



General Feedback for applicants

2025 round of the Anzac Day Trust Fund, Stream B

(Updated June 2026 for distribution to prospective applicants in 2026 round)

- The 2025 Stream B grant round was **highly competitive**, with over \$4.2 million in funding requested across all applications and only up to \$1.2 million available. Even applicants who were successful did not always receive the full amount requested or funding for all proposed activities.
- Some applications lacked **sufficient detail** in their narrative, with rationales or proposed activity descriptions that were either overly generic or not specific enough. Applications that outlined a proposed activity briefly with only one or two sentences were less competitive than applications that described each proposed activity in detail (with a full description of the activity, including how it would be successfully delivered, how many beneficiaries would benefit, the demographics of the beneficiaries, and the welfare outcomes of the activity). Applications that focused on one or two key activities with detailed descriptions and justifications were stronger than those that tried to cover a long list of activities with low detail for each.
- In some cases, there was a **lack of cohesion** between the "needs" section and the "proposed activities" section. Good applications successfully built a case for their proposal by describing the relevant needs in detail, then explaining the proposed activities and how they would address these needs.
- Several applicants provided a general list of their organisation's current activities instead of clearly identifying and addressing the **specific needs** of their members. Each need should be outlined individually, with detailed explanations. The needs (rationale) section should explain why there is a need for the activity being proposed in your application.
- **Stronger applications included data** to support their narratives. For example, they provided specific metrics such as the number of claims submitted in the past 12 months, the average number of beneficiaries attending monthly activities, the number of hospital visits conducted, the number of emergency food vouchers given out, waiting lists for services, or the projected number of beneficiaries for a new program. Data should be included in both the needs section and the proposed activities section to demonstrate the volume of needs and potential benefits.
- Applications with a focus on **long-term outcomes** were more competitive than those that focused solely on short-term outcomes.



- In some cases, budgets lacked sufficient detail and **cost breakdowns**, making it challenging to evaluate value for money or determine whether the project was well-planned. For example, if an event is proposed, the budget should break down costs such as venue hire, technology and equipment, insurance, catering, and other relevant expenses, rather than one combined line item for the whole event. These details can be included in the budget table as separate line items or notes, in the Additional Information Notes section of the budget, or as a separate attached document, if necessary.
- If an applicant is proposing to purchase a piece of equipment, the provision of a **quote** is beneficial. The quote should be from an independent source. If the application proposes to use contracted services or providers, a quote or explanation of how the cost was estimated is also beneficial.
- **Budget line items** that were not adequately justified in the narrative were not considered for funding. To be considered for funding, each line item must be linked to an identified need and explained as part of the proposed activities.
- If **administrative costs** are included, they must be explicitly tied to the delivery of programs, services, or activities that directly support welfare outcomes. General operational expenses for the organisation (for example, audit or accounting fees, or fundraising costs) are not eligible for funding under Stream B.
- If the organisation delivers services **State-wide, or in multiple locations**, information for each location should be provided, e.g. number of beneficiaries, demographics, the unique/specific services that will be provided in each location, and how it will be successfully delivered. If services will be delivered online or to beneficiaries from diverse locations rather than from a specific member-base, information on how clients will be identified or reached should be provided.
- For services or activities that have been delivered in the past, it is highly recommended the applicant provide **insights into any changes, improvements, expansions, or new elements** that will be introduced using ADTF grant funding. Applications for 'business as usual' activities were generally less competitive.
- With a limited pool of funding, part of the assessment of need and capacity looked at the **resources already available** to the applicant organisation. For the 2026 round, a new question has been added under Need/Rationale, for organisations with an annual income of over \$1 million income to explain why they are seeking ADTF funding rather than using their own available resources.