



National Service for Non-Offending Family Members of Child Sexual Abuse Perpetrators

Feedback for applicants

Thank you for your interest in the National Service for Non-Offending Family Members of Child Sexual Abuse Perpetrators grant opportunity. We appreciate the time and effort you put into your application.

The Attorney General's Department (the Department) is providing the following general feedback for grant applicants to support future grant applications.

Summary of the Grant Opportunity

Application period: opened 21 May 2026 and closed 3 July 2026.

Applications received: 24

Summary of the round: This grant opportunity aims to reduce child sexual abuse-related harms by providing free, nationally available support for non-offending family members of child sexual abuse perpetrators, and working with other government and non-government agencies, including Commonwealth, state and territory law enforcement, to promote awareness of the Service, including how it can be contacted and the support available. The grant program will provide a total of up to \$9 million GST exclusive over 3 years, from 2026–27 to 2028–29.

Conflict of Interest Management for Assessment and Selection Staff

All Community Grants Hub and Departmental staff were required to declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest before participating in the assessment and selection process.

Where a conflict was identified, appropriate steps were taken to manage it, which could include:

- Excluding the team member from undertaking assessment related to the affected application(s).
- Assigning the application(s) to an alternate assessor.
- Documenting the conflict and the management action in accordance with the Department's Conflict of Interest Policy.

Selection Process

The Community Grants Hub reviewed all applications to confirm they met the eligibility and compliance requirements for the grant opportunity. This information was provided to the Department's Grant Opportunity Delegate, who made the final decision on whether each identified grant application met those requirements. Grant Applicants whose applications were identified as ineligible or non-compliant were notified of the outcome in writing by the Community Grants Hub.

Following completion of these checks, the Department undertook the preliminary assessment of all eligible and compliant applications through an Open Competitive grant process. This involved assessing applications against the published selection criteria and any additional requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Following the preliminary assessment, the Department convened a Selection Advisory Panel to make final recommendations to the Financial Delegate. The Selection Advisory Panel was made up of subject matter experts whose role was to review the assessed applications, provide advice, and make recommendations to the Grant Opportunity Delegate.

In undertaking their role on the Selection Advisory Panel, panel members were required to consider:

- Whether applications met all eligibility and compliance requirements listed in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.
- How well responses addressed the published assessment criteria.
- The overall quality of applications compared to others received.
- The completeness and relevance of supporting attachments.
- Whether the proposed project demonstrated value for money.
- How the proposed activities aligned with the objectives of the grant opportunity.
- Any risks identified and the strategies proposed to manage those risks.

Selection Results

There was strong interest in this grant opportunity, and applications demonstrated a range of strengths. The preferred applicant was assessed as meeting the requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines, based on the strength of their responses to the published assessment criteria. Applicants were notified of the outcome of their application in writing at the end of the selection period.

The following feedback is provided to assist grant applicants in understanding what comprised a strong application and what quality responses looked like against the requirements of the grant opportunity.

Common Mistakes to Avoid

Eligibility and Compliance:

Avoid submitting incomplete applications. Ensure consortium partners are willing and able to provide required letters of support by the closing date.

Allow sufficient time to confirm that all documents are complete, current and consistent with the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Attachments and evidence:

Avoid providing responses that are overly brief, repetitive or general. Use the available character limit to address all elements of the criterion, with sufficient evidence and practical detail pertaining to your proposed model. Responses should avoid simply restating information contained in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Substantiate key claims through the application and supporting attachments and clearly explain how the evidence demonstrates your ability to implement and deliver the proposed service.

Value with relevant money and risk:

Applications were less competitive where they did not explain how the proposed model was sustainable, scalable or financially viable over the grant period.

Strong applications showed how the proposed model would use public resources efficiently, effectively and accountably, and clearly delineated the proposed activities from existing service delivery. They explained existing infrastructure, financial controls, workforce assumptions and risk management arrangements for the proposed model.

Criterion 1: Service Model Design

How will your proposed Service Model deliver the Service in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the grant?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- described how they would design and operate a comprehensive end-to-end service model, including documenting user pathways, triage and referral processes and escalation protocols
- detailed how their operating model would function, including specifying service hours, staffing profile, expected service volumes, response time standards and surge capacity arrangements
- explained how their service model was designed to be safe, user-centred and evidence-based, including compliance with digital accessibility standards and inclusive service delivery principles.

What strong applications did well:

- Presented a clear, safe and user centred end-to-end service model, covering user entry, triage, support, referral, escalation and exit pathways.
- Demonstrated that the operating model was feasible, including service hours, delivery channels, expected demand, staffing assumptions and surge capacity, and provided detail on how supporting resources and advocacy activities would support service delivery.
- Explained how support would continue where a suitable referral service could not be identified or accessed promptly.
- Demonstrated an understanding of the distinct purpose and requirements of the service and how it would operate nationally across different locations and time zones.

Common gaps observed:

- Some applications did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the proposed service or included activities outside the scope of the grant opportunity.
- Operational detail was sometimes insufficient, with service volumes and hours not supported by credible demand and workforce modelling.
- Staffing profiles were not always sufficiently detailed, with limited information provided on key roles, responsibilities and workforce structure.
- Proposed future capability was not always supported by evidence of experience delivering a comparable national or large-scale service.
- For organisations with existing capability, applications often lacked sufficient detail to clearly delineate the proposed service model from existing service delivery and demonstrate the appropriate allocation of grant funding.

Criterion 2: Child Safety, Cultural Safety, Accessibility and Practice Quality Assurance

How your proposed Service Model ensured safe, high quality and inclusive service delivery?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- outlined how their service would demonstrate commitment to and implementation of culturally safe service delivery to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples
- described how their service demonstrated commitment to accessibility, trauma-informed and culturally safe practice for National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Sexual Abuse priority groups, regardless of personal circumstances or access needs

- detailed how their service would maintain robust child safeguarding practices to ensure everyone who contacts the service, in particular children and young people, receive safe, appropriate and timely support
- explained how they would design and implement a quality assurance framework outlining staff training, professional supervision, call and content review processes and mechanisms for continuous service improvement.

What strong applications did well:

- Demonstrated how cultural safety, accessibility and inclusion would be embedded in service design and delivery for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and all other priority groups.
- Clearly explained how child safeguarding and quality assurance arrangements would operate in practice, including staff training, supervision, risk management, service review and continuous improvement.
- Supported their proposed approach with practical examples of how their organisation already delivers culturally safe, accessible and high-quality services, with demonstrated awareness of relevant legislative frameworks.

Common gaps observed:

- Applications often relied on high-level statements without explaining how cultural safety, accessibility, trauma-informed practice and child safeguarding would operate in practice.
- The needs of all priority groups were not always addressed, particularly for remote and regional communities.
- Quality assurance arrangements sometimes lacked sufficient detail, including staff supervision, content review, risk management and continuous practice improvement.

Criterion 3: Organisation capability, expertise and implementation capacity

How your organisation demonstrated the capability, expertise and capacity to effectively implement and deliver the Service?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- explained how their experience would equip them to deliver a comparable national or large-scale service and/or contact centre operations, including evidence of measurable outcomes or evaluation results
- outlined how their key personnel and their proposed governance structure would ensure timely Service establishment, including oversight of pre-launch milestones and scheduled governance checkpoints to track progress against agreed timeframes
- explained how their key personnel and their proposed governance structure would provide effective oversight and ensure a safe and effective ongoing delivery of the Service, with frameworks to support staff wellbeing and high-quality practice.

What strong applications did well:

- Linked relevant experience in comparable service delivery, large-scale operations or contact centres to the requirements of the proposed service.
- Demonstrated how existing infrastructure, personnel and governance arrangements could be leveraged to support timely establishment and ongoing delivery.
- Provided a clear implementation approach, including pre-launch activities, recruitment, milestones, readiness testing, governance checkpoints and oversight arrangements.

- Outlined practical measures to support staff wellbeing, recognising the specialist and sensitive nature of the service.
- Where applications involved consortium arrangements, stronger applications clearly defined each partner's role, governance arrangements and accountability for service delivery.

Common gaps observed:

- Some applications did not explain how previous experience would translate to delivery of the proposed service, or did not support claims with measurable outcomes, evaluation findings or other evidence.
- Workforce arrangements often lacked detail, including staffing profiles, Full-Time Equivalent hours, management structures, roles and responsibilities.
- Proposals involving significant expansion or scale-up did not always explain how implementation, workforce and governance risks would be managed.

Criterion 4: Value with Relevant Money and Financial Management

How did your proposed approach represent efficient, effective and accountable use of public resources, and how it was supported by robust financial controls and a sustainable service model throughout the grant period?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- described how they would allocate, manage and monitor their budget for the Service
- explained how their delivery model would achieve efficiency in a way that represented value with relevant money and maximised public benefit
- described how their financial governance controls, audit processes and grant acquittal process would ensure accountable use of public funds
- outlined how their organisation would remain financially viable for the duration of the grant, including management of cash flow, contingencies and unforeseen costs.

What strong applications did well:

- Demonstrated value with relevant money by supporting proposed costs with quantified workforce, demand and service delivery assumptions, and leveraging existing infrastructure.
- Outlined robust financial management, including budget oversight, internal controls, audit and grant acquittal arrangements.
- Demonstrated financial sustainability through effective cash flow, contingency and unforeseen cost management.

Common gaps observed:

- Some application budgets, timelines and risk management arrangements lacked a clear connection to the proposed service model, including demand, contingencies, staffing and resource requirements.
- Proposed expenditure across key budget categories, including legal fees and evaluation, was not always proportionate to the proposed activities or supported by a clear rationale.
- Claims about existing infrastructure were not always supported by evidence that it was suitable and scalable for national delivery.

Criterion 5: Stakeholder Partnerships and Referral Management

How did you work with stakeholders and external partner organisations to support effective delivery of the Service?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- Explained how they would establish and maintain referral pathways, escalation arrangements and partnerships with relevant government and non-government agencies, and promote awareness of the Service to law enforcement agencies
- described how they would establish and maintain partnerships with specialist providers, including how they would assess partners' capacity to accept referrals, particularly for complex and long-term clients, and coordinated referrals to avoid service users being passed between providers
- demonstrated how they would manage referrals when preferred pathways were unavailable, including alternative arrangements or support options to ensure continuity of service for clients.

What strong applications did well:

- Demonstrated established relationships with relevant government and non-government stakeholders and provided evidence that partners understood and supported their proposed roles.
- Showed how these relationships would support service promotion, coordinated referrals and continuity of support.

Common gaps observed:

- Applications did not always name key partners, define their roles, provide evidence of commitment or explain how referrals would work in practice.
- Referral arrangements lacked practical detail, including partner capacity, client transitions and alternative options where suitable providers were unavailable.
- Engagement with law enforcement, courts, government agencies and other likely referral sources was not always clearly explained.

Criterion 6: Engagement, Feedback and Continuous Improvement

How did you engage with users, communities and the broader service system to ensure continuous improvement of service delivery?

When addressing the criterion, applicants:

- described how they would engage with users, communities and priority groups in service design, delivery and promotion
- outlined how they will use feedback, collaboration and sector knowledge to inform continuous improvement.

What strong applications did well:

- Provided practical examples of meaningful engagement with service users, lived experience representatives, priority groups and sector stakeholders.
- Proposed to involve lived experience representatives early enough to inform service design and implementation.
- Explained how feedback would be collected through multiple channels, analysed and used to improve service design, delivery and promotion.

- Linked engagement and feedback to governance, quality assurance and decision-making processes.

Common gaps observed:

- Applications did not always explain when engagement would occur or how users, lived experience representatives and stakeholders would influence service design and implementation.
- Some applications did not adequately address engagement with priority groups or communities most likely to face barriers to access.

Tips for Future Applications

- Start early and read the **Grant Opportunity Guidelines** carefully.
- Check eligibility and gather required evidence before drafting your application.
- Provide complete, relevant attachments and references.
- Address each assessment criterion directly and clearly.
- Explain how your proposed activities deliver outcomes and demonstrate **value with relevant money**.
- Identify risks and outline strategies for managing them.

Next Steps

- If you are unsuccessful, you may ask for feedback within one month of being advised of the outcome by emailing NOCSNonOffendingFamilySupport@ag.gov.au. We will give written feedback within one month of your request.
- If you would like to know about upcoming grants opportunities for funding, you can [register](#)¹ to receive email alerts with [GrantConnect](#)² the Australian Government's grants information system.

¹ <https://www.grants.gov.au/RegisteredUser/Register>

² <https://www.grants.gov.au/RegisteredUser/Login>