

From: [ACT Auditor General](#)
To: [Carrick, Fiona](#)
Cc: [LA Committee - Compliance;](#) [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FMA s16B rollovers - Possible forms of appropriation
Date: Friday, 24 April 2026 12:42:44 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

OFFICIAL

Dear Ms Carrick

In response to Mr Bradbury's correspondence below I would like to clarify my comments at yesterday's hearing in relation to the Inquiry into Financial Management and Government Procurement Legislative Compliance.

When suggesting that transfers under section 16B of the *Financial Management Act 1996* (FMA) were limited to capital injections, my intention was to convey that from practical perspective these transfers were mainly used to rollover capital injections. In the hindsight, for clarification, I should have mentioned that section 16B does not have any limitation as such and that limitation is from the practical purposes of how Treasury manages and processes these instruments for agencies. Capital injections funding can be more easily assessed on a project-by-project basis however it is more difficult to do so for controlled recurrent payments (CRP) and payment for expenses on behalf of the Territory (EBT) appropriations. Hence, Treasury largely quarantines application of section 16B to CRP and EBT initiatives for one-off types of projects and where there is clear visibility on the funding arrangements. This is reflected in the higher amounts (more than 70%) of Capital Injections being rolled over using section 16B from 2023-24 to 2024-25 as opposed to CRP and EBT.

I can confirm that Mr Bradbury is correct in that section 16B of the FMA allows for rollover of all forms of undisbursed appropriation (capital injections, controlled recurrent payments and payment for expenses on behalf of the Territory).

Kind regards,

Ajay Sharma PSM | ACT Auditor-General

Officer of the ACT Legislative Assembly

ACT Audit Office, Nara Centre, Level 4, 3 Constitution Avenue, Canberra

PO Box 158 Canberra ACT 2608 | www.audit.act.gov.au

I acknowledge the Ngunnawal people as traditional custodians of the ACT and recognise any other people or families with connection to the lands of the ACT and region. I acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of this city and this region.



Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 23 April 2026 6:30 PM

To: Carrick, Fiona [REDACTED]
Cc: LA Committee - Compliance <LACommitteeCompliance@parliament.act.gov.au>; ACT Auditor General [REDACTED]
Subject: FMA s16B rollovers - Possible forms of appropriation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Fiona Carrick, MLA
Cc: Ajay Sharma PSM, ACT Auditor-General

Dear Ms Carrick,

In today's hearings of the Inquiry into Financial Management and Government Procurement Legislative Compliance, an answer to a question to the Auditor-General in relation to what forms of appropriation could be used in a FMA s16B rollover it was suggested that it was limited to Capital injections.

Hearing that answer in the audience, I doubted that it was correct. In my appearance I mentioned that doubt to you and undertook to look at my analysis of the 2024-25 authorisations.

I have added totals by form to my summary report (attached). What it shows is that all three forms of appropriation were rolled over from 2023-24 to 2024-25. The total \$111 million of s16B rollovers is made up as follows:

- \$77.9 million - Capital injection.
- \$30.3 million – Controlled recurrent payments.
- \$2.4 million – Payments on behalf of the Territory.

Best regards
Peter Bradbury

Communications from the ACT Audit Office may contain protected information for the purposes of Part 5A of the Auditor-General Act 1996 (ACT).