Indigenous Rangers Expansion Round One

Expert Panel Report – August 2024ccc

Contents

IRP Expansion Round One assessment process

250 IRP Expansion Round One applications were received. All applications were checked for completeness, compliance and eligibility and the requirement to provide evidence of cultural and legal access to land. 10 applications did not meet eligibility criteria and 2 applications were withdrawn.

All applications had to address one of the 3 IRP Expansion priorities:

1. Increasing the number of women Indigenous rangers (or women's ranger groups).
2. Increasing Indigenous rangers on dedicated IPAs currently without IRP rangers.
3. Expanding the IRP footprint in places without Indigenous rangers, with state/territory-based indicative allocations based on full time equivalent (FTE) ranger positions.

For eligible applications, NIAA conducted an assessment of each application against the 4 assessment criteria:

1. Delivering the IRP Expansion priorities
2. Community involvement and cultural competence
3. Delivering the IRP outcomes
4. Governance, capability and capacity building

Regional officers assessed applications against the selection criteria and the Program Area reviewed a sample of 51 applications across each state/territory throughout an Assessment Comparison Sampling Process. This was completed to ensure the validity and reliability of assessments. Findings suggested that applications were assessed accordingly.

Following the written assessments of applications, Regional Panels convened to review assessor scores and comments and apply their local knowledge of applicants and select applications to be recommended to the Delegate for funding. The Grant Opportunity Guidelines outlined indicative state/territory FTE targets, and an assessment panel for each state and territory (with NSW and ACT being combined) was held to prepare a list of recommended applications. For applications considered by Empowered Communities regions, their findings were also considered by Regional Panels. Regional panels comprised of Regional Managers, Program Area Assistant Director and Branch Manager and Empowered Communities representatives (where applicable).

Role of the Expert Panel

The role of the s22(1), s11C member on the Expert Panel is to:

- Review the Assessment Summary Report of potential funding applications including considering the recommendations made by the Assessment Panel Program Area, and Regional Office Joint Decision-Making Panel; and
- Consider and provide expert advice and input on other funding applications. This may also include providing expert advice to the Regional Office Joint Decision-Making Panel where it is considering funding applications that include matters relating to Indigenous Land and Water management risks/issues.

For clarity, the role of the Expert Panel is advisory and the s22(1), s11C members will not have any decision-making authority. The delegate retains decision-making power.

Expert Panel members:

Expert Panel Meeting 1	Expert Panel Meeting 2	Expert Panel Meeting 3	Expert Panel Meeting 4
s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]
s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]
s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F [2]
s47F [2]	s47F [1]	s47F [1]	s47F
Lara Wood Gladwin [3]	s47F [1]	s47F [2]	Lara Wood Gladwin [3]
s47F [4]	s47F [2]	s47F [2]	s47F [4]
s47F [4]	s47F [2]	Lara Wood Gladwin [3]	s47F [4]
s47F [4]	Lara Wood Gladwin [3]	s47F [4]	s47F [4]
s47F [4]	s47F [4]	s47F [4]	s47F [2]
s47F [4]	s47F [4]	s22(1), s11C	
	s47F [2]	s47F [6]	
	Leon Donovan [5]	s22(1), s11C	
	s47F [6]	s22(1), s11C	
	s47F	s47F [4]	
	s47F [4]	s47F [4]	
	s47F [4]	s47F [4]	
	s47F [4]		
	s47F [4]		

s22(1), s11C

[2] Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

[3] Panel Chair

[4] NIAA Program Area

[5] NIAA Regional Panel

[6] NIAA IPA Program

All external panel members completed probity training and a conflict of interest declaration. Each of the 5 s22(1), s11C members declared a conflict of interest with one organisation. This was managed by requesting them to leave the room/call when that organisation was discussed.

The Expert Panel met 4 times. Three panel members (s47F) were unable to attend the 4th panel and s47F and Lara Wood Gladwin briefed all 3 members separately.

DCCEEW's participation was limited to providing advice in relation to priority 3 Increasing Indigenous rangers on dedicated IPAs currently without IRP rangers.

s47F initially declined to participate on the assessment panel due to conflicting priorities. However, following the first meeting, the IRRG panel members, through the secretariat, requested his input. It is important to note that s47F did not receive the assessment material until the afternoon of 06 August 2024. As a result, while he provided feedback on the overall process, he felt he did not have the required comprehension to actively participate in the selection of successful or unsuccessful applications. He participated in a more advisory role, focusing on enhancing the process rather than making decisions on individual applications.

At various times between the first and last meetings some members raised questions or sought clarification on specific applications or the assessment process more broadly. Any emails or phone calls from individual panel members raising issues were addressed as received but no decisions were made. Any information was summarised and related back to the Expert Panel at the next available panel meeting.

Expert Panel Meetings summary

Expert Panel Meeting 1, 25 July 2024

s22(1), s11C

s22(1)

s22(1), s11C

Expert Panel Meeting 2, 8 August 2024

Expert Panel process - Recommend to schedule debrief meeting (individually or as a group) to summarise thoughts on the Expert Panel process.

Concerns that discussing individual applications blurs the boundaries between the expected roles of the Regional Panels and the Expert Panel and may result in us not following our established processes.

Concerns with endorsed applications

- Existing providers with relatively low scores
- New providers without the capacity to deliver and requiring significant support
- New providers with low capacity being endorsed for more funding than they can handle.

Recommendation for new providers in need of capacity building assistance to be offered a grace period to focus on capacity building before being expected to deliver outcomes.

New South Wales - concerns with concentration of endorsements in the Sydney metropolitan region in comparison to the sparse distribution of endorsements in regional/remote NSW with large Indigenous populations. Suggestions for alternative applications to be endorsed.

NSW RM clarified the Sydney metropolitan applications represent discrete areas belonging to different Traditional Owner groups and a genuine need to employ more Indigenous people in land management roles.

Concerns with Regional Panel comments - the recommendation comments in the ASR are not detailed enough to justify endorsement or non-endorsement of applications. Recommend to return ASR to Regional Panels for more detailed comments.

s22(1), s11C

Expert Panel Meeting 3, 9 July 2024

IPAs: Discussion of QLD and NSW applicants not endorsed but with IPAs that do not currently have a Ranger group. Applications recommended for funding:

s22(1)

DCCEEW recommends s22(1) to remain endorsed. Discussion on s22(1) from the same community (s22(1)) that does not have an IPA. NIAA to confirm Traditional Owner support of and governance issues relating to s22(1) , before proceeding with endorsement.

s22(1) not endorsed. The IPA is managed by a different s22(1) and has no bearing on the IPA. The Regional Office has strong concerns about the capacity of the organisation.

Further information sought from WNSW Regional Office on s22(1) capacity to manage the s22(1) (which has been unfunded for the past 10 years and is not mentioned in their application).

s22(1), s11C

s22(1), s11C

s22(1), s11C

Expert Panel Meeting 4, 16 August 2024

IPAs - Endorse the following providers:

s22(1)

Endorse with conditions to include $200,000 capacity building and gradual ramp-up of FTE:

s22(1)

The following were agreed to be moved to the reserve list:

- 4-JDCQ9DK Awabakal LALC (NSW)

s22(1)

Discussion held regarding s22(1) and s22(1) but agreed not to endorse.

Also agreed to add new (consultation) IPA in NT s22(1)

RM ENSW joined the discussion to go through all NSW applications again and discuss the proposed changes with the panel.

s22(1), s11C

Regional Panel assessments and amendments to funding

Of the 250 applications received, 109 were endorsed by Regional Panels. The following provides a summary of recommendations at the completion of the 7 Regional Panels.

	FTE			Funding		
State:	Available	Endorsed	Variance	Available	Endorsed	Variance
QLD	117	117	0	$76,419,602	$81,779,735	-$5,360,133
WA	98	98	0	$64,009,581	$66,019,815	-$2,010,233
TAS	39	44.7	-5.7	$25,473,201	$27,735,665	-$2,262,464
NT	63	63	0	$41,149,017	$36,294,810	$4,854,206
SA	62	62	0	$40,495,858	$35,039,006	$5,456,850
NSW	114	114	0	$74,460,125	$67,560,857	$6,899,267
VIC	57	51.3	5.7	$37,230,063	$25,556,365	$11,673,697
Nationwide	**550**	**550**	**0**	**$359,237,447**	**$339,986,255**	**$19,251,191**

s22(1), s11C

s22(1), s11C

Summary of State/Territory Recommendations

The Expert Panel discussed recommendations for each state/territory and the following is a summary of any issues raised and any changes made to Regional Panel endorsements.

New South Wales

71 applications received. Regional Panel endorsements:

18 applications endorsed. Of this:

- 18 Indigenous organisations (71% or more ownership, 90% or greater Indigenous Board members)
- 14 new organisations and 4 existing Indigenous Rangers Program organisations
- 2 with budgets slightly below the acceptable funding envelope
- 18 sought capacity building funding, 18 endorsed to receive requested funding.

53 applications not recommended for funding. Of this:

- 2 did not meet land checks – ineligible
- 10 scored less than 12
- 1 has sensitivities
- 4 could be considered for funding if there is additional funding available - added to the reserve list
- Remainder have reasons detailed in the Assessment Summary Report.

2 dedicated IPAs have current IRP funding s22(1), s11C and 6 dedicated IPAs do not currently receive IRP funding (s22(1)) – of these 6 dedicated IPAs 5 received applications for funding.

Both the s22(1) and the s22(1) participated in the joint decision-making process. Central Coast was able to join the main Regional Panel, however scheduling issues meant Inner Sydney missed the Regional Panel and when reconvened only presented their views to the local NIAA office. There was no disagreement on the rank ordering and all applications recommended form the ECs have been funded. The s22(1) would have like more say on allocation of FTE and would have preferred full funding of their first preference before the funding of the second preference, which has not been recommended by the Regional Manager.

Following Expert Panel deliberations, final endorsements were:

Category	Regional Panel recommendation	Expert Panel recommendation
Total applications endorsed	18	22
Total funding amount endorsed	$67,560,857	$77,240, 835
Grant round priority – addition of women rangers	18	22
Grant round priority – IPAs without ranger groups	0	4
Grant round priority – expanding the footprint	17	19

Additional Expert Panel endorsements:

s22(1)

s22(1), s11C

Lara Wood Gladwin

Chair of National Expert Panel for Ranger Expansion

26 August 2024

s22(1), s11C

Background

IRP Expansion Round One

The IRP Expansion Round One will be delivered under the Indigenous Advancement Strategy (IAS) Jobs, Land and Economy Program *1.1 – Jobs, Land and Economy*. The IAS provides grant funding for activities that address areas of need for First Nations peoples that align with targets agreed under the National Agreement on Closing the Gap.

In this funding round, an indicative allocation of new Indigenous ranger FTE positions was made for each state/territory (see Table 1). Funding will be allocated within state/territories based on the merit of projects until the FTE allocation for each state/territory is exhausted. Projects may not receive the full grant amount requested. Budget items associated with this round include specific one-off requests and are presented in Appendix 1.

Regional Panel assessment

As part of the assessment process for IRP Expansion Round One, applications were discussed and ranked by Regional Panels consisting of NIAA Regional Managers and Program Area representatives. The ranking process utilised local knowledge, took into account regional community needs and priorities, and identified any value for money considerations. The Regional Panels were required to make recommendations to: 'endorse, not endorse or endorse with changes' each application. Suggested changes could relate to project scope, budget or FTE allocation.

In making recommendations to approve applications, the Regional Panels were required to cross check the requested FTE against indicative FTE allocations for their region (see Table 1) and approve projects in order of their strength until the FTE allocation was exhausted. In many cases, the Regional Panels made changes to an application's FTE allocation and associated funding request.

The Regional Panels endorsed 88 applications with a lower amount of FTE than the amount the applicants had requested, which necessitated changes to the requested funding. All evidence of Regional Panel decision-making relating to changes to funding requests was recorded in Regional Panel decision logs. These documents contain

specific information relating to the decisions made by Regional Panels where changes to original funding requests were recommended.

Table 1. Indicative state/territory allocations of new Indigenous ranger (FTE) positions.

State/Territory	Current IRP FTE	Indicative FTE allocation
New South Wales/ACT	76	114
Northern Territory	330	63
Queensland	211	117
South Australia	69	62
Tasmania	21	39
Victoria	11	57
Western Australia	176	98
Total	894	550

Expert Panel review

The IRP Expansion Round One assessment process also included review of endorsed budgets in the Assessment Summary Report by the Expert Panel. The role of the Expert Panel was to provide strategic advice on the selection of applicants across Australia. The Expert Panel could vary rankings or recommendations for funding as a result of its review and could reconsider the distribution of indicative FTE allocations beyond the minimum allocations. The Expert Panel reviewed and endorsed 117 applications.

s22(1), s11C

From: Wood Gladwin, Lara
To: s47F
Subject: NSW and panel recommendations - with OC comments (002).xlsx [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Thursday, 22 August 2024 4:54:53 PM
Attachments: NSW and panel recommendations - with OC comments (002).xlsx

OFFICIAL

Pls see attached doc – this was the doc s22(1), s11C pulled together in response to panel concerns ; in column M, I have listed the condition/changes agreed during last week's panel meetng dn the subsequent one-on-one conversations with s47F as they missed the panel meeting – everyone agreed with them. Regional Manager ENSW has also agreed.
Grateful if you can amend the spreadsheets accordingly.
happy to discuss if anything is confusing.
thanks
Lara

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	While the applicant currently delivers an IPA activity, ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. The application could have been strengthened by providing support letters from Traditional Owners and Elders as well as better articulating specific details of the proposed work on s22(1) The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Maybe /yes. good score 15. justification inadequate. Has IPA and existing ranger team.	maybe	NSW has taken on the feedback and will recommend this activity for funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. While the proposed activity would be delivered in an IPA, the mid to north coast of NSW was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	Yes. justification inadequate. score 18 seems high based on comments. Has IPA. Concerns re previous governance issues and limited ranger capacity, consider seed funding through aucpice.	yes	NSW has taken on the feedback and will recommend this activity for funding.
s22(1)	Western New South Wales	Ranked number 5 Dedicated IPA with no IRP range that will also expand the footprint. Strong application withn a score of 18. Recommend change of 0.5 to FTE to bring gender equity to staff profile. IPA, Possible expert Panel review.	Not supported	Yes - not sure why not endorsed?. justification inadequate. score 18. Has IPA	yes	NSW has taken on the feedback and will recommend this activity for funding.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
AWABAKAL LOCAL ABORIGINAL LAND COUNCIL	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The central coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with an existing Indigenous Rangers Group. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region. While the propsoed activity is not recommended for funding at this stage, should additional FTEs become available, ENSW would consider recommending this proposal for funding.	Not supported	maybe. Justification inadequate. score 19 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	maybe	NSW would consider funding this activity should funding became available.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers an Indigenous ranger activity and submitted a strong application proposing to increase the number of women rangers. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	Maybe? s22(1) also applied but it has limited capacity, consider funding both to include request to collaborate and develop joint programs. i would be happy to help initiate engagement at no fee for service.	yes	NSW would consider funding this activity should funding became available.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. While the applicant would support new and existing rangers in 2 locally dedicated IPAs, the mid to north coast of NSW was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	I have a CoI, so please disregard my advice if you feel in appropriate, but to be clear this is a strong application writeen to support the growth of teh ranger sector. I have worked for over 15 years in many ways to support First Nations led caring for country and many existing and new ranger groups will need better support to realise there potentail. s22(1) is leading a new regional cross tenure IPA to expand the footprint and support capacity building of existing and new ranger groups. Current rangers are funded by short term grants. Rangers are supported by highly capable team and strong partnerships	yes	The application was well rated and NSW would review the recommendation should there be a second round of funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	Yes. high score 17. justification inadequate.	yes	NSW would consider funding this activity should funding became available.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	no. score 17 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	no	n/a
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers a land and sea activity and submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	yes. Score seems low. justification inadequate. Is native title group with existing ranger team - good capcity.	yes	NSW would consider funding this activity should funding became available.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	No, low capacity. New org. Capacity building support reccommended.	not endorsed	n/a
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	ENSW is a highly competitive region, any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. While a sound application was submitted, the application could have been strengthened with evidence to demonstrate robust governance arrangements and the applicant's prior experience and ability to deliver similar community based activities. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	maybe. Low score 14. Concerns re no current ranger capacity?	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. score 16 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. However, ENSW was a highly competitive region and only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity will not be delivered in an IPA and was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	s22(1), s11C tenure, could possibly fund ranger programs through partnerships and fee for service. Other areas have limited resouces.	maybe	NSW does not recommend funding. The s22(1), s11C

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. score 16 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	yes	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Western New South Wales	Application did not meet the threshold for endorsement. In the open competitive round not competitive enough agaisnt other applications and NIAA not conifdent that the organisation can deleiver the program.	Not supported	maybe. score 16 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	s22(1), s11C stretch. While a sound application was submitted, ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Maybe /yes. low score 14. justification inadequate. Recent ranger team - good local ranger capacity. May not be best host, some concerns re capacity.	yes	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 17 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	yes	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application and is proposing to establish ranger groups in areas without Indigenous Rangers and to increase the number of women rangers, meeting two of the IRP priorities. The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to deliver the proposed activity and access to the proposed lands. While the activity is not in an IPA, it covers a large portion of land on the south coast of NSW. The application costs are reasonable and will have significant impact in the region. The application meets local priorities and is considered to be value for money. While the applicant is proposing 40 FTEs over 4 years, ENSW is recommending 24 FTEs over 4 years. Should additional FTEs become available, ENSW would consider increasing the recommended FTEs.	Supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 19 seems high based on comments and knowledge of area. Concerns re limited ranger capacity.	Maybe	Expert panel support for this activity was agreed upon in meeting 14.08.24

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application was not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. score 15. Concerns re no current ranger capacity, but existing youth services favorable.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Western New South Wales	Strong application, which is expanding the footprint in a new geographical area. Employing double the number of women than men.	Not supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 17 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	yes	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Western New South Wales	Ranks number 1 as the applicant scored 18, is expanding the footprint, has double the number of women employed than men. Applicant is motivated and has been preparing for this opportunity for a long time. The NIAA expects they will be ready to quickly and with little risk to the program run an expanded ranger program. Reccomend funding the full $200,000 capacity building funding and $50,000 for strategic planning.	Supported	Yes. score 18. Funding is too high for current capacity.	yes	n/a

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers an IPA activity and submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and with ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 19 seems high based on comments. Concerns re new org and capacity.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	While a sound application was submitted, ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. The applicant is proposing to establish a new ranger group and the application could have been strengthened with further detail about the organisations experience in delivering a similar project. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Maybe /yes. low score 14. justification inadequate. Recent ranger team - good local ranger capacity. s22(1), s11C not be best host, some concerns re governance capacity, consider seed funding through aucpice.	maybe	NSW agrees with concerns about the org's governance at this stage and is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	ENSW is a highly competitive region, any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. While a sound application was submitted, the response could have been strengthened by providing further detail on how the activity aligns to priorities of the IRP Expansion. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Low score	?	n/a

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application and is proposing to expand the existing s22(1) and increase women rangers. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 19 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no ranger capacity, consider seed funding through aucpice and/or colab with s22(1)	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	maybe. score 16 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The Hunter and mid-north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The applications is not recommended for funding at this stage.	not supported	maybe. score 16 seems high based on comments. Concerns re no current ranger capacity.	maybe	NIAA agrees there is a concern about the org's ranger capacity at this stage and thus is not recommending funding.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers an Indigenous ranger activity and submitted a strong application proposing to increase the number of women rangers. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	Yes, low score. modest request - easy to allocate - low risk.	yes	NSW does not recommend funding for this activity.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers an IPA activity and submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was well written, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding in this round.	Not supported	yes, high score 20. justification inadequate. Has IPA and existing ranger team.	yes	s22(1) does not have an IPA s22(1), s11C
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers an IPA activity and submitted a strong application to expand its rangers group. While the applicant currently delivers an IPA project, the applicant is a new IPA provider and is currently embedding its governance structures and practices. As such, an expansion of its existing arrangements at this time is considered a risk should the expansion occur prior to the organisation's capacity to grow. The application is not recommended for funding at this point in time however ENSW would consider expanding the provider's footprint at a later date.	Not supported	maybe. justification inadequate. score 20 seems high based on comments. s22(1) have 2 IPA's. Concerns re governance capacity, consider seed funding through aucpice.	maybe	NSW is not recommending this activity. While the org currently delivers and IPA activity, it is new to the ranger space and currently building its capacity and governance.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. The applicant currently receives NIAA funding for IRP and IPA teams. While the applicant delivers these activities to a high standard, the applicant is requesting to add 1.5 FTE female rangers per annum. With the limited FTE allocation in ENSW, the small expansion was not considered competitive. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Maybe, low score. modest request for 1.5 women rangers - easy to allocate - low risk.	Maybe	NSW is not recommending for funding. The applicant is requesting to add 1.5 FTE however with the limited FTE allocation in ENSW, the small expansion was not considered competitive. The application was not strong.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers. The mid to north coast of NSW however was heavily prescribed and is a region with a number of existing Indigenous Rangers Groups. With ENSW being a highly competitive region, only a limited number of applications could be recommended for funding. While the application was satisfactory, the proposed activity was considered to have less impact in the region and thus did not offer the greatest value for money. The application is not recommended for funding at this stage.	Not supported	Maybe, private corp, limited community accountability. Tourism buiz. Local ranger groups.	maybe	NSW is not recommending this activity at this stage.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	While the applicant proposed to expand a current IRP on a dedicated IPA, ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. The application would have been strengthened with the inclusion of letters of support from key stakeholders in community to support claims made against the criterion. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	Low score 13, seems low. small request with existing ranger capcity.	maybe	The application was not strong and NSW is not recommending funding

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	While the applicant is proposing to establish a new ranger group on lands without existing rangers, ENSW is a highly competitive region and any score of 14 or below did not meet the threshold for endorsement. Letters of support from further key stakeholders could have strengthened the proposal. The application is not recommended for funding.	Not supported	yes. Score seems low. justification inadequate. Has IPA and existing ranger team. should be blue or yellow	yes	The application was not strong and NSW is not recommending funding
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application and is proposing to expand the IRP footprint and increase the number of women rangers, meeting two of the IRP priorities. The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to deliver the proposed activity and has access to the proposed land. The applicant will work alongside an existing ranger group and has provided letters to support this claim. The application costs are reasonable and will have significant impact in the region. The application meets local priorities and is considered to be value for money. While the applicant is proposing to gradually increase the ranger numbers to reach 61 FTEs over 4 years, ENSW is recommending 28 FTEs over 4 years. Should additional FTEs become available, ENSW would consider increasing the recommended FTEs.	Supported	No, existing s22(1) rangers, private corp with lack of community accountability, high risk issues.	no	NSW is supportive of this application and the app includes letter of support from s22(1) rangers.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	**NIAA Region**	**Regional Rationale**	**Regional Recom**	**Expert Panel rationale**	**Expert Panel recommendation**	**NSW response to expert panel recommendation**
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers a rangers group and submitted a good application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers, meeting two of the IRP priorities. The applicant is in an Empowered Community region and the application is supported by the EC. The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to deliver the proposed activity and has access to the proposed land. While the applicant is proposing to gradually increase the ranger numbers to reach 23.60 female FTEs over 4 years, ENSW is recommending 16 FTEs over 4 years. Should additional FTEs become available, ENSW would consider increasing the recommended FTEs.	Supported	No, s22(1), s11C Currently s22(1), s11C s22(1), s11C could possibly fund ranger programs through partnerships and fee for service. Other areas have limited resouces.	not endorsed	The org currently delivers a rangers program and NSW is supportive of its expansion. Strong conditions would be prescrived regarding land boundaries.
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant currently delivers a rangers activity and submitted a strong application proposing to expand the ranger footprint and increase the number of women rangers, meeting two of the IRP priorities. The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to deliver the proposed activity and has access to the proposed land. The application costs are reasonable and will have significant impact in the region. The application meets local priorities and is considered to be value for money. While the applicant is proposing 28 FTEs over 4 years, ENSW is recommending 12 FTEs over 4 years.	Supported	No, big concerns about cultural protocols and assessment advice is inconsistant. The existing s22(1) program was obtained through an unsuccessful aupice arrangement with s22(1) I have raised these concerns with NIAA in the past.	not endorsed	The org submitted a strong application and has letters of support for the activity. NSW is recommending for funding.

Application details		Recommendations				
Applicant	NIAA Region	Regional Rationale	Regional Recom	Expert Panel rationale	Expert Panel recommendation	NSW response to expert panel recommendation
s22(1)	Eastern New South Wales	The applicant submitted a strong application and is proposing to expand the IRP footprint and increase women rangers, meeting two of the IRP priorities. The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to deliver the proposed activity and has access to the proposed land. The application costs are reasonable and will have significant impact in the region. The application meets local priorities and is considered to be value for money. While the applicant is proposing 17.60 FTEs over 4 years, ENSW is recommending 16 FTEs over 4 years.	Supported	No, low capacity. New org. Capacity building support reccommended.	not endorsed	NSW recommends this app for funding, which includes funding for capacity building.

From: s22(1), s11C
To: Wood Gladwin, Lara
Cc: s47F s47F ; Donovan, Leon (Unclassified); Donovan, Leon;
Subject: RE: NSW Ranger Apps [SEC=UNOFFICIAL]
Date: Thursday, 15 August 2024 6:05:33 PM
Attachments: image001.png
NSW and panel recommendations - with OC comments.xlsx

Hi Lara,

Thank you for your time yesterday. I understand that you are meeting with expert panel on Friday and so I hope the attached spreadsheet helps.

I had a shot at collating s22(1) feedback however there were instances where the comments didn't not match with the recommendation e.g. comments states 'maybe' but the recommendation states 'yes'.

Nonetheless, I have collated the comments and have tried to group accordingly. I've hidden columns K and L and have sorted it to only include recommendations where there was a difference in opinion between the regions and expert panel. Please see below for a summary of NSW's recommendations after consideration of the panel's feedback.

Green group – we have taken on the feedback and will recommend for funding
Amber group – we would consider funding these if more funding became available.
Red group – NSW has considered the panel's comments and we generally agree with the panel's concern about the org's ranger capacity and thus will not be recommending funding.
White group – While the panel has recommended funding, NSW does not recommend funding. We might agree to disagree at this point, however, noting that funding is very limited.
Blur group – while the panel does not recommend funding, the assessors have scored these applications highly and we are recommending these activities based on the application, letters of support and geographical spread of ranger opportunities.

Have a good evening,
s22(1), s11C

From: Wood Gladwin, Lara <Lara.WoodGladwin@niaa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 5:16 PM
To: Donovan, Leon <leon.donovan@official.niaa.gov.au>; Donovan, Leon (Protected) <leon.donovan@niaa.gov.au>;s22(1), s11C s47F s47F
Cc: s47F s47F

s47F

Subject: NSW Ranger Apps [SEC=UNOFFICIAL]

UNOFFICIAL

Hi All

Leon, s22(1), s11C and I had a long chat this afternoon to s47F for the Rangers expansion panel. He has a number of suggestions for amending funding for NSW. We have said we will look at his list, keeping in mind I need to take any recommended changes to the Expert Panel on Friday to discuss. We have to balance the suggestions of all Expert panel members with the recommendations from the state panel and we are under no obligation to take them on board. I will need to reflect the Expert Panel's collective final views in the report to the delegate (not individual views).

At the moment, NSW has $6,899,267.71 underspent funds – although I know you have hit your FTE. As a starting point, you could consider using these funds to fund additional groups in NSW, noting this will go over the FTE. Given the large number of applications and IPA applications in particular in NSW, we think this is justifiable – but need to confirm with the panel. This should include consideration of the 4 IPAs we have already asked you to re-consider for funding, give funding more IPAs is a priority. The IPAs would not necessarily receive the funding they have requested and we seek your advice on that (as per earlier email from s47F).

s22(1)

3 other states have underspent funds and 3 are overspent, so we will need to draw this to the attention of the panel on Friday, too.

Please also make a list of 'maybe' applicants that you would like to fund if you had additional funding –or if we were to consider funding them as part of Round 2.
thanks
Lara

Lara Wood Gladwin
A/g Branch Manager
Environment Branch | National Indigenous Australians Agency
p. s47F m. s47F
Charles Perkins House 16 Bowes Place Phillip ACT 2606|
w. niaa.gov.au w. indigenous.gov.au

Please note I leave at 2.30pm on Tuesdays and Fridays

party or take action in reliance of any material contained within it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email informing them of the mistake and delete all copies of the message from your computer system.

IMPORTANT: This message, and any attachments to it, contains information that is confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional or other privilege. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you must not review, copy, disseminate or disclose its contents to any other party or take action in reliance of any material contained within it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email informing them of the mistake and delete all copies of the message from your computer system.
