

INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION

Question No.	Question	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	The Commissioner for IBAC submitted business cases as part of the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budgets. DTF is unable to release information relating to these submissions as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditure in each year 	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year) 	Please see table 1 for unused appropriation and 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year 	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year 	<p>Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>IBAC receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also exempt from the General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.

Question No.	Question	DTF response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates.</p> <p>Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	<p>This is an opportunity to establish formal written feedback mechanisms, noting that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p>

Question No.	Question	DTF response
5	What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.
6	Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.

Table 1: Condensed operating statement

	\$ million									
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Income from transactions										
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)	42.195	52.988	54.295	61.984	63.575	
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^(a)	0.610	4.732	1.177	3.343	
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(b)	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	0.023	
Total income from transactions	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	42.302	53.598	59.027	63.161	66.941	
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding	1.1%	8.0%	1.9%	5.0%	
Expenses from transactions										
Employee expenses	22.732	24.539	27.092	30.453	30.632	35.762	38.837	44.324	48.824	
Depreciation and amortisation	2.775	3.225	3.444	5.964	4.477	5.286	5.087	4.778	4.741	
Interest expense	0.032	0.018	0.036	0.539	0.463	0.537	0.349	0.327	0.308	
Other operating expenditure	10.833	11.913	13.1	9.572	10.637	15.470	14.754	13.732	13.068	
Total expenditure	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	46.209	57.056	59.027	63.161	66.941	
Net result from transactions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-3.907	-3.458	0.000	0.000	0.000	

NOTES:

(a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.

(b) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the Financial Management Act 1994

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.480	0.000
Total carryover funding ^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.480	0.000

NOTES:

(a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.

(b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.

(c) All carryover funding is included in the appropriation reflected in Table 1 above and should not be duplicated.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Funding for IBAC: Meeting demand and community expectations	0.3	7.8	8.9	10.1	(np)	(np)
IBAC: Enhancing Complainant Experience and IBAC's Compliance Capability	0.9	0.8
IBAC: Enhancing support provided to the Victorian public sector to prevent corruption and police misconduct	1.3	1.6	1.0
IBAC: Information Technology Strategy	0.6	1.5	0.8	0.3	0.3	(np)
Royal Commission into the Management of Police Informants	0.5	1.4	1.4	1.3	(np)
IBAC: Increase to base operational funding	7.0	7.9	8.6	8.6
Total budget funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.900	12.000	20.500	20.700	10.200	8.600

NOTES:

(a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.

(b) 'np' refers to data that was not published as the financial year was not presented in budget papers.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23 ^(b)	2023-24	2024-25 ^(b)
Implementation of IBAC Information Technology Strategy					0.107				
Additional funding for Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission						0.610			
Funding supplementation for IBAC							4.446		
Development of critical information technology systems and witness welfare programs for IBAC							1.391		
Additional operational funding for IBAC								0.399	
Budget Supplementation for IBAC								0.054	
Budget supplementation for IBAC								0.725	
Integrity Bodies VPS EBA wages funding									2.022
Supporting IBAC's Witness Welfare Program									0.100
Operational supplementation for the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission									1.825
Total Treasurer's Advance funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.107	0.610	5.837	1.178^(c)	3.947

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) Total funding may not align with the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to aggregation of asset and output funding in state financial reports.
- (c) Table may not sum to the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to rounding.

VICTORIAN OMBUDSMAN

Question No.	Question	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	The Ombudsman submitted business cases as part of the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budgets. DTF is unable to release information relating to these submissions, as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	• Total expenditure in each year	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	• Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year)	Please see table 1 for unused appropriation and 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved.
	• Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	• Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year	<p>Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>The Victorian Ombudsman receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also exempt from the General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.</p>
	• Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	• Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing

Question No.	Question	DTF response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	<p>such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p> <p>DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p> <p>DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p> <p>DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates.</p> <p>Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	<p>Formal written feedback mechanisms could be established, however DTF notes that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p> <p>This feedback would be provided to integrity agencies directly, as Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials.</p>

Question No.	Question	DTF response
5	What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.
6	Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.

Table 1: Condensed operating statement

	\$ million								
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Income from transactions									
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)	19.090	18.835	20.177	21.440	21.691
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^(a)	0.996	1.046	2.241	0.756	1.941
Special appropriation	0.516	0.623	0.548	0.769	0.585
Section 29 revenue	0.073	0.177	0.350	0.293	0.157
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(b)	16.488	15.824	18.724	19.313
Total income from transactions	16.488	15.824	18.724	19.313	20.675	20.681	23.316	23.259	24.375
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding	4.8%	5.1%	9.6%	3.3%	8.0%
Expenses from transactions									
Employee expenses	11.530	10.275	12.460	13.048	13.708	14.877	16.866	17.454	18.388
Depreciation and amortisation	0.518	0.573	0.590	0.886	1.516	1.701	1.751	1.715	1.843
Interest expense	..	0.002	..	0.087	0.248	0.305	0.284	0.261	0.237
Other operating expenditure	4.713	4.814	5.700	4.830	4.488	3.921	4.416	3.852	3.922
Total expenditure	16.760	15.663	18.750	18.852	19.960	20.804	23.316	23.282	24.390

Net result from transactions	-0.272	0.161	-0.026	0.461	0.715	-0.123	0.000	-0.024	-0.015
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

NOTES:

- (a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.
- (b) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the Financial Management Act 1994 **\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total carryover funding ^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.
- (b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a) **\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Victorian Ombudsman office relocation	1.5
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office		0.7	5.3	1.0	1.0	1.1	(np)	(np)	(np)	(np)
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office				4.2	4.0	3.6	4.5	(np)	(np)	(np)
Securing a sustainable Ombudsman for Victorians					0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	(np)	(np)
VO: Sustainable base funding for the Victorian Ombudsman						1.8	2.5	3.0	3.5	(np)
Supporting the operations of the Victorian Ombudsman								0.7
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral								0.7
Total budget funding	1.500	0.700	5.300	5.200	5.700	7.200	7.700	5.100	3.500	..

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) 'np' refers to data that was not published as the financial year was not presented in budget papers.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office		0.614							
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office			0.100						
Victorian Ombudsman funding supplementation				2.310					
Additional funding for Victorian Ombudsman					0.715				
Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral Investigation					0.281				
Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral Investigation						0.546			
Ombudsman's legislative mandate						0.500			
Victorian Ombudsman Parliamentary Referral Investigation							1.429		
Budget supplementation for the Victorian Ombudsman							0.812		
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral								0.613	
Additional operational funding for the Victorian Ombudsman								0.144	
Integrity Bodies VPS EBA wages funding									0.759
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral into flood planning decisions at Kensington Banks									0.698
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral into insurance management claims									0.484
Total Treasurer's Advance funding^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.614	0.100	2.310	0.996	1.046	2.241	0.757	1.941

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) Total funding may not align with the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to aggregation of asset and output funding in state financial reports.
- (c) Table may not sum to the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to rounding.

INTEGRITY OVERSIGHT VICTORIA

Question No.	Question	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	The Chief Integrity Inspector submitted business cases as part of the 2025-26 budget process. DTF is unable to release information relating to this submission as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditure in each year 	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year) 	Please see table 1 for unused appropriation and 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year 	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year 	<p>Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>Integrity Oversight Victoria receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also exempt from the General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.

Question No.	Question	DTF response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	DTF will provide a partial response to this question by 17 April, however some of these items may not be able to be provided as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates.</p> <p>Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisations, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	<p>Formal written feedback mechanisms could be established, however DTF notes that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p> <p>This feedback would be provided to integrity agencies directly, as Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials.</p>

Question No.	Question	DTF response
5	What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.
6	Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?	The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.

Table 1: Condensed operating statement

	\$ million									
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Income from transactions										
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)			4.940	5.746	7.733	7.840	7.976	
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^{(a) (b)}	0.209	
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(c)	3.358	3.355	3.633	4.718	0.907	
Total income from transactions	3.358	3.355	3.633	4.718	4.940	5.746	8.640	7.840	8.185	
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding	
Expenses from transactions										
Employee expenses	1.868	2.144	2.503	2.913	2.951	3.538	4.516	4.806	5.403	
Depreciation and amortisation	0.718	0.288	0.215	0.639	0.721	0.748	0.689	0.826	0.700	
Interest expense	0.000	0.001	..	0.033	0.026	0.017	0.009	0.110	0.075	
Other operating expenditure	0.815	0.922	1.039	1.133	1.242	1.444	1.880	1.957	1.563	
Total expenditure	3.400	3.355	3.758	4.718	4.940	5.746	7.094	7.699	7.740	
Net result from transactions	-0.042	0.000	-0.124	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.546	0.142	0.444	

NOTES:

(a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.

(b) Treasurer's Advances were not separately disclosed in IOV's annual report until the 2024-25 financial year. Treasurer's Advance funding shown in Table 4 below is likely represented in IOV's annual appropriations.

(c) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the *Financial Management Act 1994* **\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.029	0.250	0.521	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.109	0.150	0.300	0.000
Total carryover funding ^{(b)(c)}	0.029	0.359	0.671	0.300	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.
- (b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.
- (c) All carryover funding is included in the appropriation reflected in Table 1 above and should not be duplicated.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a) **\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Best practice integrity oversight			0.6	0.6	0.6
Funding for Victorian Inspectorate					1.6	2.1	2.1
Victorian Inspectorate base funding							1.3	4.3	4.6	4.7
Total budget funding	0.000	0.000	0.600	0.600	2.200	2.100	3.400	4.300	4.600	4.700

NOTE:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a) **\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(b)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Victorian Inspectorate resourcing					0.452				
Victorian inspectorate					0.072				
Total Treasurer's Advance funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.524	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) Treasurer's Advances were not separately disclosed in IOV's annual report until the 2024-25 financial year. Treasurer's Advance's shown in Table 4 below are likely represented in IOV's annual appropriations.

INDEPENDENT BROAD-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	1	The Commissioner for IBAC submitted business cases as part of the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budgets. DTF is unable to release information relating to these submissions as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	2	Please see column 'Funding sought' in Table 5 below, which shows the Treasurer's Advances (TA) sought by integrity agencies from 2016-17 to 2025-26.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	1	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditure in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year) 	1 and 2	Please see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 for unused appropriation • Table 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved • Table 5 for unused TA funding (this can be found by comparing information in columns 'Funding approved' and 'Actual drawdown').
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year 	1	Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> . IBAC receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also exempt from the	

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
			General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	<p>Please see columns 'Funding sought' and 'Funding approved' in Table 5 below, which show where the Treasurer has not approved, or approved less than, funding requested by integrity agencies.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	Same as above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. Initiative titles provide a high-level rationale for the funding request.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. The Treasurer approves funding on a case-by-case basis, based on the information provided by integrity agencies and the priorities of the Government.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	2	DTF is not aware of any unfunded out-of-cycle funding requests relating to delivering investigations.

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	1	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates. Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>. Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	1	<p>This is an opportunity to establish formal written feedback mechanisms, noting that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p>
5	<p>What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>
6	<p>Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>

Table 1: Condensed operating statement**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Income from transactions									
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)	42.195	52.988	54.295	61.984	63.575
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^(a)	0.610	4.732	1.177	3.343
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(b)	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	0.023
Total income from transactions	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	42.302	53.598	59.027	63.161	66.941
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding	1.1%	8.0%	1.9%	5.0%
Expenses from transactions									
Employee expenses	22.732	24.539	27.092	30.453	30.632	35.762	38.837	44.324	48.824
Depreciation and amortisation	2.775	3.225	3.444	5.964	4.477	5.286	5.087	4.778	4.741
Interest expense	0.032	0.018	0.036	0.539	0.463	0.537	0.349	0.327	0.308
Other operating expenditure	10.833	11.913	13.1	9.572	10.637	15.470	14.754	13.732	13.068
Total expenditure	36.372	39.695	43.672	46.528	46.209	57.056	59.027	63.161	66.941
Net result from transactions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-3.907	-3.458	0.000	0.000	0.000

NOTES:

(a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.

(b) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the Financial Management Act 1994**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.480	0.000
Total carryover funding ^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.480	0.000

NOTES:

(a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.

(b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.

(c) All carryover funding is included in the appropriation reflected in Table 1 above and should not be duplicated.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a)**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Funding for IBAC: Meeting demand and community expectations	0.3	7.8	8.9	10.1	(np)	(np)
IBAC: Enhancing Complainant Experience and IBAC's Compliance Capability	0.9	0.8
IBAC: Enhancing support provided to the Victorian public sector to prevent corruption and police misconduct	1.3	1.6	1.0
IBAC: Information Technology Strategy	0.6	1.5	0.8	0.3	0.3	(np)
Royal Commission into the Management of Police Informants	0.5	1.4	1.4	1.3	(np)
IBAC: Increase to base operational funding	7.0	7.9	8.6	8.6
Total budget funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.900	12.000	20.500	20.700	10.200	8.600

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) 'np' refers to data that was not published as the financial year was not presented in budget papers.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23 ^(b)	2023-24	2024-25 ^(b)
Implementation of IBAC Information Technology Strategy					0.107				
Additional funding for Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission						0.610			
Funding supplementation for IBAC							4.446		
Development of critical information technology systems and witness welfare programs for IBAC							1.391		
Additional operational funding for IBAC								0.399	
Budget Supplementation for IBAC								0.054	
Budget supplementation for IBAC								0.725	
Integrity Bodies VPS EBA wages funding									2.022
Supporting IBAC's Witness Welfare Program									0.100
Operational supplementation for the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission									1.825
Total Treasurer's Advance funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.107	0.610	5.837	1.178^(c)	3.947

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) Total funding may not align with the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to aggregation of asset and output funding in state financial reports.
- (c) Table may not sum to the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to rounding.

Table 5: Treasurer's Advances (including items unpublished and funding unused)

\$ million

Treasurer's Advances ^(a)	Financial year	Funding sought	Funding approved	Actual drawdown ^(b)
IBAC Commissioner's salary gap	2024-25	0.341	0.341	0.341
Witness Liaison Program/ Witness Welfare Support	2024-25	0.100	0.100	0.100
IBAC Office Relocation - Make good of existing building (459 Collins St)	2024-25	0.880	0.880	0.880
Lump sum one-off cash payment – 2024 VPS EBA	2024-25	1.752	1.752	1.752
3 per cent wages uplift – 2024 VPS EBA	2024-25	0.271	0.271	0.271
Capital expenditure	2024-25	0.604	0.604	0.604
Treasurers Advance reinstatement from 2022-23 to 2023-24	2023-24	0.725	0.725	0.725
COVID Debt Levy supplementation	2023-24	0.464	0.464	0.399
Budget supplementation for IBAC	2023-24	0.054	0.054	0.054
TA reinstatement of 2021-22 for IBAC operations	2022-23	1.391	1.391	1.391
Additional funding for IBAC	2022-23	0.740	0.740	0.740
Mental health wellbeing surcharge supplementation	2022-23	0.205	0.205	0.205
Increase to base operational funding	2022-23	7.002	7.002	3.502
Additional funding for IBAC	2021-22	7.004	7.004	0.610
IBAC Base Review	2021-22	0.500	0.500	0.000
Increase in IBAC's office lease funding	2021-22	0.522	0.522	0.000
Implementation of IBAC Information Technology Strategy	2020-21	0.107	0.107	0.107
IBAC	2017-18	0.500	0.500	0.000
IBAC	2016-17	0.500	0.500	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Output Treasurer's Advances (TA) may be combined with capital TAs, consistent with Victorian Annual Financial Report (AFR) disclosures. Table may include initiatives omitted from DTF's Tranche 1 response due to ambiguous disclosure titles. Requests made under sections 29, 30, 32 or 33 of the Financial Management Act 1994 have been omitted from this exercise.
- (b) 'Actual drawdown' is derived from the AFR TA disclosure, as shown in section 'Payments from advance to the Treasurer'.

INTEGRITY OVERSIGHT VICTORIA

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	1	The Chief Integrity Inspector submitted business cases as part of the 2025-26 budget process. DTF is unable to release information relating to this submission as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	2	Please see column 'Funding sought' in Table 5 below, which shows the Treasurer's Advances (TA) sought by integrity agencies from 2016-17 to 2025-26. This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	1	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditure in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year) 	1 and 2	Please see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 for unused appropriation • Table 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved • Table 5 for unused TA funding (this can be found by comparing information in columns 'Funding approved' and 'Actual drawdown').
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year 	1	Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> . Integrity Oversight Victoria receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also	

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
			exempt from the General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	<p>Please see columns 'Funding sought' and 'Funding approved' in Table 5 below, which show where the Treasurer has not approved, or approved less than, funding requested by integrity agencies.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	Same as above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. Initiative titles provide a high-level rationale for the funding request.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. The Treasurer approves funding on a case-by-case basis, based on the information provided by integrity agencies and the priorities of government.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	2	DTF is not aware of any unfunded out-of-cycle funding requests to deliver investigations.

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	1	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates. Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>. Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	1	<p>This is an opportunity to establish formal written feedback mechanisms, noting that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p>
5	<p>What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>
6	<p>Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>

Table 1: Condensed operating statement**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Income from transactions									
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)			4.940	5.746	7.733	7.840	7.976
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^{(a) (b)}	0.209
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(c)	3.358	3.355	3.633	4.718	0.907
Total income from transactions	3.358	3.355	3.633	4.718	4.940	5.746	8.640	7.840	8.185
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding
Expenses from transactions									
Employee expenses	1.868	2.144	2.503	2.913	2.951	3.538	4.516	4.806	5.403
Depreciation and amortisation	0.718	0.288	0.215	0.639	0.721	0.748	0.689	0.826	0.700
Interest expense	0.000	0.001	..	0.033	0.026	0.017	0.009	0.110	0.075
Other operating expenditure	0.815	0.922	1.039	1.133	1.242	1.444	1.880	1.957	1.563
Total expenditure	3.400	3.355	3.758	4.718	4.940	5.746	7.094	7.699	7.740
Net result from transactions	-0.042	0.000	-0.124	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.546	0.142	0.444

NOTES:

- (a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.
- (b) Treasurer's Advances were not separately disclosed in IOV's annual report until the 2024-25 financial year. Treasurer's Advance funding shown in Table 4 below is likely represented in IOV's annual appropriations.
- (c) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the Financial Management Act 1994**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.029	0.250	0.521	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.109	0.150	0.300	0.000
Total carryover funding^{(b)(c)}	0.029	0.359	0.671	0.300	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.
- (b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.
- (c) All carryover funding is included in the appropriation reflected in Table 1 above and should not be duplicated.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a)**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Best practice integrity oversight			0.6	0.6	0.6
Funding for Victorian Inspectorate					1.6	2.1	2.1
Victorian Inspectorate base funding							1.3	4.3	4.6	4.7
Total budget funding	0.000	0.000	0.600	0.600	2.200	2.100	3.400	4.300	4.600	4.700

NOTE:

(a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a)**\$ million**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(b)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Victorian Inspectorate resourcing				0.452					
Victorian inspectorate				0.072					
Total Treasurer's Advance funding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.524	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

NOTES:

(a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.

(b) Treasurer's Advances were not separately disclosed in IOV's annual report until the 2024-25 financial year. Treasurer's Advance's shown in Table 4 below are likely represented in IOV's annual appropriations.

Table 5: Treasurer's Advances (including items unpublished and funding unused)

\$ million

Treasurer's Advances^(a)	Financial year	Funding sought	Funding approved	Actual drawdown^(b)
Provision of outputs				
Funding supporting Enterprise Agreement for incremental wage indexation	2024-25	0.028	0.028	0.028
Funding supporting Enterprise Agreement for one off lump sum payment	2024-25	0.181	0.181	0.181
TA reinstatement for the Victorian Inspectorate	2020-21	0.222	0.222	0.000
Urgent TA for Victorian Inspectorate	2019-20	0.745	0.745	0.452
Best practice integrity oversight	2019-20	0.554	0.554	0.094
Best practice integrity oversight	2018-19	0.554	0.554	0.000
Additions to net asset base				
TA reinstatement for capital program	2020-21	0.406	0.406	0.000
VI's Case Management System - TA reinstatement	2019-20	0.431	0.431	0.000

NOTES:

- (a) Output Treasurer's Advances (TA) may be combined with capital TAs, consistent with Victorian Annual Financial Report (AFR) disclosures. Table may include initiatives omitted from DTF's Tranche 1 response due to ambiguous disclosure titles. Requests made under sections 29, 30, 32 or 33 of the Financial Management Act 1994 have been omitted from this exercise.
- (b) 'Actual drawdown' is derived from the AFR TA disclosure, as shown in section 'Payments from advance to the Treasurer'.

VICTORIAN OMBUDSMAN

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
1	What budget bids have been made to DTF by the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC), the Victorian Ombudsman (VO) and Integrity Oversight Victoria (IOV) during the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budget development cycles? What funding have these integrity agencies been granted for the 2026-27 financial year?	1	The Ombudsman submitted business cases as part of the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 budgets. DTF is unable to release information relating to these submissions, as it expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
2	Please provide data and/or commentary on the Victorian integrity agencies' budgets, budget bids, and any additional funding requests for the financial years 2016-2017 through 2025-26 (inclusive). Where available, please provide the following:	2	Please see column 'Funding sought' in Table 5 below, which shows the Treasurer's Advances (TA) sought by integrity agencies from 2016-17 to 2025-26. This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget sought, with specific amounts sought through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge/supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual funding approved, with specific amounts received through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual appropriation (output and capital) • Surge supplementary funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advances) 	1	Please see tables 3 and 4 below for a breakdown of publicly available information, sourced from end-of-year financial reports and budget papers. DTF notes that unpublished funding or funding that was published under another entity may not be included in this list.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditure in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unused appropriation amounts (including any amounts approved for carryover in each year) 	1 and 2	Please see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 for unused appropriation • Table 2 for a breakdown of the carryover funding approved • Table 5 for unused TA funding (this can be found by comparing information in columns 'Funding approved' and 'Actual drawdown').
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual supplementation of base funding – percentage and dollar amount of supplementation in each year 	1	Please see table 1 for a breakdown of this information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process and/or formula used to determine annual adjustments (supplementation) to agency base funding each year 	1	Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> . The Victorian Ombudsman receives full indexation of 2.5 per cent each year on its recurrent budget to manage cost pressures. The organisation is also	

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
			exempt from the General Efficiency Dividend, which is an annual saving placed on all departments to ensure that they are operating efficiently.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which funding was sought but not received, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	<p>Please see columns 'Funding sought' and 'Funding approved' in Table 5 below, which show where the Treasurer has not approved, or approved less than, funding requested by integrity agencies.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives which received a different amount of funding than what was sought, including specific amount(s) sought 	2	Same as above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of any initiatives for which surge/supplemental funding was sought and the reasons for which it was sought 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. Initiative titles provide a high-level rationale for the funding request.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all funding requests, any reasons given for differences between funding sought and received 	2	<p>Please see Table 5 for the list of funding requests made outside of the general budget process. The Treasurer approves funding on a case-by-case basis, based on the information provided by integrity agencies and the priorities of government.</p> <p>This information is limited to TAs or new appropriation sought outside of annual budget processes. DTF is unable to release information relating to funding requested as part of budget processes, as DTF expects that in providing such information, DTF would reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes of Cabinet.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If appropriate, please provide examples of unfunded investigations or other activities. 	2	DTF is not aware of any unfunded out-of-cycle funding requests to deliver investigations.

Question No.	Question	Tranche	DTF response
3	<p>Please describe the annual budget development process through which you engage with IBAC, the VO and IOV. In particular, please highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative requirements and policy principles by which integrity agencies' budget proposals are assessed • Consultation points with integrity agencies and other stakeholders • Feedback mechanisms on integrity agencies' budget proposals. 	1	<p>DTF often offers multiple rounds of feedback to integrity bodies on their budget submissions before final lodgement to ensure their bids are consistently presented and adhere to established budget templates. Integrity agencies are requested to lodge their budget submissions through an online portal managed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Funding requests are assessed in line with the needs of the organisation, priorities and commitments of government (including fiscal capacity) and the requirements set out under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i>. Following the Budget and Finance Committee's consideration of business cases, agencies are notified of budget outcomes via the communication of decision minutes sent by DTF. Representatives may reach out to their DTF counterparts if they have any questions or concerns with the information provided.</p> <p>DTF could provide additional feedback if requested, however this feedback would be limited to the quality of the business case or the budget-related information provided by the agency during the budget process.</p>
4	<p>In their February 2026 joint paper with the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Advancing budget transparency for Victoria's core integrity agencies, IBAC and the VO seek formal written and verbal debrief mechanisms for providing feedback on budget outcomes. Are there opportunities to establish such feedback mechanisms? What would they look like?</p>	1	<p>This is an opportunity to establish formal written feedback mechanisms, noting that the feedback would be specific to the quality of the business case(s) submitted, as DTF could not reveal, directly or indirectly, the deliberative processes and considerations of Cabinet.</p>
5	<p>What opportunities are there to build additional Parliamentary oversight or consultation into the budget development process in relation to integrity agencies?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>
6	<p>Under legislation IBAC's, the VO's and IOV's annual budgets are to be determined each financial year in consultation with the Integrity and Oversight Committee (Committee). However, in practice this has not occurred due to constraints around sharing Cabinet-in-Confidence materials during the budget development process. How could these constraints be managed so that the Committee could provide oversight during budget development as required by legislation?</p>	1	<p>The Parliamentary Integrity Oversight Committee may choose to work with integrity agencies in relation to their budget priorities. As Parliamentary committees may not be privy to Cabinet in Confidence materials, it is unlikely that this Committee could be involved in the development of business cases.</p>

Table 1: Condensed operating statement

	\$ million								
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Income from transactions									
Annual appropriation (Provision of Outputs)	19.090	18.835	20.177	21.440	21.691
Supplementation (Advance from Treasurer) ^(a)	0.996	1.046	2.241	0.756	1.941
Special appropriation	0.516	0.623	0.548	0.769	0.585
Section 29 revenue	0.073	0.177	0.350	0.293	0.157
Other income (including grants from portfolio departments) ^(b)	16.488	15.824	18.724	19.313
Total income from transactions	16.488	15.824	18.724	19.313	20.675	20.681	23.316	23.259	24.375
Supplementation as a percentage of total funding	4.8%	5.1%	9.6%	3.3%	8.0%
Expenses from transactions									
Employee expenses	11.530	10.275	12.460	13.048	13.708	14.877	16.866	17.454	18.388
Depreciation and amortisation	0.518	0.573	0.590	0.886	1.516	1.701	1.751	1.715	1.843
Interest expense	..	0.002	..	0.087	0.248	0.305	0.284	0.261	0.237
Other operating expenditure	4.713	4.814	5.700	4.830	4.488	3.921	4.416	3.852	3.922
Total expenditure	16.760	15.663	18.750	18.852	19.960	20.804	23.316	23.282	24.390
Net result from transactions	-0.272	0.161	-0.026	0.461	0.715	-0.123	0.000	-0.024	-0.015

NOTES:

(a) Supplementary funding may include routine payments provided to offset the cost of enterprise bargaining agreements, new state levies or other administrative expenses.

(b) Integrity agencies became budget independent on 1 July 2020. Prior to budget independence, these agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC), which included Section 29 revenue, Treasurer's Advances and special appropriations. As such, these revenues have not been separately identified prior to 2020-21 and are reflected in the 'other income' line.

Table 2: Carryover under Section 32 of the Financial Management Act 1994

	\$ million								
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ^(a)	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Provision of outputs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Additions to net asset base	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total carryover funding ^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

NOTES:

(a) Prior to budget independence on 1 July 2020, integrity agencies received funding via grants from portfolio department DPC. Carryover is not applicable to non-appropriation entities, therefore integrity agencies could not carryover unspent appropriation from a previous financial year.

(b) Funding shown reflects unused appropriation from the previous financial year that was carried over into the current year.

Table 3: Appropriation as published in annual budget papers^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Victorian Ombudsman office relocation	1.5
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office		0.7	5.3	1.0	1.0	1.1	(np)	(np)	(np)	(np)
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office				4.2	4.0	3.6	4.5	(np)	(np)	(np)
Securing a sustainable Ombudsman for Victorians					0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	(np)	(np)
VO: Sustainable base funding for the Victorian Ombudsman						1.8	2.5	3.0	3.5	(np)
Supporting the operations of the Victorian Ombudsman								0.7
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral								0.7
Total budget funding	1.500	0.700	5.300	5.200	5.700	7.200	7.700	5.100	3.500	..

NOTES:

(a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in budget papers due to the timing in which the funding is provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.

(b) 'np' refers to data that was not published as the financial year was not presented in budget papers.

Table 4: Treasurer's Advances as published under annual end of year financial reports^(a)

\$ million

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office		0.614							
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office			0.100						
Victorian Ombudsman funding supplementation				2.310					
Additional funding for Victorian Ombudsman					0.715				
Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral Investigation					0.281				
Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral Investigation						0.546			
Ombudsman's legislative mandate						0.500			
Victorian Ombudsman Parliamentary Referral Investigation							1.429		
Budget supplementation for the Victorian Ombudsman							0.812		
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral								0.613	
Additional operational funding for the Victorian Ombudsman								0.144	
Integrity Bodies VPS EBA wages funding									0.759
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral into flood planning decisions at Kensington Banks									0.698
Supporting the Victorian Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral into insurance management claims									0.484
Total Treasurer's Advance funding^{(b)(c)}	0.000	0.614	0.100	2.310	0.996	1.046	2.241	0.757	1.941

NOTES:

- (a) Treasurer's Advances may also appear in the budget funding shown in Table 3 due to the timing in which the is funding provided. These disclosures should be considered as one to avoid duplication.
- (b) Total funding may not align with the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to aggregation of asset and output funding in state financial reports.
- (c) Table may not sum to the Treasurer's Advances shown in Table 1 due to rounding.

Table 5: Treasurer's Advances (including items unpublished and funding unused)
\$ million

Treasurer's Advances ^(a)	Financial year	Funding sought	Funding approved	Actual drawdown ^(b)
Addressing cyber security and information management risk	2025-26	0.479	0.000	0.000
Addressing the VI findings and the IOC performance audit compliance deficiencies.	2024-25	1.389	0.000	0.000
Parliamentary Referral an investigation pursuant to Section 16 of the Ombudsman Act 1973 - Flood planning decisions at Kensington Banks 900,000	2024-25	0.900	0.900	0.698
Parliamentary Referral an investigation pursuant to Section 16 of the Ombudsman Act 1973 - Victorian Managed Insurance Authority management of Domestic Building Insurance claims	2024-25	0.675	0.675	0.484
Lump sum one-off cash payment and 3 per cent wages uplift – 2024 VPS EBA	2024-25	0.760	0.760	0.760
COVID Debt Levy	2023-24	0.149	0.149	0.143
Parliamentary Referral into the alleged serious misconduct and corruption involving Victorian public officers.	2023-24	0.613	0.613	0.613
Parliamentary referral into the alleged politicisation of the Victorian Public Service	2022-23	1.500	1.500	1.429
Budget supplementation for the Victorian Ombudsman	2022-23	0.700	0.700	0.812
Mental health wellbeing surcharge	2022-23	0.585	0.585	0.000
Executing the VO's legislative mandate	2021-22	1.330	1.330	0.500
Parliamentary Referral an investigation pursuant to Section 16 of the Ombudsman Act 1973 and the Crimes Act 1958 relating to alleged serious misconduct and corruption involving Victorian public officers.	2021-22	0.550	0.550	0.546
Ombudsman's Parliamentary Referral Investigation	2020-21	0.281	0.281	0.281
Victorian Ombudsman funding needs 2020-21	2020-21	1.209	1.209	0.715
Delivering on legislative amendments to the Ombudsman Act 1973 (Victoria), and prepare for budgetary independence prior to 1 July 2020	2019-20	3.519	3.519	2.310
Funding to the Ombudsman's Office	2018-19	0.100	0.100	0.100
VO - Funding to the Ombudsman's office	2017-18	0.714	0.714	0.614

NOTES:

- (a) Output Treasurer's Advances (TA) may be combined with capital TAs, consistent with Victorian Annual Financial Report (AFR) disclosures. Table may include initiatives omitted from DTF's Tranche 1 response due to ambiguous disclosure titles. Requests made under sections 29, 30, 32 or 33 of the Financial Management Act 1994 have been omitted from this exercise.
- (b) 'Actual drawdown' is derived from the AFR TA disclosure, as shown in section 'Payments from advance to the Treasurer'.