



27 August 2020.

Committee Secretary
Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Re Submission The Administration of Government Grants: Inquiry into Auditor-General's Reports 5, 12 and 23 (2019-20)

Dear Chair,

Please find my submission and working documents attached for your information.

My submission is in no way critical of the Auditor-General or the work they do in looking at the Grants programs.

However it is my submission that the Sports Infrastructure Grants program is the tip of a much larger iceberg, in the Administration and Governance of grants by the Commonwealth.

My submission shows the inequitable use of Commonwealth funds in these grants schemes which is not in accord with the grants rules and guidelines and may well be unlawful. Which are matters associated with these grants programs mentioned in the terms of reference specifically and Commonwealth grants programs generally.

Appended to this letter (by email) is an outline of my research into the Sports Infrastructure grants program, the spreadsheet pertaining to my analysis of that program as well as further analysis of the community Development Grants and Regional Grants programs and their associated spreadsheets.

Yours Sincerely.

Vince O'Grady.

SUBMISSION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT GRANTS: INQUIRY INTO AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Submitted by Vincent O'Grady 27 Aug 2020.

What is the real Story? Sports Grants, Community Development Grants and Regional Grants.

Introduction.

Following the loss by the Labor party of the 2019 federal Election, I wrote a paper about why the Labor party lost that Election. I asked [REDACTED] Labor Member, [REDACTED] to write it with me. [REDACTED] agreed and we set about writing a proper and in depth analysis of why Labor Lost.

My background (in Australia) was in Industrial Marketing, a discipline which involved a lot of in depth analysis of Product, Price Promotion and Place (Distribution of the promotion).

Whilst at university studying this discipline (Bachelor of Business majoring in Marketing) we had used a Harvard Case study approach which fitted the task exactly.

The Product was Political Policy produced by the Labor party, Price referred to the way that policy affected people individually and also at a higher level the Federal budget. The Promotion and distribution referred to the making of messages about Policy and the way and means they were disseminated to the public.

After we had written and submitted the paper it was of much interest to read the Sports Infrastructure grants report by the Auditor-General and I have followed that issue for some time now.

Government and Governance.

Following the publishing of our paper we continued a dialogue with members of the public about what we had discovered. Copies of the paper were sent to many people to read.

Much discussion was had about the so called misleading and untruthful pronouncements of the Liberal party, the National party and their allies in the press.

The press in Australia seem to pounce on slight miscalculations by the labor party and gloss over the misdemeanours of the Coalition parties. Labor MP's are made to resign and the Coalition MP's just seem too tough it out and survive.

During this time there came to the notice of the press a Scandal which they couldn't ignore, because it had been referred to the Auditor General, who is an independent body at arm's length from Government, and by statute has the ability to delve deeply into Government programs.

That scandal was the Sports infrastructure grants.

A thorough reading of the Sports Infrastructure grants report by the Auditor General was generally informative and satisfied my curiosity. I was especially interested in the aspect raised by the Auditor General about the Minister's lawful basis for approving these grants.

Following the report and the subsequent setting up of a Select Committee on Administration of Sports Grants, I was interested to read Professor Anne Twomey's submission (Submission 14) to that Inquiry regarding the lawful basis generally for the Commonwealth to make grants under existing legislation and also under the Australian Sports Commission Act.

It's always a difficulty finding out what the real story is with these types of grant programs. The press report on facts which may in fact not exist. This time it was a general message of "they all do it you know, so nothing really to see here"

This sort of approach stung me into action and I wondered if "they all did it".

In my search for evidence to answer to this proposition in the positive or negative I found out the following background information.

1/ Until 2007, there were no rules and guidelines for federal grants. As The Auditor general's Audit Report No.21 2011–12 states,

On page 11 of that report

Summary

Introduction

1. Grants administration is an important activity for many Commonwealth entities, involving the payment of billions of dollars of public funds each year.¹ However, prior to late 2007, there was no official guidance provided to agencies relating specifically to the administration of grant programs. In December 2007, Finance Minister's Instructions were issued providing information about the Budget and other related processes, including the decision-making processes that were to apply to grants.

2. In particular, the 2007 Instructions introduced a requirement that Ministers should not make any decisions on discretionary grants without first receiving departmental advice on the merits of the grant application relative to the guidelines for that program. The Instructions further provided that two types of grant decisions (the approval of grants that agencies had recommended be rejected and grants within a House of Representatives Minister's own electorate) were to be referred to a group of Ministers for decision.² In respect to the public reporting of approved grants, the Instructions required that the details of individual grants were to be published on agency websites within two days of the announcement of the grant.

3. In February 2008, the then Minister for Finance and Deregulation (Finance Minister) announced that a comprehensive review of the value of discretionary grants and the transparency and effectiveness of existing programs would be undertaken.³ In establishing and undertaking the review, particular attention was paid to the findings and recommendations of the wide range of audits of grants administration undertaken by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO). In this respect, the July 2008 report of the Strategic Review of the Administration of Australian Government Grant Programs (Strategic Review) commented that many of these audits had raised significant issues going both to the overall framework for the administration of grant programs and to the quality of administration of individual programs.⁴

4. The Strategic Review recommended the retention of the existing requirement for public reporting of individual grants, albeit with some changes to the operation of the requirement.⁵ In light of the findings and recommendations of the Strategic Review, the Government decided that the requirement for Ministers to refer two types of grant decisions to a Ministerial group would be replaced by an arrangement under which responsibility for such decisions would be retained within the responsible portfolio, but with the associated requirement that Ministers will report to the Finance Minister:

- all decisions to approve a particular grant which the agency has recommended be rejected; and
- for Ministers that are a Member of the House of Representatives, each instance in which they approve a grant in their own electorate.

5. These additional reporting requirements took effect in January 2009 (through revised Finance Minister's Instructions). They were subsequently retained, with some minor amendments, in the Commonwealth Grant Guidelines (CGGs), which were issued on 1 July 2009 to give full effect to the Government's consideration of the recommendations of the Strategic Review. The reporting provisions (and related grant administration requirements) were also supported by the retention in the CGGs of the requirement that Ministers will not approve a proposed grant without first receiving agency advice on its merits. Table S 1 summarises the three key grant reporting obligations that are currently in place.

The Minister for finance in 2007 in December 2007 was The Hon Lindsay Tanner MP, Minister for Finance and Deregulation. The Rudd Labor government was returned after the 24 Nov 2007 Federal Election.

Labor was in for the 6 years from that date until September 2013.

During that time there was one particular grant program which was audited by The Auditor general. See. ANAO 2014_2015_09.pdf. Which audited the Regional Development Australia Fund.

This audit was for rounds 3 and 4 which covered the value of \$226,381,913

A previous Audit had been done for rounds 1 and 2. To the Value of \$349,416,635

I have examined and analysed the whole four rounds of the Grant scheme which amounted to a value of \$ and determined that overall the distribution of grants to Political party Electorates was as follows.

Please note my analysis methodology is described in detail later in this submission.

Table of Summary Analysis.

Regional Development Australia Fund grants under Labor

		Value	Australian Labor value	Coalition Value	Independent Value	Totals
Round1	2010	\$149,652,855	\$78,177,667	\$56,833,948	\$14,641,240	\$149,652,855
Round 2	2011	\$199,763,780	\$78,647,000	\$121,116,780	\$0	\$199,763,780
Round 3	2012	\$31,137,083	\$9,010,177	\$19,891,906	\$2,235,000	\$31,137,083
round 4	2013	\$195,244,830	\$134,271,567	\$47,133,263	\$13,840,000	\$195,244,830
RDAF Total		\$575,798,548	\$300,106,411	\$244,975,897	\$30,716,240	\$575,798,548
		100.00%	52.12%	42.55%	5.33%	
		Value	Australian Labor value	Coalition Value	Independent Value	Totals
Percentages						
Round1		25.99%	52.24%	37.98%	9.78%	
Round 2		34.69%	39.37%	60.63%	0.00%	
Round 3		5.41%	28.94%	63.88%	7.18%	

Round 4	33.91%	68.77%	24.14%	7.09%
---------	--------	--------	--------	-------

Discussion of this Grant Analysis.

Whilst it may be possible to lay a charge of Pork Barrelling at the ALP and [REDACTED] when one looks at round 4 distribution of funds, when taken as a whole the distribution of funds across all four rounds between Labor, Coalition and Independent Electorates is fair and balanced. So the answer to the charge "They all do it" is roundly debunked.

It would be unfair to compare grants schemes decisions made before the guidelines were implemented by The Minister for Finance, with schemes under those rules because it would not be comparing like with like.

2/ Grants made before 1 Jan 2018 were reported on website of the Department responsible for administration of the scheme. After this date all Grants made by all departments were put on a Government portal called GrantConnect.

<https://www.grants.gov.au/>

This portal has current grants and opportunities for prospective grantees as well as downloadable excel spreadsheets of searchable parameters.

In 2018 there were 24,447 with a value of AUD \$15,407,883,195 (All active and retired agencies.)

In 2019 there were 24,001 with a value of AUD \$15,816,923,048 (All active and retired agencies.)

In 2020 to 23 Jun 2020 there have been 10,802 with a value of AUD \$5,112,475,664 (All active and retired agencies.)

3/ I also learned that Sport Australia is an independent Commonwealth body and is not covered by the grants <https://www.finance.gov.au/government/commonwealth-grants/commonwealth-grants-rules-guidelines>. However Sport Australia can still be Audited by the ANAO.

My Analysis of Sport Australia Sports Infrastructure Grants.

Following the breaking of the Sports Rorts story, I felt I was always looking for more information, especially when a spreadsheet which has electorate Information on it was leaked. Much of what was said about the sports rorts was incomplete information. I felt I had to know more and so determined to do my own analysis.

After downloading the 684 grants from the Sport Australia website and placing them in a spreadsheet, I searched for a means of marrying up each individual grant with their electorate. I found a suitable utility on the Australian Electoral Commission website under the menu item "For Voters" and the subject "Find my electoral division."

<https://electorate.aec.gov.au/>

I then proceeded to go through each individual Grantee and match them with an electorate, which I then matched with a political party. This exercise took me 4 days. The spreadsheet is attached to this submission.

After completion I then did an overall Analysis of the results. They are as follows.

Sports Infrastructure grants break up of Grants per Political party.

Coalition total Grants	419
Coalition total GrantValue	\$61,751,371
Coalition Percentage grants	61.26%
Coalition Percentage grants Value	61.58%
Independent total Grants	43
Independent total GrantValue	\$6,892,089
Independent Percentage grants	6.29%
Independents Percentage grants Value	6.87%
Labor total Grants	223
Labor total GrantValue	\$31,629,410
Labor Percentage grants	32.60%
LaborPercentage grants Value	31.54%

The results speak for themselves. At this stage I didn't do an analysis of the individual Political parties who make up the Coalition. I concentrated on the three major players, Coalition, ALP and Independent seats.

As you can see the Coalition seats were awarded 61.58% of the grant Value and Labor seats were awarded 31.54% with the independents coming third with 6.87% of the value.

There are a couple of pointers to remember here.

- a) Each electoral division is roughly the same size in relation to numbers of electors.
- b) In an open and competitive tender process, one could reasonably expect that the distribution of grants would fall in a balanced way with a percentage margin of plus or minus 5%. Taking into account the stringent application and assessment criteria.

Having done the higher level analysis I then determined to show the distribution of the grant funds by state and as a proportion of each party's seats within those states.

Summary of Sports Infrastructure Grants by State, Numbers and Value.

State	Number grants	Value of Grants	National Party/LNP Value	National Party/LNP number	Liberal Party Value	Liberal Party number	Independent Parties	Independent Parties number	Labor Party Value	Labor Party number
New South Wales.	176	\$23,962,027	\$5,496,918	46	\$7,955,893	53	\$609,700	3	\$9,899,516	74
Queensland	117	\$21,067,948	\$17,986,082	97	\$636,397	4	\$2,445,469	16	\$0	0
Australian Capital Territory	13	\$1,575,405	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$1,575,405	13
Northern Territory	11	\$2,853,921	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$2,853,921	11
South Australia	65	\$11,105,727	\$0	0	\$5,999,325	35	\$1,197,072	6	\$3,909,330	24
Tasmania	24	\$3,136,887	\$0	0	\$1,168,580	9	\$740,982	6	\$1,227,325	9
Victoria	176	\$25,236,643	\$2,641,855	19	\$9,977,061	69	\$1,898,866	12	\$10,718,861	77
Western Australia	102	\$11,334,312	\$0	0	\$9,889,260	87	\$0	0	\$1,445,052	15
Total	684	\$100,272,870	\$26,124,855	162	\$35,626,51	257	\$6,892,089	43	\$31,629,410	223

Summary of Electoral Divisions by State.

State	Number of electorates	Number Liberal Electorates	Number Nationals/LN P electorates	Number Independents Electorates	Number of Labor electorates	Totals	Coalition Seats Awarded grants	Independent Seats awarded grants	Labor Seats awarded grants
New South Wales.	48	15	7	1	24	48	21	0	19
Queensland	30		22	1	6	30	23	1	5
Australian Capital Territory	3				2	2	0	0	3
Northern Territory	2				3	3	0	0	2
South Australia	10	4	0	1	5	10	4	1	5
Tasmania	5	2		1	2	5	2	1	2
Victoria	38	12	3	2	21	38	14	2	17
Western Australia	16	11			5	16	11	0	4
Total	151	44	32	7	68	151	75	5	57

Community Development Grants.

Following my analysis of the Sports Infrastructure Grants I determined to look more closely at Grants generally.

The problem I had with the data was with the amount of time it took to analyse huge amounts of data, matching the locality and Postcode with the Federal Electorate.

Methodology and the basis for Analysis.

I determined to build a “master key” which had all of the data in it for reference from a working spreadsheet. To this end I found and entered into a spreadsheet all of the Post codes and Localities in Australia, some 17,776 postcodes. Then I had to match them up with the Electorates.

To do that in the Sports infrastructure Grants I matched each individual in the Find my electorate application on the AEC website. I did not intend to do that again as it was far too time consuming. 684 grants took me 4 days to match with their electorates. Looking at the Community Development Grants there were literally hundreds of grants. I needed a more robust methodology to analyse them.

I then rang a friend of mine in Canberra who is also an IT expert. I explained my difficulty and he agreed to help. Within two days he had sent me a file with all the Localities, post codes and Electorate data. I then considered what other desirable information would be required. I added columns for Political Party, sitting member and then the margin they had won by in the 2019 election. (To apply if necessary a definition of marginal to any further analysis).

My Analysis of community Development grants.

Overview.

The Community Development Grants commenced by establishment of funds in MYEFO 2013 – 2014.

The processes for the Community Development grants say they are designed to achieve Australian Government objectives and are run in line with the Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines (CGRGs). The process document then goes onto say The Grant opportunity opens and “The Australian Government selects projects to be invited to submit a Request for Information form.” So it is not an open process. The Government identifies the need and then invites the organisation to apply. I wondered if this was legal?

At this stage it should be noted that the CGRG’s state the following.

Objectives of grants administration

- 1.1. *The objective of grants administration is to promote proper¹ use and management of public resources through collaboration with government and non-government stakeholders to achieve government policy outcomes.*
- 1.2. *This objective is achieved through:*

¹

- a. *the legislative, policy and reporting framework for grants administration set out in Part 1 of the CGRGs;*
- b. *the seven key principles for better practice grants administration, discussed in Part 2 of the CGRGs:*
 - i. *robust planning and design;*
 - ii. *collaboration and partnership;*
 - iii. *proportionality;*
 - iv. *an outcomes orientation;*
 - v. *achieving value with relevant money;*
 - vi. *governance and accountability; and*
 - vii. *probity and transparency;*
- c. *whole-of-government and individual entity grants administration practices.*²

From <https://www.finance.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-11/commonwealth-grants-rules-and-guidelines.docx>

Having learned these things I then went onto the Analysis of the grants granted since 2014 in three Spreadsheet viz.

1/ The Community Development grant spreadsheet held on the Department of Infrastructure Web site for grants granted between the commencement of the scheme and 31 Dec 2017

2/ The Grants Granted in the Calendar year 2018 (1 Jan 2018 to 31 Dec 2018)

3/ The grants granted in the Calendar year 2019 (1 Jan 2019 to 31 Dec 2019)

The total value of these three spreadsheets was \$1,125,652,603

After I had done the Analysis I was disturbed by some claims in the Budget papers and the actual value of all the Community Development Grants I had analysed. Basically the numbers didn't add up.

I then summarised all of the allocations to the CDG program in MYEFO's and Budgets from 2013-14 to 2019-20.

Below is my analysis.

Further to this, is a claim made in the Budget papers which is also at odds with value of funds allocated in the Department of Infrastructure spreadsheets for CDG (Before 2018) and the Grant Connect spreadsheets downloaded from Grant connect for the 2018 and 2019 years. If the \$2.5 billion figure in the Budget papers and reproduced below is correct, then in an exhaustive search \$1 billion is missing.

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23			
Community Development Grants Program														
Myefo 2013-14	22	160	140	20					Established in this MYEFO.					
Budget 2014 papers		0	0	0	0									
Myefo 2014-15		0	0	0	0	0								
2015 budget papers			10	30	10									
Myefo 2015-16			0	0	0	0	0							
2016 budget					0	0	0	0						
Myefo 2016-17					59.3	222.9	219.2	66.6						
2017 budget						0	0	0	0					
Myefo 2017-18						0	0	0	0					
budget 2018							0	0	0	0				
Myefo 2018-19							2.2	5.5	8.1	17		Additional Projects		
budget 2019								18.7	32.5	19.3	18.8	Additional Projects		
Totals	22	160	150	50	69.3	222.9	221.4	90.8						986.4
Myefo 2018-19 Note.														

Myefo 2018-19 Note

The Government will provide an additional \$177.7 million over five years from 2018-19 to the Community Development Grants Programme for 68 infrastructure projects that support local communities across Australia.

Funding for this measure has already been partially provided for by the Government

One must also look at this pertinent question.

In the 2019-20 budget papers -

https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/statements/2019_2020/ministerial-statement/files/Building-stronger-regional-communities-2019-2020.pdf - it was stated:

“The Community Development Grants Programme (CDG) provides funding for critical projects where the Australian government has identified the need for new or upgraded facilities. Projects range from new sporting facilities, to upgrading community centres and small-scale infrastructure projects. CDG projects have contributed to local economies, created jobs and boosted confidence within a region. Since 2013-2014 the government has provided funding of \$2.5 billion, including for 455 projects from the 2016 election.”

However, only about half of the \$2.5 billion turns up in the GrantConnect site spreadsheets.

Here is my top level analysis of the Community Development grants program from inception to March 2019.

Note. At this point it would be advantageous for the reader to know how the analysis was done.

1/ As discussed before we had created a spreadsheet “master file” which contained all of the localities, Postcodes, electorates, and associated data such as political party sitting in that seat as at 2019, sitting member, Margin won by in 2019.

2/ The data from the Department of Infrastructure website for CDG grants before 1 Jan 2018 was on the Department of Infrastructure web page.

<https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/grants/index.aspx>

These spreadsheets have a lot of data in them including postcode data.

3/ Data from the GrantConnect Government portal is also in spreadsheet format and also contains a lot of data. Including Post code data.

4/ Excel from the Microsoft Office Suite of programs is a very powerful tool and has many functions and formulas that can be applied to analyse data.

5/ In this case I used one of the functions of Excel and one of the formulas available.

6/ The Data filter function.

Where a lot of data is in a column and there are numerous columns with numerous data, it is possible to automatically group each column by using the data filter feature. This I did.

It is then possible to sort the columns and search for specific information.

For example in the Column headed department I went and chose The Department of Infrastructure. So that only Grants programs administered by that department came up. I then went to the Grant

name column and chose the Community Development Grant Program so that only Community Development grants came up.

7/ The Vlookup feature

In this iteration of the spreadsheet I then added 4 new columns named, Electorate, Political Party, Sitting member and margin won by in 2019.

In each cell below the column heading I then used the Vlookup feature of the spreadsheet and referenced the postcode for a particular Dept of Infrastructure, community development grant with my master Spreadsheet, which had all of the post codes and their electorates in it. That formula then returned the electorate that that grant was in to the cell the formula was in.

I was then able to do the same for the other three Columns and then copy those 4 formulas down for the whole of the data set.

Now I could choose each individual Electorate and see how much money was allocated to each individual electorate for the years analyses.

I placed the results in a summary Spreadsheet. (which I have attached).

8/ Using the above methodology I was able to do an analysis of the grants by party and by individual electorate.

The Analysis of the distribution of funds for the Community Development Grants showed the following.

Overall.

Total Spent	\$1,125,652,603		
Total Labor Grants	\$276,136,095	68 seats.	24.53%
Total Coalition Grants	\$779,387,534		69.24%
Total Nationals	\$144,120,360	10 Seats	12.80%
Total LNP	\$226,062,024	23 Seats	20.08%
Liberals	\$409,205,150	44 Seats	36.35%

Hardly exhibiting *proportionality*; or *probity and transparency*;

Distribution of grants by State.

State Totals	Total	Percentage	Total Seats
ACT	\$4,170,462	0.37%	3
New South Wales	\$279,376,059	24.82%	47
Northern Territory	\$48,990,890	4.35%	2
Queensland	\$324,648,783	28.84%	30
South Australia	\$66,906,493	5.94%	10
Tasmania	\$77,912,912	6.92%	5
Victoria	\$202,465,710	17.99%	38
Western Australia	\$121,181,294	10.77%	16
		0.00%	
		0.00%	
Total	\$1,125,652,603	100.00%	

Percentage of Seats per Party per State

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Ind	Nationals
ACT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New South Wales	51%	0%	32%	0%	2%	15%
Northern Territory	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Queensland	20%	77%	0%	0%	3%	0%
South Australia	50%	0%	40%	0%	10%	0%
Tasmania	40%	0%	40%	0%	20%	0%
Victoria	55%	0%	32%	3%	3%	8%
Western Australia	31%	0%	69%	0%	0%	0%

Value per party per state

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Ind	Nationals
ACT	\$4,170,462					
New South Wales	\$62,927,359		\$139,919,040			\$76,529,660
Northern Territory	\$48,990,890					
Queensland	\$58,510,760	\$226,062,024			\$40,075,999	
South Australia	\$13,388,589		\$39,766,904		\$13,751,000	
Tasmania	\$17,065,000		\$55,223,137		\$5,624,775	
Victoria	\$39,583,335		\$84,614,475	\$9,669,000	\$1,008,200	\$67,590,700
Western Australia	\$31,499,700		\$89,681,594			

Percentage by Party by Value by State

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Ind	Nationals
ACT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New South Wales	23%	0%	50%	0%	0%	27%
Northern Territory	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Queensland	18%	70%	0%	0%	12%	0%
South Australia	20%	0%	59%	0%	21%	0%
Tasmania	22%	0%	71%	0%	7%	0%
Victoria	20%	0%	42%	5%	0%	33%
Western Australia	26%	0%	74%	0%	0%	0%

Regional Grants Programs

Following that analysis I then completed an Analysis of Several Regional Grants programs.

Viz.

1/ Building Better Regions Fund Programme - Infrastructure Projects Stream - as at 31 December 2017

2/ Building Better Regions Fund Programme - Community Investments Stream - as at 31 December 2017 (Dept Infrastructure Spreadsheet)

3/ Stronger Communities Programme - as at 31 December 2017 (Dept Infrastructure Spreadsheet)

4/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2018 to 31 Dec 2018 BBRF Infrastructure Stream

5/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2018 to 31 Dec 2018 BBRF Community Investments Stream

6/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2018 to 31 Dec 2018 Stronger communities

7/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2019 to 31 Dec 2019 BBRF Infrastructure stream

8/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2019 to 31 Dec 2019 BBRF Community Investments Stream

9/ Grants connect Spreadsheet 1 Jan 2019 to 31 Dec 2019 Stronger communities

The Total Value of these grants Programs was \$714,563,851.

Here is a Higher level table of the grants analysed.

Total Spent	\$714,563,851	
Labor Totals	\$154,806,633	21.66%
Coalition Totals	\$521,272,641	72.95%
The Nationals	\$129,428,223	18.11%
		with 6.62% of the seats
LNP	\$152,901,935	21.40%

Distribution of grants by State.

State Totals	Total	Percentage
ACT	\$5,024,029	0.70%
New South Wales	\$197,155,406	27.59%
Northern Territory	\$19,904,729	2.79%
Queensland	\$177,146,702	24.79%
South Australia	\$45,979,579	6.43%
Tasmania	\$24,227,581	3.39%
Victoria	\$123,474,149	17.28%
Western Australia	\$121,651,676	17.02%
		0.00%
		0.00%
Total	\$714,563,851	100.00%

Percentage of Seats per Party per State

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Ind	Nationals
ACT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New South Wales	51%	0%	32%	0%	2%	15%
Northern Territory	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Queensland	20%	77%	0%	0%	3%	0%
South Australia	50%	0%	40%	0%	10%	0%
Tasmania	40%	0%	40%	0%	20%	0%
Victoria	55%	0%	32%	3%	3%	8%
Western Australia	31%	0%	69%	0%	0%	0%

Value per party per State.

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Ind	Nationals		
ACT	\$5,024,029							\$5,024,029
New South Wales	\$63,798,957		\$39,440,032		\$373,716	\$93,542,701		\$197,155,406
Northern Territory	\$19,904,729							\$19,904,729
Queensland	\$9,725,108	\$148,101,935			\$19,319,659			\$177,146,702
South Australia	\$4,146,918		\$34,759,453		\$7,073,208			\$45,979,579
Tasmania	\$5,359,617		\$18,037,870		\$830,094			\$24,227,581
Victoria	\$44,681,110		\$27,219,617	\$2,982,103	\$12,705,797	\$35,885,522		\$123,474,149
Western Australia	\$2,166,165		\$119,485,511					\$121,651,676
	\$154,806,633	\$148,101,935	\$238,942,483	\$2,982,103	\$40,302,474	\$129,428,223		714,563,851

Percentage per value per State.

	Labor	LNP	Liberals	Green	Independent	Nationals
ACT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
New South Wales	32%	0%	20%	0%	0%	47%
Northern Territory	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Queensland	5%	84%	0%	0%	11%	0%
South Australia	9%	0%	76%	0%	15%	0%
Tasmania	22%	0%	74%	0%	3%	0%
Victoria	36%		22%	2%	10%	29%
Western Australia	2%	0%	98%	0%	0%	0%
	0%					