



Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Inquiry into grants management

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory
Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Approved for publication

Report 17
10th Assembly
April 2023

About the committee

Establishing resolution

The Assembly established the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on 2 December 2020.

The Committee is responsible for the following areas:

- ACT Auditor-General;
- Office of the Legislative Assembly;
- Accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the ACT and its authorities;
- All reports of the Auditor-General which have been presented to the Assembly; and
- Treasury including taxation and revenue.

You can read the full establishing resolution [on our website](#).

Committee members

Mrs Elizabeth Kikkert MLA, Chair

Mr Michael Pettersson MLA, Deputy Chair

Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Secretariat

Ms Sophie Milne, Committee Secretary

Ms Kate Mickelson, Assistant Secretary

Ms Batool Abbas, Administrative Assistant

Contact us

Mail	Standing Committee on Public Accounts Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory GPO Box 1020 CANBERRA ACT 2601
Phone	(02) 6205 0435
Email	LACommitteePA@parliament.act.gov.au
Website	parliament.act.gov.au/parliamentary-business/in-committees

About this inquiry

Under Standing Order 216, standing committees can self-initiate an inquiry into any subject area it is given responsibility for by the establishing resolution. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts resolved to conduct an inquiry into grants management on 14 September 2022.

The Committee informed the Assembly of its intention to conduct this inquiry on 20 September 2022.

Terms of Reference

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts will inquire into and report on matters relating to the processes and management of grants programs with particular reference to:

- 1) the range and availability of funding for grants programs;
- 2) the manner in which grants are determined, including the:
 - a. oversight of funding determinations;
 - b. transparency of decision making under grants schemes;
 - c. independence of the assessment of projects;
 - d. scope of Ministers' discretion in determining which grants are approved; and
 - e. adequacy of policy and legislative frameworks under which grants are administered;
- 3) the measures necessary to ensure the integrity of grants schemes and public confidence in the allocation of public money; and
- 4) any other related matter.

Contents

About the committee	i
Establishing resolution	i
Committee members	i
Secretariat	i
Contact us	i
About this inquiry	ii
Acronyms and abbreviations	iv
Recommendations	v
1. Conduct of the inquiry	1
2. Background	2
3. Matters considered by the Committee	3
Grant design	3
Grant overheads	5
Transparency	11
Grant information	13
Accountability	14
Policy improvements	18
System improvements	19
4. Conclusion	22
Appendix A: Submissions	23
Appendix B: Witnesses	24
Thursday 02 February 2023	24
Appendix C: Questions taken on notice	25
Questions taken on notice	25

Acronyms and abbreviations

Acronym	Long form
ACT	Australian Capital Territory
ACTCOSS	ACT Council of Social Service
ATOD	Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drugs
ATODA	Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT
CMTEDD	Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
The Committee	Standing Committee on Public Accounts
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019, caused by the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2
EOI	Expression of interest
EPSDD	Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate
The Framework	Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A framework and best practice policy
M and E	Monitoring and evaluation
MLA	Member of the Legislative Assembly
NGO	Non-government organisation
RAT	Rapid Antigen Test, for the detection of COVID-19

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish a community sector consultation mechanism to ensure the range and availability of funding for grants programs is meeting community needs in the ACT.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review grant program contract lengths and mechanisms for recurrent funding to ensure grants have positive and sustainable impact on community issues.

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include the option for allocating costs to include volunteer management in ACT Government grant programs.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include flexible grant management approaches relating to the way in which grant outcomes can be delivered by the community organisation.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government improve consistency across the ACT Government in the design, management of and acquittal of grants, including standardised insurance requirements, a standardised application form, and standardised acquittal processes for small dollar grants.

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine an initial Expression of Interest process before requiring more detailed grant applications so projects out of scope are identified early, before extensive time is committed to developing them.

Recommendation 7

To ensure transparency in the grant decision making process, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government:

- ensure that selection criteria, outcomes and reporting requirements are co-designed in partnership with the community sector; and
- provide open communication and feedback to all grant applicants.

Recommendation 8

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require a community representative on grants selection committees/panels.

Recommendation 9

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government make the following information publicly available prior to organisations applying for a grant:

- grant process flowcharts for each funding opportunity;
- grant decision making process;
- decision maker;
- selection criteria;
- outcomes (including links to wellbeing indicators);
- reporting requirements;
- an explicit statement on how administrative overheads, staffing costs and Project Management for activities for the Grant shall be covered during the grant process; and
- draft deed applicable to grant.

Recommendation 10

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update applicants' information resources and documents on the ACT Government Grants website.

Recommendation 11

Where the Minister is the decision maker for a grant, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government make the grant application appraisal and recommendations made to the Minister publicly available. Where it is unable to be released due to confidentiality or sensitivity concerns, officials must provide reasons to the unsuccessful applicants.

Recommendation 12

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish a specific process for feedback on the quantum of money allocated to grant categories within budget consultation.

Recommendation 13

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the administrative requirements and complexity of the application and reporting process of grants to ensure the application process is proportionate to the funding amount and outcomes. It is recommended a two-tier approach be adopted with lower levels of accountability for very small grants (<\$10,000) versus multiyear larger grants with more robust procedures.

Recommendation 14

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government not require detailed information on all expenditure where incorporated organisations and not-for-profit companies have thorough processes of financial management and annual audit.

Recommendation 15

The Committee recommends that *The Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A Framework and Best Practice Policy* be amended as follows:

- In Section 1.5 Governance - officials must provide reasons as to why an applicant is successful/unsuccessful; and
- In Sections 3.1 Planning Design and 3.2 Selection and Decision Making - these sections be updated to include:
 - consulting and co-designing grants with the community sector; and
 - having community sector and/or community member with lived experience representation on grants selection committees/panels.

Recommendation 16

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government expand funding opportunities to include grants that have a focus on sustainability and circular economy for the community sector.

Recommendation 17

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a review of language and accessibility in all ACT Government grant program materials.

Recommendation 18

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require that information about grant applicant organisations be saved on SmartyGrants, regardless of the Grant Program Directorate, to reduce the administrative burden when applying for grants.

1. Conduct of the inquiry

- 1.1. The Committee received 8 submissions to the inquiry. These are listed in **Appendix A**.
- 1.2. The Committee held a public hearing on Thursday, 2 February 2023. Witnesses who appeared at the hearing are listed in **Appendix B**.
- 1.3. The Committee had two Questions Taken on Notice from the public hearing. These are listed in **Appendix C**.

2. Background

A grant is an arrangement where money is provided to a recipient as financial assistance by the Territory for a specified purpose that enables the recipient to achieve goals and objectives that are consistent with Territory policy.¹

- 2.1. In 2021–22 the ACT Government provided approximately \$54.3 million in grants across seven directorates and over 118 programs, as well as over \$342 million in COVID-19 specific support programs.²
- 2.2. The policy framework for grant management in the ACT is given in the *Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A framework and best practice policy* (the Framework). Under this Framework, each agency has responsibility for developing its own specific grants administration practices and processes.³ Agencies are expected to use establish best practice in planning grant programs, selecting recipients, managing and monitoring grant progress and payments, and review and evaluation.⁴
- 2.3. Several of the ACT Government’s grant programs are managed using the SmartyGrants application, a cloud-based administration software package which is used by several federal, state, and local government entities as well as charitable and corporate funding bodies.⁵
- 2.4. Under the key principles laid out in the Framework, grant administration should focus on the delivery of outcomes that implement government policy, and granting activities should be underpinned by good governance structures and clear lines of accountability. In addition, grant management should incorporate robust planning, proportionate requirements, collaborative relationships with recipients and stakeholders, maintain probity and transparent processes, and ensure efficient and effective use of public funds.⁶
- 2.5. Eligible grant applications are assessed by a panel, who generally then make recommendations to the relevant Minister who makes the final decision. Successful applicants are informed and a public announcement is made.⁷ A Deed of Grant, or contract, between the recipient and the ACT Government, makes the obligations, including reporting and acknowledgement requirements, of both parties explicit. Acquittal documentation, showing how grant money has been expended, may include an independent audit and is carried out at the conclusion of the granting process.⁸

¹ Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, [Administration-of-Government-Grants-in-the-ACT.pdf](#), 2021, p 2.

² ACT Government, *Submission 3*, pp 1–2.

³ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 1.

⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 2.

⁵ Smartygrants, *Homepage*, [SmartyGrants | Home](#), (accessed 14 April 2023).

⁶ Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, [Administration-of-Government-Grants-in-the-ACT.pdf](#), 2021, pp 3–4.

⁷ ACT Government, [Applying for a grant - ACT Government Grants](#), (accessed 14 April 2023).

⁸ ACT Government, [Receiving a grant - ACT Government Grants](#), (accessed 14 April 2023).

3. Matters considered by the Committee

Grant design

- 3.1. In their submission, the Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT (ATODA) noted that the ACT had a ‘strong and collegiate NGO [non-government organisation] service sector’ working with the ACT Government to improve community wellbeing. They suggested that there were opportunities to develop the government’s relationship with NGOs to improve decision-making relating to the range and availability of funding for ACT grants programs.⁹
- 3.2. ATODA described the determination of availability of funding for different sectors as ‘an opaque process for the community’, saying that little information was shared with stakeholders about the reasons for funding levels. Noting that the ACT community and health are proactive where possible in considering needs and funding requirements, ATODA suggested that greater transparency from the Government on how funding allocations were determined would allow stakeholders to provide the most relevant information to support those determinations.¹⁰
- 3.3. In their submission, the ACT Council of Social Service (ACTCOSS) concurred, describing regular consultation with the community sector as ‘essential’ to provide expert input on the range and availability of ACT Government grants.¹¹
- 3.4. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, in answer to a question on how the Government determines which issues or areas will have grant coverage, the Chief Minister responded that different portfolios make those determinations differently, which may also include intergovernmental discussions. The Chief Minister also noted that the annual budget cycle had ‘primacy’ in the business case development process.¹²
- 3.5. The Chief Minister said that ‘New programs emerge out of new government policy’, and that policy development over a four-year election cycle could impact intergovernmental, commonwealth-state/territory and commonwealth-local programs.¹³

Committee Comment

- 3.6. The Committee considers that the community sector is well-placed to inform government on community needs, and that consultation with the sector would provide improved decision-making on the range and availability of grants programs to meet those needs.

⁹ Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 3.

¹⁰ Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 3.

¹¹ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 4.

¹² Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 7.

¹³ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 7.

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish a community sector consultation mechanism to ensure the range and availability of funding for grants programs is meeting community needs in the ACT.

- 3.7. The Committee heard from submitters that contract lengths and lack of certainty of continued funding could adversely affect the community, as short-term contracts did not allow for sustained benefits and required disproportionate administrative effort.¹⁴
- 3.8. ATODA noted that treatment for alcohol and other drugs often involves multiple providers, and that removal of funding from a one program could result in disrupting ‘a whole treatment ecosystem’:¹⁵
- ...people’s treatment journeys are often complicated and involve lots of different providers. So, someone might start out wanting needle and syringe program as harm reduction; they might find out that the people treat them humanely, engage further and decide maybe some treatment is appropriate, but they need different treatment types including detox services and then maybe residential rehab and then maybe counselling. That treatment journey has seen them quite possibly cross between four different providers, between NGOs and government. Looking at this just from the perspective of “is government getting great value on this contract?” misses the fact that if you change providers you have disrupted that ecosystem; overall government is getting worse value for money because this chain of service availability no longer exists.¹⁶
- 3.9. In their submission, ACTCOSS said that the ‘short-term, ad hoc nature of many grants’ limited sustainable activities, and that when a service provider had delivered a grant with meaningful outcomes, there may be no mechanism for continued funding, potentially leaving individuals and families without continued support. Furthermore, smaller organisations could be deterred from submitting an application by the ‘significant administrative effort’ which was not proportionate to the funding amount.¹⁷
- 3.10. Landcare ACT noted in their submission that an annual grant application process, in addition to posing an administrative burden, risked lapses in environment work, which increased overall costs if areas were left unmanaged for periods of time.¹⁸
- 3.11. In their submission, Southern ACT Catchment Group noted that many environmental projects would benefit from multi-year funding, rather than one year funding, to achieve ‘real outcomes’.¹⁹

¹⁴ See, for example: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 2; Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2; Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2; ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

¹⁵ Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 2.

¹⁶ Dr Devin Bowles, Chief Executive Officer, Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 33.

¹⁷ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

¹⁸ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2.

¹⁹ Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2.

- 3.12. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, the Chief Minister noted that multi-year grants allow an organisation employing staff to deliver a program to provide employment security. He said that the risk of an organisation not delivering when a longer-term commitment had been ‘locked in’ could often be addressed by ‘milestone agreements and requirements to report on and acquit grants year by year, even if you are in a multi-year funding agreement’.²⁰
- 3.13. In answer to a Question Taken on Notice, the Chief Minister provided information outlining that several Directorates provide multiyear grants as well as annual funding for ‘one-off specific purposes’. In particular, four of the five programs provided by ACT Health Directorate included multiyear grants ‘provided for health programs to create supporting environments to improve the health of Canberrans with the focus on prevention and harm reduction.’²¹

Committee Comment

- 3.14. The Committee considers that sustained funding for long-term programs provides sustained benefit to the community and certainty for volunteers and employees as well as those requiring support. Where grant recipients have delivered good outcomes, mechanisms for recurrent funding should be available to ensure that these outcomes continue for the good of the community.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review grant program contract lengths and mechanisms for recurrent funding to ensure grants have positive and sustainable impact on community issues.

Grant overheads

- 3.15. Several submitters noted that project management and volunteer management funding was inadequately provided for in some grant programs.²²
- 3.16. In their submission, Southern ACT Catchment Group noted that 10 percent of a grant was usually allocated to administration costs, including financial management, insurance and office expenses. However, this did not cover project management costs such as community and government liaison, contract management, monitoring and evaluation (M and E), or communications. They noted that their organisations and other similar groups provided valuable project management expertise that was unrecognised in the grants system.²³

²⁰ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 6.

²¹ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *answer to QTON 2: Annual vs multiyear grants*, 2 February 2023 (received 20 February 2023), pp 1–2.

²² See, for example: Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2; Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, pp 2–3; ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, pp 4–5, 7; Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 3.

²³ Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2.

- 3.17. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, the Committee heard from Southern ACT Catchment Group that for small grants, such as grants for less than \$10,000, community groups often ran at a loss:

If you get a \$5,000 grant, you are not going to be able to do proper project management and get enough payment to actually run the project.²⁴

- 3.18. Landcare ACT added that core funding covered day-to-day engagement with their member groups but did not cover time or resources needed to manage grants:

We have grown from 19 groups to 29 in the past three years, and I know the other catchment groups are in a similar boat. So we are really just struggling at the moment to be able to meet the community need and to really support the community interest to get up and to do this environmental stewardship in the community. So I think it is really critical that we continue to be allowed to have project management and administration within these grants to ensure that we are actually able to support the community.²⁵

- 3.19. Landcare ACT said in their submission that they recognised that grants should not pay for staff to carry out work that was part of core business, but argued that most projects ‘are beyond core business and require remuneration for management’.²⁶

- 3.20. ACTCOSS noted in their submission that volunteers are ‘integral’ to grant delivery in many community organisations, and said that grant funding should include an option for allocating costs to volunteer management such as ‘recruitment, retention, training, ongoing support, and recognition of volunteers’.²⁷ ACTCOSS further noted that, according to a 2021 ACTCOSS-commissioned study²⁸, over 60 percent of ACT community organisations had decided not to apply for an ACT grant or program funding because of poor cost coverage. Some organisations had said they could not apply for grants because their volunteers lacked ‘time or capacity’.²⁹

- 3.21. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, ACTCOSS told the Committee that the cost of managing volunteers often went unrecognised:

Because they are volunteers, it is assumed there are no overhead costs, when there are significant overhead costs—sometimes even more significant overhead costs because you are managing a higher level of risk when you are managing a volunteer. What Volunteering ACT has told us, and what we have heard across the sector, is that those kinds of external costs outside of the actual project delivery

²⁴ Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 26.

²⁵ Ms Kat McGilp, Executive Officer and Catchment Coordinator, Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 26.

²⁶ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, pp 2–3.

²⁷ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

²⁸ Natasha Cortis, Megan Blaxland, and Elizabeth Adamson, *Counting the Costs: Sustainable funding for the ACT community services sector*, [Report: Counting the Costs: Sustainable funding for the ACT community services sector | ACT Council of Social Service Inc. \(actcoss.org.au\)](#), December 2021.

²⁹ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, pp 4–5.

have to be considered, essentially, in any grant or funding arrangement, and that is not something that we are seeing at the moment.³⁰

- 3.22. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, the Chief Minister acknowledged that overhead costs for NGOs and volunteer organisations should be taken into account:

It is not that you win this grant and that automatically entitles you to, from a separate pool of money, more administration funding. I do not think we are going to set up that sort of environment. But the realistic cost of delivery of a service or program needs to be accounted for. If it is unrealistic to deliver without administrative supports for the organisation beyond its existing resource base, then it clearly has to be a factor in grant decision-making.³¹

Committee Comment

- 3.23. The Committee considers that allowing for volunteer management costs to be included in ACT Government grant programs will allow volunteer and community groups to more effectively contribute their resources and expertise in to deliver grant-funded activities.

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include the option for allocating costs to include volunteer management in ACT Government grant programs.

- 3.24. Flexibility in timelines and methods of delivery for grants was identified by several submitters as desirable for more effective outcomes.³²
- 3.25. In their submission, ATODA noted that experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic had ‘demonstrated the need for embedded flexibility within grants for services,’ saying that, for example, ‘some sectors such as the disability sector were fully reimbursed for the cost of RATs [COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Tests] and others like the ATOD sector were not, with insufficient transparency around how those determinations were made’.³³
- 3.26. ACTCOSS said in their submission that flexibility in outcome delivery for grants would ‘acknowledge that the organisations are the experts in their field and allow them to be able to adapt and respond to emerging community needs’.³⁴
- 3.27. Both Southern ACT Catchment Group³⁵ and Ginninderra Catchment Group³⁶ noted in their submissions that the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) had allowed increased flexibility in environmental grant administration in recent

³⁰ Dr Gemma Killen, Acting Chief Executive Officer, ACT Council of Social Service, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 35.

³¹ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, pp 8–9.

³² See, for example: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 4; Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2; ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 8; Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 4.

³³ Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, p 4.

³⁴ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 8.

³⁵ Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2.

³⁶ Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 4.

years, which helped when delays were unavoidable, such as those caused by weather or by COVID-19. They both noted the need for such flexibility to also accommodate community engagement and land manager permissions and processes.

Committee Comment

- 3.28. The Committee considers that flexible grant management approaches would allow grant recipients to adapt and respond to different needs and situations as required.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include flexible grant management approaches relating to the way in which grant outcomes can be delivered by the community organisation.

- 3.29. The Committee heard that terms and conditions for different ACT Government grant programs are often inconsistent, and that the SmartyGrants website for grant applications also has inconsistent wording and requirements.³⁷
- 3.30. Mr Chris Mobbs, Chair, Hackett Community Association, told the Committee at the public hearing that there could be ‘an incredible difference’ in insurance requirements between grants, with the required public liability insurance cover varying from ‘an appropriate type and level’ to \$10 million or up to \$20 million for a heritage grant.³⁸
- 3.31. In their submission, Landcare ACT echoed these concerns, noting applications, deeds grant agreement and acquittal were all processes where consistency could be improved between Directorates and sections within Directorates.³⁹
- 3.32. Auditing requirements could also differ significantly, with some grants requiring financial statements to be certified by a registered accountant even for small amounts. The cost of such auditing was usually borne by the organisation’s own fundraising efforts.⁴⁰
- 3.33. Southern ACT Catchment Group noted in their submission that differing requirements for information and level of detail varied by grant program, and did not reflect the level of funding required but rather internal policy of the body offering the grant.⁴¹
- 3.34. Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, told the Committee at the public hearing:

I often find that the variations in the different deeds and the types of contracts that we are required to engage in are often quite different and complex. A little organisation like us, as well as smaller community groups who we auspice, do not actually have that sort of legal expertise to look at those fine levels of details.⁴²

³⁷ Hackett Community Association, *Submission 1*, p 1.

³⁸ Mr Chris Mobbs, Chair, Hackett Community Association, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 15.

³⁹ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2.

⁴⁰ Mr Chris Mobbs, Chair, Hackett Community Association, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 15–16.

⁴¹ Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 1.

⁴² Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 21.

- 3.35. In its submission, the ACT Government said that a range of funding agreements was used to ensure that public money is used for the intended purpose, by defining project deliverables, scheduling payment of grant funds, and specifying reporting requirements and acquittal procedures. 'These include using either a Deed of Grant, Letter of Offer, or a Memorandum of Understanding with the form of agreement commensurate with the scale, nature, complexity, and risks involved in the granting activity'.⁴³

Committee Comment

- 3.36. The Committee notes that, in its *Report 6: Inquiry into environmental volunteerism*⁴⁴, the Standing Committee on Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity recommended that the ACT Government standardise terms and conditions for grant applications and acquittal across ACT Government directorates.
- 3.37. The Committee further notes that the ACT Government response to that report agreed to the recommendation, saying:

All grants administered by the ACT Government are required to use a standard deed of grant designed by the ACT Government Solicitor. This deed of grant template outlines a standardised set of terms and conditions which can then be followed by the differing requirements of each program. ACT Government grant programs are also required to follow the whole of government Administration of Government Grants in the ACT policy. Through these two documents and relevant processes, the ACT Government will continue to ensure grant programs are standardised while still providing flexibility for the differing requirements of each program.⁴⁵

- 3.38. The Committee considers that improved consistency across all processes involved in applying for and acquitting grants would reduce administrative burdens on volunteer and community groups, and facilitate consistent auditing and oversight of grant programs.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government improve consistency across the ACT Government in the design, management of and acquittal of grants, including standardised insurance requirements, a standardised application form, and standardised acquittal processes for small dollar grants.

- 3.39. A number of organisations said that an Expression of Interest (EOI) process at the start of a grant application process would be beneficial, by focussing applications into those areas

⁴³ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 3.

⁴⁴ Standing Committee on Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity, Recommendation 2, *Report 6: Inquiry into environmental volunteerism*, 22 November 2022, p 12.

⁴⁵ ACT Government, *ACT Government Response to the Standing Committee on Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity Report No. 06 – Inquiry into environmental volunteerism*, March 2023, p 3.

most likely to succeed, and meaning that applicants did not waste time and effort on developing applications unlikely to receive funding.⁴⁶

- 3.40. Ms Kat McGilp, Executive Officer and Catchment Coordinator, Ginninderra Catchment Group, detailed an example for the Committee at the public hearing on 2 February 2023. She noted that environment grants have a one-step application process, which could involve up to a week of work including planning, site visits, research and engagement with landowners. A recent application for a grant to carry out weed removal required a lot of effort, and the group had been successful in earlier similar applications, but ‘it turned out that in that particular round weed management was not deemed a priority’, and the application was unsuccessful. Ms McGilp noted that

It would have saved us a lot of time if we just put in an initial plan and they said, “No, sorry; not this year”. We could save it for another year or another grant.⁴⁷

- 3.41. During the public hearing, ACTCOSS told the Committee that they would be supportive of an EOI process, not only to reduce the time spent on grant applications that were unlikely to succeed, but also to increase transparency about grant decisions:

So when grants are not awarded, letting people know why, which would also help them in future grant applications to know what they need to include, what they should not have included. And some more transparency when grants open about what the government is looking for so that people know that they do not need to apply if it is not a relevant thing for them.⁴⁸

Committee Comment

- 3.42. The Committee considers that an initial EOI process at the start of grant application processes may be beneficial both to applicants and grant providers, by reducing time and effort spent on applications unlikely to succeed, and encouraging higher-quality subsequent applications.

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine an initial Expression of Interest process before requiring more detailed grant applications so projects out of scope are identified early, before extensive time is committed to developing them.

⁴⁶ See, for example: Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2; Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 4; Mr Christopher Mobbs, Chair, Hackett Community Association, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, pp 18–19; Dr Gemma Killen, Acting Chief Executive Officer, ACT Council of Social Service, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 30.

⁴⁷ Ms Kat McGilp, Executive Officer and Catchment Coordinator, Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 23.

⁴⁸ Dr Gemma Killen, Acting Chief Executive Officer, ACT Council of Social Service, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 30.

Transparency

- 3.43. In its submission, ATODA noted that reporting requirements for grants were often a significant load on organisations, and suggested that these requirements should be co-developed between grantees and responsible directorates to ensure that the burden was minimised and that reporting met the needs of both the recipient and the ACT Government. ATODA further noted that the primary aim of reporting is to ensure that recipients have delivered against their grants, and called for other potential uses of the data to be deprioritised.⁴⁹
- 3.44. During the public hearing, Dr Devin Bowles, Chief Executive Officer, ATODA, noted that co-development of reporting requirements would not only ensure that the ACT Government was getting the information it needed, but would also provide ‘the on-the-ground knowledge for what metrics are actually the best ones to use’.⁵⁰
- 3.45. ACTCOSS concurred, saying in its submission that members had reported that the decision-making process for grants was often opaque, and that this could be addressed by ensuring that selection criteria, outcomes and reporting requirements were co-designed in partnership with the community sector. ACTCOSS also called for ‘open communication and feedback’ to all grant applicants.⁵¹
- 3.46. In its submission, the ACT Government cited collaboration as a ‘key principle’ within the grants administration framework, saying that a collaborative and cooperative relationship between the administering agency, the grant recipient and other stakeholders would ‘assist efficient and effective grant administration’.⁵²

Committee Comment

- 3.47. The Committee is of the opinion that co-development of reporting requirements by the ACT Government and community organisations will promote transparency by improving understanding of the information required and knowledge of the most effective measures of success, on both sides.

Recommendation 7

To ensure transparency in the grant decision making process, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government:

- ensure that selection criteria, outcomes and reporting requirements are co-designed in partnership with the community sector; and
- provide open communication and feedback to all grant applicants.

⁴⁹ Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Submission 4*, pp 4–5.

⁵⁰ Dr Devin Bowles, Chief Executive Officer, Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 31.

⁵¹ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 5.

⁵² ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 6.

- 3.48. Several submitters were of the opinion that community representation on selection panels for community grants would increase transparency and effectiveness.⁵³
- 3.49. In their submission, ACTCOSS suggested that to ensure that independent and relevant background knowledge was employed in assessment of grant applications, selection panels should include the community sector and/or a community member with lived experience. ACTCOSS argued that this measure would provide ‘a combination of relevant expertise and experience to support the objectives of the grant opportunity’⁵⁴.
- 3.50. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, the Committee heard that involvement in the decision-making process resulted in better buy-in from the community. Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, told the Committee:
- Where the community want the money to go on the ground is really significant, particularly when we have 60 to 80 ParkCare, Landcare and on-ground environmental stewardship groups who work really hard for nothing. It is really important that their opinion on where things need to go is seen as quite an informed opinion.⁵⁵
- 3.51. Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT, added that the inclusion of a community representative on a selection panel would increase transparency around decision-making:
- Obviously that person would not share the details of why or why not a particular grant got up, but it does increase transparency around what the criteria is for assessment, and it helps people to understand more about that process as well.⁵⁶
- 3.52. Ms Preuss also noted that having a representative peak body provide the community representative on a selection panel could help to ensure that the person was able to fulfil the function required and was able to represent a broader group, rather than being a ‘handpicked’ individual.⁵⁷
- 3.53. The ACT Government noted in its submission that transparency in the grant process includes scrutiny of the grant planning and processes and ‘providing assurance that grants administration processes are appropriate, and any legislative obligations are being met’.⁵⁸

Committee Comment

- 3.54. The Committee considers that the inclusion of a community representative on grant selection panels would increase community trust in the application process, provide expertise and insight on community priorities, and increase transparency by providing relevant feedback on assessment criteria.

⁵³ See, for example: Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Submission 5*, p 2; Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 3; ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 5; Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 3.

⁵⁴ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 5.

⁵⁵ Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 23.

⁵⁶ Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 24.

⁵⁷ Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 24.

⁵⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 6.

Recommendation 8

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require a community representative on grants selection committees/panels.

Grant information

3.55. Under the *Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A Framework and Best Practice Policy*, grant program guidelines must be developed for all grant programs, and include information on:

- the aim or purpose of the grant;
- available funding;
- eligibility requirements;
- exclusions;
- assessment of applications;
- acceptance of a grant; and
- other relevant information for an applicant.⁵⁹

3.56. In their submission, ACTCOSS noted that consultation with their members had identified that applicants needed clear, concise information on funding opportunities. ACTCOSS suggested a flowchart outlining timelines, funding amount, decision-makers and the decision-making process would provide applicants with an overview of the grant process.⁶⁰

Committee Comment

3.57. The Committee considers that high-quality, useful and concise information should be made available to potential grant applicants, to ensure they have access to all the relevant information.

Recommendation 9

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government make the following information publicly available prior to organisations applying for a grant:

- grant process flowcharts for each funding opportunity;
- grant decision making process;
- decision maker;
- selection criteria;

⁵⁹ Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, [Administration-of-Government-Grants-in-the-ACT.pdf](#), 2021, p 3.

⁶⁰ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

- outcomes (including links to wellbeing indicators);
- reporting requirements;
- an explicit statement on how administrative overheads, staffing costs and Project Management for activities for the Grant shall be covered during the grant process; and
- draft deed applicable to grant.

3.58. In their submission, ACTCOSS noted that the Funding Managers' Guide available on the ACT Government Grants website was developed in 2012 and needed updating. ACTCOSS further noted that the document was overlong at 52 pages and should be shortened.⁶¹

Committee Comment

3.59. The Committee considers that it is important that information and guidance provided to grant applicants is up-to-date, relevant, and helpful.

Recommendation 10

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update applicants' information resources and documents on the ACT Government Grants website.

Accountability

3.60. In their submission, ACTCOSS noted that the advice on the ACT Government Grants website that, after a grant application is submitted, 'Generally, recommendations are then made to the relevant Minister who makes the final decision' was in conflict with the *Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A Framework and Best Practice Policy*, which states that the appraisal and selection processes must be free from the risk of political bias.⁶²

3.61. During the public hearing, Dr Gemma Killen, Acting Chief Executive Officer of ACTCOSS, told the Committee that this did not necessarily mean that decision-making should not rest with the relevant Minister, but that more transparency was required:

At the moment for some grants we are having a process where people are not told why they have not received a grant and it might have been at a minister's discretion and then there is a suggestion possibly of political bias in the appointment because people do not know what has happened. So if there is more

⁶¹ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

⁶² ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 6; Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, [Administration-of-Government-Grants-in-the-ACT.pdf](#), 2021, p 5.

transparency and more community involvement in the selection process for grants, that would reduce some of that political bias.⁶³

- 3.62. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, the Chief Minister, Mr Andrew Barr MLA, said that the degree of involvement in decision-making by a minister could vary depending on the grant program. Mr Barr noted that, in his experience as Minister for Tourism for example, he determined that there would be particular grants made available:

I then sought advice from the department on structuring a framework for assessment. They sent me a brief to say “This is our proposal”. I would then approve that or otherwise, and they would then undertake the grants process. They would then make a series of recommendations, and I would get a brief for noting—not to override decisions but for noting—that these were the successful applicants in the program. So I as minister in that example determined that there would be a program and determined the quantity of money that would be available—although there is a little bit of an overlay with the Treasurer there in that context and with the ERC and then ultimately cabinet. But I would not be sitting on the selection panel to determine which grants are supported.

- 3.63. In response to a Question Taken on Notice regarding how often a ministerial decision on a grant had varied from directorate advice, the Chief Minister said that this was not common, and in 2021–22, only one such instance had been identified. In that instance, the Minister had increased the recommended amount of funding to the grant recipient.⁶⁴

Committee Comment

- 3.64. The Committee considers that, to avoid any perception of political bias in the grant process, increased transparency regarding decision-making at the ministerial level is beneficial.

Recommendation 11

Where the Minister is the decision maker for a grant, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government make the grant application appraisal and recommendations made to the Minister publicly available. Where it is unable to be released due to confidentiality or sensitivity concerns, officials must provide reasons to the unsuccessful applicants.

- 3.65. During the public hearing, the Chief Minister was asked about communication with unsuccessful grant applicants. In his response, he noted that at times grant applications were suitable and met the criteria for funding, but other applications were ranked more highly.⁶⁵

⁶³ Dr Gemma Killen, Acting Chief Executive Officer, ACT Council of Social Service, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 32.

⁶⁴ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *answer to QTON 1: Grants – Ministerial delegate decision-making*, 2 February 2023 (received 20 February 2023), p 1.

⁶⁵ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 4.

3.66. The Chief Minister added:

That would be a reasonable ground for a business case to be submitted for an increase in the grant program, and it would be a powerful argument, subject to all other constraints on the territory budget, for the government to consider increasing the amount of money available under a particular grants program because we felt that the quality of applications and the sorts of applications we were getting were meeting the objectives of the grants program but we simply were not able to fund all of them.⁶⁶

Committee Comment

3.67. The Committee considers that, where grant programs are oversubscribed with high-quality applications, increases in those grant programs should be routinely sought under the budget process to meet community need.

Recommendation 12

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish a specific process for feedback on the quantum of money allocated to grant categories within budget consultation.

3.68. The Committee heard from Landcare ACT that, while peak bodies generally had the expertise to write grant applications, doing so placed a high burden on them. Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT, told the Committee during the public hearing that a potential solution could involve two tiers, where small grant rounds had less administrative burden, while larger grant rounds with higher funding and for longer periods would require more information.⁶⁷

3.69. In their submission, ACTCOSS noted that smaller organisations could be deterred from submitting grant applications by the ‘significant administrative effort’ which was not proportionate to the funding amount.⁶⁸

3.70. During the public hearing, Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, told the Committee that, while her organisation often lost money on very small projects despite grant funding, and the government preferred larger projects with more visible larger results, ‘We have to respond to what our members want, and our members often want very small projects. [...] they are essential to respond to our community.’⁶⁹

3.71. During the public hearing on 2 February 2023, Mr Russ Campbell of the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD) told the Committee:

... we often have a look at the grants portal, ensuring that it has actually got the right sort of information in that part of the portal which says how to apply for a

⁶⁶ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 4.

⁶⁷ Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, pp 20–21.

⁶⁸ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

⁶⁹ Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 27.

grant and trying to simplify that. [...] we want to try to ensure that, as far as possible, there is a level playing field, in terms of the knowledge set coming to the table.⁷⁰

Committee Comment

- 3.72. The Committee considers that the grant application process should not serve as a disincentive to smaller organisations and should not place an administrative burden on applicants which is disproportionate to the level of funding offered.

Recommendation 13

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the administrative requirements and complexity of the application and reporting process of grants to ensure the application process is proportionate to the funding amount and outcomes. It is recommended a two-tier approach be adopted with lower levels of accountability for very small grants (<\$10,000) versus multiyear larger grants with more robust procedures.

- 3.73. In their submission, Landcare ACT noted that some grant programs had ‘arduous’ financial acquittal processes which required evidence for all expenditure, while others had lower levels of scrutiny for higher funding. Acknowledging the need for financial accountability, Landcare ACT argued that, given that incorporated organisations and not-for-profit companies have thorough financial management and audit processes in place.⁷¹
- 3.74. Ginninderra Catchment Group also noted in their submission that acquittal requirements were inconsistent across ACT Government agencies, and suggested that the extensive financial acquittal processes required for some grants indicated a level of ‘mistrust’ from the government toward community-based non-profit organisations.⁷²
- 3.75. At the public hearing, the Chief Minister told the Committee that grant programs were very diverse, varying from less than \$100 to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and that there was ‘a continuum of scrutiny and assessment criteria around a larger grant program’.⁷³
- 3.76. In their submission, the ACT Government noted that monitoring of payments and progress was an integral part of good governance and risk management, and that the stringency of acquittal procedures should be balanced against the level of risk, while taking the cost of compliance into account.⁷⁴
- 3.77. The government further noted that proportionality is a key principle of grant management, saying that:

⁷⁰ Mr Russ Campbell, Deputy Under Treasurer; Budget, Procurement, Infrastructure and Finance; Treasury; Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 3.

⁷¹ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2.

⁷² Ginninderra Catchment Group, *Submission 8*, p 3.

⁷³ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 3.

⁷⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 3.

... the framework for a granting activity should be commensurate with the scale, nature, complexity, and risks involved in the granting activity.⁷⁵

Committee Comment

- 3.78. The Committee considers that acquittal processes for grants should not be unduly onerous, especially that where organisations have demonstrated that they have good financial management processes in place.

Recommendation 14

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government not require detailed information on all expenditure where incorporated organisations and not-for-profit companies have thorough processes of financial management and annual audit.

Policy improvements

- 3.79. In their submission, ACTCOSS noted that according to the *Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A Framework and Best Practice Policy*, officials must provide advice to the delegate including 'reasons as to why an applicant was successful'.⁷⁶ For improved transparency, ACTCOSS suggested that officials should also be required to give reasons why an applicant was not successful.⁷⁷

Committee Comment

- 3.80. The Committee considers that, in line with Recommendations 7 and 8 above, the ACT Government grant administration policy should also be updated to include co-development of grants in partnership with the community sector, and inclusion of a community representative on grant selection panels.

Recommendation 15

The Committee recommends that *The Administration of Government Grants in the ACT: A Framework and Best Practice Policy* be amended as follows:

- In Section 1.5 Governance - officials must provide reasons as to why an applicant is successful/unsuccessful; and
- In Sections 3.1 Planning Design and 3.2 Selection and Decision Making - these sections be updated to include:
 - consulting and co-designing grants with the community sector; and

⁷⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 3*, p 6.

⁷⁶ Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, [Administration-of-Government-Grants-in-the-ACT.pdf](#), 2021, p 3.

⁷⁷ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 6.

- having community sector and/or community member with lived experience representation on grants selection committees/panels.

System improvements

- 3.81. ACTCOSS noted in their submission a lack of grant opportunities for the community sector which focus on climate change and the circular economy.⁷⁸
- 3.82. According to the ACT Government consultation YourSay webpage, the circular economy aims to maximise the value of materials, creates jobs and stops waste from being produced in the first place:

The benefits of adopting a circular economy are not just about improving the natural environment, wellbeing and supporting the transition to a net zero city. The circular economy provides great opportunities for innovation, economic growth and job creation.⁷⁹

Committee Comment

- 3.83. Given that the ACT Government has recently finished consultation on its Draft Circular Economy Strategy and work is underway to develop the ACT Circular Economy Action Plan⁸⁰, the Committee considers it appropriate that grants with a circular economy and sustainability focus be available to community organisations.

Recommendation 16

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government expand funding opportunities to include grants that have a focus on sustainability and circular economy for the community sector.

- 3.84. In their submission, Landcare ACT observed that ‘legalistic’ language in grant deeds was often difficult for smaller groups and organisations to navigate.⁸¹
- 3.85. ACTCOSS agreed, calling in their submission for the language used in the overall grant process to be accessible for culturally and linguistically diverse communities and available in plain English.⁸²
- 3.86. During the public hearing, the Chief Minister said that the move to online forms for grant applications and endeavours to write grant program guidelines in plain English had made the application process easier. He noted that a ‘certain level of information’ was required

⁷⁸ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

⁷⁹ ACT Government, [Draft ACT Circular Economy Strategy | YourSay ACT](#) (accessed 13 April 2023).

⁸⁰ ACT Government, *Timeline*, [Draft ACT Circular Economy Strategy | YourSay ACT](#) (accessed 13 April 2023).

⁸¹ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2.

⁸² ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 7.

by decision-makers to be satisfied that successful applicants would deliver the stated outcomes.⁸³

Committee Comment

- 3.87. The Committee considers that ACT Government grant programs should be accessible and written in plain English wherever possible, to enable community groups to pursue grant opportunities without undue hardship or need of external expertise for interpretation.

Recommendation 17

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a review of language and accessibility in all ACT Government grant program materials.

- 3.88. Landcare ACT noted in their submission that the use by some directorates of the SmartyGrants application for grant management was welcomed by their members. They observed that the use of SmartyGrants allowed for information about each organisation to be saved online, independent of the grant program directorate, which would reduce the administrative burden when applying for further grants.⁸⁴
- 3.89. In their submission, ACTCOSS reported that their members considered SmartyGrants to be a 'suitable and functional platform' for grant applications and the reporting process, and that it should be retained.⁸⁵
- 3.90. During the public hearing, the Committee heard from Southern ACT Catchment Group that more information should be available on SmartyGrants:

But the actual deed, the signing of the deed and the final report date are not put on SmartyGrants at all. In fact, very little is put on SmartyGrants. The application is and, coming close to the acquittal, the acquittal form is put on. I believe that everything should be up there.⁸⁶

Committee Comment

- 3.91. The Committee is of the opinion that more use could be made of SmartyGrants to reduce the administrative burden on grant applicants, including saving applicant organisations' information on the platform.

⁸³ Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Chief Minister, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 3.

⁸⁴ Landcare ACT, *Submission 6*, p 2.

⁸⁵ ACT Council of Social Service, *Submission 7*, p 8.

⁸⁶ Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment Group, *Committee Hansard*, 2 February 2023, p 28.

Recommendation 18

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require that information about grant applicant organisations be saved on SmartyGrants, regardless of the Grant Program Directorate, to reduce the administrative burden when applying for grants.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1. The Committee has made 18 recommendations in this report with the aim of improving grant management processes for applicants and recipients, and ensuring that ACT Government grants meet government policy outcomes and are delivered in a transparent, accountable manner for the greatest public benefit.
- 4.2. The Committee wishes to extend its appreciation to all inquiry participants for their engagement throughout the inquiry process and for the valuable contributions they made in assisting and informing the Committee's deliberations.

Mrs Elizabeth Kikkert
Chair
April 2023

Appendix A: Submissions

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
1	Hackett Community Association	08/11/2022	16/11/2022
2	Kevin Cox	27/11/2022	28/11/2022
3	ACT Government	30/11/2022	30/11/2022
4	ATODA	01/12/2022	01/12/2022
5	Southern ACT Catchment Group Inc	01/12/2022	01/12/2022
6	Landcare ACT	02/12/2022	02/12/2022
7	ACTCOSS	02/12/2022	02/12/2022
8	Ginninderra Catchment Group	02/12/2022	02/12/2022

Appendix B: Witnesses

Thursday 02 February 2023

ACT Government

- **Mr Andrew Barr MLA**, Chief Minister
- **Mr Russ Campbell**, Deputy Under Treasurer; Budget, Procurement, Infrastructure and Finance; Treasury; Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
- **Mr Stuart Friend**, Executive Branch Manager, Expenditure Review Branch, Finance and Budget, BPIF, Treasury, CMTEDD

Mr Kevin Cox

Mr Christopher Mobbs, Chair, Hackett Community Association

Ms Karissa Preuss, Chief Executive Officer, Landcare ACT

Ms Martine Franco, Executive Officer, Southern ACT Catchment group

Ms Kathryn McGilp, Executive Officer and Catchment Coordinator, Ginninderra Catchment Group

ACT Council of Social Service

- **Dr Gemma Killen**, Acting Chief Executive Officer
- **Ms Emma Hawke**, Community Assistance Support Program Development Officer

Dr Devin Bowles, Chief Executive Officer, Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Association ACT

Appendix C: Questions taken on notice

Questions taken on notice

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
1	02/02/23	Chief Minister	Grants – Ministerial delegate decision making	20/02/23
2	02/02/23	Chief Minister	Grant Funding – Annual vs multiyear grants	20/02/23