

Feedback for Applicants

To request feedback specific to your application send an email to bbrfeedback@industry.gov.au.

The feedback in this document is of a general nature. Not all of the information provided will apply to all applicants.

Building Better Regions Fund - Community Investments Stream - Round Four – Drought Support

- Round four of the Building Better Regions Fund - Community Investments Stream was highly competitive.
- A total 170 applications were received requesting approximately \$16.9 million, with 54 projects approved totalling over \$2.49 million.

Eligibility

All applications were assessed to determine whether they complied with the eligibility requirements under the program guidelines. Only applications that met all of the eligibility requirements were appraised against the merit criteria.

The key issues impacting the eligibility of applications were:

- Applicants requested funding for an ineligible project. Projects must fit under one of the following categories:
 - Local events
 - Strategic planning
 - Regional leadership and capability.
- Infrastructure projects are not eligible under the Community Investments Stream.
- The application included a significant amount of ineligible activities as identified in Section 5.1 and Appendix B of the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.
- Applicants requested funding for a 'Local events' project but did not identify a new or expanded event, or requested funding for the same event multiple times. You can only receive funding for an event once under this program.
- Cash contributions to meet the co-funding requirement were not confirmed. Letters must be on the organisation's letterhead, signed and dated by an authorised person and set out the value and timing of contributions and any conditions attached. These applicants were contacted to request the missing information and they did not provide it.
- The applicant was not an eligible entity.
- The applicant did not provide all the required mandatory attachments listed in Table 2 of the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Merit assessment

Eligible applications progressed to merit assessment. Applicant claims and evidence against the four merit criteria were considered. Competitive applications scored highly against all criteria.

Criterion 1 – Economic benefit:

This criterion was weighted and contributed up to 15 marks out of the total score of 40.

- Claims of the projects expected economic benefits must be clearly defined and quantified. The claims should be supported by recent evidence specific to the project.
- Strong applications:
 - demonstrated how the project would deliver the claimed economic benefits, for example, through evidence of appropriate linkages to show how the benefits would be realised from the project;
 - demonstrated how the benefits would be sustained beyond the project period; and
 - included a project specific Business Case, Project Management Plan, or similar documents or justification including but not limited to, a demand analysis, research/case studies or similar projects, a needs analysis and/or a feasibility study.
- Applications that failed to define, quantify and/or provide supporting evidence limited the potential score on this criterion.
- All applications were required to provide estimates of the number of jobs the project will create and provide supporting evidence. Strong applications sufficiently demonstrated the employment impacts were for new/additional jobs created by the project, and substantiated the expected duration of employment.
- Further guidance on estimating employment outcomes can be found at www.business.gov.au/bbrf.

Criterion 2 – Social benefit:

This criterion was weighted and contributed up to 15 marks out of the total score of 40.

- Claims of the projects expected social benefits must be clearly defined and quantified. Claims should be supported by recent evidence specific to the project.
- Strong applications:
 - demonstrated how the project would deliver the claimed social benefits, for example, through evidence of appropriate linkages to show how the benefits would be realised from the project;
 - demonstrated how the benefits would be sustained beyond the project period; and
 - provided evidence to support the social benefit claims commensurate with the size and complexity of the project.
- Applications that provided general, unsubstantiated claims, or that repeated previously stated economic benefits, limited the potential score on this criterion.

Criterion 3 – Project delivery:

This criterion contributed up to 5 marks out of the total score of 40.

- Applicant viability and project viability was considered under this criterion.
- Strong applications:

- demonstrated meaningful project planning that aligned to the project and set out the project scope, implementation methodology, timeframes, budget, risks and consideration of required approvals;
- demonstrated a track record with similar projects and/or access to people with the right skills and experience;
- demonstrated access to infrastructure, capital equipment, technology and intellectual property (if relevant); and
- for local events and activities projects, demonstrated how future events would be funded without further funding assistance from the Australian Government, and how an one-off event would result in benefits beyond the project period.

Criterion 4 – Impact of funding on your project:

This criterion contributed up to 5 marks out of the total score of 40.

- Assessment against this criterion considered:
 - how much partner funding had been confirmed above the minimum requirement. Both cash and in-kind contributions were taken into account;
 - how many partners were evidenced as committed to the project;
 - the need for funding; and
 - the level of community commitment and support for the project.

- Strong applications:
 - demonstrated the extent and nature of the partnerships, including those of a non-financial nature, that were formed to deliver the project;
 - evidenced partner funding to demonstrate that the applicant had been successful in leveraging greater funding;
 - demonstrated support from different levels of government, the community, and/or the private sector;
 - confirmed additional partner funding above the minimum requirement; and
 - provided a rationale and evidence to support a need for funding. That is, why the project would not go ahead, or be diminished, without grant support, particularly when the applicant had sufficient funds to undertake the project without grant assistance.