

● Grant Requirements

Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm transition to Community-control and residential services.

Stage 1: Partnership and Readiness Grant



Health and Community Services Directorate



Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Background	3
2.	About the Grant	4
2.1.	The Grant	4
	The Grant in context	4
2.2.	Objectives	5
	Grant objectives	5
	Government Objectives	7
2.3.	Grant Outcomes.....	8
2.4.	Funding	8
2.5.	Timeframe.....	8
3.	Eligibility Criteria	9
3.1.	Who can apply?	9
3.2.	Eligible expenditure	11
3.3.	What the grant funds cannot be used for	11
4.	How to apply.....	11
4.1.	Timeline for Grant process	12
4.2.	Joint (consortia) applications.....	12
4.3.	Grant Briefing Session.....	13
4.4.	Questions during the application process	13
5.	Assessment Criteria	14
5.1.	Weighted Criteria.....	15
5.2.	Non-Weighted Criteria.....	17
5.3.	Grant Assessment	18
5.4.	Assessment Criteria Scoring Rubric	20
5.5.	Scoring Scale Table	28
6.	Successful grant application.....	29
6.1.	Grant payments	29
7.	Ethical and compliant process.....	30
7.1.	Probity	30
7.2.	Conflicts of Interest.....	30
7.3.	Privacy.....	31
8.	Reporting.....	31
9.	Meetings.....	32

10.	Contract Management and Governance	33
11.	Performance Management	33
12.	Feedback.....	34
12.1.	Providing feedback	34
12.2.	Receiving feedback	34
13.	Resources and useful links	34
13.1.	Support for ACCOs	35
13.2.	AEEF	35
14.	Definitions	35
14.1.	Abbreviations.....	35
14.2.	Glossary	36

1. Introduction

The Health and Community Services Directorate (HCSD) is excited to announce the release of this open grant opportunity to support the transition of the Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm (NBHF) to Community-control.

The NBHF provides a culturally safe and informed therapeutic setting where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples can make ongoing and meaningful changes in their lives. The NBHF is currently operated by HCSD.

This grant, *Stage 1 - Partnership and Readiness Grant* (the Grant) will identify an Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation (ACCO) HCSD can partner with to deliver Community-control of the NBHF.

The Grant does not involve service delivery. The Grant is to fund an ACCO to plan and prepare for transition of the NBHF to Community-control in partnership with HCSD. HCSD will continue to manage operations of the NBHF over the term of the Grant.

1.1. Background

In 2003, Traditional Custodians of the ACT region brought together Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to establish a vision for what was later to become the NBHF.

Since 2017 the ACT Government (initially as ACT Health, and then as HCSD) has delivered 10-week day programs on the NBHF site in collaboration with participants, families and Communities. The NBHF provides a place of healing, where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples can feel safe and supported to make ongoing and meaningful changes in their lives. Day programs have delivered lasting and meaningful impact through genuine partnerships with ACT and region Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. To learn more about the current NBHF service and program, please visit:

<https://www.act.gov.au/community/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-peoples/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-health/ngunnawal-bush-healing-farm>

Self-determining a pathway to Community-control of the Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm

HCSD recognises the NBHF will be most effective when it is in Community hands. We also know the pathway to Community-control must be led by Community and move at a pace that Community determines to ensure sustainable outcomes. This approach is based on the knowledge that ACCO services are better for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, achieve better results, employ more Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and are often preferred over mainstream services¹.

¹ Clause 43, National Agreement on Closing the Gap, 6. Priority Reform Two – Building the Community-controlled Sector | Closing the Gap

Over 2024-25 and following Community consultation, work to prepare HCSD and the NBHF for Community-control (and later residential services) has been progressed with the support of sector experts, Ngaimpe Consulting. This will further support the success of the grant recipient. More information about how we are doing that will be provided at the industry briefing.

2. About the Grant

2.1. The Grant

This grant opportunity is for an ACCO to partner and work alongside the HCSD to prepare for the transition to Community-control of the NBHF day program operations, and future transition to a residential service.

The Grant does not involve the delivery of services at the NBHF. The HCSD will continue to manage current day-program operations at the NBHF over the term of the Grant.

The Grant in context

We recognise the transition to Community-control and residential services will be a significant process and not achieved within the term of the Grant.

The Grant is the first stage of a multi-stage process intended to support the transition to Community-control of the NBHF, and the later transition to a residential service:

- Stage 1: Partnership and readiness (the Grant)

Subsequent stages while outside the scope of the Grant, are provided for context:

- Stage 2: Community-control of NBHF operations (subject to a funding decision by the ACT Government); and
- Stage 3: A residential service (subject to a funding decision by the ACT Government).

The grant requirements you are responding to relate only to the Grant at Stage 1.

We are providing an outline of the intended subsequent stages to inform your response to this grant opportunity. As part of the Grant, you will be required to show how you will use the funding to reach the capability to progress to Stage 2 and Stage 3, and your vision, intent and commitment to do so.

The following outlines further detail about the anticipated multi-stage process:

- **Stage 1: Partnership and readiness** – this Grant will be a formal partnership agreement between the ACT Government and the successful ACCO to enable:
 - collaborative groundwork between the ACCO, and partners (including ACT Government) to enable future Community-control and service delivery;
 - readiness activities only, with “readiness” meaning the successful ACCO has capacity and capability to take over Community-control of the NBHF day-program operations

- the successful ACCO will not be required to provide services over the term of this Grant; and
- the ACT Government will continue to fund and manage current NBHF operations, staffing and land/buildings/maintenance etc. over the term of this Grant.
- **Stage 2: Community-control of current operations** – will enable the successful ACCO (identified in Stage 1) to transition into responsibility of the NBHF day program operations subject to:
 - Government funding decisions to progress to Stage 2;
 - A successful response to an intended Stage 2 direct source grant, demonstrating readiness to progress to responsibility for the day services at the NBHF; and
 - Clearly defined terms of what this responsibility does and does not include. Examples include, but are not limited to program operations, staffing and land management.
- **Stage 3: A residential service** – processes to support the transition to, and delivery of, a residential service, subject to:
 - Government funding decisions to progress to Stage 3;
 - A successful response to an intended Stage 3 direct source grant demonstrating readiness to progress to a residential service at the NBHF; and
 - Clearly defined terms of what this responsibility does and does not include will be developed in partnership over Stage 2. Examples include, but are not limited to program operations, staffing, compliance, land zoning and land management.

2.2. Objectives

Grant objectives

The objective of this grant is to fund the foundational activities related to the transition of the NBHF to Community-control. This grant opportunity has been developed to support a sustainable and effective Community-led transition to Community-control. There are no service delivery activities within the term of this grant.

The successful ACCO will use this Stage 1 grant funding to do the collaborative groundwork required for future service delivery in the subsequent stages, including:

- a) responsibility for the NBHF day-program operations
- b) a later transition to a residential service.

While the above two points are not within the scope of this Grant, the intent of this grant is to fund the required work, to be done in partnership with the HCSD, to design how you will be successful in achieving Stage 2 and Stage 3. We recognise some actions will be for your organisation, some will be for HCSD/ACT Government, and some will be shared.

The Grant requires the successful organisation to:

1. Plan and prepare for the transition of the NBHF to Community-control, in partnership with the HCSD and through working effectively and collaboratively with:
 - **Traditional Custodians and Elders;**

- **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, families and Communities in the ACT and region; and**
 - **The ACT Government, and broader health and community sector partners including ACCOs and ACCHOs.**
2. Over the grant period, develop capacity and capability to deliver the services in Stage 2 and to begin planning for Stage 3. This means using the grant to be service-ready by the end of the term of the grant, including:
- ensuring relevant accreditation and qualifications are in place; and
 - compliance with all relevant legislation to ensure the health and safety of staff and future clients.

The successful ACCO will need to be service-ready by the end of Stage 1 to transition to Stage 2 and have planning in place to support future work on Stage 3. As part of this, we anticipate the following will be developed in partnership over the term of this grant:

- **a transition governance mechanism**
 - establish a well-defined and agreed way to work in partnership with HCSD/ACT Government
 - develop a Terms of Reference for the governance mechanism including effective and culturally responsive conflict resolution processes.
- **a comprehensive transition plan relating to:**
 - day program operations at the NBHF
 - a residential service at the NBHF
 - detailing actions and timelines to transition the NBHF to Community-control, with consideration given to safety and quality, staffing, Community, systems and processes, and evidence, particularly to support the funding and legal pathways to subsequent stages
 - to be agreed and endorsed by the above governance mechanism.
- **organisational readiness to implement the above plan demonstrated through:**
 - well-defined and documented processes and systems for such things as incidents, complaints, quality improvement and so on
 - relevant qualifications, accreditations and compliance requirements in place to support your proposed and agreed pathway.

It is expected the successful ACCO partner identified in this Grant will progress to Stages 2 and 3. As such, experience and capacity to deliver Stage 2 and plan for Stage 3 needs to form part of the assessment for Stage 1.

We encourage innovation. As such, these grant requirements aim to balance being clear about what needs to be achieved without being prescriptive about how it should be done. HCSD acknowledges that while delivering the grant requirements is to be done in partnership; self-determination is paramount and central. We want you to describe:

- how you see the partnership working, and what supports you will need
- what you will require of HCSD (and potentially more broadly ACT Government) to be good partners in this formal partnership agreement
- how you will work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, families and Communities across the ACT and region.

Government Objectives

This grant process responds to what ACT Government have heard from ACT and Region Traditional Custodians and other Aboriginal and Torres Strait peoples who live here, and the Community-controlled sector. It also considers the importance of transitioning the NBHF to Community-control, and ensuring alignment with the broader policy commitments of the ACT Government:

- **National Agreement on Closing the Gap** - This grant is in line with the National Agreement on Closing the Gap, particularly contributing to:
 - Priority Reform One: Formal Partnerships and Shared Decision-Making
 - Priority Reform Two: Building the community-controlled sector
 - Priority Reform Three: Transforming Government Organisations
 - Priority Reform Four: Shared Access to Data and Information at a Regional Level
- **ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement 2019-2028** - The Core Focus Area, Community Leadership is also important: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have a strong voice, are decision makers on issues that impact them and lead in the achievement of positive life outcomes.

Other related strategies and frameworks relevant to Stages 2 and 3, that may inform your planning in Stage 1 might include:

- *ACT Drug Strategy Action Plan 2022-2026 objectives*
- *ACT Wellbeing Framework*
- *National Framework for Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Treatment 2019-2029*
- *National Quality Framework for Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Treatment*

2.3. Grant Outcomes

The outcome of this Grant will be an established effective place-based partnership that leads to shared decision-making building on the success and strengths of Community to respond to local priorities and improve outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, families and Communities in the ACT and region.

Additionally, at the end of this Grant, the ACCO and HCSD will be ready to transition NBHF day program operations to Community-control, with clear planning and pathways established to meet the grant objectives listed at 2.1.

This Grant and the resulting partnership support the National Agreement on Closing the Gap², Priority Reform 2 - Building the Community-control sector through Priority Reform 1 - Formal Partnerships and Shared Decision Making and through these formal partnerships will implement Priority Reform 3 - transforming government organisations.

This Grant also contributes to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement 2019-2028 Core Area Community Leadership:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have a strong voice, are decision makers on issues that impact them and lead in the achievement of positive life outcomes³

2.4. Funding

Through multiple processes with Community, we have heard a range of different ideas about how the transition could occur. We would like to understand what funding you need to support your vision for delivering Stage 1, in preparation for the transition to Community-control. You can provide this as part of the Non-Weighted Criteria at section 5.2.

2.5. Timeframe

Grant funding is for a period of one year with the possibility of extension of an additional one plus one year (totalling 3 years), depending on timeframe to transition to Community-control.

² <https://www.closingthegap.gov.au/national-agreement/priority-reforms>

³ https://www.act.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/2381138/ACT-Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-Agreement-2019-2028.pdf

3. Eligibility Criteria

3.1. Who can apply?

To ensure funding is provided in a manner that aligns with key legislation and policy, grant respondents must meet the following eligibility criteria:

- ACT ACCOs that meet Clause 44 of the National Agreement on Closing the Gap (see Clause 44 – *National Agreement on Closing the Gap*), or
- ACT ACCO led partnerships and collaborations (see Partnerships and Collaborations below).
- the applicant must operate, and have established governance structures, in the ACT.

The Health and Community Services Directorate is using the definition of an ACCO as detailed in the National Agreement on Closing the Gap, which is:

Clause 44 - National Agreement on Closing the Gap

An Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Community-Controlled Organisation that delivers services, including land and resource management, that builds the strength and empowerment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and people and is:

- *incorporated under relevant legislation and not-for-profit;*
- *controlled and operated by Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people;*
- *connected to the community, or communities, in which they deliver the services;*
- *governed by a majority Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander governing body.*

Guidance on sources of evidence is provided in the following table.

Clause 44 Criteria	Source of Evidence
Incorporated by State or Commonwealth legislation and a not-for-profit organisation	Certificate of Incorporation to be provided, see below options: Registration with the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) OR Registered as an Australian Public Company, Limited by Guarantee on Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) <u>AND</u> Registered on the Australian Charities and Not-For-Profits Commission (ACNC) Charity Register.
Controlled and operated by Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people	An extract from the organisation's constitution requiring all or the majority of members to be Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people OR A copy of the organisation's constitution/rule book and assess clause/s relating to membership. If registered with ORIC, the constitution/rule book will be available as a public document. Governing documents are downloadable from the ACNC.
Connected to the community, or communities, in which they deliver the services	Applicants must be an organisation established to provide culturally appropriate services to the ACT Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander community. The applicant must operate in and have established governance structures in the ACT. Connection to community can be demonstrated by the organisation, board and/or members living in and/or having historical connection to the community.
Governed by a majority Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander governing body	An extract from the organisation's constitution requiring the majority of the Board Directors to be Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people OR A copy of the organisation's constitution/rule book and assess clause/s relating to membership/directorship. If registered with ORIC, the constitution/rule book will be available as a public document. Governing documents are downloadable from the ACNC.

3.2. Eligible expenditure

Not all expenditure outlined in your grant response may be eligible for grant funding. The Territory makes the final decision on what is eligible expenditure under the grant. Should you be selected as a preferred respondent in a grant assessment process, eligible expenditure will be further discussed during contract negotiations.

For expenditure to be eligible, you must incur the expenditure on your grant activities between the start date and end or completion date for your grant activity.

3.3. What the grant funds cannot be used for

- (a) Government operated services
- (b) purchase of land
- (c) purchase of vehicles
- (d) major capital expenditure
- (e) costs incurred in the preparation of a grant application or related documentation.
- (f) the salaries or training and development of staff not involved in the delivery of grant funded activities
- (g) activities for which you are already receiving government funding
- (h) major construction/capital works
- (i) activities undertaken by or on behalf of political organisations
- (j) activities which subsidise commercial activities
- (k) funded clinical trials
- (l) overseas travel
- (m) activities for which other commonwealth, state, territory or local government bodies have primary responsibility.

4. How to apply

Prospective Respondents will be required to access the grants package and submit their grant application via the [SmartyGrants](#) platform.

Respondents will need to be familiar with these grant requirements, specifically section 5.4 – Assessment Criteria Scoring Rubric and Scoring Scale Table and associated documents to develop a strong application, including:

- The Healing Framework: Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm
- National Agreement on Closing the Gap: Summary information and further reading

4.1. Timeline for Grant process

You must submit a grant application between the published opening and closing dates. We will not accept late applications, unless it is the direct result of mishandling by HCSD.

If you are successful, HCSD expects that you will be able to commence your grant activity in May 2026.

Activity	Expected timeline
Grant opportunity open on SmartyGrants	Late November 2025
Sector briefing	Late November 2025
Grant opportunity closes on SmartyGrants	Early February 2026
Assessment of applications and approval outcome	Mid February – Mid March 2026
Delegate approval of outcomes of selection process	Mid to Late March 2026
Notification of Preferred and Non-Preferred Respondents	Late March 2026
Negotiations with Preferred Respondents and award of grant agreements	Late March – Mid April 2026
Formal notification to unsuccessful respondents (until agreements have been awarded and executed, this cohort is referred to as 'non-preferred respondents')	Late May to Mid June 2026
Earliest start date of grant activity	Mid May 2026

4.2. Joint (consortia) applications

We recognise that some organisations may want to partner with other organisations to deliver the grant requirements. This may be two or more ACCOs applying as a consortium, or an ACCO applying with a non-ACCO organisation where the partnership will strengthen the capability and capacity of the ACCO.

In these circumstances, there must be a lead organisation. Only the lead organisation may submit the Application Form and enter into a grant agreement with the Territory. The lead organisation must meet the eligibility criteria at Item 3.1 (i.e. must be an ACCO).

The application must identify all other members of the proposed consortium and include a letter of support from each of the partners. Each letter of support should include:

- a) Details of the partner organisation/s.
- b) An overview of how the partner organisation will work with the lead organisation and any other partner organisations in the consortium/group to successfully complete the grant activity.
- c) How governance and administrative requirements (such as strategic decision making, risk identification/mitigation, financial management and reporting) will be facilitated between entities involved in the consortium/group.
- d) An outline of the relevant experience and/or expertise the partner organisation will bring to the consortium/group.

- e) The roles/responsibilities of the partner organisation and the resources they will contribute (if any).
- f) Details of a nominated management level contact officer.

You must have a formal arrangement in place with all parties prior to execution of the grant agreement. A copy of this formal arrangement must be provided to the HCSD if requested, prior to the execution of the grant agreement. Consortium partner organisations may also need to provide key documentation such as evidence of insurance and accreditation when requested by the Territory.

Only the lead organisation will enter into a grant agreement with HCSD, however the lead organisation must have the authority to do so on behalf of the consortium members.

4.3. Grant Briefing Session

Briefing information to explain the application process will be provided on the webpage when the grant opportunity opens, here: <https://www.act.gov.au/money-and-tax/grants-funding-and-incentives>.

A briefing session is scheduled shortly after the opening of the grant opportunity. During the grant briefing, HCSD will provide the opportunity to further clarify the grant requirements and submission process and answer questions from any prospective grant respondents.

4.4. Questions during the application process

If during the application period, you require clarification of grant information, or if you experience technical or process difficulties, please email PSRContracts@act.gov.au. HCSD will respond to emailed questions within 3 working days.

Questions received that are related to the grant opportunity, and subsequent responses, will be de-identified and communicated to all potential respondents on the webpage, <https://www.act.gov.au/money-and-tax/grants-funding-and-incentives>, and updated regularly.

The opportunity to ask questions or seek clarification will close 10 full days before the end of the application period. This allows HCSD to broadly spread the information to all potential respondents (in line with principles of probity), with sufficient time for respondents to consider the impact of the response on their application.

For ACCOs, general support in responding to this grant may be available through the Aboriginal Services Development (ASD) team in HCSD. Additionally, you may wish to explore with that team your organisation's suitability to access the Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisation (ACCO) Establishment and Expansion Fund (AEEF). For more information on this and connecting with the ASD team, please see section 14: 'Resources and useful links'.

5. Assessment Criteria

The below assessment criteria help us to better understand to what level your organisation can govern, plan and deliver against the grant requirements, and what support you may need to build the required capacity and/or capability.

We anticipate a range of types of organisations may respond to this grant opportunity. This could include new or emerging Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations (ACCOs), established ACCOs, or innovative consortium approaches.

When answering:

- If your organisation (or lead organisation as a consortium) is established, please provide examples that demonstrate the requirement.
- If your organisation (or lead organisation as a consortium) is new or emerging, please answer how you would go about the requirement or how you intend to meet the requirement. You are welcome to list any support you may need*.

The level of detail and supporting evidence you provide in your application should match the size and complexity of what you are proposing. Word limits for all weighted criteria give an indication of the level of detail/explanation expected.

The grant assessment process will include an assessment of Weighted and Non-Weighted Criteria.

- a) **Weighted Criteria** scores are assigned a weighting based on the criterion's level of importance or value in delivering the Grant requirements.
- b) **Non-Weighted Criteria** are scored to show where an application satisfies (or does not satisfy) particular criteria.

Attachments may be used to help visualise relationships, comparisons, data or trends, or to represent timelines or schedules and must be limited to 1 page per attachment. The attachments must be clear and easy to understand, not excessively used, and serve a purpose to enrich the content of the written response.

The attachments must be referenced in the written response and properly labelled.

5.1. Weighted Criteria

WC1	Delivering on the objectives	/50
1a	Please provide an overview of your vision for the NBHF and what your Organisation will do, including timelines in Stage 1 to get to Stage 2 and support future work on Stage 3? Word limit: 750 words excluding attachments* <i>*Up to three supporting attachments permitted</i>	5
1b	How will you ensure genuine and coordinated Community collaboration? Strong responses might include consideration of: • Cultural safety • Ways in which all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples across the ACT and region can be equitably engaged and have voice • Respect for Traditional Custodians and Cultural Authority, including how you may meet the vision of the Traditional Custodians of the ACT and region for the NBHF, aligned to The Healing Framework: Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm (Appendix 2.2). • Where independent collaboration is needed • Clear feedback and communication loops. Word limit: 750 words excluding attachments* <i>*Up to three supporting attachments permitted</i>	15
1c	What core strengths does your Organisation have to enable collaboration with non-government sector partners including ACCOs and ACCHOs? Strong responses might include: • Description of key collaborative partners you have established relationships with, or who you intend to build relationships with. • How you intend to support positive dynamics and relationships with these partners. Word limit: 500 words excluding attachments* <i>*Up to three supporting attachments permitted</i>	10
1d	In line with Priority Reform 1 of Closing the Gap, how do you see the formal partnership between your Organisation and HCSD working? Strong responses might include: • The roles and responsibilities each partner will be accountable for in an effective formal partnership to ensure the success of Stage 1 and beyond. • Your proposed approach to collaboration and conflict resolution. • What you require of HCSD to be good partners in this partnership agreement. For further information on the Priority Reforms please refer to appendix 2.3 Word limit: 300 words excluding attachments* <i>*Up to three supporting attachments permitted</i>	5

1e	What risks and challenges can you identify that may impact delivery of the grant requirements, and how will you reduce these risks? <i>*Risks and challenges may include (but are not limited to) workforce issues, client/population demographics and need, funding, the legal/policy environment, quality and safety, consortia arrangements, reputation and relationships, communications, technology and advancement, evidence, agency, and advocacy.</i> No word limit – Please use the Risk Assessment template provided.	15
-----------	---	-----------

WC2 Organisational overview		/20
2a	Please explain how the following works in your organisation. If there are any that you do not have in place, please outline your plans to meet these in the future. 1. A board with diverse ACT and region Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander membership, or similar governance structure, that oversees your organisation's functions, processes, and funding; 2. An organisational structure, showing staff roles (identify if these roles already exist or will be filled in the future); 3. Any formal process for continuous quality improvement; 4. Formal process to identify, manage and report risks; 5. Ensure financial responsibility over the term of the grant agreement. Word limit: 750 words excluding attachments* *Up to five supporting attachments permitted	15
2b	What is your organisation's: • Vision and mission, and • Values and culture? Word limit: 300 words excluding attachments* *Up to three supporting attachments permitted	5

WC3 Relevant experience		/30
3a	What relevant experience does your organisation have to deliver the grant requirements? • If your organisation is established, include relevant experience in providing similar services/programs in the last three (3) years. • If your organisation is new or establishing, what have you done or will you do to build your organisation's experience in delivering similar services? You should detail any support you may need. Word limit: 500 words	10
3b	What experience do you have working in collaboration with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, families and Communities in the ACT and region? Word limit: 500 words	10

3c	What experience do you have working collaboratively with government sector partners, and non-government sector partners including ACCOs and ACCHOs?	10
	Word limit: 500 words	

5.2. Non-Weighted Criteria

NWC1	Please provide a breakdown of how much funding you will need and how this will be used to deliver Stage 1? You may wish to consider the following: Direct costs - with a clear breakdown of each itemised cost for the financial year. Direct costs may include (but are not limited to): • Staffing • Equipment hire • Consumables • Consultancy - industry expert advice Indirect costs which will support organisational capability over the life of the grant – with a clear breakdown of each itemised cost for the financial year. Indirect costs may include (but are not limited to): • Assets • Administration • Rent • Utilities • Communications • Insurance • Accreditation Note: When providing your itemised costings, provide as detailed a breakdown as possible No word limit
NWC2	Referees: Provide contact details for two referees who could substantiate documented experience. No word limit
NWC3	State if the proposal is dependent on another funding source and if so, whether the funding stream is ACT Government funding or from another source. No word limit

5.3. Grant Assessment

The first step in the grant assessment process involves HCSD doing an initial Compliance Assessment and Eligibility Assessment. This includes a cross check of information (such as ABN/CAN numbers) against publicly available records.

Only compliant and eligible applications will move onto the Assessment of Weighted and Non-Weighted Criteria.

Assessment of Weighted Criteria

During the Weighted-Criteria Assessment, Grant Assessment Panel members will independently review each grant application against the Assessment Criteria outlined in **section 5.1**. Each member will provide a score for Weighted Criteria based on the Assessment Criteria Scoring Rubric and Scoring Scale Table.

Panel members will consider your application on its merits, based on:

- a) the overall objective/s and outcomes to be achieved through providing the grant activity;
- b) the strength of detail and evidence provided within your application and attachments, that supports your organisation's approach, capacity and capability to meet the grant requirements; and
- c) the relative value of the grant sought.

Once panel members have finalised their independent reviews, assessments and scoring of each application, panel members will meet as a group to discuss and debate their individual scores and comments until the group reaches a consensus score for each part of each application.

The Assessment Criteria Scoring Rubric (the "Rubric") and the Scoring Scale Table (the "Table") are used in conjunction to help the Assessment Panel provide consistency of scoring during both individual and panel scoring phases. The Rubric provides descriptions in the scoring column to guide in the assessment of responses. They are indicative only and not exhaustive or wholly representative of potential responses. Therefore, the Table is an adjunct assessment tool to describe generic qualities of a response to aid assessment scoring.

Assessment of Non-Weighted Criteria

When assessing if your application shows value for money, panel members will review the costings provided in your application and will consider the:

- a) relative value of the grant sought
- b) available budget
- c) extent to which the evidence in the application demonstrates that it will contribute to meeting the objectives and outcomes identified in these Grant Requirements.

Grant approvals

Once the Grant Assessment Panel has finalised the assessments, the Chair of the Panel will provide a formal recommendation to the Delegate for their approval.

The Director-General of the Health and Community Services Directorate is the delegate for the Grant. The delegate will make a final determination of the grant recipient based on the recommendations put forward by the Chair of the Grant Assessment Panel and the available funding under the grant.

The delegate's decision is final in all matters, including:

- a) the approval of the grant
- b) the grant funding amount to be awarded
- c) the terms and conditions of the grant.

Notification of application outcomes

The Grant Assessment Panel will advise respondents of the outcome of applications by phone and in writing. HCSD will advise the successful, or the Preferred Respondent, of any specific conditions attached to the grant and will set up a time to commence contract negotiations.

Non-Preferred Respondents are those whose application has been unsuccessful in the short-term. From time to time however, contract negotiations with Preferred Respondents break down, and in such circumstances, HCSD reserves the right to re-engage Non-Preferred Respondents in contract negotiations as a Preferred Respondent.

Once the Grant Agreement has been executed, Non-Preferred Respondents will be formally notified that they have been unsuccessful in the grant process. The Respondents that have been unsuccessful can request a formal debrief. Debrief requests should be made to PSRContracts@act.gov.au within 10 working days of being notified as unsuccessful. The business unit responsible for the grant will respond to any request for feedback via email as soon as practicable.

5.4. Assessment Criteria Scoring Rubric

The descriptions in the scoring column are for guidance to help assess responses. They are indicative only and not exhaustive or wholly representative of potential responses.

Weighted Criteria 1

1a – Please provide an overview of your vision for the NBHF and what will your organisation do, including timelines, in Stage 1 to get to Stage 2 and support future work on Stage 3?

Excellent (5)	• Shared, culturally grounded vision demonstrably co-owned by Community and Traditional Custodians • Stage-gated roadmap linking Stage 1 deliverables to Stage 2/3 capabilities with critical path and resourcing plan • Embedded evaluation plan (process, outcome and impact) with independent assurance • Sustained alignment with NBHF Healing Framework, Cultural Authority and intergenerational outcomes
Good (4)	• Compelling, co-designed vision endorsed by relevant Community and Elders • Detailed Stage 1 implementation plan with timeline, budget, risk controls and escalation points • Explicit transition criteria/readiness indicators for Stage 2 and Stage 3 • Integrated performance framework with baseline, targets and data governance arrangements
Adequate (3)	• Clear vision aligned to NBHF purpose and Healing Framework • Defined Stage 1 workplan with milestones and responsible roles • Identifies dependencies to initiate Stage 2 and preparatory actions for Stage 3 • Basic monitoring approach with output and outcome measures
Poor (2)	• High-level vision statements with limited specificity to the NBHF context • Stage 1 activities proposed but not clearly sequenced or costed • Limited identification of outputs/outcomes or performance indicators • Minimal reference to alignment with NBHF Healing Framework and Traditional Custodians' vision
Inadequate (1)	• No articulated vision for the NBHF or linkage to the NBHF Healing Framework • No description of Stage 1 activities or how they enable Stage 2/3 • No measurable outcomes, milestones or resourcing identified • No reference to Cultural Authority, Traditional Custodians, or Community aspirations

1b – How will you ensure genuine and coordinated Community collaboration?

Excellent (5)	• Demonstrated history of trust-based partnerships delivering Community-led outcomes across the ACT and region • Strong Cultural Authority arrangements (letters of support, MOUs, Elders councils) guiding decisions • Independent collaboration mechanisms appointed by Community (e.g., Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander facilitators/mediators) • Live feedback dashboards and grievance processes co-designed with Community and regularly reviewed
Good (4)	• Co-design framework with Community governance, accessible venues/modalities and fair remuneration for participation • Cultural Safety standards (incl. supervision, yarning approaches and trauma-aware practice) operationalised • Transparent decision-making and data sharing agreements with Community sign-off • Continuous feedback loops with public reporting on 'you said / we did'
Adequate (3)	• Documented engagement plan covering ACT and region with inclusive participation methods • Protocols for recognising Cultural Authority and Traditional Custodians embedded • Defined points for independent collaboration and conflict-of-interest management • Two-way feedback processes with timeframes and publication commitments
Poor (2)	• Ad-hoc engagement activities with limited inclusion of diverse First Nations communities • Limited identification of when independent facilitation/collaboration is needed • Reference to Cultural Safety without operational detail • Basic communications with no closed-loop feedback
Inadequate (1)	• No credible approach to Community collaboration or Cultural Safety • No mechanisms for ACT/region-wide engagement or equitable access to voice • No recognition of Traditional Custodians or Cultural Authority • No feedback, transparency or accountability loop

1c – What core strengths does your organisation have to enable collaboration with non-government sector partners including ACCOs and ACCHOs?

Excellent (5)	• Mature ecosystem of partners with proven delivery of outcomes through ACCO/ACCHO-led collaboration • Joint commissioning or braided funding models implemented with transparent performance management • Shared data environments with Indigenous Data Governance and consent protocols • Partnerships recognise Cultural Authority and embed ACCOs/ACCHOs as lead decision-makers
Good (4)	• Operational partnership governance (steering groups, KPIs, issue escalation) in place • Documented integrated care pathways and shared workforce development initiatives • Resourcing and contract mechanisms that enable proportional funding and fair risk-sharing • Mechanisms to privilege ACCO/ACCHO leadership in decisions that affect Community

Adequate (3)	- List of active and prospective partners with defined roles and contacts - Examples of prior joint initiatives and lessons learned - Partnering protocols (e.g., MoUs, information-sharing, referral pathways) drafted - Plan to support positive relational dynamics and avoid duplication
Poor (2)	- roles, contributions and benefits unclear - Limited experience with shared care pathways or joint projects - Informal communications with no agreed protocols - Minimal understanding of ACCO/ACCHO leadership and priorities
Inadequate (1)	- No identified partners or collaborative arrangements - No evidence of capability to operate within multi-partner environments - No governance structures for partnership decision-making - No plan for respectful engagement with ACCOs/ACCHOs

1d – In line with Priority Reform 1 of Closing the Gap, how do see the formal partnership between your organisation and HCSD working?

Excellent (5)	- Fully operational Joint Decision-Making structure with appropriate balance of authority, co-budgeting and transparency - Evidence of timely issue resolution and continuous improvement via joint reviews - Partnership delivers measurable outcomes for Stage 1 and builds readiness for Stage 2/3 - CTG Priority Reform 1 practices are embedded at a strategic level both operationally and at a Territory level. - Data partnership governed by Community-endorsed principles with independent assurance
Good (4)	- Signed Heads of Agreement with joint governance, shared KPIs and resourcing commitments - Clear accountability map and escalation pathways (incl. executive sponsorship) - Embedded CTG Priority Reform 1 practices incl. shared agenda-setting and co-authored reports - Data sharing and Indigenous Data Governance arrangements with consent and access controls
Adequate (3)	- Draft partnership agreement outlining roles, meeting cadence and joint planning - Defined dispute resolution process and performance reporting schedule - Commitment to Joint Decision-Making and co-chairs for governance forums - Initial data sharing protocols acknowledging governance of data
Poor (2)	- Intent to partner is stated but mechanisms are vague - Partial role descriptions with gaps in accountability - Generic conflict resolution statements without timeframes - Limited consideration of Joint Decision-Making or CTG Priority Reform 1
Inadequate (1)	- No defined arrangement for shared decision-making with HCSD - Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities not articulated - No dispute resolution or issue escalation process - No commitments to transparency, data sharing or Indigenous Data Governance

1e – What risks and challenges can you identify that may impact delivery of the grant requirements, and how will you reduce these risks?

Excellent (5)	• A comprehensive and dynamic risk management with live dashboards and periodic independent review • Contingent resourcing and contractual levers to maintain service continuity • Proven crisis response with documented learnings applied • Mature data stewardship with Community oversight and external assurance
Good (4)	• Quantified risk analysis with thresholds, early warning indicators and escalation • Integrated controls embedded in project schedule and budget • Tested continuity and incident response (table-tops or drills) • Data governance aligned to Indigenous Data Sovereignty with audit trails
Adequate (3)	• Risk register covering delivery, workforce, finance, partners and reputation • Mitigations assigned to owners with timelines • Business continuity plan addressing essential functions and service handover • Data risk controls (access, consent, data quality) identified
Poor (2)	• High-level risks listed without likelihood/impact analysis • Treatments are generic and not costed or time-bound • Limited consideration of dependencies (e.g., workforce thin markets) • Basic privacy statements without controls or monitoring
Inadequate (1)	• No risk identification for service continuity, workforce, finances or cultural safety • No risk register, owners or treatments • No business continuity or surge plan for critical services • No consideration of governance-of-data, privacy or consent risks

Weighted Criteria 2

2a – Please explain how the following works in your organisation. If there are any that you do not have in place, please outline your plans to meet these in the future.

	Established	New/emerging
Excellent (5)	• Board demonstrates Cultural Authority and strategic oversight with transparent reporting to Community • Adaptive structure with workforce planning, succession and capability development • CQI drives measurable improvements evidenced by trend data and external review • Robust financial stewardship (clean audits) and risk maturity verified independently	• Board established and operating with Community endorsement prior to major deliverables • Fully staffed critical roles with onboarding, supervision and cultural support in place • CQI embedded from day one with baseline metrics and improvement targets • Risk and finance systems independently reviewed pre-implementation

Good (4)	• Board includes Elders and diverse ACT/region representation with active sub-committees • Org structure aligns resources to Stage 1 deliverables with clear delegation of authority • CQI integrated with incident/complaint systems and learning cycles • Enterprise risk framework linked to budgeting and performance reporting	• Detailed Board establishment process (skills matrix, nominations, induction and Cultural Authority protocols) • Resourced structure aligned to Stage 1 deliverables with delegated authorities • CQI toolkit procured with training plan and early audit schedule • Risk and financial management procedures operationalised with reporting templates
Adequate (3)	• Board charter, membership and meeting cadence documented with minutes • Current org chart with role descriptions and vacancy management plan • CQI policy with audit schedule and corrective action tracking • Risk register and financial procedures implemented for grant period	• Time-bound plan to constitute Board with diverse ACT/region representation and interim governance in place • Draft org chart with critical roles, recruitment plan and position descriptions • CQI framework selected with proposed audit/learning cycle • Draft risk register and interim financial controls prepared
Limited (2)	• Board exists but composition lacks Community representation or clarity of authority • Organisational structure is outdated or roles unfilled • CQI activities occur ad-hoc without policy or schedule • Risk and finance controls documented but not applied consistently	• Intent to establish Board stated without timelines or selection process • Provisional org structure lacks clarity on key functions • Initial quality activities described but no framework or tools • Generic risk and finance statements without procedures
Inadequate (1)	• No evidence of a governing Board with diverse ACT/region First Nations membership • No current Organisational structure or role accountabilities • No formal continuous quality improvement (CQI) system • No enterprise risk management or financial controls for grant term	• No credible plan to constitute a governing Board with First Nations representation • No draft Organisational structure or role delineation • No proposed CQI approach or quality policy • No plan for risk management or financial controls during grant term

2b – What is your organisation's:

- Vision and mission, and
- Values and culture?

Excellent (5)	• Vision/mission demonstrably drive decision-making and outcomes for Community • Values lived and measured (staff survey trends, retention of First Nations staff) • Culture recognised by Community partners and external assessments as exemplary
Good (4)	• Co-created vision/mission with Community endorsement and regular review • Values embedded in HR, performance and procurement policies • Evidence of culturally safe practice and psychological safety initiatives
Adequate (3)	• Vision and mission aligned to NBHF purpose and Community outcomes • Values defined with expected behaviours and leadership responsibilities • Examples of culture-building practices (e.g., yarning, cultural leave, supervision)
Poor (2)	• Vision/mission statements generic and not tailored to Community needs • Values listed without behaviours or accountability • Limited examples of culture in practice
Inadequate (1)	• No clear Organisational vision or mission relevant to NBHF • Values not articulated, no evidence of a culturally safe workplace • No link between culture and service delivery

Weighted Criteria 3

3a – What relevant experience does your organisation have to deliver the grant requirements?

	Established	New/emerging
Excellent (5)	• Demonstrated leadership and innovation with sustained impact over multiple years • Independent evaluations and Community testimonials confirm outcomes • Consistent over-performance against KPIs with transferable methodologies to NBHF	• Compelling pathway to sustainable capability with resourced partnerships • Independent readiness assessment indicates low delivery risk • Plans demonstrate credibility to transition to full delivery within grant term
Good (4)	• Strong track record delivering comparable services at scale in the ACT/region • Published outcomes/evaluations demonstrating impact and equity for First Nations peoples • Exemplary contract management with proactive risk management	• Formal partnership(s) with experienced ACCOs/ACCHOs for joint delivery/mentorship • Structured learning plan with evaluation of readiness • Early small-scale delivery with documented outcomes and improvements

Adequate (3)	• Board charter, membership and meeting cadence documented with minutes • Current org chart with role descriptions and vacancy management plan • CQI policy with audit schedule and corrective action tracking • Risk register and financial procedures implemented for grant period	• Defined capability-building plan with partners/mentors and milestones • Budget and timeline allocated to training, systems and supervision • Proposed pilots or shadowing to build delivery experience
Limited (2)	• Limited or tangential experience with minimal outcomes evidenced • References provided without verifiable performance measures • Basic compliance reported with gaps or corrective actions outstanding	• Preliminary ideas to build capability without milestones or partners • Limited understanding of governance and compliance requirements • Minimal planning for workforce or systems readiness
Inadequate (1)	• No relevant experience delivering comparable services/programs in the past three years • No references, performance data or learnings provided • No evidence of compliance with past contracts	• No credible pathway to acquire relevant delivery capability • No identified mentors, partners or capacity-building supports • No understanding of regulatory or contractual obligations

3b – What experience do you have working in collaboration with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, families and Communities in the ACT and region?

Excellent (5)	• Deep, long-standing partnerships under Cultural Authority with clear Community endorsement • Practice leadership in Cultural Safety, including mentoring and workforce development • Evidence of Community-led outcomes and intergenerational benefit
Good (4)	• Strong sustained relationships with Communities across the ACT and region • Co-designed programs with shared governance and remuneration for lived experience • Demonstrated outcomes improving access, experience and equity
Adequate (3)	• Documented experience working with First Nations peoples with positive feedback • Staff training and supervision models in Cultural Safety in place • Services adapted to local Community context and languages
Poor (2)	• Limited engagement experience with inconsistent Cultural Safety practices • Few examples of co-design or Community-led decision-making • Minimal adaptation of services to local context
Inadequate (1)	• No demonstrated experience working with First Nations peoples in the ACT/region • No evidence of culturally safe practice or Community trust • No use of strengths-based, trauma-aware approaches

3c – What experience do you have working collaboratively with government sector partners, and non-government sector partners including ACCOs and ACCHOs?

Excellent (5)	• System-level collaboration delivering measurable outcomes at scale • High-trust relationships with transparent performance/data sharing • Partnerships elevate ACCO/ACCHO leadership in system decisions
Good (4)	• Effective cross-sector governance with clear accountability and KPIs • Shared care models or integrated service pathways operating in practice • Evidence of joint commissioning or coordinated funding approaches
Adequate (3)	• Documented collaborations with defined interfaces, referrals and shared activities • Formalised communications (e.g., MoUs/agreements) and meeting cadence • Examples of joint planning and coordinated service pathways
Limited (2)	• Limited collaboration history: roles and interfaces unclear • Ad-hoc communications without formal protocols • Minimal evidence of joint planning or shared pathways
Inadequate (1)	• No experience collaborating with government or sector partners on service delivery • No mechanisms for coordination or information sharing • No understanding of roles across the system

5.5. Scoring Scale Table

DESCRIPTOR	RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT CRITERION	RATING
Excellent	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion exceeds all the relevant requirements such that the Territory will receive some additional value above the grant's requirements. - Response demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Weighted Assessment Criterion and provides an excellent level of detail in all areas. - A strategic view of the requirements within the broader Territory context are presented. - Information provided is comprehensive. All claims are fully substantiated.	5
Good	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion meets all the relevant requirements and may marginally exceed some relevant requirements. - Response demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Weighted Assessment Criterion and provides a good level of detail in most areas. - Some insignificant uncertainties occur and/or some minor omissions in substantiation. But claims are overall well supported and/or documentation contains majority of the information expected of this Weighted Assessment Criterion.	4
Adequate	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion meets all most of the relevant requirements. - Response demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Weighted Assessment Criterion and provides an adequate level of detail in some areas. - Some minor uncertainties or information gaps occur but claims or documentation generally contains the information expected of this Weighted Assessment Criterion.	3
Poor	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion does not meet a minority of the relevant requirements. - Response demonstrates a poor understanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Assessment Weighted Assessment Criterion with some shortcomings or deficiencies and lacks detail across all areas. - Claims and documentation omit or are unable to substantiate key requirements of the Weighted Assessment Criterion.	2
Inadequate	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion meets only a negligible number of the relevant requirements. - Response demonstrates a minor misunderstanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Weighted Assessment Criterion, containing significant flaws in approach and do not provide detail or information across all areas. - Claims and documentation are mostly unsubstantiated.	1
Not Acceptable or Unable to assess	- Response to Weighted Assessment Criterion does not meet any of the relevant requirements. - Response demonstrates a major misunderstanding of the requirements demonstrated against the Weighted Assessment Criterion, lacking fundamental details to address this Weighted Assessment Criterion. - Claims and documentation are unsubstantiated and unreliable. AND/OR - Response was not assessed in part or in full, as it did not provide any requested information.	0

6. Successful grant application

We will offer the Successful Respondent a legally binding grant agreement with the Territory.

We will use a standard agreement for this program, with general terms and conditions that cannot be changed.

The agreement must be signed by the Successful Respondent and executed by the Territory before any payments can be made under the Grant. The Territory is not responsible for any expenditure until the agreement has been executed. If you choose to commence grant activities before the agreement is executed, you do so at your own risk.

The agreement may include specific conditions, such as those determined during the assessment and/or contract negotiations, or conditions imposed by the delegate. HCSD will clearly articulate these within the agreement.

When offered a grant agreement, the Successful Respondent will have 20 days business days from the date of written offer to sign and return the signed agreement to HCSD, so that it can be executed by the Delegate in a timely manner. HCSD will work with Successful Respondent to finalise the details.

The offer may lapse if both parties (the Successful Respondent and the Delegate) do not sign and execute the grant agreement within the allocated timeframe (20 working days from offer to execution). Under certain circumstances, HCSD may extend this period.

Once an agreement has been executed, the Success Respondent is then known as the Grant Recipient. The Grant Recipient may request changes to the grant during the life of the agreement. However, any changes will need to be agreed in writing between HCSD and the Grant Recipient.

6.1. Grant payments

The agreement will clearly state:

- a) the total amount of grant funding to be paid over the period of the agreement; and
- b) the schedule of payments.

HCSD will not be able to exceed the maximum grant amount outlined in the agreement. Further costs incurred by the organisation that are related to the grant activity, but which exceed the maximum grant amount will fall under the responsibility of the organisation to meet.

HCSD will make payments to the Grant Recipient according to an agreed schedule set out in the agreement. Some payments may be subject to satisfactory progress on the grant activity and compliance with reporting requirements.

The grant payments must be used to deliver on the Grant Requirements, and the Grant Recipient must provide financial reporting as required, setting out the amount of funding received for that period of time, and the costs to deliver Stage 1: Partnership and readiness.

7. Ethical and compliant process

7.1. Probity

The ACT Government defines probity as “complete and confirmed integrity, uprightness and honesty in a particular process”. Compliance with probity assists in ensuring that an investment can withstand internal and external scrutiny. In pursuing value for money in a grant process, the Territory must have regard, amongst other things, to probity and ethical behaviour. More information about probity can be found on the [*Procurement ACT website*](#).

The ACT Government will make sure that the grant opportunity process is fair, according to the published guidelines and that it incorporates appropriate safeguards against fraud, or other unlawful activities. This grant process will also be undertaken in a manner consistent with the ACT Government’s framework and best practice policy for the [*Administration of Government Grants in the ACT*](#).

7.2. Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest have the potential to compromise the integrity of the grant opportunity. A conflict of interest, or perceived conflict of interest may arise for an ACT Public Service employee, a member of a Grant Assessment Panel, a member of a committee, an advisor or a Grant Respondent (or personnel within a Grant Respondent organisation). Conflicts of interest include:

- a) Professional, commercial or personal relationships with a party who is able to influence a grant assessment or application selection process, such as an ACT Government officer.
- b) Someone who has a relationship with, or interest in, an organisation from which they will receive personal gain because the organisation receives a grant under the grant program/grant opportunity.

Grant Respondents will be asked to declare, as part of their grant application, any perceived or existing conflicts of interests.

If a Grant Respondent identifies a potential, actual, apparent, or perceived conflict of interest after a grant application has been submitted, or at any time during the grant assessment or selection process, they must inform the Directorate in writing immediately.

Territory employees also have existing confidentiality obligations and an ongoing requirement to disclose and take steps to avoid and manage any actual, perceived, or potential conflicts of interest in connection with ACT Public Service employment. These obligations arise from such sources as:

- a) *ACT Public Service Code of Conduct 2022*
- b) *ACT Public Service Code of Ethics*
- c) *Public Sector Management Act 1994*
- d) *Crimes Act 1900*

To promote best practice, the Delegate, all Assessment Panel members, and other individuals involved with the grant assessment process must read and sign a **Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure** and the **Confidentiality Undertaking** prior to undertaking a grant assessment.

7.3. Privacy

In respect of any Personal Information (defined in section 8 of the *Information Privacy Act 2014 (ACT)*) that is held in connection with the Contract, the Grant Recipient must:

- a) comply with the Territory Privacy Principles (TPPs) and any applicable TPP Code (sections 21(1) and (3) of the *Information Privacy Act* refer) as though the Grant Recipient is a public sector agency and must not (and procure that any subcontractor engaged by the Grant Recipient under this Agreement does not) act or engage in a practice that breaches a TPP or a TPP Code
- b) co-operate with any reasonable requests or directions of the Territory arising directly from, or in connection with, the exercise of the functions of the Information Privacy Commissioner under the *Information Privacy Act*.

8. Reporting

The Agreement will set out a description of the outputs and outcomes, and the performance and financial reporting requirements.

The Grant Recipient will report to the Territory using a template, or alternative platform, provided by the Territory.

Review points will be included in the contract, including before any extension of the Agreement, to consider if reporting requirements, outcomes, the description of the activity/deliverables, or other issues need to be amended.

From time to time, HCSD may ask the Grant Recipient for ad-hoc reports. This may be to provide an update on progress, or any significant delays or difficulties in completing the grant activity.

The Grant Recipient must provide the reports outlined in the table below.

The Grant Recipient must provide the following reports:

Title	Description	Distribution	Timing
Financial Report	This report will contain information about how funding was acquitted during the reporting period and an Audit Report on the Grant Recipients accounts. In addition, it will include information about the indirect costs connected with the delivery against the grant requirements.	To be submitted to HCSD Community Sector Contracts & Grants unit (CSCGU)	Within 30 days of 30 June for each financial year of the Agreement Period and withing 30 days of 31 December
Status Update Report	This report will be about how you are achieving against grant requirements and may contain data and information demonstrating agreed Outputs and Performance Expectations.	To be submitted to HCSD CSCGU	Timeframe and frequency to be agreed during negotiations

9. Meetings

The Grant Recipient must attend the following meetings:

Meeting	Timing	Attendees
Regular partnership group meeting	- Possibly monthly initially to update transition plan, then review as Stage 1 progresses. - Timeframe and frequency to be agreed during negotiations	To be agreed during negotiation, based on proposal

Either party may request additional meetings throughout the Term of the Agreement to aid communication or resolution of issues, and overall contract management, at no additional costs to the Territory.

● 10. Contract Management and Governance

The funding instrument will be managed in accordance with the Territory contract management plan and any variations to the funding instrument will not be accepted without prior Territory written approval.

The Grant Recipient must nominate a Contract Manager as the authorised representative under the funding instrument and the key contact for notices under the funding instrument. The Contract Manager will have delegation to represent the Grant Recipient in all respects, including ensuring Grant Recipient alignment with the Territory's strategic priorities.

A Territory Contract Manager with appropriate delegations will engage and work with the Grant Recipient Contract Manager.

The Territory reserves the right to negotiate the inclusion of additional Service Requirements or amendments of existing Services for the term of the funding instrument.

The Grant Recipient must notify the Territory as soon as practicably possible if for any reason they are no longer able to deliver a particular Service Requirement and discuss potential alternative approaches.

The Grant Recipient must maintain the same Service Requirements for the term of the funding instrument and substitutions will not be accepted without prior review, testing and approval by the Territory.

● 11. Performance Management

The Grant Recipient must achieve compliance with the Performance Requirements and Service Requirements, including agreed milestones, as detailed in the Deed of Grant.

Together with data and information reported in the Service Performance Report will be used to measure ongoing performance and raise any issues in any contract management meetings with the Grant Recipient.

The performance of the Grant Recipient will be monitored over time using the agreed measures.

Where a deficiency in the Grant Recipient's performance is identified the Territory and the Grant Recipient will work together to develop a means of remedying the deficiency. Where an identified deficiency is unable to be remedied or non-performance continues despite a remedy being implemented, the Territory may seek to terminate the funding instrument for default.

12. Feedback

12.1. Providing feedback

We know we have more work to do in transitioning to Community-control. While we anticipate a formal evaluation as part of subsequent stages of the NBHF transition, we want to learn through this process. It is important to assess what we are doing and the outcome/impact, as well as how we are doing it. This develops an evidence base to inform future transitions.

As such, we welcome your feedback at any point. You can email feedback to:

PSRContracts@act.gov.au

While we may not be able to change this current process, we can use your feedback to inform future processes.

12.2. Receiving feedback

The Respondents that have been unsuccessful can request a formal debrief. You must make a request for a debrief within 10 working days of being notified as unsuccessful. The debrief itself can be delivered at an agreed time by phone, virtually or in-person. Please email PSRContracts@act.gov.au to request a debrief. The business unit responsible for the grant will respond to requests for feedback via email as soon as practicable.

13. Resources and useful links

If you have not prepared a proposal or written a grant application across ACT Government, you will be required to set up a login as a new user. We suggest you take some time to understand the process and how to navigate SmartyGrants. You will find lots of tips on the SmartyGrants website: <http://help.smartygrants.com.au/display/help/Help+Guide+for+Applicants> .

Things to consider:

- Start early – gather your support materials including quotes. The more evidence to support an application, the better. Ensure the evidence is relevant to the project/activity to be funded.
- Consider a SmartyFile:
 - SmartyFiles are designed to make the application process easier.
 - You can use SmartyFile to store your organisation's key files, contact information and other data.
 - SmartyFiles allows you to pre-fill grant applications and safely collaborate and share information with team members. You can transfer information stored in SmartyFile directly into SmartyGrants forms.

SmartyGrants provides a range of resources and tools to help you navigate the online application tool and submit your application including a Help Guide for Applicants.

If you are looking to understand some common grant terminology, the Grants Hub has made available an A – Z list of common grant terminology.

A list of frequently asked questions is available on the ACT Government Grants website.

13.1. Support for ACCOs

The Aboriginal Service Development (ASD) Branch in the Health and Community Services Directorate is available to provide practical support to assist you to develop and submit your application as needed. Please contact the ASD via AboriginalServiceDevelopment@act.gov.au.

13.2. AEEF

The Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation Establishment and Expansion Fund (AEEF) provides a funding source for local Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisations (ACCOs) for support to establish, grow and be more sustainable. You may wish to explore more about potential eligibility here:

<https://www.act.gov.au/open/aboriginal-community-controlled-organisation-establishment-and-expansion-fund>

14. Definitions

14.1. Abbreviations

ACCO	Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation
AEEF	Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation Establishment and Expansion Fund (AEEF)
ASD	Aboriginal Service Development
HCSD	Health and Community Services Directorate
NBHF	Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm
AOD	Alcohol and Other Drug
CSI	Community Sector Indexation
NGO	Non-Government Organisation

14.2. Glossary

Term	Definition
Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisation (ACCO)	The definition of an ACCO in the ACT utilises the National Agreement on Closing the Gap definition (Clause 44). Under this Agreement, an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Community-Controlled Organisation delivers services, including land and resource management that builds the strength and empowerment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and people and is: • incorporated under relevant legislation and not-for-profit • controlled and operated by Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people • connected to the community, or communities, in which they deliver the services • governed by a majority Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander governing body.
Carer	Someone who provides unpaid care and support to a family member or friend who needs help with daily activities or health issues.
Clients	People who access the service seeking treatment and/or support.
Community Sector Indexation	The annual percentage increase set by the ACT Government and paid to Community Sector Organisations funded to deliver health and community services.
Cultural Authority	The recognised right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elders and Knowledge Holders to speak for Culture, Country and Community. It comes from Cultural Protocols and Traditions, not outside systems, and guides how decisions are made in a respectful and culturally safe way.
Grant	A grant is an arrangement where money is provided to recipient as financial assistance by the Territory for a specified purpose that enables the recipient to achieve goals and objectives that are consistent with Territory policy
Grant Period	The total period of the grant program.
Grant Recipient	A Grant Recipient that has an executed agreement in place and has received funding from the Territory to undertake a grant activity.
Health and Community Services Directorate	ACT Health Directorate merged with Community Services Directorate to form the new Health and Community Services Directorate (HCSD) from 1 July 2025. HCSD continues to operate the NBHF and to support the transition to Community-control.

Model of Care Model of Service Delivery	A framework or explanation of how care and services are provided so that the desired outcomes are achieved.
Non-Preferred Respondent	A grant Respondent whose grant application has not been selected as a preferred application; however, an executed Agreement is not yet in place. Should negotiations with Preferred Respondents break down, the Territory reserves the right to engage a Non-Preferred Respondent in an Agreement for grant activity.
Objectives	Objectives are what the ACT Government wants achieved by the Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm transition to Community-control and residential services investment. Objectives may not be realised for a long-time following initiation of new services and programs and may only be met if other conditions outside of the service are addressed. Services may contribute to Objectives being met, but not solely, and attribution of individual Service's achievement to Objectives being met may be difficult to quantify. Example: Reduce barriers to service navigation.
Outcome	The level of performance or achievement that occurs because of the delivery or service provided by a Service. The actual change or difference resulting from intervention. Examples: Service User has improved wellbeing following treatment.
Outcome Reporting	Commissioning for outcomes is about how the service is meeting the needs of the community and then demonstrating through reporting how the service is delivering the agreed outcomes for the community.
Preferred Respondent	A grant Respondent whose grant application has been selected as a preferred application however an executed agreement is not yet in place.
Respondent	An Organisation that submits an application for funding to undertake a grant activity.
Service	The set of activities the Organisations are funded to provide. Example: Early childhood education and care
Service user	A person who attempts to access a Service, a person who uses a Service, or a person who has recently ceased using a service and may include carers or family members of a person.
Stakeholder	Used as an all-encompassing term for individuals, groups or sectors with an interest in, or who are affected by, commissioning and the delivery of the health services. Stakeholders may include non-government organisations, people with lived and living experience and their families and carers, government workers, peak organisations, and academics.

Territory	As represented by the Health and Community Services Directorate.
Successful Respondent	A Grant Recipient that has an executed agreement in place. A Preferred Respondent becomes the Successful Respondent once that agreement is in place.
Unsuccessful Respondent	When a Non-Preferred Respondent is formally notified, they have been unsuccessful they become an Unsuccessful Respondent.

Acknowledgement of Country

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

Accessibility

If you have difficulty reading a standard printed document and would like an alternative format, please phone 13 22 81.



If English is not your first language and you need the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS), please call 13 14 50.

For further accessibility information, visit www.act.gov.au/accessibility

www.act.gov.au/health | Phone: 132281

© Australian Capital Territory, Canberra | October 2025
