

**From:** McCormick Gordon [<mailto:Gordon.McCormick@infrastructure.gov.au>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 28 April 2015 9:42 AM  
**To:** Cardell, Susan (REPS)  
**Subject:** FW: Submission to JCPAA on Audit Report No. 9 (2014-15)

Susan,

Please find below the response to the questions on notice taken at the JCPAA meeting attended on 6 March 2015.

Regards

Gordon

Gordon McCormick  
General Manager  
Regional Programmes  
Infrastructure Investment Division  
☎ 02 6274 8212 | ✉ <mailto:gordon.mccormick@infrastructure.gov.au>

Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development  
GPO Box 594 CANBERRA ACT 2601 | [www.infrastructure.gov.au](http://www.infrastructure.gov.au)

**Mr WYATT:** Given the scope of what you have indicated, did you have applications from capital cities that the department had to notify applicants that they were not eligible?

The assessment process under round four of the Regional Development Australia Fund (RDAF) identified projects that were located in a capital city. All applicants were required to outline how their project/activity would benefit the broader region.

Applications were assessed against a number of selection criteria and consideration as part of that assessment included, if the project was located in a capital city, did it demonstrate how it will benefit the broader region.

Of the total 164 applications received 34 were identified as having a project/activity located in a capital city.

Of those 34 applications:

4 were Recommended for Funding;  
4 were Suitable for Funding;  
24 were Not Recommended for Funding; and  
Two were ineligible for reasons other than not benefitting the broader region.

The assessment of 24 applications as Not Recommended for Funding included consideration of the benefit to the broader region, as well as a range of other factors. All applicants, including unsuccessful applicants, were invited to seek feedback on the assessment of their application.

**Mr WYATT:** I would still like to see the differential wording for the criteria between those two rounds.

Rounds three and four of the Regional Development Australian Fund (RDAF) were launched concurrently with each round having separate programme guidelines. Under both rounds applicants submitted Expressions of Interest to their Regional Development Australia (RDA) committees who would prioritise applications against their Regional Plans. The key points of difference between the programme guidelines for rounds three and four are outlined below.

#### Round Three

- RDA committees selected five priority applications to proceed to a full application to the Department.
- Supported small towns which were defined as an urban centre with a population of 30,000 or less. Towns had to be self-contained, with clearly defined borders or boundaries, and located in rural, remote, regional or peri-urban areas.
- Total of \$50 million in grant funding was available for selected projects.
- Grants of \$50,000 to \$500,000 were available.
- Eligible organisations were local government authorities and not-for-profit organisations with an annual income of \$500,000 or more.

#### Round Four

- RDA committees selected three priority applications to proceed to a full application to the Department.
- Projects should have had a strong focus on regional benefits, with preference given to projects and/or benefits that spanned local government areas and/or RDA committee boundaries. Projects should also have fostered creative and innovative solutions to regional needs and issues.
- Total of \$175 million in grant funding was available for selected projects.
- Grants of \$500,000 to \$15 million were available.
- Eligible organisations were local government authorities and not-for-profit organisations with an annual income of \$1 million or more.