESS & UNKNOWNS BUILDER

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

Document what is known, what remains uncertain, and the next technical or legal decision needed.

SITE CONTROL, ELIGIBILITY & TECHNICAL CHECKLIST

Readiness Item	Status	Evidence / Location	Owner	Next Decision / Study
Ownership / site control				
Access for assessment or work				
Applicant eligibility				
Site and activity eligibility				
Liability / defenses / agreements				
Environmental conditions and data gaps				
Title / liens / encumbrances				
Zoning / land use approvals				
Utilities and infrastructure				
Physical / geotechnical constraints				

Risk & Unknowns Register

Risk / Unknown	Potential Consequence	Information or Decision Needed	Owner	Target Date

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS				
Operating Product	**Status**	**Owner**	**Location / Version**	**Next Update / Decision**
Site control record				
Eligibility screen				
Technical due-diligence checklist				
Risk and unknowns register				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
What is the intended reuse, and how was it selected?			
Is there credible community, public, or market demand?			
Who could own, operate, develop, occupy, or steward the site?			
What infrastructure, approvals, or complementary investments are required?			
What would make the reuse financially, operationally, and socially durable?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

B. REUSE ALTERNATIVES & END-USER PATHWAY BUILDER

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

Compare realistic reuse options and identify the owner, operator, end user, and complementary investments required.

REUSE ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Reuse Alternative	Community Fit	Site / Technical Fit	Demand Evidence	Owner / Operator / End User	Financial & Operating Durability	Next Validation Step

Selected Reuse & End-User Pathway

Selected reuse and reason	
Community validation still needed	
Likely owner / developer	
Likely operator / occupant / end user	
Approvals and infrastructure required	
Complementary investments required	
Long-term stewardship and operating model	

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Reuse alternatives brief				
Market/end-user scan				
Development concept				
Long-term ownership and stewardship pathway				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who is accountable for moving the project forward?			
What decisions belong to residents, public entities, owners, technical advisors, and capital partners?			
Are partner roles, contributions, and handoffs explicit?			
Is there a regular operating cadence and a way to resolve conflict or delay?			
Would the partnership remain active if no grant were currently open?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

B. GOVERNANCE, ROLES & HANDOFFS BUILDER

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

Clarify accountability, decision rights, contributions, operating cadence, and the handoffs most likely to fail.

PARTNER ROLES, CONTRIBUTIONS & HANDOFFS

Partner / Group	Interest / Authority	Concrete Contribution	Accountable Role	Key Handoff / Dependency	Commitment Status

Decision Rights & Operating Cadence

Decision / Function	Recommends	Decides / Accountable	Executes	Consulted / Informed

Meeting cadence: _____ Escalation path: _____ Decision record location: _____

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Governance charter				
Partner-role map				
Decision-rights matrix				
Meeting and escalation cadence				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who will perform project management, procurement, compliance, and reporting?			
What expertise is available internally, through partners, or through consultants?			
Are predevelopment costs and capacity gaps visible?			
Can the organization manage cash flow, match, reimbursement, and grant conditions?			
What capacity must be built now rather than after award?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

B. CAPACITY & PREDEVELOPMENT BUILDER

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

Identify delivery functions, capacity gaps, predevelopment costs, and the strategy to build, buy, or borrow capacity.

DELIVERY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

Delivery Function	Current Source / Lead	Capacity Level	Gap or Risk	Build / Buy / Borrow Strategy
Project management				
Procurement and contracting				
Environmental / engineering / technical				
Community engagement and accountability				
Financial management / cash flow / match				
Grant compliance and reporting				
Legal / real estate / risk				
Communications, data, and records				

Predevelopment Budget & Technical Assistance Plan

Activity / Deliverable	Estimated Cost	Funding Status / Source	Timing	Procurement / Delivery Lead

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Capacity assessment				
Predevelopment budget				
Technical assistance plan				
Delivery and grant-management plan				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
What is the next fundable phase - not merely the total project cost?			
Which costs require grants, flexible capital, debt, equity, guarantees, or owner investment?			
What match, leverage, bridge, or predevelopment resources are needed?			
What must occur before later capital can participate?			
Is there a credible sequence from current condition through reuse and stewardship?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

B. FUNDING SEQUENCE & CAPITAL PARTNER BUILDER

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

Break the project into fundable phases and identify the resource, prerequisite, timing, and gap for each phase.

FUNDING SEQUENCE MAP

Phase / Milestone	Use of Funds	Amount / Range	Capital Type	Candidate Source(s)	Prerequisite	Timing	Gap / Risk

Capital types may include public grant, philanthropy, recoverable or flexible capital, debt, equity, guarantee, tax credit, owner investment, or in-kind support.

Capital Partner Map

Partner / Source	Type	Best Fit / Role	Relationship Status	Next Contact / Ask	Owner

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Uses-and-sources map				
Funding sequence				
Capital partner map				
Funding gap and timing analysis				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Can the project produce a clear need, scope, budget, schedule, and benefit case?			
Are baseline conditions and proposed outcomes documented?			
What evidence is required for decisions, applications, and community accountability?			
How will progress, commitments, risks, and outcomes be tracked?			
How will lessons update the pipeline and improve the next project?			

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

B. EVIDENCE FILE, OUTCOMES & LEARNING BUILDER

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

Organize the evidence needed for decisions and applications, then define how progress and learning will be maintained.

PROJECT EVIDENCE FILE

Required Artifact / Evidence	Status	Location / Link	Owner	Last / Next Update
Community need / purpose statement				
Project scope and current phase				
Budget / uses and sources				
Schedule and milestones				
Site control / eligibility / technical records				
Reuse / market / end-user evidence				
Community benefit commitments				
Partner roles and commitments				
Baseline conditions and outcome measures				
Funding history / prior decisions / lessons				

Outcome & Commitment Scorecard

Outcome / Commitment	Baseline	Target	Timeframe	Data Source / Method	Reporting Owner

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Project brief and evidence file				
Outcome and commitment scorecard				
Risk/milestone tracker				
After-action and learning record				

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	

Component Summary

Strongest asset		Top constraint / unknown	
Target condition		Evidence that will show progress	
Accountable owner		Review date / trigger	

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now				
30 days				
60 days				
90 days				

4 | Funding-Ready System Synthesis

Connect the eight component outputs into one operating system for the current project and the community's future funding pipeline.

A. Priority Constraints & Dependencies

Priority	Constraint / Unknown	Components Affected	Root Cause / Broken Interface	Prerequisite Action	Owner / Due
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

B. Next Fundable Milestone

Current project condition / phase	
Next fundable milestone	
Why this milestone matters	
Conditions that must be true first	
Estimated cost or range	
Likely resource types	
Decision / opportunity timing	
Milestone owner	

C. Funding Readiness Statement

In one paragraph, summarize what is ready, what is not yet ready, what must happen next, and why the project is worth advancing.

5 | Integrated 30/60/90-Day Funding-Ready Action Plan

Timing	Component(s)	Action / Deliverable	Accountable Owner	Partners / Resources	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
NOW						
NOW						
30 DAYS						
30 DAYS						
60 DAYS						
60 DAYS						
90 DAYS						
90 DAYS						

The integrated plan should focus on the few actions that unlock the next milestone, not create an exhaustive list of every desirable activity.

Operating Cadence

Review / Meeting	Purpose	Participants	Cadence / Next Date
Project delivery review			
Community benefit / accountability review			
Capital and funding review			
Portfolio and learning review			

6 | Maintain Funding Readiness: Portfolio Learning & Reassessment

Reassessment Triggers

- [ ] A major technical finding changes site risk, scope, cost, or reuse feasibility.
- [ ] Ownership, access, eligibility, or liability status changes.
- [ ] A partner, project sponsor, end user, developer, or capital source enters or exits.
- [ ] A funding opportunity is released, awarded, declined, or delayed.
- [ ] Community priorities, benefit commitments, or displacement risks change.
- [ ] A milestone is completed, missed, or materially revised.

After-Action & Learning Record

Milestone / funding cycle reviewed	
What worked and should be repeated?	
What failed, slowed, or created rework?	
Which component or interface was the root cause?	
What new evidence or capability was created?	
What should change in the project pipeline or operating process?	
Who owns the update and by when?	

Version Control

Version	Date	Project / Portfolio	Primary Changes	Approved / Reviewed By

OPERATING PRINCIPLE

The objective is not to complete the workbook once. The objective is to maintain a shared, evidence-based system that keeps the community and its project pipeline Funding Ready for current and future opportunities.

Appendix | Notices, Attribution & Suggested RI Use

Model Notice

RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ is a working model of the Redevelopment Institute. All rights reserved.

Attribution Notice

The RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ is a Redevelopment Institute model informed by the systems-building principles and tools developed in Will Warren's Building Systems that Work: A Rural Guide to Aligning Workforce, Economic Development and Opportunity.

Use Limitation

This toolkit is an organizational, project-pipeline, and funding-readiness tool. It is not legal, environmental, engineering, accounting, investment, procurement, or grant-compliance advice. Project teams should obtain qualified professional guidance appropriate to the site, transaction, funding source, and jurisdiction.

Information governance: Completed worksheets may contain sensitive project, ownership, financial, environmental, or partner information. Establish appropriate access, retention, version-control, and sharing rules before use.

Trademark Status

The ™ symbol indicates a claimed trademark or service-mark designation. It does not indicate federal registration. Do not use the ® symbol unless registration has been granted.

Suggested RI Applications

Product	Role
RI Three-Category Readiness Evaluation™	An evidence-based evaluation of application, project, and systems readiness used to determine the current readiness position and identify gaps before entering the complete toolkit.
RI Funding Readiness Gap Summary™	The consolidated record of readiness gaps, missing evidence or decisions, and the FROS components that should receive particular attention during the full system build.
RI Project Readiness Profile™	The evidence-based full-tool output showing current and target maturity, operating products, ownership, handoffs, and actions across all eight components.
RI Funding Sequence Map™	The phased capital roadmap connecting milestones, uses, prerequisites, public/philanthropic/private sources, and timing.
RI Readiness Action Plan™	The accountable 30/60/90-day implementation pathway for building missing operating conditions and advancing the pipeline.
RI Funding Readiness Clinic™	A facilitated application of the complete model to a live site, connected initiative, or community project pipeline.