



23 July 2024

Thank you for the question on notice from the Standing Committee on Social Issues regarding its inquiry into the procurement practices of government agencies in New South Wales and its impact on the social development of the people of New South Wales:

**Are there any examples of that setting a window of price and then having people compete within it? Is that something that we have seen elsewhere?**

We have identified the following examples of this:

1. Most government grant programs (local, state and federal) in Australia set a maximum grant value, overall aims of the grant program, and then have applicants compete on quality, outcomes and innovation. Current NSW Government grants include, for example:
  - a. Up to \$50,000 per applicant for [Regional Events](#)
  - b. Up to \$500,000 per organisation for [training programs tailored to Local Aboriginal Land Councils, Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations and Native Title Prescribed Body Corporates](#)
  - c. Up to \$50,000 per landowner to [protect and improve koala habitat](#)
  - d. Up to \$40,000 per applicant to [provide older people in NSW with access to low-cost digital literacy training](#)
2. The Australian Government sets the price for its employment support programs and tenderers must respond with their achievable scope (how many jobseekers they can support in which employment regions), governance and innovation. This includes contracts that cover:
  - a. Workforce Australia
  - b. Disability Employment Services
  - c. Transition To Work
  - d. Career Transition Assistance
  - e. Time to Work Employment Service
3. Other Australian Government tenders that have set the price and asked for respondents to compete on quality, outcomes or innovation include the [Social Enterprise Development Initiative \(SEDI\) Grants Administrator](#). In this example, the price to administer the grants was set, as was the size of the grants to be administered.