

Agencies Scoring 70-100				
Agency	Amount Requested	Risk Assessment	Average Score	Years
One More Child	\$200,000	low	91	2
Mtn Child Advoc. Ctr.	\$200,000	Low	90	1
Pat's Place Child Adv.	\$196,290	Low	90	2
The Salvation Army	\$199,994	Low	89	1
One Place	\$200,000	Low	87	2
Christian Recovery Ctr	\$170,208	Low	86	1
Thompson Child & Fam	\$197,203	Low	85	2
Safe House Project	\$199,333	Low	85	2
First Fruit Ministries	\$199,935	Low	84	2
CTS	\$200,000	low	81	1
NC Stop HT	\$50,000	low	81	2
The Bridge	\$200,000	Medium	70	2
Agencies Scoring 60-69				
Agency	Amount Requested	Risk Assessment	Average Score	Years
Gate Beautiful	\$199,478	Medium	69	1
USCRI	\$200,000	medium	67	1
Beloved Haven	\$143,412	Medium	67	2
Survivor Network	\$190,511	Medium	66	1
514 Revolution	\$199,560	Medium	62	1
Faith Action	\$200,000	Medium	61	2
Agencies Scoring 59 and below				
Agency	Amount Requested	Risk Assessment	Average Score	Years
One Hope Refuge	\$200,000	High	57	1
Daughters of Worth	\$200,000	Medium	52	2
Justice Ministries	\$200,000	Medium	52	2
Legacy of Hope	\$200,000	Medium	51	2
Project Lost Sheep	\$200,000	High	30	2

One More Child

- Scored 91
- Location: Serving Raleigh-Durham Area with staff in NC, based in Florida
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 Yes
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Continue to develop mobile team in RDU area
 - Build relationships with the community and increase access to tangible goods and referrals
 - Use evidence-based interventions to promote a community-based approach to serving victims of HT

Scorer Comments

- Very well done- services to directly impact survivors.
- This application is obviously one that was written for another past grant. Answers are not located under the correct questions which makes the grant hard to follow, but the information is all there. Timeline has activities starting in June 2024. No actual months, dates in timeline.

Staff Comments

None

Mountain TN Child Advocacy Ctr.

- Scored 91
- Location: Asheville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 Yes
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Increase adult support and resilience pathways for children through Case Management
 - Partner with Asheville City and Buncombe County Middle Schools to provide child safety and prevention education
 - Provide child wellbeing outpatient therapy services to identify and heal victims of HT

Scorer Comments

- Very strong application. Measures have activities, outputs, and performance metrics, but no outcomes.
- While this provider does have some focus on education, they were able to tie together how that education will be used as a pipeline for identifying victims and providing case management and other services.
- Great application and thorough budget!

Staff Comments

None

Pat's Place Child Advocacy Ctr.

- Scored 90
- Location: Charlotte, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 yes
- Requesting \$196,290 over 2 years
- Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Continue support and development of the "YES!" program
 - Provide salary support to the Client Services Specialists
 - Provide transportation support for the program

Scorer Comments

- Very well-done application. Provider was able to demonstrate continued growth and need funding to continue a successful on-going program. Great opportunity for continued support in the Meck. area for youth.
- Good proposal but the proposal or timeline doesn't state anything about using funds for transportation although that is a budget line item. The timeline wasn't broken down into months or quarters.
- They seem to have a lot of support from effective and reputable organizations despite their lack of longevity, existing or established funding source.

Staff Comments

None

The Salvation Army

- Scored 89
- Location: Raleigh, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 yes, 1 no
- Requesting \$199,994 over 1 year
- Four Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Hire trauma-informed, HT specific case managers and supervisor
 - Have case managers join the rapid response team for Wake County
 - FIGHT program staff to respond to National HT hotline for referrals
 - Have case manager supervisor provide community awareness trainings and develop partner relationships

Scorer Comments

- No need is described. Need more detail about impact on victims.
- I am concerned that "increase awareness" was listed as a very general objective. There were inconsistent project plans where the writer noted 18 training opportunities in one section and then 20 in another. There were more opportunities for case management services, but I did not see that laid out in the proposal. Additionally, I think the budget would need modification before consideration for grant funding.

Staff Comments

None

One Place

- Scored 87
- Location: Jacksonville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 yes, 1 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Expand database to continue to strengthen case management services
 - Establish internal human trafficking response team
 - Provide training to MDT partners and community stakeholders

Scorer Comments

- Applicant did not state how data base improvement would directly impact victims/services. Last year they served 9 victims. Would like to have seen them note some sort of increase (i.e.; within 6 months of implementation of data base, will see a 15% increase in referrals). Proposal was internally focused on the organization and not enough on the external impact victims/clients.

Staff Comments

None

Christian Recovery Center

- Scored 86
- Location: Shallotte, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 yes, 1 no
- Requesting \$170,207.50 over 1 year
- Four Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Currently in the process of building a Women's Life Center (Breaking ground 1/2025)
 - Create temporary location for Women's Life Center in Ash NC
 - Support existing services to trafficking victims through recovery program and StATUSA's therapeutic support
 - Develop, strengthen, and expand services offered to survivors

Scorer Comments

- this was very well written grant application, I am hesitant to fund a program that is very spiritual focused and does not seem to have prior experience working with survivors. on paper their plan looks like nice, and I can tell they have lots of experience with substance use and plan on using a similar module working with survivors. the program wants to employ survivors right out of recovery to work for the agency is a red flag.
- Overall, the application is difficult to follow. The need is described. The goal, objectives, and measurement are not clear. There is a long list of activities that will be completed, but there is limited output outcome data. The budget and program objectives do not appear to be aligned or need more explanation. For example, the budget includes \$8,675 in equipment items but there is no indicated what objective this helps meet. Concerning that they plan to find an LCSW to pay \$43,000
- standards scoring would have increased their score
- Very well done application. Thorough, concise and committed to the work. Could have used more detail in the budget expenditure and I am unclear on the one section of the self assessment that was unmet.
- No breakdown of calculations in budget and no mention of various items stated in the budget throughout the grant proposal (transportation, security equipment, food).

Staff Comments

- Agency is a 16.20 grantee and have spent \$5,950 of the \$208,000 they were awarded.
- Agency applied in Round 1 and has since significantly improved on both their risk score and application score.

Thompson Child & Family Focus

- Scored 85
- Location: Matthews, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 yes
- Requesting \$197,203 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Reduce symptom related trauma to youth served
 - Ensure clients and their families are satisfied with the care and services they receive
 - Educate clients with skills that help them secure employment

Scorer Comments

- Need section not well articulated. There is some additional support in section 6. Lacks detail for the highest budget item of mentors
- I would fund this, but it would need to be significantly amended. The applicant notes that they would spend \$40,000 to have an artist paint 5 murals at the facility. To me, this felt a bit out of touch with the needs of the community. Additionally, they note funds to be used for YMCA memberships. I am sure this could be accomplished through an MOU as they are both non-profits. This was a well done application, however I am unsure of the direct impact on survivors and if there is a better usage of these funds. Additional notes on saved PDF.
- Good idea and good use of funds. Just took off points for not adding in partner meetings to timeline and the roles of the partners explained.

Staff Comments

None

The Safe House

- Scored 85
- Location: Charlotte, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 3 yes, 2 no
- Requesting \$199,333 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - 24/7 Crisis Response Warmline expansion
 - Enhance the case management services offered to victims
 - Provide immediate support for survivors including transportation, shelter, and necessities

Scorer Comments

- The proposal lists the outcomes but does not provide a plan for how they plan to leverage the additional partnerships. It also does not list what effort is taken to ensure that the referrals are trauma informed and providing ethical services. Limited detail on how direct costs will be provided.
- Despite final score, it seems this org could source less scarce private funding.
- This appears to be an already very successful program. It seems the funds would go immediately to direct survivor services and applicant states with funding will have the ability to double impact. This was a very strongly written application with clear thought and attention to detail put into it. I think they have the capacity and skill set to begin work on day 1 of the grant.
- Great application just took off points for not providing enough information on MOU partners and their roles.

Staff Comments

- The Safe House applied in Round 1 and has since improved their risk level score and application score greatly for Round 2.

First Fruit

- Scored 84
- Location: Wilmington, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 Yes, 1 No
- Requesting \$199,935.08 over 2 years
- Four Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Provide housing interventions to victims of HT and related support services
 - Collaborate and train local partners to ensure proper identification of HT victims
 - Assist and refer to other essential services for victims
 - Improve outcomes of victims of human trafficking by providing support services

Scorer Comments

- Rental assistance lacks details. Strong application.
- While this seems like a worthy org, the application doesn't clearly indicate how NGO targeting homeless population will successfully direct funds to HT.
- Majority of funding going towards rental support, client utilities and other services directly supporting victims.
- Timeline talks about hiring an outreach worker but that's not in the budget. Some of goals and objectives do not add up to what is in the budget.

Staff Comments

- First Fruit has improved greatly since round 1 as both their risk level and score increased between the Round 1 and Round 2 applications

CTS Community Development

- Scored 81
- Location: Charlotte, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 3 Yes, 2 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 1 year
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Provide direct care recovery services to HT victims/survivors up to age 21
 - Enhance collaboration with orgs that share an aligned mission and vision
 - Plan, coordinate, implement community outreach and education to increase HT awareness in Charlotte area

Scorer Comments

- Very well written, I can tell this organization has been thoughtful about it's approach.
- The need for short term housing is not explained in the need section. Timeline does not include anything regarding housing. No LOS or MOUs with trafficking agencies or providers who would provide services to clients. This agency is new to the trafficking space and plans to lead an initiative of trafficking providers which is both presumptuous and unrealistic.
- Overall, this was a very well done application. I am curious about their funding outside of the 4 private donations listed. No real detail about fundraising goals or initiatives. My only concern would be sustainability moving forward without a fundraising plan.
- Budget expenditure and proposal budget did add up but some items were not in the correct sections on Budget Expenditure report. That made it hard to compare.

Staff Comments

None

NC Stop Human Trafficking

- Scored 81
- Location: Greenville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 3 yes, 2 no
- Requesting \$50,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Develop human trafficking victim services within the local area
 - Provide training to local law enforcement, healthcare providers, and other victim advocacy services
 - Fund survivor needs and build partnerships within the community

Scorer Comments

- I plan to serve surrounding counties without hiring another staff to help with case management does not provide the capacity for the services need. I love the idea of expanding, they need to think through how to make this sustainable.
- NCSHT does not appear to be eligible for this grant. The requirement of this funding stipulate that an agency must "Provide direct services to victims of human trafficking, which may include case management, client safety, client well-being, and other services, including health, transportation, housing, education, and employment assistance." Other MDTs or Task Forces with direct service providers likely wanted to apply and did not because they are not eligible. The cover sheet did state that in rare occasions assistance is provided when no other service provider can. Therefore, objectives that do not clearly identify what services NCSHT will specifically provide and are not actually provided via a direct service provider are the only ones that were scored.
- Very well done. For all they stated they would do, I think they could be awarded more than the \$50,000
- Well written grant but it seems like they would need to ask for more funding to meet the need/ goals and objectives.

Staff Comments

None

The Bridge

- Scored 70
- Location: Durham, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 yes, 1 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Enhance direct services to survivors through increase community collaboration
 - Grow case management services
 - Enhance and re-establish the Human Trafficking Regional Response Team in the RDU and High Country areas

Scorer Comments

- Outcomes are included but no outputs. No details on strategies to increase clients by 25%. Need details on housing line item in budget.
- Funding would be used mostly for salaries for current unpaid employees/co-executive directors. There were several spelling and other errors throughout the application. I observed an overall lack of attention to detail. The objectives and measurables on this application seemed subpar to me in comparison to other applications.
- Wondering how goals will be measured. Concerned about capacity and sustainability with small number of employees.

Staff Comments

- The Bridge applied in Round 1 and has improved on both their score and risk level greatly in comparison to their previous application

Gate Beautiful

- Scored 70
- Location: Fayetteville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 No, 1 yes
- Requesting \$199,478 over 1 year
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Implement Jail outreach program over a 10-week period to provide intervention to minor females at Cumberland Regional Juvenile Detention Center
 - Develop and enhance Street Outreach Program
 - Hire Community Outreach Case manager for the Street Outreach program

Scorer Comments

- Inconsistency in providing outputs and outcomes across all measures so impact is hard to measure. Rent is listed in contractual section of budget. Website is listed in budget but no discussed in cover sheet.
- Not all goals relate directly to survivor needs. Two of the goals include education/outreach including hiring a Community Outreach Case manager who would be responsible for networking and outreach. Concerning to me that they did not submit the documents as requested and instead submitted a 38-page narrative. Even with so much detail, the budget does not break down how they arrived at their figures. Additionally, 3 employees are noted to have benefits at apx. 16K each (34K in salary). Budget break down is concerning, especially without explanations. They also note a 1500 promotional video which does not tie directly to victim services.
- The grant is well written but too long. The concern is that they only have one paid staff member so sustainability and capacity are not good. The other concern is that the salaries in the budget are too low.

Staff Comments

None

USCRI

- Scored 67
- Location: Raleigh, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 3 No, 2 yes
- Requesting \$200,000 over 1 year
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Complement existing HT services offered through partner agency, Lutheran Services Carolinas
 - Hire full time Case manager
 - Assist survivors with needs such as rent assistance and emergency expenses

Scorer Comments

- Overall the application lacks detail. There are no outputs or outcomes so it is difficult to measure impact.
- This plan lacked in significant detail with only one paragraph for each section. Additionally, I had concerns regarding the budget and how feasible it would be to have one remote employee with a statewide case load. The budget noted only 6 statewide trips for the grant lifecycle which seems incredibly low due to the intensive nature of case management services for survivors. I feel grant funding could be better used with other organizations at this time.
- Not enough detail in goals and objectives area. No real timeline of activities.

Staff Comments

None

Beloved Haven

- Scored 67
- Location: Moyock, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 2 yes, 3 no
- Requesting \$143,412.16 over 2 years
- Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Enhance and expand work that org is currently accomplishing
 - Continue to build victim/staff relationship building
 - Remain up to date in current training trends
 - Support Transportation Costs

Scorer Comments

- I would fund this grantee under the condition that \$20 an hour for a grant writer part-time would not lend the results they are anticipating, I would suggest to bring someone on full time or contract out with a professional, \$20 an hour is a low rate for fundraiser consultant.
- Need for housing a wraparound services not addressed. No outputs, outcomes, or measurement. Impact difficult to measure. Lacks detail for speaker expenses.
- Letters or support and geographic area were notable.
- Application was lacking- no real connection to how this would benefit survivors directly. Grant funds going towards salary for grant writer- does not make sense.
- I was confused by the budget and the training calculations also not clear on if they are planning to hire a client advocate or just pay the ED more money to do the job. No job description for a client advocate or grant writer as stated. And there was no timeline no specific time frames months, years, quarters.

Staff Comments

- Agency is a 16.20 grantee
- Beloved Haven applied in Round 1, they have since improved both their risk score and application score for Round 2.

Survivor Network

- Scored 66
- Location: Durham, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 1 yes, 4 no
- Requesting \$190,511 over 1 year
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Provide vocational based case management to survivors
 - Provide a Peer Support network to survivors
 - Offer mental health support for survivors through relationships with various direct support providers

Scorer Comments

- Unique concept. Need makes sense in theory but would be strengthened with data. Outcome surveys are referenced but no details. Impact is weak- no outcomes. The ED salary (included in cover sheet) is not commensurate with the age and size of the organization and operating budget. There is reimbursement for \$9,000 for travel but almost all of the services are virtual.
- I want to fund this organization because they are survivor lead and we need that here in NC but I am very concerned about the sustainability beyond the grant and the grantee is asking for a good portion of the ED's salary for the grant. If funded, please provide with capacity and sustainability building to ensure the grantee has the skills to sustain themselves beyond the grant cycle.
- This felt like a good start, but I would be concerned about awarding funds to this group without further developing a timeline and specific plan for how they will identify additional victims/peer support members, etc. No real mention of how goals will be measured outside of slight increases in current numbers.
- I have questions about the impact of the goals and how they are measurable. Timeline is not clear enough. Not sure why they do not have more MOU's with organizations or even more MOU's they are working on. *I am wondering also about the employee they have that also works for Gate Beautiful since they have turned in an application as well. Is this allowable?*

Staff Comments

- Survivor Network applied in Round 1 and has since greatly improved on both their risk score and application score

514Revolution

- Scored 62
- Location: Wilmington, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 2 yes, 3 no
- Requesting \$199,560 over 1 year
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Expand the Restoration House Program from 3 to 6 beds and stay timeframe from 4 months to 12 months
 - Expand Women's Care Coordination Program
 - Increase staffing to accommodate for expansion of services

Scorer Comments

- Strong grant application, I would have liked to see more with their sustainability plan other than hiring a part-time fundraiser. This section lacked depth, if funded I would make it a point to work with agency to provide support in this area.
- The need is not well articulated. More detail would help strengthen the application. The objectives are realistic and seem achievable but there is no measurement framework. The items described are activities, not output or outcomes. No details for timeline. No details regarding staff.
- General concerns about budget, timeline and sustainability.
- There were no performance measures and no good description of the goals. Also, no real time line of activities.

Staff Comments

- Agency is a 16.20 grantee

Faith Action

- Scored 60.6
- Location: Greensboro, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 No
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Two Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Educate immigrant and refugee community as well as community partners and members
 - Provide one on one case management services to survivors

Scorer Comments

- Inconsistence in the program narrative and budget, it was not clear how "training" costs would be covered, although this was described several times in the program narrative as a key point, in addition they claimed to be staffed to serve 1,000 clients this is interesting claim.
- Measurement framework could be strengthened with outcomes and performance indicators. Some line items, like mental health, do not have performance indicators in cover sheet
- Really wanted to recommend to fund because we need more support for immigrant populations but materials didn't make compelling case that funds would be used for HT specifically and they seem to have access to other more generous private funding.
- This is another application where education is one of the primary objectives. This provider notes that educating staff on how to identify trafficking is one of the main objectives. I am intrigued by this provider's professional network and community. I think there is a lot of potential for them to have a good reach; however they mostly identified the need as educating themselves and the community, and did not tie the objectives/use of funding back to how they would provide services directly to survivors of trafficking (i.e.; training would potentially help them identify more survivors during their current work).
- No breakdown of cost in months/quarters in timeline. No breakdown of project costs in budget. No clear impact and how it will be measured.

Staff Comments

- Faith in Action applied in Round 1 and has since improved both their risk score and application score for Round 2

One Hope Refuge

- Scored 57
- Location: Wake Forest, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 4 no, 1 yes
- Requesting \$200,000 over 1 year
- Two Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Hire 3 full-time and 2 part-time members to the care team
 - Cover care team salaries

Scorer Comments

- Objectives could be strengthened with how many will be served and the impact. Would like more details on number of survivors who will be served and the impact ED required qualifications are limited, Payroll taxes included in salaries
- Unsure about recommendation to fund or deny.
- Proposal did not include how the grant funding would be used to increase services for survivors. Focused on hiring and how to retain employees. No current funding or plan to sustain.
- Not really clear on their capacity or sustainability. Application states they have a budget of \$420,000 but I do not see those figures anywhere.

Staff Comments

None

Daughters of Worth

- Scored 52
- Location: Greenville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Two Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Strengthen emergency response capacity by expanding hours of drop-in center to 24 hours and develop 24-hour hotline
 - Strengthen prevention education programming through hiring of part-time Director of Prevention Education

Scorer Comments

- budget is missing, totally blank, nice idea of launching a drop-in center and hotline but idea seems unstable with the vast need of volunteers to make it run, would need more staffing to make sure it's stable and has capacity for survivor care.
- No budget. Activities and outputs included but not outcomes.
- Lack of budget harmed the application.
- Budget worksheet was left blank. Also, the requested amount on pg. 2 of the cover page and proposal was left blank. The provider did note they are requesting 2 years of funding, but did not break down any specifics. Would not fund without that information or more detail in proposal.
- No budget attached at all. I have a concern about sustainability and if staff would continue to work as volunteers. Concern about how difficult it will be to recruit volunteers for a 24 hour operation.

Staff Comments

None

Justice Ministries

- Scored 52
- Location: Charlotte, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Initiative to be used with Grant Funding
 - Expand bed space to be able to serve trafficking victims
 - Plans to purchase 5 additional campers to expand housing capacity through their project “Tiny House Project”

Scorer Comments

- Application is a very unique idea that does not require long term sustainable funding. There are no outputs or outcomes which makes impact difficult to determine.
- Provider stated they wouldn't update MOUs "for the sake of this grant."- unclear what partnerships exist, in addition to current funding. Only funding listed is "pending". Plan was over simplistic and did not detail enough about how funds would be used, or capacity to work beyond this grant other than thru "G-d's grace and provision."
- No goals and objectives. No timeline. No mention of where the campers will come from or an estimate of campers. No partnership with camper company. No budget breakdown.

Staff Comments

None

Legacy of Hope

- Scored 51
- Location: Asheville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Two Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Expand, develop, strengthen victim services through providing safe spaces to identify abuse and enhancing partnerships within the community
 - Develop SMART – Safety Parties and Reports
 - Create best practice guidelines through knowledge gained by social workers to have more trauma-informed and responsive specialists and volunteers

Scorer Comments

- the project is not well explained and there are no objectives or measurement framework. The budget lists 2 years but salaries only add to 1 year; some of the dollar amount do not add up correctly.
- I would not recommend this provider to receive grant funding. They are very new to trafficking, do not clearly define how they will assist survivors, do not have a strong history of working with survivors outside of discoveries doing concurrent work, no current staffing, need more education on trafficking.
- The goals are not clear, there is no impact or objectives. No real timeline. The budget is incorrect. Calculations are not correct information doesn't match the proposal budget.

Staff Comments

none

Project Lost Sheep

- Scored 30
- Location: Reidsville, NC
- Did scorers recommend funding this agency? 5 no
- Requesting \$200,000 over 2 years
- Three Initiatives to be used with Grant Funding
 - Locate and liberate victims
 - Provide necessities to survivors such as food, water, transportation, case management, and emergency shelter
 - Provide educational scholarships to victims

Scorer Comments

- Activities only, not outputs or outcomes. Budget has rounding issues and lack of details. Overall, the cover sheet lacks a professional tone. No details about how these "Ops" are conducted.
- Applicant does not appear to have the skills, background and resources to be a successful grant recipient.
- No explanation of what type of "equipment" they are purchasing. Not clear on if they have a shelter they have it marked that they do have a shelter but they have a line item for hotels. Not real clear on what exactly they do in conjunction with police.

Staff Comments

- Project Lost Sheep applied in Round 1 and has improved their application score for Round 2.