

Multi-Sport Community Facility Fund

Feedback for applicants 2021-2022



Please note the feedback is not comprehensive, and is intended to provide assistance to applicants to identify strengths and shortfalls of their application however all points may not be relevant to your application.

The Office of Sport is not able to provide feedback that is specific to your application and encourages all applicants who wish to reapply for MSCFF 22/23 to consider the feedback below when completing their application.

Merit criterion 1: Strategic justification

Applications that scored well against this criterion may have:

- Clearly demonstrated that the project will cater for more than one sport and/or will build partnerships with other sporting codes/user groups
- Provided clear analysis (with supporting evidence) showing the project will lead to additional participation and program content/scheduling for a range of user groups including women and girls, people with disability, First Nations peoples and people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities
- Provided a clearly completed Facility Usage Schedule demonstrating increased participation as a result of the project, which was realistic based on project/activities proposed
- Clearly demonstrated alignment to NSW Government priorities, Federal sport policies, Community Strategic Plans, NSO/SSO strategies, other strategies and plans
- Provided clear evidence that the project had undertaken stakeholder consultation and/or was based on demonstrated community need

Shortfalls against this criterion may have included:

- Inability to clearly demonstrate that the project will benefit multiple sports and/or build partnerships with other sporting codes/user groups
- A Facility Usage Schedule that was incorrectly completed or incomplete
- Projects that had not demonstrated consultation and/or partnerships with other key facility users
- A lack of evidence (including letters of support and other attachments) of stakeholder consultation and/or community need

Merit criterion 2: Project scope and inclusive design

Applications that scored well against this criterion may have:

- Provided a clear scope of works supported by clear documentation (such as facility brief, master plan, schematic, concept or detailed design plans) that was sufficient for the size and complexity of the project
- Demonstrated that the project elements of the facility design and physical environment specifically cater to female users, and that this was informed through consultation or evidence (which was provided)
- Demonstrated clearly that the project incorporated design principles and best practice approaches outlined in the Fund guidelines

Shortfalls against this criterion may have included:

- Scope that was unclear and/or did not sufficiently detail interactions with existing facilities or infrastructure projects at the project site
- Inconsistent scope across application, business case, and/or supporting documentation
- The absence of sufficient supporting documentation clearly demonstrating the project scope and/or with sufficient detail to identify any risks or issues for project delivery
- Inclusion of ineligible scope items

Merit criterion 3: Project affordability

Applications that scored well may have:

- Provided a detailed budget including project costs and which clearly explained the project components that will be funded by the grant and the components to be funded by the applicant.
- Presented clear evidence the financial co-contribution is confirmed for the project.
- Provided supporting evidence (such as cost plan, QS report, quotes etc) demonstrating robust and recent itemised cost planning plus appropriate inclusion of contingency and escalation costs.
- Identified all partners and presented a clear strategy to fund and manage ongoing operations (including routine and lifecycle costs and allowing for ongoing operating and maintenance requirements), and where necessary provided supporting evidence of partner understanding and commitment to this strategy.

Shortfalls against this criterion may have included:

- A budget that was incomplete and/or lacking in sufficient detail
- A budget that was not consistent with figures in the application form and/or supporting cost evidence and/or business case.
- No supporting evidence demonstrating cost planning or cost planning provided was of a poor quality (not current/undated/did not align to project scope etc)
- Insufficient evidence of financial co-contribution(s) and/or evidence that the financial co-contribution(s) were unconfirmed
- Did not include sufficient evidence of a strategy to fund and manage ongoing operations and/or sufficient evidence stakeholders identified as responsible were aware and supported this strategy

Merit criterion 4: Project deliverability and applicant capability

Applications that scored well may have:

- Included project timeframes (with supporting evidence such as detailed project plan, timeline, designs etc) that were within timeframe requirements in Fund guidelines
- Demonstrated DA approval and/or that a DA was not required (such as through a letter from Council that showed clear understanding of project scope and confirmed that a DA was not required)
- Demonstrated a clear delivery strategy (such as through a clear project plan and/or clear agreement with a partner delivery organisation)
- Demonstrated that the delivery organisation has proven experience in delivering similar size projects (such as evidence of project management resources and/or specialist external resources to be engaged to deliver the project).
- Included clear risk management, project management and procurement plans and/or strategies that were sufficient to the scale and complexity of the project

Shortfalls against this criterion may have included:

- Included a project timeline that did not meet Fund guidelines (projects to commence construction in 2022 and be completed by 30 June 2025)
- Provided unclear or insufficient evidence the project had DA approval and/or did not require a DA
- Not included a clear delivery strategy or a delivery strategy that was incomplete and/or unconfirmed by key stakeholders
- Not included clear risk management, project management and procurement plans or plans that were incomplete or insufficient for the scale and complexity of the project

For more information

Questions about the Fund can be emailed to infrastructuregrants@sport.nsw.gov.au or visit the [Multi-Sport Community Facility Fund 2021-22 recipient web page](#).