



Government Gazette

of the State of

New South Wales

Number 95–Other
Monday, 18 March 2024

The New South Wales Government Gazette is the permanent public record of official NSW Government notices. It also contains local council, non-government and other notices.

Each notice in the Government Gazette has a unique reference number that appears in parentheses at the end of the notice and can be used as a reference for that notice (for example, (n2019-14)).

The Gazette is compiled by the Parliamentary Counsel's Office and published on the NSW legislation website (www.legislation.nsw.gov.au) under the authority of the NSW Government. The website contains a permanent archive of past Gazettes.

To submit a notice for gazettal, see the Gazette page.

The Cabinet Office

Grants Administration Guide

March 2024



Contents

1.	Overview	3
1.1	Purpose	3
1.2	Who is required to comply with this Guide?	3
1.3	Is compliance with the Guide mandatory?	4
1.4	Legislative and policy framework	4
1.5	Structure of the Guide	6
1.6	Acknowledgement	6

2.	Definitions	8
----	-------------	---

3.	Your responsibilities under the Guide	10
----	---------------------------------------	----

4.	Definition of a 'grant'	17
4.1	A 'grant' includes	17
4.2	A 'grant' does not include	17
4.3	Assessing whether or not a financial arrangement is a 'grant'	18

5.	Key principles of grants administration	20
5.1	Robust planning and design	21
5.2	Collaboration and partnership	22
5.3	Proportionality	22
5.4	Outcomes orientation	23
5.5	Achieving value for money	23
5.6	Governance and accountability	24
5.7	Probity and transparency	25

6.	Process of grants administration	28
6.1	Planning and designing the grant opportunity	28
6.2	Promoting the grant opportunity	34
6.3	Receiving and assessing grant applications	35
6.4	Providing grants	37
6.5	Publishing grant information	38
6.6	Monitoring and acquitting grants	39
6.7	Grants evaluation	40

7.	Review of the Guide	43
----	---------------------	----

Appendix A:	Publication of grants information and data	45
-------------	--	----

1

1. Overview

1.1 Purpose

Grants are a way of distributing public money to achieve government policy outcomes for the benefit of the community.

The NSW Government is committed to ensuring that all public money is spent fairly, effectively and transparently. Grants administered by the NSW Government must:

- deliver value for public money in achieving their stated objectives
- involve robust planning and design
- adopt key principles of transparency, accountability and probity
- deliver a high-quality customer experience.

This Guide provides:

- an overview of the grants administration process
- overarching principles that apply to all NSW Government grants
- specific requirements that must be complied with when administering grants.

The Guide aims to harmonise grants administration processes across government and ensure that the key principles of transparency, accountability and probity are embedded in the way NSW Government grants are delivered.

Further materials to support the grants administration process, including templates and more detailed process guidance continue to be developed to supplement this Guide and are available online at nsw.gov.au/grants-and-funding/grants-administration-guide

The use of template documents is not mandatory; however, it is encouraged. These templates will likely need modification to suit specific circumstances. It is recommended that agencies seek legal assistance in the use and adaptation of these documents.

1.2 Who is required to comply with this Guide?

This Guide applies to:

- Ministers
- officials, being government sector employees within the meaning of the *Government Sector Employment Act 2013* (NSW), excluding employees of State Owned Corporations (**SOCs**)
- Ministerial staff.

The Guide applies to all grants administered by the government sector. The Guide does not apply to local government or SOC. However, where local government or other third parties administer grants on behalf of the NSW Government, officials **must** satisfy themselves that there are practices and procedures in place for the administration of the grants consistent with the key principles and requirements of the Guide, with appropriate adaptations as necessary.¹ This may be achieved, for example, through the terms of engagement between the NSW Government agency and the relevant third party or the grant agreement (if applicable). These arrangements should be considered at the planning and design stage.

NSW Government boards and committees may be involved in grants administration, including by providing advice to Ministers or officials who exercise the expenditure functions of government. The Guide applies to Ministers and officials carrying out those functions. All parties involved in grants administration for or on behalf of the NSW Government are encouraged to adhere to the Guide.

¹ Where multiple agencies are involved in a grant that is to be administered by a third party, officials may need to satisfy themselves of this by way of consultation with the other agency or agencies.

1.3 Is compliance with the Guide mandatory?

Compliance with the Guide is mandatory and a legal requirement under the *Government Sector Finance Act 2018* (NSW) (**GSF Act**).

Section 10.3A(1) of the GSF Act provides that a Minister, their staff and an employee of a government sector agency must not knowingly breach a mandatory requirement contained in the Guide.

The Guide is also issued under a Premier's Memorandum. Premier's Memoranda are binding on Ministers and agencies and compliance is required and expected. For government sector employees, failure to comply may result in disciplinary action under the *Government Sector Employment Act 2013* (NSW).

Ministerial staff must comply with this Guide in accordance with the terms of their employment under the *Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013* (NSW). In addition, under the NSW Office Holder's Staff Code of Conduct, staff must comply with all applicable laws, applicable codes of conduct and Premier's Memoranda.

The Guide provides best practice guidance and includes some mandatory requirements. Where a requirement is mandatory, this is indicated by the use of the word '**must**' or the words '**must not**' in relation to that requirement.

Mandatory requirements are primarily located in section 6 and are summarised in section 3 of the Guide.

1.4 Legislative and policy framework

The Guide sits alongside other requirements that apply to the expenditure of public money in NSW, as well as laws and policies that govern ethical behaviour. The Guide does not affect the requirements of those laws and policies, and officials, Ministers and Ministerial staff **must** ensure that they comply with all relevant laws when administering grants. Key requirements of that legislative and policy framework are set out below.

1.4.1 *Government Sector Finance Act 2018* (NSW) (**GSF Act**)

The GSF Act requires that the expenditure of money must be 'authorised', namely:

- with lawful authority, and
- in accordance with any delegation.²

Officials are to be guided by the values of accountability, integrity and transparency when managing public money, as follows:

- **Accountability:** take reasonable care so that use of government resources and related money is efficient, effective and prudent.
- **Integrity:** place public interest over private interest and not use position or information improperly for financial or personal gain.
- **Transparency:** ensure that any real or perceived conflicts of interest are effectively avoided, managed and disclosed.³

Additionally, the GSF Act imposes obligations on the accountable authority to implement:

- financial management policies and procedures
- effective systems for risk management, internal control and assurance (including by means of internal audits) that are appropriate systems for the agency
- arrangements for ensuring compliance with the GSF Act

and to ensure compliance with such policies and procedures.⁴

The GSF Act also imposes several requirements directly related to grants administration.

As noted above, the GSF Act specifies that Ministers, their staff and employees of government sector agencies must not knowingly breach a mandatory requirement contained in the Guide.⁵

The GSF Act also requires that:

- Ministers must not approve a grant to which the Guide applies unless satisfied that the grant:
 - is an efficient, effective, economical and ethical use of money, and
 - achieves value for money⁶
- when approving or declining a grant to which the Guide applies, a person must have regard to the key principles of grants administration specified in the Guide.⁷

² GSF Act, section 5.5.

³ GSF Act, section 3.7(1).

⁴ GSF Act, section 3.6(1).

⁵ GSF Act, section 10.3A(1).

⁶ GSF Act, section 10.3A(2).

⁷ GSF Act, section 10.3A(3).

Various policies, including Treasury Policy Papers (TPP) and Treasury Policy and Guidelines (TPG), support the requirements of the GSF Act. Where these policies are relevant to grants administration, they are mentioned in the Guide.

1.4.2 Government Sector Employment Act 2013 (NSW) (GSE Act)

The Ethical Framework established under the GSE Act prescribes the core values of integrity, trust, service and accountability, and sets out the principles of expected behaviour of officials including:

- acting professionally with honesty, consistency and impartiality
- placing the public interest over personal interest; providing transparency to enable public scrutiny
- being fiscally responsible and focusing on efficient, effective and prudent use of resources.⁸

1.4.3 State Records Act 1998 (NSW) (SR Act)

The SR Act requires public offices (including agencies and Ministerial offices) to keep full and accurate records of the activities of the office. It is an offence to, among other things, abandon, dispose of, damage or alter a State record.⁹

1.4.4 Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 (NSW) (GIPA Act)

The GIPA Act provides for the proactive release of government information by agencies and gives members of the public an enforceable right to access government information held by an agency. A Minister is an agency for the purposes of the GIPA Act.¹⁰ Access to government information is only to be restricted if there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

The GIPA Act and the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018 make certain grants information ‘open access information’¹¹, which must be made publicly available unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of the information. The grants information prescribed as open access information is the information that is required under the Guide to be published by the agency on the NSW Government [Grants and Funding Finder](#). These GIPA Act requirements will be satisfied where agencies adhere to the publication requirements under section 6.5 of the Guide.

1.4.5 Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988 (NSW) (ICAC Act)

The ICAC Act provides for the Independent Commission Against Corruption (**the ICAC**) to investigate corrupt conduct involving or affecting public authorities and public officials. The ICAC’s jurisdiction extends to government agencies, local councils, Ministers, members of Parliament (**MPs**) and persons employed under the *Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013*.

While it can take many forms, corrupt conduct includes conduct involving a breach of public trust, the dishonest or partial exercise of official functions, or conduct that affects the honest or impartial exercise of official functions (s 8(1)).¹² Conduct by a Minister or MP that breaches an applicable code of conduct may also be investigated by the ICAC.¹³

1.4.6 NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct

The Ministerial Code of Conduct¹⁴ establishes the standards of ethical behaviour required of Ministers, including imposing a duty to act honestly and in the public interest. In the exercise or performance of their official functions, a Minister must not act dishonestly, must act only in what they consider to be the public interest, and must not act improperly for their private benefit or for the private benefit of any other person.¹⁵

The Ministerial Code of Conduct also deals with conflicts of interest, including by providing that a Minister must not, without the written approval of the Premier, make or participate in the making of any decision or take any other action in relation to a matter in which the Minister is aware they have a conflict of interest.¹⁶

The Ministerial Code of Conduct is prescribed by the ICAC Regulation for the purposes of section 9 of the ICAC Act, meaning that a substantial breach of the code could amount to corrupt conduct under the ICAC Act.

⁸ GSE Act, section 7.

⁹ SR Act, section 21.

¹⁰ GIPA Act, section 4.

¹¹ GIPA Act, section 6 and section 20.

¹² ICAC Act, section 8(1).

¹³ ICAC Act, section 9.

¹⁴ Contained in the Appendix to the, Independent Commission Against Corruption Regulation 2017 (NSW) (**ICAC Regulation**).

¹⁵ Ministerial Code of Conduct, section 6.

¹⁶ Ministerial Code of Conduct, section 7(2).

1.4.7 Other laws and policies

The NSW Office Holder's Staff Code of Conduct¹⁷ sets out the ethical standards that apply to Ministerial staff, including the obligation to:

- behave honestly and with integrity
- acknowledge that staff do not have the power to direct officials and that officials are not subject to their direction
- recognise that executive decisions are the preserve of Ministers or authorised officials, and not staff acting in their own right
- comply with all applicable laws, applicable codes of conduct and Premier's Memoranda (including this Guide and the record keeping requirements under the SR Act).

1.5 Structure of the Guide

The Guide is structured as follows:

- Sections 1 and 2 of the Guide provide an overview and a list of key definitions.
- Section 3 sets out the responsibilities of Ministers, Ministerial staff and officials, which are considered in further detail in sections 5 and 6.
- Section 4 sets out the definition of a grant.
- Section 5 details the key principles that underpin grants administration in NSW.
- Section 6 details the process for administering grants and the specific requirements that apply to Ministers, Ministerial staff and officials in relation to grants.

1.6 Acknowledgement

The Guide was developed by close reference to the *Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines 2017 (CGRGs)*. The Guide adopts a similar approach to the CGRGs – setting out key principles and mandatory requirements – and draws on the concepts and requirements contained in the CGRGs. The Commonwealth was consulted during the drafting of the Guide.

¹⁷ The Code is in the Minister's Office Handbook.

2

2. Definitions

Agency	Means government sector agency under the <i>Government Sector Employment Act 2013</i> (NSW)
Assessment team	The person or persons responsible for assessing individual grants against the grant guidelines
CGRGs	<i>Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines 2017</i> (Cth)
Decision-maker	The person with responsibility for deciding whether to approve or decline a grant
Eligibility criteria	The conditions which must be met by an applicant to qualify for a grant
Grants administration	Refers to the processes that an agency puts in place to deliver grants. It includes planning and design; promotion; assessment and decision-making; the making of a grant; the management of grant agreements; the ongoing relationship with grantees; reporting; and review and evaluation
Grant lifecycle	Refers to the stages of grants administration, from planning and design to evaluation
Grant guidelines	Refers to a document containing the relevant information required for potential grantees to understand: the purpose, outcomes and objectives of a grant; the application and assessment process; the governance arrangements (including roles and responsibilities); and the operation of the grant
Grant	As defined in Section 4 See also table 1 for definitions of competitive, non-competitive and one-off or ad hoc grants ¹⁸
Grant opportunity	The grant process or program where grant(s) are made available to grantees and potential grantees
Grantee	Means the individual or organisation selected to receive a grant
Officials	Means persons employed in the government sector under the <i>Government Sector Employment Act 2013</i> (NSW), excluding employees of State Owned Corporations
Ministerial staff	Means persons employed under the <i>Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013</i> (NSW) by Ministers as a member of their staff
Selection criteria	Comprises eligibility criteria and assessment criteria

¹⁸ The key principles and mandatory requirements set out in the Guide must be met for all grants. Where relevant, the Guide provides appropriate exceptions, such as exceptions that apply for non-competitive grants.

3

3. Your responsibilities under the Guide

Reference in Guide

Ministers		
	• Be familiar and comply with the principles and grants administration processes set out in this Guide, as well as applicable laws and policies that guide ethical behaviour	
	• Promote compliance with this Guide by officials and Ministerial staff	
	• Comply with the following mandatory requirements:	
	– Ministers must ensure they comply with all relevant laws when administering grants	1.4
	– Ministers must comply with their record keeping obligations under the SR Act	5.6
	– Ministers must not approve a grant that has been assessed as ineligible, unless they make a decision to waive the eligibility criteria	6.3.2
	– Ministers who are involved in the grants administration process must administer the grant in accordance with the grant guidelines	6.3
	– A Minister must not approve or decline a grant without first receiving written advice from officials on the merits of the proposed grant or group of grants (see exceptions at 6.3 <i>Receiving and assessing grant applications</i> for non-competitive grants) ¹⁹	6.3.2
	– A Minister (or other decision-maker) who approves or declines a grant must record the decision in writing, including the reasons for the decision (and any departure from the recommendation of officials), having regard to the grant guidelines (if any), the selection criteria and the key principle of achieving value for money, and manage these records in accordance with the requirements of the SR Act (see exceptions at 6.3 <i>Receiving and assessing grant applications</i> for non-competitive grants)	6.3.2

¹⁹ The exceptions for non-competitive grants at 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications* do not apply to one-off, ad hoc grants. The principles and requirements in the Guide that apply to competitive grants apply in the same way to one-off, ad hoc grants (including the requirements that the Minister must receive written advice from officials and must record the reasons for the decision).

Officials

- Be familiar and comply with the principles and grants administration processes set out in this Guide, as well as applicable laws and policies that guide ethical behaviour
- Provide full and frank advice to Ministers about grants, grants processes and decision-making
- Comply with the following mandatory requirements:
 - Officials must ensure they comply with all relevant laws when administering grants **1.4**
 - Officials must comply with their record keeping obligations under the SR Act **5.6**

Planning and designing grant opportunities

- Officials must put in place practices and procedures to ensure that grants are administered consistently with the key principles and requirements in the Guide **5**
- Where local government or other third parties are engaged to administer grants on behalf of NSW Government, officials must satisfy themselves that there are practices and procedures in place for the administration of the grants consistently with the key principles and requirements of the Guide, with appropriate adaptations **1.2**
- Officials must demonstrate at the planning and design stage how a grant opportunity will deliver value for money by identifying benefits and costs (economic, social, environmental and cultural) **5.5**
- Officials must identify and manage risks for all grants, in accordance with agencies' responsibilities under the GSF Act **5.1, 6.1.2**
- In the case of all grant opportunities that are complex, high-risk or of high value, officials must conduct checks of the applicant (the potential grant recipient) proportionate to the value and risk of the grant **6.1.2**
- Officials must develop and implement fraud controls that are proportionate to the value and risk of the grant and consistent with NSW public sector risk management requirements **5.7**
- Officials must seek probity advice (whether external or internal) for all grant opportunities that are complex, high-risk or high-value (consistent with the agency's expenditure and risk management frameworks), to support the design, application, assessment and decision-making phases **6.1.2**
- When designing the assessment process, officials must consider and develop a plan for managing any conflicts of interest that might arise **5.7, 6.1.5**

- Where a method other than a competitive merit-based selection process is to be used (including one-off or ad hoc grants), officials must document why that method will be used and outline the risk mitigation strategies. This must be approved by the relevant Minister (or head of agency or delegate) 6.1.5
- In the case of one-off or ad hoc grants, grants must be assessed against the criteria specified at 6.1.4 6.1.4
- Officials must prepare clear, consistent grant guidelines for all grants (except for one-off or ad hoc grants, for which guidelines are not mandatory), which contain information about a grant, including the details set out below at 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity* 6.1.7
- Where it is anticipated that a grant opportunity will involve input from MPs or other stakeholders, officials must ensure that the grant guidelines clearly outline the role of stakeholders and the engagement process, and that all stakeholder input is documented, including how it was considered in the assessment process 6.3.3
- Officials must capture in the grant guidelines (or, where guidelines are not required and not prepared, otherwise document) what support is made available to applicants and relevant details of that support 6.1.8
- Officials must also document what support has been given to a grant applicant and the reasons for giving that support 6.1.8
- Where significant changes are made in relation to a grant opportunity, officials must revise the grant guidelines and, except in the case of any guidelines developed for one-off or ad hoc grants, publish the revised guidelines 6.1.7
- In the case of one-off or ad hoc grants, officials must ensure that relevant information about the grant is documented, including the decision-maker for the grant 6.1.7
- Officials must ensure that key information about grant opportunities is published on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder²⁰ 6.2
- Where grants are provided on a one-off or ad hoc basis, the grant guidelines are not required to be published. However, officials must ensure that information about the grant is made available on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder no later than 45 calendar days after the grant agreement takes effect, or, if there is no grant agreement, no later than 45 calendar days after the first payment is paid to the grantee 6.5

Assesment and decision-making

- Officials must administer a grant in accordance with the grant guidelines 6.3
- Officials must not approve a grant that has been assessed as ineligible, unless they make a decision to waive eligibility criteria 6.3.2

²⁰ If certain information cannot be published on that site, officials may publish that information on the agency website until it is able to be published on the Grants and Funding Finder.

- In limited circumstances where eligibility criteria are to be waived, officials must ensure the reasons are documented and the waiver must be approved by the decision-maker (whether as part of the final approval or otherwise) **6.3.2**
- Officials must provide written advice to the decision-maker that includes, at a minimum, the matters outlined at 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications* (see exceptions at 6.3 for non-competitive grants) **6.3.1**
- An official must not approve or decline a grant without first receiving written advice from officials on the merits of the proposed grant or group of grants (see exceptions at 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications* for non-competitive grants).²¹ **6.3.2**
- An official who approves or declines a grant must record the decision in writing, including the reasons for the decision (and any departure from the recommendation of the assessment team) having regard to the grant guidelines (if any), the selection criteria and the key principle of achieving value for money, and manage these records in accordance with the requirements of the SR Act (see exceptions at 6.3 for non-competitive grants) **6.3.2**
- Officials must ensure that (where relevant) all decisions in the assessment process are documented, as set out below at 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications* (see exceptions at 6.3 for non-competitive grants) **6.3**

Providing grants and publishing grant information

- Officials must ensure that grantees are subject to clear and specific written terms and conditions for a grant. This should be by way of a funding agreement, unless not practicable **6.4**
- Officials must ensure that information on the decisions made in relation to grants awarded is published on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder no later than 45 calendar days after the grant agreement takes effect or, if there is no grant agreement, no later than 45 calendar days after the first payment is paid to the grantee (see exceptions at 6.5 *Publishing grant information*) **6.5**
- Where there is a legal obligation to maintain confidentiality over certain grant information, officials must publish as much information as is permitted and the reasons for not publishing the information fully must be documented by officials (see exceptions at 6.5 *Publishing grant information*) **6.5**
- Where there is a policy exception to the requirement to publish grant information, officials must publish as much information as is reasonably practical. The approval of the Minister must be obtained and the reasons for not publishing the information fully must be documented by officials and published (see exceptions at 6.5 *Publishing grant information*) **6.5**

²¹ The exceptions for non-competitive grants at 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications* do not apply to one-off, ad hoc grants. The principles and requirements in the Guide that apply to competitive grants apply in the same way to one-off, ad hoc grants (including the requirements that the Minister must receive written advice from officials and must record the reasons for the decision).

- Officials must provide emergency relief grants information to the Auditor-General within 3 months of the grant agreement taking effect, or, if there is no grant agreement, no later than 3 months after the first payment is paid to the grantee **6.5.1**

Ministerial staff

- Be familiar and comply with the principles and grants administration processes set out in this Guide, as well as applicable laws and policies that guide ethical behaviour
- Comply with the following mandatory requirements:
 - Ministerial staff must ensure that they comply with all relevant laws when administering grants **1.4**
 - Ministerial staff must comply with their record keeping obligations under the SR Act **5.6**
 - Ministerial staff must put in place practices and procedures to ensure that Ministerial involvement in grants administration is conducted in a manner that is consistent with the key principles and requirements in the Guide **5**
 - Where a Minister is the decision-maker, Ministerial staff must ensure that the decision is recorded in writing and the records are managed in accordance with the requirements of the SR Act **6.3**

As noted above, where local government or other third parties administer grants on behalf of the NSW Government, practices and procedures must be in place to ensure that grants administration is conducted in a manner that is consistent with the key principles and requirements of the Guide, with appropriate adaptations as necessary.

Additionally, where boards and other committees established under NSW legislation are involved in grants administration, the Guide applies to Ministers and officials carrying out grants administration functions, with appropriate adaptations as necessary.



4

4. Definition of a 'grant'

4.1 A 'grant' includes

For the purposes of the Guide, a 'grant' is an arrangement for the provision of financial assistance by the NSW Government (or on behalf of the NSW Government) whereby money:

1. is paid to a grantee other than the NSW Government²²
2. is intended to help address one or more of the NSW Government's policy outcomes
3. is intended to assist the grantee to achieve its objectives
4. does not result in the return of goods or services by the grantee of an equivalent value to the NSW Government (i.e. it is a non-reciprocal exchange).

4.2 A 'grant' does not include

For the purposes of the Guide, a 'grant' does not include:

- the purchase of goods and services for the direct use or benefit of the NSW Government (i.e. procurement or tender – refer to the NSW Government Procurement Policy Framework)
- commissioning another party to carry out work on behalf of the NSW Government (for example, payments to non-government organisations to deliver services to agency clients – refer to *TPP16-05 NSW Government Commissioning and Contestability Policy*)
- a gift of government property as defined in the GSF Act²³
- ex gratia and act of grace payments made to persons who have suffered a financial or other detriment **as a result of the workings of government**²⁴
- a payment to a person of a benefit or an entitlement established by legislation
- an arrangement that is explicitly for the purpose of the transfer of funds and/or assets between NSW Government entities or SOCs

- tax rebates and concessions on government fees and charges established through legislation or regulation, for example, a refund or discount on a charge. This exclusion does not include government voucher schemes
- a loan provided on commercial terms
- a payment of remuneration, compensation or damages
- payments by the NSW Government to the Commonwealth (for example, if the NSW Government contributes funding to a Commonwealth program, scheme or initiative)
- a payment from the Commonwealth where the NSW Government is used as an intermediary to distribute funds to other parts of government or to non-government entities
- a scholarship
- a sponsorship arrangement in which the NSW Government provides money to an organisation or individuals to carry out a particular event or activity in return for sponsorship rights
- third-party asset transfers (the transfer of an asset outside the government sector, through a sale or long-term lease, attributable to a contractual arrangement). For example, an infrastructure asset constructed by the NSW Government which is transferred to a NSW council/electricity provider (as relevant) for maintenance and operation on completion.

22 This does not mean that grants as part of a program with both government and non-government applicants are not grants for the purposes of the Guide. In these circumstances, the grant should be treated as a grant under the Guide, and be administered accordingly, notwithstanding that some of the grant recipients may be government agencies.

23 GSF Act, section 5.6.

24 Other kinds of acts of grace and ex gratia payments may constitute a grant, for example, high volume, low-value emergency-response payments.

4.3 Assessing whether or not a financial arrangement is a 'grant'

The above definition informs the scope of the Guide.

In assessing whether or not the relevant financial arrangement is a grant, you should first **consider the 4 key characteristics** identified at 4.1 above. If one of these characteristics does not apply, then the arrangement in question is likely not a grant.

If all 4 key characteristics are established, you should then consider the exclusions identified in 4.2 above to see if any apply.

If in doubt as to how to characterise a particular arrangement, seek advice from your agency's legal or governance area.

The Guide applies to all payments that meet the definition of a grant, including payments made:

- as a result of a selection process, regardless of whether that process is open, closed, targeted, competitive or non-competitive
- where particular criteria are satisfied
- on a one-off or ad hoc basis.

Other NSW legislative instruments or policies, such as the *Public Works and Procurement Act 1912* (NSW), may apply to other financial arrangements that do not fit within the definition of a grant for the purposes of the Guide.

5

5. Key principles of grants administration

The GSE Act establishes the government sector core values of integrity, trust, service and accountability. These values underpin the work of government and should be embedded in grants administration. This includes requirements to be fiscally responsible, to focus on efficient, effective, and prudent use of resources, and to provide transparency to enable public scrutiny.

The CGRGs set out 7 key principles to be applied in administering grants:

Key principles of grants administration



These key principles are adopted in this Guide and are set out in further detail below. The principles reflect the government sector core values and provide a strong foundation for grants administration.

Officials **must** put in place practices and procedures to ensure that grants are administered in a manner that is consistent with the following key principles and requirements in the Guide. Similarly, Ministerial staff **must** put in place practices and procedures to ensure that Ministerial involvement in grants administration is conducted in a manner that is consistent with the key principles and requirements in the Guide.

5.1 Robust planning and design

Effective planning and design facilitates fair, effective and transparent grants administration. It helps ensure that grants meet identified needs and deliver value for money. Planning and implementation issues should be considered before commencing a grant opportunity. The specific issues to be addressed will depend on the grant, including its complexity and scale.

Grant planning is also about being strategic in establishing the grant and having regard to activity across the government sector in identifying a particular need that could be met through a grant. Officials should make use of all available information and existing evidence in devising and implementing grants, including through collaboration and partnership.

Officials should have regard to whether a grant is the best vehicle to achieve the intended policy objectives. This involves developing a range of feasible options that would meet the intended objectives. For instance, it may be more effective, in certain circumstances, to provide a direct service or commission a contracted service rather than establish a grant.

If a grant is the appropriate mechanism, officials should then consider different options for the design of the grant to determine the best approach for achieving the objectives.

Planning a grant should include having regard to:

- the rationale for the grant initiative and how the grant initiative will meet government objectives, including expected outcomes and benefits and how to measure these
- the location or area in NSW that the grant initiative is targeting (e.g. regional NSW)
- the potential for co-design with prospective grantees and/or other stakeholders to best meet identified needs
- the expected costs and benefits of the grant initiative and the risks and sensitivities associated with these
- any taxation or accounting treatments required in respect of the grant
- commercial considerations, including consideration of an appropriate funding strategy and grant agreement
- management issues, including:
 - the approach to engaging and communicating effectively with stakeholders

- risk identification and management
- accountability, probity and transparency in administering the grant
- appropriate application and selection processes to be used
- the role of decision-makers (the decision-maker will need to have a financial delegation that allows them to execute the grant agreement)
- appropriate performance measures
- monitoring and evaluation (which may be under a benefits realisation planning framework)
- appropriate documentation, including guidelines and application information
- applicable legal, policy and governance requirements (see 1.4 *Legislative and policy framework*), such as the GSF Act and NSW Government appraisal and evaluation policies (see 6.1 and 6.7).

Once the parameters of a grant have been established, officials should consider the risks associated with the grant opportunity. This entails identifying the risks that may arise and taking steps to avoid or mitigate those risks. This should be built into the grants process. Officials **must** ensure that grants administration processes identify and manage risks for all grants, in accordance with agencies' responsibilities under the GSF Act (see 6.1.2 *Assessing and managing risk* below).

Risk management activities will vary depending on the grant. Some risks can be appropriately mitigated or managed through the grant agreement, while other risks are better managed across the grant life cycle. Administration processes should be proportionate to the scale and risk profile of the grant. Specific mandatory requirements regarding risk management are outlined further below at 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity*.

Officials should ensure that the party who is best placed to manage a specific risk is identified and tasked with managing that risk. In a jointly funded or delivered grant opportunity, it may be appropriate to share the responsibility for some risks. Active risk management should occur throughout the grant life cycle.

See 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity* for information on how to plan and design a grant and specific policy requirements.

5.2 Collaboration and partnership

Collaboration and partnership with stakeholders is an important part of grants administration. The needs of stakeholders should be considered in the development of grant opportunities, and it should not be assumed that the same approach will suit all grant opportunities.

Officials should consider the interaction of the grant with other government or non-government funded activities, particularly where there are similar policy outcomes.

Where policy responsibility or grants administration is shared between different agencies or levels of government, or where an agency or third party is responsible for the grants administration of another agency or entity, a focus on collaboration and partnership is critical.

Consultation and cooperation with government and non-government stakeholders can:

- improve the design and delivery of grants
- identify and reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication in grants
- improve the responsiveness, flexibility and relevance of grants
- reduce administration costs for government and non-government stakeholders
- support the appropriate sharing of responsibility for costs and risks among stakeholders
- support the development of appropriate outputs, accountability requirements, governance structures and documentation for the grant
- assist potential grantees to understand the grants administration process.

Co-design of grants with stakeholders may be appropriate in some cases, enabling stakeholders to have input on the design of the grant opportunity to meet their needs more effectively.

Effective collaboration and partnership with grantees is important throughout the grants administration process. A well-designed grant agreement will help establish the basis for effective working relationships based on collaboration between the grantee and the agency, and a shared understanding of objectives and expectations. Longer term grant agreements may be conducive to improved partnerships between grantees and agencies and should be considered where appropriate.

In pursuing collaboration and partnership opportunities, due regard should be had to any issues that may arise in respect of probity, conflict of interest and the potential for competitive advantage.

5.3 Proportionality

Grants may vary in scale and complexity. Effective grants administration requires a customised approach for each grant opportunity according to the value and complexity of the grant and the associated risks.

Officials should tailor grant guidelines, application processes, assessment processes, grant agreements, and reporting and acquittal requirements taking into account the potential risks and specific circumstances. In doing this, officials should consider:

- the capability and experience of applicants and grantees
- the intended policy outcomes
- the purpose, value and duration of a grant
- the nature and type of deliverables
- governance and accountability requirements
- the nature and level of the risks involved
- the effect of any application or process requirements for grantees on the accessibility of the grant.

Officials should determine the volume, detail and frequency of reporting requirements proportional to the risks involved and the intended policy outcomes.

Officials should also consider opportunities to reduce the burden of reporting requirements while managing risk, including by having regard to information that is otherwise available (for example, information that is otherwise collected by government and available to the relevant officials or publicly available) and by aligning grant reporting requirements with a grantee's internal reporting requirements (such as the annual reporting cycle), where appropriate.

Officials should balance the rigour of acquittal procedures against the level of risk involved with the grant activity, the grantee and the costs of compliance. For example, officials should consider that independently audited financial statements may be expensive and difficult to obtain for certain grantees, or the cost may represent a large proportion of a low-value grant.

Any considerations of proportionality made by officials in the planning and design of grant opportunities should be documented, particularly to explain the approach taken towards identified risks. Officials should review these decisions prior to opening further grant rounds.

5.4 Outcomes orientation

Grants administration should be designed and implemented with a focus on achieving outcomes and benefits consistent with government objectives. To ensure an outcomes orientation, officials should refer to *TPP18-06 NSW Government Business Case Guidelines*.²⁵

TPP18-06 recommends:

- developing **objectives that are outcomes and benefits-focused** and that are:
 - linked to NSW Government agency priorities
 - measurable and clear about how and when objectives are expected to be achieved
 - clearly communicated to key stakeholders, including grantees
 - reviewed regularly to ensure they remain relevant and appropriate
- documenting how the grant's **inputs and activities are expected to lead to the desired outcomes and benefits** (see 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity* for further information)
- planning for **monitoring and evaluation**, which includes establishing **appropriate performance measures** for evaluation to assess whether intended outcomes and benefits are being realised. Officials should ensure these measures are specified in grant guidelines and agreements.

Following the implementation of a grant opportunity, officials should implement an outcomes evaluation to assess if and how it led to intended changes and met objectives (see 6.7 *Grants evaluation*). The outcome evaluation can also inform an economic evaluation, which assesses value for money.

Officials should work collaboratively with grantees to ensure a shared understanding of the objectives and intended outcomes and benefits of grants, and the approach to monitoring these. Officials should consider what support or resources might assist grantees to identify and monitor grant outcomes and benefits.

Grants administration should also be designed and implemented to enable grantees to focus on achieving outputs, outcomes and benefits for the beneficiaries of grants, namely the individuals, organisations or community that benefit (directly or indirectly) from the grant.

5.5 Achieving value with relevant money

Determining value for money in grants administration requires an assessment of the lifetime benefits of a grant opportunity against its lifetime costs. These costs and benefits will be affected by a range of factors including how they are distributed among groups within the community, and the efficiency with which outcomes are achieved. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the grant in achieving its intended purpose, compared with alternative options, should also be a consideration.

Achieving value for money is important to ensure the benefits of grants are maximised for the people of NSW. Value for money should be a key consideration across the grant life cycle, from its initial design through to implementation and evaluation.

Some ways officials may deliver value for money in grants administration include:

- efficient and effective grants design and delivery
- working with stakeholders to develop or modify grant opportunities
- using processes and procedures proportional to the grant's value and risk
- promoting the ethical use of public resources
- considering and testing against alternative options to achieve the same outcome (for example, the government itself delivering the good or service for which a grant would otherwise have been provided)
- managing risk to minimise unintended consequences, such as wasteful or fraudulent use of resources
- maintaining flexibility to respond to changing circumstances
- supporting grantees to achieve value for money in their grant activities
- monitoring whether funds are being used for the intended purposes, and programs or projects remain on track.

Ways in which grantees may contribute to delivering value for money include:

- considering the most efficient and innovative means of carrying out grant activities
- considering how government objectives and their identified needs can be mutually achieved

²⁵ See page 16 of the Guidelines. Outcomes and benefits are at the centre of NSW Government financial decision-making.

- adopting an effective approach to identifying and managing risks
- collaborating with officials in monitoring and evaluation processes.

To inform decisions about whether a grant opportunity should proceed, officials **must** demonstrate at the planning and design stage how it will deliver value for money by identifying expected lifetime benefits and costs.²⁶ This should include consideration of all benefits and costs – economic, social, cultural and environmental – both monetary and non-monetary. The approach taken to assess value for money should be proportionate to the value and risk of the grant. A grant’s lifetime begins at implementation and ends when significant benefits and costs are no longer realised.

TPG22-04 Submission of Business Cases requires business cases for NSW Government investments over a certain value.²⁷ A business case involves the comparison of feasible options for achieving the policy objectives, including consideration of the costs, benefits and risks of each option. Business cases are good practice for smaller proposals, in particular where there is potential for significant impact on the community, economy or environment.

All business cases are required to include a cost-benefit analysis (**CBA**) in accordance with *TPG23-08 NSW Government Guide to Cost Benefit Analysis*. A CBA should consider a range of realistic options to achieve the stated objective. A CBA offers the most comprehensive means of assessing value for money; it incorporates the complete range of expected benefits and costs across the grant life cycle. It can consider economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits and costs, as well as their distribution across the community. Benefits and costs that cannot be quantified can be described qualitatively. A CBA should also account for risk and uncertainty in expected benefits and costs through sensitivity analysis.

While these NSW Government policies are not mandatory for smaller grant opportunities, they provide helpful guidance for officials.

The benefit-cost ratio (**BCR**) and the net present value (**NPV**) are key metrics produced in a CBA. A BCR greater than one and a positive NPV indicate that quantified benefits outweigh the quantified costs. These metrics are not the sole means of demonstrating value for money but, where CBAs are required, decision-makers should be provided with these metrics in the formal advice from

the assessment team. Decision-makers should also consider non-monetary benefits and costs, distributional analysis (i.e. how costs and benefits are distributed across different groups or parts of the community), and the appropriateness of the proposed grant activity in meeting government objectives. A CBA includes information on these qualitative components, and gathering community perspectives through research and consultation is critical to these considerations.

For smaller or time-critical grant opportunities, value for money may be assessed with more streamlined approaches, such as rapid CBAs, which are based on the same principles but requires less precision. Agencies should first liaise with NSW Treasury to check whether a rapid CBA is appropriate. Where it is not practicable to quantify or monetise benefits, other appraisal methods may also be considered, such as a cost-effectiveness analysis. Where a full CBA has been replaced with a partial or rapid one, provision should be made within the program for an ex-post evaluation including a CBA.

Officials should also consider value for money at the individual grant level. This may not be practicable for high-volume grants such as those for emergency relief. The approach taken to assess value for money in grant applications should be proportionate to the value and risk of the grant, and the capability of the applicant. Officials should consider what support and resources might assist applicants to make assessments in a cost-effective manner. This may include providing guidance on how to capture data and identify key benefits and costs, or providing CBA templates and logic models, where appropriate.

5.6 Governance and accountability

Good grants administration is underpinned by solid governance structures and clear accountabilities. Ministers, Ministerial staff, officials and grantees should all be accountable for their roles in grants administration. Accountability in grants administration is relevant both to the process of grants administration, and the achievement of government outcomes.

Officials should develop policies, procedures and documentation necessary for the effective and efficient governance and accountability of grants administration. This should include the development of grant guidelines and associated operational guidance for administering grant activities. It is particularly important that such guidance clearly sets out who is responsible for different aspects

²⁶ In the case of one-off or ad hoc grants, this requirement may be satisfied in the brief to the decision-maker on the merits of the grant required at section 6.3.1 below.

²⁷ A CBA is a mandatory part of a business case, which is required for capital, recurrent and ICT proposals with an estimated total cost of \$10 million or higher: *TPG23-08 NSW Government Guide to Cost-Benefit Analysis*. Note, this cost threshold is set by Treasury’s Submission of Business Cases (TPG22-04), p. 5.

of the grants process, including those responsible for making recommendations and the designated decision-maker. When determining the designated decision-maker, consideration should be given to ensuring the decision-maker has a financial delegation that allows them to expend funds for each grant.

It is important to ensure that those with responsibilities in relation to a grant have the right experience and skills. For example, officials involved in developing and/or managing grants should have the necessary grants management, stakeholder liaison and financial management skills, while officials involved in assessing applications should be appropriately skilled and have access to procedural instructions and/or training before processing grant applications. Additionally, external subject matter experts may be able to provide valuable expertise, including as part of the assessment team.

Record keeping is a key component of good governance and accountability. Good record keeping supports better decision-making. For example:

- officials are better able to assess risks where they have records about previous and current grantees and their performance
- documented reasons for decisions in awarding or not awarding grants supports equitable grants assessment, particularly when selection processes are conducted over an extended period of time.

Ministers, Ministerial staff and officials **must** comply with their record keeping obligations under the SR Act and their responsibilities under the GIPA Act.

Officials should ensure that grant agreements are well drafted, easy to understand and fit for purpose, as this will contribute to good governance and accountability. Officials should also ensure that grant agreements are supported by ongoing communication, active grants management and performance monitoring requirements, which are proportional to the risks involved.

The grant agreement should be signed by the decision-maker unless they have approved the agreement being signed by another official with the necessary financial delegation. For example, the Minister may be the decision-maker, but may authorise an official, such as the Secretary or a Deputy Secretary, to execute the grant agreements, depending on the value of the grants and applicable financial delegations.

5.7 Probity and transparency

Probity relates to ethical behaviour. Grants administration must be conducted honestly, impartially and with integrity and accountability.

Transparency refers to those involved in grants administration, including Ministers, Ministerial staff, officials and grantees, being open to scrutiny about grants administration processes. This involves providing reasons for decisions and the exchange of information between agencies, the Parliament, grantees and the community. Transparency provides assurance that grants administration is being carried out appropriately and in accordance with any applicable requirements. It also supports oversight of the expenditure of public money through grants.

It is noted that accountability and transparency are related concepts. Accountability involves grantees, officials and decision makers being able to demonstrate and justify the use of public resources. This necessarily involves all parties keeping appropriate and accessible records.

Probity and transparency in grants administration are achieved by ensuring that:

- decisions relating to grants are impartial, appropriately documented and published, publicly defensible and lawful
- grants administration incorporates appropriate safeguards against fraud, unlawful activities and other inappropriate conduct.

This includes establishing appropriate internal controls for grants administration. For example, making different officers responsible for assessing grant applications, giving financial approval for the expenditure and making the grant decision ensures that there are checks and balances at various stages of the grants administration process.

Additionally, it is important to establish and adhere to transparent and systematic application and selection processes, which are competitive and merit-based where appropriate and are used to allocate grants based on clearly defined criteria.²⁸

These processes must guard against actual or perceived conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest arises when a reasonable person might perceive that a Minister's or an official's private interests could be favoured over their public duties. Officials involved in grants administration should not have a direct or indirect interest that may influence the administration of a particular grant activity.

When designing the assessment process, officials **must** consider and develop a plan for managing any

²⁸ Note that the Guide contemplates circumstances where a method other than a competitive merit-based selection process may be used, subject to approval.

conflicts of interest that might arise. Mechanisms should be in place to manage potential conflicts of interest, such as a register of interests and procedures for declaring interests. For Ministers and officials, these mechanisms are already in place under the *Code of Ethics and Conduct for NSW Government Sector Employees* (in the case of officials) and the Ministerial Code of Conduct (in the case of Ministers), and the procedures used in grants administration should reflect these.

Additionally, officials **must** develop and implement fraud controls for grants administration that are proportionate to the value and risk of the grant and consistent with NSW public sector risk management requirements (see 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity*). This should include providing a risk appetite statement for all medium-risk to high-risk grants.

Reported information should be assessed as part of the acquittal process for grantees to ensure appropriate use of grant money. Officials should be aware of the procedures to follow when fraud or misappropriation is suspected.

Appropriate probity and transparency measures help to ensure that the public interest is prioritised in grants processes. The public interest, sometimes referred to as the 'common good', concerns what is in the best interests of the community, rather than

the private interest of individuals. Acting in the public interest is essential for government decisions about the use and expenditure of public money.

While the use of government funds, including the allocation of grants, may give rise to a political benefit (sometimes referred to as pork-barrelling), it must still serve a public purpose. Grants that benefit private interests at the expense of, or without due consideration of, the public interest are improper and may amount to a breach of public trust.

Conduct arising from pork-barrelling may be unlawful depending on the circumstances. The conduct may be unlawful where it amounts to, for example, corruption, bribery, maladministration or records mismanagement/destruction. Criminal sanctions following prosecution may also arise.

The current integrity-based legislation in NSW (described at 1.4 above) provides legally enforceable sanctions for unlawful or improper conduct in the context of grants administration (which involves decisions by Ministers and officials about the allocation and spending of public money). In addition to this existing legal framework, this Guide is directed to ensuring that the public interest remains paramount in the administration of NSW Government grants.



6

6. Process of grants administration

The key principles outlined in section 5 underpin the grants administration process in NSW. This section of the Guide provides a high-level overview of that process, outlines best-practice considerations and specifies key requirements, including mandatory requirements where specified.

The key principles and mandatory requirements set out in the Guide must be met for all grants. Where relevant, the Guide provides appropriate exceptions, such as exceptions that apply for non-competitive grants.²⁹

6.1 Planning and designing the grant opportunity

Careful planning is required to ensure that grants achieve government objectives and are administered effectively. The importance of planning and design in developing grants is highlighted at 5.1 above.

6.1.1 Considering objectives and initial planning

The following NSW government policy guidelines set out mandatory requirements, recommendations and general guidance for officials designing grants:

- *TPP18-06 NSW Government Business Case Guidelines*, which provides guidance on how to prepare a business case³⁰ with a level of detail scalable to the size and risk of the grant
- *TPG23-08 NSW Government Guide to Cost-Benefit Analysis*, which sets out mandatory requirements and guidance for completing a CBA³¹
- *TPG23-17 The Disaster Cost-Benefit Framework*, which includes a rapid assessment framework that can be applied when providing immediate relief in response to a disaster.

These guidelines should be consulted for current value thresholds that trigger the requirement to comply. However, the guidelines listed above provide useful guidance for officials planning grants of any value.

A business case demonstrates how a proposed grant has been designed to meet government objectives, and includes 3 stages:

1. problem definition
2. strategic business case
3. detailed business case.

Key elements within these stages include: a case for change, options development, CBA, financial impact analysis, commercial analysis and management analysis. A business case also outlines how monitoring and evaluation will be carried out.

Importantly, a business case helps to ensure that the design of any new grant opportunity is based on sound evidence of the nature and extent of the identified problem, and evidence of policy responses proven to be effective in addressing the issue.

As part of the business case officials should develop a logic model³² that maps the relationships between the rationale for the grant and a grant's expected inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and benefits.

For smaller grant opportunities, a formal business case may not be required, but these components should still be considered in grant planning.

Often, grants are necessary to:

- provide immediate, targeted relief to businesses and communities affected by a natural disaster
- provide immediate relief, support and assistance in other emergency situations
- support medium to long-term recovery and resilience.

The timeframe for planning these types of grants may be compressed to meet urgent community needs. While full business cases and CBA may not be possible for these types of grants, officials should still consider the key elements outlined above, including how the grant opportunity will meet government objectives, to the fullest extent practicable within the time constraints they face.

An early step to be taken in planning and designing a grant opportunity is to consider how a grant is to be delivered where multiple agencies are involved in the process. Where this is the case, the relevant

²⁹ See table at 6.1.3.

³⁰ Note, Treasury's Submission of Business Cases (TPG22-04) requires business cases for proposals valued over \$10 million, p.5.

³¹ A CBA is a mandatory part of a business case, which is required for capital, recurrent and ICT proposals with an estimated total cost of \$10 million or higher.

³² It may also be described as a Program Logic or Investment Logic map.

agencies should agree between themselves the roles they perform throughout the grant life cycle, and which agency takes responsibility for the applicable mandatory requirements at any given time. The agencies should outline this arrangement in the grant guidelines and may seek to capture it in a Memorandum of Understanding, particularly if funds are transferred between the agencies for the purpose of delivering the grant.

6.1.2 Assessing and managing risk

A key element of planning and designing a grant opportunity is to assess and manage risk. Officials **must** ensure that grants administration processes identify and manage risks for all grants, in accordance with agencies' responsibilities under the GSF Act.

Grants administration risks can be categorised into 3 broad categories:

- **program risks** relating to the planning, design and implementation of the grant by the agency, such as:
 - the scale of the grant
 - the complexity of the grant
 - whether it is a novel or new approach
 - the agency's capacity to administer the grant
- **grantee risk** relating to the grant recipient, such as:
 - the grantee's industry or sector
 - the grantee's experience and capacity to deliver the grant activities
 - the history of the grantee
- **governance risks** relating to the governance of the grant, such as:
 - the relationship between the grantor and grantee
 - the relationship between the parties to the grant agreement
 - the grantee's accountability procedures.

Risk management should be proportional to the program risk level (low, medium or high), which depends on the likelihood and consequence of the risks occurring. Grants that can typically carry higher risks are grants that have a high dollar value, are complex or are awarded via a non-competitive process.

Officials **must** seek probity advice (whether external or internal) for all grant opportunities that are complex, high-risk or of high value, to support the design, application, assessment and decision-making phases. Thresholds should be applied for complexity,

risk and value consistent with the agency's expenditure and risk management frameworks.

In the case of all grant opportunities that are complex, high-risk or of high value, officials **must** also conduct checks of the applicant (the potential grant recipient) proportionate to the value and risk of the grant. Checks may include criminal checks, internal conflict checks or ASIC searches, among others.

The information obtained from these checks may be used to determine if the applicant meets specific eligibility criteria, or to inform the merits brief provided to the Minister. For example, information obtained from these checks may be relevant in assessing the capacity of the proposed grant recipient to deliver the proposed project. Which checks are conducted will depend on the circumstances of the particular grant. This should be considered in the planning and design stage and should be factored into administration costs.

Officials should also seek assurances from prospective applicants as necessary and, again, proportionate to the value and risk of the grant. For example, in completing an application for a grant, an applicant may be required to indicate that they are not insolvent or subject to ongoing legal proceedings. The applicant should be required to provide updated information to the agency if their circumstances change in this regard.

These resources provide further guidance on identifying and managing risk:

- **Risk Management Toolkit for NSW Public Sector agencies** (TPP12-03) provides principles-based guidance on how agencies can develop and maintain risk management frameworks and processes.
- **Internal Audit and Risk Management Policy for the General Government Sector** (TPP20-08) helps agencies to meet obligations under the GSF Act.
- **Supplier due diligence: a guide for NSW public sector agencies** is an ICAC publication that helps agencies in conducting due diligence checks on potential suppliers.

6.1.3 Developing key elements of a grant opportunity

There are a number of ways in which grants can be offered, which can be broadly categorised as follows:

	Type of grant process	Description
Competitive	Open, competitive	Applications must be submitted by a specified date. Eligible applications are then assessed on their comparative merits against nominated criteria.
	Targeted, competitive	Open to a smaller number of potential grantees based on the specialised requirements of the grant activity.
Non-competitive	Closed, non-competitive	Applicants are invited to submit applications that are assessed individually, without reference to the comparative merits of other applications.
	Open, non-competitive	Applications are assessed individually against the selection criteria, without reference to the comparative merits of other applications.
	Demand-driven or 'first-in, first-served'	Applications that satisfy stated eligibility criteria are approved, up to the limit of available funding.
One-off or ad hoc grants	One-off or ad hoc grants	Grants determined on an ad hoc or targeted basis, usually by Ministerial decision.

Table 1. Types of grant process



The following sections of the Guide set out the process for all grants. Where relevant, the Guide provides appropriate exceptions, such as exceptions that apply for non-competitive, demand-driven grants. Following the planning and design phase, officials should develop the following key elements of the grant and assessment process:

- selection criteria, comprising eligibility criteria and (where relevant) assessment criteria
- assessment process – including an assessment stage and a decision-making stage. For competitive grants, this will involve an assessment team making a recommendation to the decision-maker, who then makes a final decision. In the case of large-scale non-competitive grants (such as demand-driven or ‘first in, first, served’ grants), the assessment process may be modified and may not involve the typical two stages in the same way.

Each of these key elements is considered further below.

6.1.4 Determining selection criteria (eligibility and assessment criteria)

All grants should have clear eligibility criteria which outline the minimum requirements an applicant must meet to be eligible for funding. The criteria should enable applicants to consider whether they are eligible before applying for a grant. This should include specifying the evidence the applicant will need to submit to satisfy the eligibility criteria, where relevant.

Eligibility criteria may include specifications such as eligible entities or applicant types, eligible project activities or funding uses, eligible locations, or required co-contribution amounts. To support applicants’ understanding of what may or may not be eligible, the guidelines should include examples – such as eligible and ineligible entities, applicant types, activities, funding uses, locations or co-contribution amounts – where this may assist applicants.

The planning and design of a grant opportunity, including the development of selection criteria, should include consideration of the location or area in NSW that the grant is targeting. This will likely be linked to the objectives and rationale of the grant. For example, a grant targeting regional infrastructure projects will likely specify areas in regional NSW as eligible locations.

For non-competitive grants, applications should be assessed against the eligibility criteria and, where relevant, the assessment criteria, including checking the evidence submitted with the application. For competitive grants, applicants who meet the eligibility criteria should then be assessed against the assessment criteria by comparison with other applicants.

Assessment criteria should be designed to permit an objective assessment of relevant factors. The criteria should enable assessment of the relative extent to which applications meet the criteria, rather than binary factors. Criteria should encompass considerations such as:

- consistency of the proposal with the objectives of the grant opportunity
- capability, experience and skills of the applicants
- deliverability of the project, including demonstrating that the applicant has the capacity and expertise to deliver the project within budget and timeframes
- technical aspects of the proposal – the infrastructure and technical capacity to fulfil the project requirements, including by reference to evidence such as a business case
- financial arrangements
- economic benefit
- ability to demonstrate community support.

Where factors such as the geographical distribution of grantees or the spread of project/activity types are to be taken into account, this should be specified in the assessment criteria.

Other matters that might be considered in determining selection criteria include government priorities or policies. For example, assessment criteria might include sustainability considerations, or the ability of a project to encourage market participation of diverse groups, or increase local employment.

In determining assessment criteria, consideration should be given to whether the criteria are to be given equal weighting.

In the case of one-off or ad hoc grants, grants **must** be assessed against the following criteria and these criteria must inform the briefing to the decision-maker required at 6.3.1 below:

- the project for which funding is proposed to be provided is deliverable within the proposed time frame and scope
- the proposed grant recipients have sufficient capacity and expertise to deliver the project
- the grant will provide community benefit
- the grant will achieve value for money
- alignment with NSW Government policy objectives.

Additional assessment criteria may be added at the discretion of the agency

6.1.5 Selecting an appropriate assessment process

The assessment process should be determined at the outset of the grants administration process. Information about the assessment process should be included in the grant guidelines.

In the case of competitive grants, a two-stage assessment process that includes an assessment stage and a decision-making stage should be used to determine successful grants recipients. An assessment team should make a recommendation in writing to the designated decision-maker who then makes a final decision.

The composition of the assessment team depends on the scale and nature of the relevant grant, having regard to the proportionality principle. Assessment teams can benefit from external subject matter experts, including non-officials, and from involving officials who have not been involved in the design of the grant opportunity. Having two separate teams of officials involved in the design of and the assessment process for a grant opportunity respectively also enables officials involved in the design stage to communicate with potential applicants, for example, to test the key elements of the proposed grant opportunity, without compromising the impartiality of the assessment process. Depending on the composition of the assessment team and the complexity of the grant opportunity, the assessment process may be structured so that one group of officials carries out the initial consideration of the eligibility and assessment criteria, to inform the final funding recommendations made by a separate group of officials. Members of the assessment team may also consult with relevant subject matter experts to inform the assessment. As noted above, these details should be documented and captured in the grant guidelines.

Key factors to be considered by officials when deciding the most appropriate assessment process include:

- the likely number and type of applications
- the nature of the grant activity, such as the complexity of the projects and any technical or other expertise required
- the value of the grant
- the need for timeliness and cost-effectiveness in the decision-making process while maintaining rigour, equity and accountability
- the risk profile of the grant opportunity.

The assessment process may include weighting against criteria, or other process, and this information should be included in the grant guidelines for transparency.

When developing an assessment process, officials **must** consider and develop a plan for the management of any conflicts of interest that might arise (see above at 5.7 *Probity and transparency* regarding principles relating to conflicts of interest). This should adhere to existing conflict of interest requirements and procedures, including those that apply in the relevant agency and under the Ministerial Code of Conduct where relevant.

One-off or ad hoc grants generally do not involve planned selection criteria and assessment processes, but are instead designed to meet a specific need, often due to urgency or other circumstances. One-off grants are determined on an ad hoc basis, usually by Ministerial decision. These grants are generally not available to a range of grantees or on an ongoing basis.

Grants offered through a non-competitive process may involve applicants being assessed individually against criteria rather than by comparison with other applicants' submissions. In the case of non-competitive grants, the assessment process may be modified and may not involve a two-stage assessment and decision-making process (involving an assessment team making a recommendation to a decision-maker) (see 6.3 *Receiving and assessing grant applications*).

Where a method other than a competitive, merit-based selection process is to be used (including one-off or ad hoc grants), officials **must** document why that method will be used and outline the risk mitigation strategies. This **must** be approved by the responsible Minister (or head of agency or delegate).

6.1.6 Identifying the designated decision-maker

A key consideration in establishing a grant opportunity is determining who will be the decision-maker. A Minister or an official may play this role, and either may be an appropriate decision-maker depending on the circumstances.

Practical considerations such as timing constraints, the extent of administrative work involved and potential conflicts of interest will be relevant in selecting the decision-maker. For example, where there is likely to be a large number of applicants, it may not be practical for Ministers and other heads of agencies to carry out the necessary conflict of interest checks for each applicant or proposed grantee (noting that the Ministerial Code of Conduct deals extensively with the obligations of Ministers in relation to conflicts of interest).

There is no legal or policy requirement that grant payments must be approved by Cabinet or a Committee of Cabinet. The convention of Cabinet confidentiality may impede transparency in the grants administration process. Seeking Cabinet approval for specific grant payments is also inconsistent with the doctrine of individual Ministerial responsibility (i.e. the principle that Ministers are accountable to the Parliament for the day-to-day administration of matters arising within their portfolios) and can create uncertainty about who is ultimately accountable for those decisions (i.e. the agency that administers the grant opportunity and makes the recommendation, the responsible Minister, or the Cabinet as whole). Cabinet and Cabinet Committees can still play a role in approving the allocation of funding for grant opportunities, approving grant guidelines, and receiving reports on outcomes and benefits.

6.1.7 Developing grant guidelines and associated materials

Potential grantees need reasonable access to adequate information to enable them to decide whether or not to apply for a grant and then, if they do, to complete the grant application. Grant guidelines are an important component of grants administration documentation and should be given careful consideration and approved at the appropriate level.

Officials should ensure that grant guidelines clearly inform potential grantees of their eligibility and of the terms and conditions they will need to meet during the grant life cycle, such as financial and performance reporting. Where possible, the proposed grant agreement should be included with the grant guidelines so that this can be taken into account by potential grantees.

For all grants other than one-off or ad hoc grants, officials **must** prepare clear and consistent grant guidelines that contain the following minimum information:

- the purpose and objectives of the grant
- selection criteria (comprising eligibility and assessment criteria) and assessment process
- grant value
- opening and closing dates
- any support available to grant applicants (see further below at 6.1.8 *Providing support to applicants*)
- application outcome date
- source agency or agencies
- the decision-maker.

The guidelines **must** clearly specify who is responsible for different aspects of the grants process, including identifying those responsible for making recommendations and the designated decision-maker. It is appropriate to identify those persons by reference to their role or grade, rather than by name.

Where relevant, grant guidelines should also include:

- requirements for evidence and documentation in support of an application
- indicative reporting and acquittal requirements
- the process that applies where aspects of the project for which funding is obtained change after the grant has been approved (i.e. a variation to the approved funding activity is sought)
- a description of complaint handling, review and/or access to information mechanisms.

The format and complexity of guidelines may vary depending on the grant.

Although not required to do so, officials may choose to develop grant guidelines for one-off or ad hoc grants. If such guidelines are developed, they must include the mandatory assessment criteria for one-off or ad hoc grants set out at 6.1.4 *Determining selection criteria (eligibility and assessment criteria)* above. Even if grant guidelines are not developed for one-off or ad hoc grants, officials **must** ensure that relevant information about the grant is documented, including the decision-maker for the grant.

Officials should consider testing the proposed settings of a grant opportunity with stakeholders. See 5.5 *Achieving value for money* for further information.

Where possible, changes to the grant guidelines should be minimised once a grant opportunity has opened. However, where significant changes have been made in relation to a grant opportunity, such as changes affecting the assessment of applications or changes to the grant amount, officials **must** revise grant guidelines and, except in the case of any guidelines developed for one-off or ad hoc grants, publish the revised guidelines. It may be appropriate to advise applicants whose applications have already been received of the changes and provide them with an opportunity to modify their applications. All application documentation should clearly emphasise the eligibility and assessment criteria so that applications can be assessed in a consistent, transparent and accountable way. The design of the application form should assist potential grantees to provide information in respect of all selection criteria.

Application forms and associated information should be easy to understand and provide all necessary information. Guidance should include contact points and details for further information.

Online grants management platforms may be the most effective way to administer grants, with significant potential benefits for agencies, applicants and grantees. Online platforms can streamline application processes and all subsequent interactions between the applicant and the agency.

6.1.8 Providing support to applicants

In developing a grant opportunity, officials should consider what support, if any, may be provided to grant applicants during the application process. This could include technical support with online forms, practical guidance about how to complete an application, or, in some cases, support with application writing. In rare circumstances, the support provided may be more substantial, including funding support to allow the preparation of a business case in support of a grant application where one is necessary. For the purposes of this section, support does not include general guidance or information about the administration of the grant, which will generally be provided as a matter of course for all grants.

In considering what kinds of support should be made available to applicants for a particular grant opportunity, officials should consider:

- **Equity** – support given must not unfairly advantage or disadvantage certain applicants. All applicants should have a sufficient opportunity to obtain support if support is offered. Where relevant and possible, if support has been given to one applicant that can be shared with other applicants – such as advice or guidance on a particular element of the grant application – that support should be made available to all applicants. This may be done, for example, by publishing that information on the grant website.
- **The characteristics of the applicant cohort** – for certain grant opportunities, the applicant cohort, or some of the applicants, may have particular needs that mean it is appropriate to provide additional support. For example, vulnerable applicants might have difficulties understanding the application process or preparing a written application without assistance. In these circumstances, a failure to provide adequate support might in effect exclude these prospective applicants from the process.
- **Whether the proposed support is economical and represents value for money** – officials should consider the cost of support to be provided, whether that cost is justifiable, especially as against the grant funding available, and whether the ‘investment’ of providing support achieves value for money. As an example, it might be possible to provide support in a cost-effective way, through an email account and ‘hotline’

for enquiries that require minimal resources. This small allocation of resources might help ensure a higher quality of applications and be considered an economical use of resources that achieves value for money. On the other hand, more substantial support, such as providing funding to allow an applicant or applicants to prepare a business case in support of their application, may not be an economical option and may not deliver value for money.

- **Transparency** – it is critical that any support provided is appropriately documented and made public. Officials **must** capture in the grant guidelines (or, where guidelines are not required and not prepared, otherwise document) what support is made available to applicants and relevant details of that support. Officials **must** also document what support has been given to a grant applicant and the reasons for giving that support.
- **Separation of roles** – in designing the grant program, officials should consider allocating roles and responsibilities so that, where possible, those involved in providing support to applicants do not also play a role in making recommendations or decisions about a grant application. This will help ensure impartiality in decision-making and avoid the risk of undue influence.

6.2 Promoting the grant opportunity

Details of the grant opportunity should be promoted and made publicly available. Officials should choose methods that will promote open, transparent and equitable access to grants, ensuring that publicly available grants are notified in ways that provide all potential grantees with a reasonable opportunity to apply. Increasing awareness of the grant opportunity can also lead to an improvement in the quantity and quality of applicants, which can in turn lead to improved outcomes and benefits.

Careful consideration should be given to the importance of increasing awareness of grants in key target groups. Appropriate and effective promotion of grants can include print and broadcast media, news features and editorials, newsletters and direct mail, workshops or other special events, public launches or announcements, the internet, social media and the use of local officers.

Notifications or announcements of anticipated grant outcomes should not be made before the assessment process for that grant opportunity has concluded. The only circumstances in which this might occur are:

- in the case of an election commitment

- where the timing of the project or matter for which funding is sought is such that the prospective grant recipient requires an indication of whether funding might be available before it is possible to complete the grant assessment.

If it is necessary to notify or announce a proposed grant before the assessment of that proposed grant is completed, the notification or announcement should state that the proposed grant is subject to compliance with the requirements of the Guide. In these circumstances, the assessment must be completed as soon as possible thereafter, and the funding cannot be provided until the grant has been approved in accordance with the requirements of this Guide.

Officials **must** ensure that key information about grant opportunities is published on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder via nsw.gov.au/grants-and-funding.³³ The minimum requirements are detailed grant guidelines that include the information outlined at 6.1 *Planning and designing the grant opportunity* (also set out in **Appendix A**).

Where grants are provided on a one-off or ad hoc basis, grant guidelines are not required and, if they are developed, are not required to be published. However, officials **must** ensure that information about the grant is made available on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder (see section 6.5 *Publishing grant information* below).

6.3 Receiving and assessing grant applications

Officials and Ministers who are involved in the grants administration process **must** administer the grant in accordance with the grant guidelines.

The process for the receipt and assessment of grant applications should follow these general steps:

- **Eligibility cull** – Grant applications should be considered and culled against the eligibility criteria (see below for approval required for the waiver of eligibility criteria). Ineligible applications should not proceed in the assessment process. Only the eligibility criteria are relevant at this stage, not the assessment criteria. The outcomes of the eligibility cull should be documented and, where relevant, referred to the assessment team and/or decision-maker.
- **Assessment against assessment criteria** – A committee or panel (assessment team) should assess the applications against the assessment criteria. The assessment team will assess the

grant applications against the assessment criteria and document its decisions, including reasons for decisions.

- **Recommendation** – The assessment team makes recommendations in writing to the designated decision-maker. In doing so, the assessment team will detail the procedures followed and the performance of the applications against the assessment criteria.
- **Decision-making** – The decision-maker considers the recommendations of the assessment team (and, where relevant, the outcomes of the eligibility cull). Decisions must be recorded and any departure from the assessment team's recommendation must be documented with written reasons and published.
- **Announcement** – Public announcement of the decision may be made and information about grants awarded must be published (see 6.5 *Publishing grant information*, including for exceptions). Announcements should not be made regarding grants awarded before the grantee has been informed. Written advice to unsuccessful applicants (where practicable, with reasons for the application being unsuccessful) should be provided on or before the announcement.

In undertaking the assessment process, officials **must** ensure that all decisions in the selection process are documented, including (where relevant):

- the outcomes of a cull of applications against eligibility criteria (including where an ineligible application has proceeded to assessment and the reasons for waiving the eligibility criteria. See below for approval required for the waiver of eligibility criteria)
- the recommendations made by the assessment team, including reasons for those recommendations
- the decisions made by the designated decision-maker, including any departure from the assessment team's recommendation and reasons for that.

Where a Minister is the decision-maker, Ministerial staff **must** ensure that the decision is recorded in writing and the records are managed in accordance with the requirements of the SR Act.

6.3.1 Briefing the decision-maker

Officials **must** provide written advice to the decision-maker, which, at a minimum:

³³ If certain information cannot be published on that site, officials may publish that information on the agency website until it is able to be published on the Grants and Funding Finder.

- outlines the application and selection process, including the eligibility and assessment criteria used to select the recommended grantees, including the criteria for one-off or ad hoc grants, where relevant
- includes the merits of the proposed grant or grants having regard to the grant guidelines (if any), the selection criteria and the key principle of achieving value for money
- identifies the recommended grantees
- identifies proposed funding amounts for each recommended grantee
- identifies that funds are available for the grant or grants
- includes relevant input from key stakeholders (such as MPs, the responsible Minister, Ministerial staff and other Ministers) and the consideration given to that input in the assessment process.

(See exceptions below for non-competitive grants.)

While officials do not have to rank all applications when briefing the designated decision-maker on the merits of a specific grant or group of grants, officials should, at a minimum, indicate:

- which grant applications fully meet the assessment criteria
- which applications partially meet the assessment criteria
- which applications do not meet any of the assessment criteria.

Where a probity advisor has been engaged to provide independent assurance to the decision-maker, this assessment is to be provided to the decision-maker.

Where there is an assessment team making recommendations to a decision-maker, those recommendations should be made in writing.

6.3.2 Requirements for decision-makers

A decision-maker **must not** approve or decline a grant without first receiving written advice from officials on the merits of the proposed grant or group of grants (see exceptions below for non-competitive grants).

A Minister or an official who approves or declines a grant **must** record the decision in writing, including the reasons for the decision (and any departure from the recommendation of officials), having regard to the grant guidelines (if any), the selection criteria and the key principle of achieving value for money, and manage these records in accordance with the requirements of the SR Act (see exceptions below for non-competitive grants).

Decision-makers may approve or decline grants in variance from the recommendation of officials. If a decision-maker has decided to approve or decline a particular grant where this would depart from the recommendation of the assessment team, the decision maker **must** declare this in the relevant documentation, including the reasons for the departure.

In limited circumstances, a decision may be made to waive eligibility criteria, for example, where not doing so would:

- lead to perverse or unfair outcomes
- be contrary to the policy intent, or
- damage the reputation and integrity of the grant program.

If so, the reasons for waiving the eligibility criteria **must** be documented and the waiver **must** be approved by the decision-maker (whether as part of the final approval or otherwise).

Decision-makers **must not** approve a grant that has been assessed as ineligible, unless they have decided to waive eligibility criteria in accordance with the above requirements.

6.3.3 Input from Ministers, MPs and others

Where it is anticipated that a grant opportunity will involve input from MPs or other stakeholders (such as other levels of government or industry representatives), officials **must** ensure that the grant guidelines clearly outline the role of stakeholders; there are processes in place to manage this interaction (including equitable opportunity for MPs); and all stakeholder input is documented as part of the assessment process, where relevant. Where such input is received outside of the process set out in the grant guidelines, this must be documented.

6.3.4 Assessment processes for non-competitive grants

For non-competitive grants, particularly high-volume grants, the assessment process may differ from the above in some respects. For example, high-volume, non-competitive grants (including demand-driven or 'first-in, first-served' grants), may not involve a two-stage assessment and decision-making process (involving an assessment team making a recommendation to a decision-maker) in the same way as occurs for competitive grants. This process may instead occur on a program-wide level and the recommendation to and/or consideration by the decision-maker may be adapted appropriately. There must nonetheless be processes in place (whether automated or otherwise) for the consideration of whether the eligibility criteria are met.

In these cases, the agency needs to clearly identify the:

- designated decision-maker, who must be satisfied that the funds are being assessed and administered in accordance with the approved criteria and policy intent. This may entail approving program-wide policies and processes for assessment, risk management, quality assurance and auditing, and escalation of any compliance issues
- assessor(s), responsible for ensuring grants are administered in accordance with approved criteria.

Where automated systems are used, such as for high-volume grants, records from the relevant system should be retained as part of the documentation of the grant administration process (and be made available for internal auditing and fraud control in appropriate cases).

These exceptions do not apply to one-off, ad hoc grants.

6.3.5 One-off and ad hoc grants

In the case of one-off, ad hoc grants, the Minister is generally the decision-maker. The principles of this Guide relevant to decision-makers apply equally for these types of grants (and the exceptions for non-competitive grants are not applicable), including:

- A decision-maker **must not** approve or decline a grant without first receiving written advice from officials on the merits of the proposed grant or group of grants.
- A decision-maker who approves or declines a grant **must** record the decision in writing, including the basis for the approval having regard to the grant guidelines (if any), the selection criteria and the key principle of achieving value for money.

6.4 Providing grants

Once a grant is offered to the successful applicants and the unsuccessful applicants have been advised, the terms and conditions of the grant are to be formalised in writing. Officials **must** ensure that grantees are subject to clear and specific terms and conditions for a grant.

This should be by way of a grant agreement (also referred to as a funding agreement), unless not practicable. While there is no required format for a grant agreement, officials should ensure that the chosen form is fit for purpose having regard to the nature of the grant and grantee, the risks associated with the grant and the principle of proportionality. Officials should ensure that the chosen form of grant agreement supports proper use and management of grant money.

Officials should ensure that grant agreements are legally enforceable, well-drafted and provide:

- agreed terms and conditions with regard to the use of the grant
- a clear understanding between the parties on required outcomes
- clarity as to termination rights – officials may wish to include a clause that would allow for a grant agreement to be terminated in certain circumstances, including where an applicant has engaged in conduct that might cause reputational damage to the NSW Government or agency, or has provided misleading information in support of their application
- appropriate accountability for grant money, including monitoring and acquittal requirements, and how unspent funds may be dealt with
- the performance information and other data that the grantee may be required to collect as well as the criteria that will be used to evaluate the grant, the grantee's compliance and the grantee's performance
- a clear understanding of the responsibility of parties where there are auspice arrangements.

There may be some circumstances in which administering grant agreements for each grantee may not be practicable, such as for emergency relief and high-volume grants required to be delivered in a timely manner to a large number of recipients. In such instances, grantees must, at a minimum, agree to be bound by clear and specific terms and conditions as a condition of receiving the grant.

All written agreements must require grantees to acknowledge the financial support by the NSW Government, where possible.

6.4.1 Variations requested after a grant is decided

Occasionally, a successful grant recipient may, after the grant has been approved, request a change to the funded project.

When determining what approvals are required for a change to the funded project, the key issue is whether the change in scope would amount to a new grant. If the change is such that the grant recipient is essentially requesting a new grant (e.g. additional funds for an existing program, or the use of the same funds for a different, unapproved purpose), then the change in scope should be treated as a new grant, and considered in line with the requirements of the Guide and the ordinary processes under any relevant guidelines.

A minor change to an approved project that does not substantively impact the approved purpose or substantively change the timing or conditions of the approved grant would not generally need to be treated as a new grant. In these circumstances, it would be appropriate for officials to handle the minor change request without seeking the decision-maker's approval, although officials should consider notifying the decision-maker of the change for information.

The kinds of proposed changes that might amount to a minor change include:

- an extension-of-time request of a relatively short duration, unless the approved purpose has a time requirement or constraint (for example, the approved funding is for an event to be hosted by a certain time)
- a minor change to scope that aligns with the approved purpose and does not involve the seeking of any additional funds.

If a change request – or a new grant following a change request – is approved by the decision-maker or officials as necessary, further steps will need to be taken to implement the change or new grant. For example, if a grant agreement has been executed, it may need to be amended to reflect the changed scope (if approved). There may also be additional or new publication requirements to ensure transparency about what has been funded.

For clarity and consistency, officials may wish to consider capturing in the terms of the grant agreement the process for requesting and implementing a change in scope.

6.5 Publishing grant information

Effective disclosure and publishing of grants administration are essential for transparency and public accountability. Reliable and timely information on grant decisions supports public confidence in the quality and integrity of grants administration.

Officials **must** publish the following information about grants to best-practice customer experience standards on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder at nsw.gov.au/grants-and-funding³⁴:

- upcoming grant opportunities
- open grant opportunity guidelines³⁵
- all grants awarded
- the exercise of Ministerial discretion in making grant decisions that vary from the

recommendation of officials, including the reasons for any such decision

- program evaluations.

For each category of information listed above, officials **must** meet the specific information and data publishing requirements set out in **Appendix A**.

Officials **must** ensure that information on the decisions made in relation to grants awarded is published no later than 45 calendar days after the grant agreement takes effect (subject to the exceptions below). If there is no grant agreement, then the period of 45 calendar days commences when the first payment is paid to the grantee. This timeframe aligns with the timeframe for registering government contracts under the GIPA Act.

There may be circumstances where officials determine that publishing a grant decision would be contrary to one or more of the following:

- legal requirements under the *Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998* (NSW) (**PPIP Act**) and/or the *Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002* (NSW) (**HRIP Act**)
- other statutory requirements
- the terms of a grant agreement.

In those circumstances, there is a **legal obligation** to maintain confidentiality over certain grant information. The approval of the Minister to maintain confidentiality in this circumstance is not required; however, the relevant officials **must** publish as much information as is permitted. For example, it may be possible to omit the name of the grantee and other personal information but to publish other grant details. The reasons for not publishing the information fully **must** be documented by officials.

In some circumstances, there may be a **policy exception** to the requirement to publish information on grants awarded, for example, where officials consider that publishing a grant decision would:

- not be practical or feasible in the circumstances, or
- adversely affect the achievement of government policy outcomes.

In those circumstances, the approval of the Minister not to publish the information **must** be obtained and relevant officials **must** publish as much information as is reasonably practicable. The reasons for not publishing the information fully **must** be documented by officials and published.

³⁴ If certain information cannot be published on that site, officials may publish that information on the agency website until it is able to be published on the Grants and Funding Finder.

³⁵ If grants are provided on a one-off or ad hoc basis, grant guidelines are not required and, if they are developed, are not required to be published.

Notwithstanding the above exceptions, officials **must** publish the following overarching information about grants awarded: the name of the grant or a description of the grant, the number of grants recipients, the total value of the grant opportunity and the decision-maker.

Where grants are provided on a one-off or ad hoc basis, grant guidelines are not required and the requirement to publish upcoming grant opportunities is not applicable. However, officials **must** ensure that information about the grant(s) awarded is made available on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder no later than 45 calendar days after the grant agreement takes effect, including the name of the recipient, the amount paid and the grant activity (subject to the legal or policy exceptions outlined above). As above, if there is no grant agreement, then the period of 45 calendar days commences when the first payment is paid to the grantee.

6.5.1 Provision of emergency relief grant information to the Auditor-General

Officials **must** provide emergency relief grants information to the Auditor-General within 3 months of the grant agreement taking effect, or, if there is no grant agreement, no later than 3 months after the first payment is paid to the grantee.

Emergency relief grants are grants that provide relief or recovery assistance for a 'natural disaster' or 'terrorist act'.³⁶ They may include emergency grants co-funded with the Commonwealth under the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements (DRFA).³⁷

Information about emergency relief grants that must be provided to the Auditor-General includes:

- the grants information required to be published on the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder under 6.5 *Publishing grant information of this Guide*
- grants information required to be reported by NSW agencies to the Commonwealth under the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements 2018.

6.6 Monitoring and acquitting grants

Grants administration does not end with the signing of a grant agreement and payment of grant money. Grant agreements should be supported by ongoing communication, active grants management and performance monitoring, which are proportional to the risks involved.

Providing clear guidance and support to grantees for the acquittal process is generally more cost effective

for agencies than identifying and remedying issues at a later stage. Accordingly, agencies should provide grantees with appropriate guidance and templates, as well as avenues for obtaining further guidance from the agency.

Reliable, timely and adequate evidence is required to demonstrate that the grant has been expended in accordance with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement. Monitoring of payments and progress towards outcomes, benefits and government objectives is integral to good governance and risk management.

Agencies should ensure that they are adequately resourced to carry out ongoing grants monitoring and management to respond to changing circumstances and ensure continued compliance with the requirements of the Guide. This includes, for example, identifying new or changing risks. This may involve consideration at both the individual project level, which may require amendments to the funding agreement, and consideration of the grant opportunity overall.

6.6.1 Monitoring

Monitoring is an ongoing and systematic process of collecting and analysing information about a grant opportunity, for the purpose of:

- tracking progress of grant activities
- establishing whether funds were dispersed correctly and used for intended purposes
- assessing outcomes, benefits and value for money (see 6.7 *Grants evaluation*).

Officials should monitor individual grants as well as the overall grant opportunity.

Developing a monitoring and evaluation framework is required in the business case for new grant opportunities. Officials should adhere to *TPP18-06 NSW Government Business Case Guidelines*.

The need for data collection from grant recipients should be weighed against the associated costs of collecting such information. When determining what information should be collected, it is important to consider the purpose of the information, how it relates to the grant acquittal or evaluation, and how practicable it is to collect the data. The information collected should be:

- well-defined
- only what is necessary

³⁶ These terms are defined in the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements 2018 Guidelines.

³⁷ The DRFA is a joint Australian Government-State cost-sharing arrangement to alleviate the financial burden on the states and facilitate the early provision of assistance to disaster-affected communities.

- presented in a form that is clear and easy to understand
- coordinated between agencies to reduce duplication (subject to any restrictions on sharing information, such as under the PPIP Act).

A grantee's responsibilities to collect and share data should be clearly defined. Officials should establish performance measures for acquittal and evaluation and specify them in grant guidelines and agreements. Progress reports against agreed performance measures or milestones, or site visits by officials, may help to track progress, outcomes and benefits.

6.6.2 Acquittal

An acquittals process is a key part of continuous financial monitoring that accounts for how funds have been spent. Officials should conduct an acquittal for individual grants, assessing grantees' compliance with the terms and conditions set out in the funding agreement, or other relevant documentation. Funding agreements should include adequate safeguards to prevent misuse of grant funds and stipulate what should happen to funds that are not fully expended.

Where conducting an acquittal for each grant is not practicable, such as in high-volume grant opportunities for emergency relief, appropriate alternative methods for verifying how grant money has been spent should be applied. The approach taken to acquit grants should be proportionate to the size and risk of the grant. When assessing small grants, a financial assessment that includes a grantee's declaration on how grant funds have been spent may be sufficient. For larger or more complex grants, a more rigorous acquittal process is required that may include the provision of invoices for all activities undertaken and other evidence of how funds have been spent.

6.7 Grants evaluation

An evaluation is a systematic and transparent process of collecting and analysing information that can be used to assess the appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness and/or net social benefits of a grant opportunity. Evaluating grants is important for:

- determining whether a grant is on track to meet objectives and government priorities, and any performance improvement needed
- identifying outcomes and benefits, including assessing how the grant has improved the welfare of the NSW community
- contributing to a broader knowledge base to help inform the design and appraisal of future grant opportunities.

There are 3 main types of evaluation:

- **process evaluation**, to consider how an initiative is delivered, whether it has been implemented as intended, and any issues arising in its implementation
- **outcome evaluation**, to examine if and how an initiative is leading to intended changes
- **economic evaluation**, to identify and measure the impacts of an initiative relative to its costs, for providing an assessment of value for money or net social benefit.

The NSW Government publication *TPG22-22 Policy and Guidelines: Evaluation* sets out mandatory requirements, recommendations and guidance for agencies to plan for and conduct evaluation. The guidelines state that, regardless of the size of an initiative, it is good practice to plan for monitoring and evaluation. They provide recommendations for tailoring evaluation to the size, strategic significance and risk of an initiative. The guidelines require that, for government investments of significant size, including grants, evidence of costs, outcomes, benefits and value for money are to be reported.

Consistent with the guidelines, agencies should:

- prioritise grant evaluations according to their value, risk and significance in contributing to government objectives (e.g. agency objectives)
- schedule evaluations at intervals appropriate to the grant's implementation timeframe, particularly where grants are ongoing or long term
- scale evaluation activities so they are proportional to the size and risk of the grant
- evaluate grant programs and activities before extending or expanding them, or initiating new, similar grant opportunities.

Ex-post CBAs are recommended for investments valued over \$50 million, or for smaller investments where evidence will inform future decision-making (e.g. pilots).

If, however, an ex-ante business case and/or CBA was required but did not take place due to an emergency or other exigency, an evaluation including an ex-post CBA must be conducted. Agencies must clearly identify who will be held responsible for completing the evaluation and that sufficient resources are set aside.

Evaluations should be transparent. The Evaluation Guidelines (TPG22-22) require that agencies proactively and publicly release the findings of evaluations, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of the information, in line with the GIPA Act.³⁸

³⁸ Agencies may also choose to release a plain English executive summary and statement of findings on their website. Grant administrators may choose to collate evaluations for publication, to limit requirements on smaller organisations to undertake publishing.

7

7. Review of the Guide

This Guide will be reviewed on an ongoing basis to ensure it achieves its purpose and to assist in identifying appropriate modifications that may be required.

Review record

Date	Action	Version
September 2022	Guide issued	1.0
March 2024	Updated Guide issued	2.0

Version 2.0

APPENDIX

A

Appendix A: Publication of grants information and data

The information and data publication requirements for NSW Government grants, which are subject to the exceptions outlined in 6.5 *Publishing grant information*, are:

Category	Data item
Open grant opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grant guidelines, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Purpose and objectives– Selection criteria and assessment process– Grant value– Opening and closing dates– Application outcome date– Any support available to grant applicants– Source agencies– Decision-maker
Upcoming grant opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• High-level program objectives and purpose• Estimated grant value• Expected opening and closing dates• Source agencies
Grants awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Name of project to be funded• Name of successful grant recipient• Location or contact address of the grant recipient³⁹• Location of the project to be funded• Funding amount granted to each recipient for the particular project/service• The term of the funding deed in relation to each grant/project• Number of grant applicants• Number of grant recipients• Source agencies• Designated decision-maker
Ministerial discretion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Occasions in which a Minister awards or declines a grant in variance from the recommendation of officials, and the reasons for doing so
Program evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program name• Grant recipient name and funding amount• Program evaluation, including findings, analysis and methodology• Name of parties that undertook the evaluation (e.g. NSW agency or external consultant)

³⁹ This might be the business address or otherwise the suburb where the grant recipient is located.

Additional data publishing requirements:

- 'Grant value' for upcoming and open opportunities should be a specific amount, or if this is not possible, a range with specific minimum and maximum amounts provided.
- 'Funding amount' for grants awarded should include the overall value of a grant, as well as the dollar value awarded to any 'downstream' recipients, subject to the exceptions referred to above.⁴⁰ For example, a grant awarded to an organisation to cover the transport costs of its delegation to a conference should report both the total value of the grant to the organisation and the value to each delegate. Where it is not possible to obtain and provide this information within the time requirements in 6.5 *Publishing grant information*, officials should provide an estimate of the dollar value awarded to downstream recipients, with this information to be updated as necessary. Alternatively, in circumstances where publication of information is not practical or feasible, there is a policy exception in the Guide, subject to Ministerial approval.
- All grant dates, including indicative dates, should be specified as a day, month and year. It is not sufficient to provide an entire month or quarter for opening, closing or decision dates.
- 'Source agency' should include the primary agency responsible for administering the grant, as well as any partner agencies or organisations. Contributions to funding the grant should be reported for each agency in addition to the total grant value.
- Grants data must be made available in a machine-readable format (e.g. CSV) with quantitative data items formatted to allow for computation. For example, a grant value of one thousand dollars must be presented as '1,000' and not as 'one thousand' or '1 thousand'.
- Data must be retained on a publicly available platform, such as the NSW Government Grants and Funding Finder⁴¹, for at least 7 years.
- Future updates to data items should not diminish the capacity of users to make comparisons of grant spending over time or across agencies.

⁴⁰ Where grant money received by a grantee is transferred to another organisation/individual (an indirect grantee) who would then expend the grant money, the indirect grantee is a 'downstream recipient' and this should be declared. On the other hand, where a grantee uses the funds received to procure a good or service, the provider/supplier is not a 'downstream recipient' and this expenditure does not need to be declared.

⁴¹ If certain information cannot be published on that site, officials may publish that information on the agency website until it is able to be published on the Grants and Funding Finder.

Contact us

T 02 9228 5555
W tco.nsw.gov.au

© State of NSW 2024

Copyright

This publication is protected by copyright. With the exception of (a) any coat of arms, logo, trade mark or other branding; (b) any third party intellectual property; and (c) personal information such as photographs of people, this publication is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. The licence terms are available at the Creative Commons website at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>.



The Cabinet Office (TCO) requires that it be attributed as creator of the licensed material in the following manner:
© State of New South Wales The Cabinet Office, 2024

You may also use material in accordance with rights you may have under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), for example under the fair dealing provisions or statutory licences.

The use of any material from this publication in a way not permitted by the above licence or otherwise allowed under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth) may be an infringement of copyright. Infringing copyright may expose you to legal action by, and liability to, the copyright owner. Where you wish to use the material in a way that is not permitted, you must lodge a request for further authorisation with TCO.

Disclaimer

TCO does not guarantee or warrant, and accepts no legal liability whatsoever arising from or connected to, the accuracy, reliability, currency or completeness of any material contained in this publication.

Information in this publication is provided as general information only and is not intended as a substitute for advice from a qualified professional. TCO recommends that users exercise care and use their own skill and judgment in using information from this publication and that users carefully evaluate the accuracy, currency, completeness and relevance of such information. Users should take steps to independently verify the information in this publication and, where appropriate, seek professional advice.

Nothing in this publication should be taken to indicate TCO's or the NSW Government's commitment to a particular course of action.

Enquiries

Enquiries relating to this publication or use of material in this publication should be directed to TCO:

T 02 9228 5555

W www.nsw.gov.au/grants-and-funding/grants-administration-guide/contact-us-about-guide