

Donor Review Simulation

What a DFI reviewer will likely say in committee

Purpose

This simulation prepares Terra Vita Hub for a DFI or climate-fund committee conversation. It shows the questions a reviewer is likely to raise, the institutional answer the Hub should provide, and the evidence that should be visible in the protected workspace.

Committee framing

A DFI reviewer is likely to view Terra Vita Hub positively as audit-ready governance infrastructure. The reviewer will not expect the platform to replace the ministry, fund, or committee. They will expect the platform to prove that decisions remain human, evidence is traceable, and MRV signals are attached to the same governed record.

Likely committee questions

Question: Does the platform make decisions?

Position: No. It structures evidence and review. Authority remains with ministries, DFIs, and committees.
Evidence: Governance boundary statement, reviewer route, role mapping.

Question: Where is the risk-assurance posture?

Position: It must be visible in the protected Governance Architecture workspace.
Evidence: Risk Assurance Note, Safeguards Framework, risk register.

Question: How is data sovereignty handled?

Position: Hosting region, residency, retention, access, and export controls must be deployment settings.
Evidence: Sovereignty memo, export audit log, access policy.

Question: How does MRV attach to national systems?

Position: Methods remain national; the Hub binds signals to evidence, decisions, and reporting.
Evidence: MRV attachment section, indicator lineage, evidence requirements.

Question: How are safeguards handled?

Position: Safeguards, grievances, consultation evidence, and conditions must sit in the same chain.
Evidence: Safeguards framework, grievance routing, conditions log.

Question: Is there a donor-submission pack?

Position: Yes. Artifacts must be exportable and committee-ready.
Evidence: Evidence and Export workspace, Risk Management Annex.

Expected reviewer conclusion

The likely DFI committee reaction is positive, subject to deployment-specific conditions.

The concept is institutionally strong because it is governance-first, non-automated, evidence-bound, and aligned with donor review logic.

The most likely committee condition will not be whether the platform is conceptually sound. It will be whether each deployment has completed the operational readiness controls before scale-up.

Conditions the reviewer may place on approval

- approved data-sovereignty configuration
- confirmed production and staging separation
- RLS and role-mapping verification
- two institutional administrators per programme
- continuity and restore test evidence
- MRV evidence-quality checks
- export-audit and retention procedures
- safeguards and grievance-record routing

Use of this simulation

This simulation should remain protected. It is a preparation artifact for DFI walkthroughs and committee review. It should be paired with the Institutional Readiness Memo, Risk Assurance Note, Safeguards Framework, and Risk Management Annex.

It should not be presented as a guarantee of donor approval. It is a readiness tool that helps the team prepare evidence, sequencing, and reviewer answers.