SPECIAL MINISTER OF STATE

Answers to Questions on Notice

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: Can I move to tranche seven of the approvals—did you get a briefing note on tranche seven?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I've provided an answer on this. You'll need to check with the program office. I don't believe tranche seven came to me.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: In the papers that we got through the SO 52, there were two documents confirming that you had that brief on 1 December last year, still had it in 2024, and that it's still in the Minister's office. The evidence that we have is that "tranche seven (four projects)", which is still sitting with the Minister, came from your department. It says you did have it.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I would have to take that on notice. I'm very happy to do so. We produce publicly all the documents for this. The Parliament and the public have all the documents in relation to this.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: Well, in relation to that, Minister—

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I'm happy to check the advice on that.

See answer to Legislative Council Question on Notice 3542

he Hon. MARK LATHAM: Minister, for the benefit of the Committee, could you undertake to investigate how, in this list of briefs provided by Alison Morgan and the Premier's Department to your office on 6 November last year, item number 13, the note for the brief for tranche seven, was cancelled? How can that happen? In theory, a brief can't just disappear, can it?

The CHAIR: Exactly.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: No. I've taken that on notice and I'm happy to provide further information. T

he Hon. MARK LATHAM: You'll come back to us?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Absolutely. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: You've said th See answer to Legislative Council Question on Notice 3542

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Things that you're not aware of, I'm assuming you'll undertake to investigate on behalf of the Committee to get to the truth. Are you aware that the

property at Botany Road, Alexandria, is owned privately by a company called Fernari, the principal of which is Brent Maksimovich?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: No.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Why would an allocation be made for a renovation of a kitchen for a property outside the electorate owned by a private company that then gets to own the worth of the renovation?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I don't know the answer to that. I have signed off on a small number of grants outside the electorate, but only where it's been brought to my attention, and only where there's a public purpose to giving money.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Did you sign off on this one?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I would have to take that on notice. I don't recall, but I'd be happy to get more details.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Are you aware that Mr Maksimovich also owns a construction company called Maxim Potential that specialises in the renovation of cafes, restaurants and shops, and one would possibly suspect that he owns the property, and he's doing the work to the value of the \$100,000 taxpayer funds?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: No, I was not aware of that.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Can you undertake to investigate?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, of course.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: If what I've described is accurate, is that within the guidelines of this program?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I should take that on notice, but I'd be happy to investigate the issues you've raised, look at the guidelines and see whether I regard that as appropriate. The detailed merit assessment for this project is found in the document titled Local Small Commitments Allocation Grant Program - Tranche 25 - project eligibility waiver and funding recommendation which was publicly released in November 2024. The merit assessment reads in part:

Benefits:

1. The project will address a high need for vulnerable beneficiaries - homeless people. The benefits are achievable by providing food to vulnerable people. 2. The need is clearly explained, and the project outcomes will meet those needs and benefit the local client group community both now, and also into the future.

Value for Money:

1. Satisfactory: The deliverables are fit for purpose, have a medium utility time, and are capable of achieving the benefits. However, there is a limited co-contribution and investment is in a privately owned business facility and not community or Council owned.

2. The need for this project is well-explained. The project will meet these needs and be an effective, ethical and efficient use of funds. The project will deliver good value for money by supporting the client group and reducing the potential pressure on other Government and NGO service providers.

Deliverability:

1. I note the charity does not own the building it is seeking to renovate and is a tenant. Issuing a grant should be dependent upon an understanding of a medium to long-term lease arrangement. The LSCA Program Office should have some guarantee that Will2Live will be a beneficiary of this grant for some time through medium to long term lease arrangements being in place. This is to ensure that renovations undertaken by Will2Live are not negated by the short-term end of lease, thereby benefiting the property owner rather than the charity deliverables.

2. The applicant is very experienced in this type of service delivery project management. The applicant will engage with appropriate contractors in the project delivery. Special funding conditions recommended by assessor/s or LSCA Program Office Provide an official lease document of a lease greater than 3 years beyond 30 September 2026. he Hon. MARK LATHAM: Will you now talk to the Premier to find out why—they all say, John, of course, that it's only a rort if you're not in it. Now Mr Greenwich is in it, will you

ask the Premier how he got in it?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I've taken on notice the aspects of this that relate to the Local Small Commitments Allocation.

See answer to previous question.