

## Questions to the Department of Home Affairs

Request for comment sent on 10 July 2026

Hi [name removed for privacy],

Thank you for your email.

We have reviewed the Senate Estimates transcript and have attached a copy for reference. The relevant line of questioning begins on page 75.

We have several follow-up questions arising from the Department's responses:

1. When questioned by Senator Shoebridge regarding the process used to determine the quantum of the \$124 million funding package for the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), Mr Warnes stated: "There was a further request made of the \$102 million." When Senator Shoebridge asked, "What was the assessment that landed with the figure? Or is the answer, 'That's what was requested'?", Mr Warnes replied: "That's correct. That's what was requested and identified, as required for security funding, by the Executive Council of Australian Jewry."

**Could the Department clarify what assessment process was undertaken to determine the amount of funding awarded? Specifically:**

- **To what extent was the funding amount based on ECAJ's request as opposed to an assessment conducted by the Department or government?**
- **Could the Department provide a copy of the grant guidelines, assessment criteria and any other program documentation governing the grants awarded to ECAJ?**

2. During the hearing, Ms Dyde stated that: "ECAJ have a grants administrator that runs the application process and a board that considers all applications." We have been informed that ECAJ has engaged consulting firm Advisen to administer and assess grant applications.

**Can the Department confirm:**

- **Whether it is aware of ECAJ's engagement of Advisen;**
- **Whether the Department approved or otherwise reviewed this arrangement;**
- **What oversight the Department has of Advisen's role in the administration of public funds; and**
- **How much grant funding has been spent on administration, consulting or advisory fees, including payments to Advisen?**

3. When asked why grants were awarded to an ACT incorporated association with limited reporting requirements, Ms Dyde responded "That is the corporate entity that represents ECAJ as the peak body, and so that is the organisation that was eligible for funding. It's not charitable funding; it's not tax deductible funding; it's operational security funding. So they were the appropriate entity to receive that funding to distribute it as the peak body."

ECAJ has an ASIC registered entity called The Trustee For ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund (ABN: 65 692 477 584).

**Why were the funds distributed to ECAJ's ACT incorporated association rather than its ASIC-registered entity? Given the significant value of the grants, would it have been more appropriate to distribute the funding to an ASIC-regulated company with mandatory reporting requirements?**

4. During the hearing, Senator Shoebridge raised concerns that organisations which may have disagreements with ECAJ could perceive the grant process as a "hostile environment". Ms Foster responded that "ECAJ is recognised as a peak Jewish organisation; and yes, that is the decision that was made by government to set up the grants in that way."

**What steps has the Department taken to ensure organisations that are not affiliated with ECAJ, or which may hold differing views from ECAJ, are able to access funding through a process that is independent, transparent and free from actual or perceived conflicts of interest?**

**Additionally, does the Department maintain any reporting regarding:**

- The number of organisations that have applied for funding through ECAJ;
- The number of successful and unsuccessful applications;
- The value of grants awarded; and
- Any complaints, disputes or reviews relating to funding decisions?

**If so, will this information be made public?**

*Department's response*

"The Department does not have any additional information to provide beyond statements made during estimates, which can be accessed via [2026-27 Budget estimates – Parliament of Australia](#)."

Request for comment sent on 20 May 2026

Dear Department of Home Affairs media team,

We are preparing an article regarding grants awarded by the Department to the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (EJAC).

On 22 April 2026 the Department awarded a [grant of \\$112.2 million](#) to the Executive Council of Australian Jewry for the purpose of “enhancing security for Jewish communities”.

In addition, on 13 November 2023 the Department [awarded a separate grant](#) to ECAJ initially valued at \$27.5 million. The value of that grant has subsequently been amended multiple times, most recently on 30 March 2026, and is now listed as \$63.8 million.

The grants were awarded to an ACT incorporated association rather than the ACNC-registered charity associated with the organisation. The incorporated association’s details are as follows:

- Name: Executive Council Of Australian Jewry
- ABN: 17 162 489 951
- Association number: A04520

We seek the Department’s response to the following questions:

1. Are these grants separate from, or inclusive of, the \$124 million in funding awarded to EJAC announced in the [federal budget](#) last week?
2. Why was the grant awarded to the ACT incorporated association rather than the ACNC-registered charity, [The Trustee For ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund](#)?
3. Given ACT incorporated associations are [not required to lodge audited financial statements](#), what due diligence and oversight processes did the Department undertake before awarding the grant?
4. Does the Department believe it is appropriate to award such a significant amount of grant money to an organisation that is not regulated by the ACNC or ASIC?
5. Has the Department conducted any risk assessment regarding ECAJ's governance, financial controls or operational capacity? If so, what were the findings?
6. Could you please provide details of the specific activities, programs or security measures the funding will be used for?
7. Does the grant permit funding to be used for lobbying, advocacy, legal activities or public communications, or is it strictly limited to physical security and related measures?
8. What reporting, auditing or other compliance requirements have been imposed as conditions of the grant?
9. What mechanisms has the Department implemented to ensure the funding is used solely for the approved purposes?
10. Is any portion of the funding intended to be distributed onward to third-party organisations? If so, what oversight arrangements apply to those distributions?

11. Was the grant awarded through an open competitive process, a restricted process, or a direct allocation? If the latter, why was that approach adopted?
12. Will details of the grant agreement, including milestones, reporting obligations and performance measures, be made public?
13. The [Trustee For ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund](#) declared that it received \$0 in revenue from government grants over the past decade. Is this misleading in light of the significant government grant funding the organisation has received?

*Department's response*

Attributable to a Departmental spokesperson:

- The Australian Government will provide \$604.2 million over five years from 2025-2026 (and \$8.1 million per year ongoing) in response to the antisemitic Bondi terrorist attack on 14 December 2025.
- This includes \$102 million (plus GST) granted to the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ) for enhanced security for the Jewish community.
- This funding builds on the \$58 million (plus GST) granted to ECAJ for improved safety and security at Jewish sites across the country, including schools, pre-schools, synagogues and faith-based community centres after the 7 October 2023 terrorist attack.
- All Commonwealth grants are administered in accordance with the Commonwealth Grants Rules and Principles and Australian Government Grants Framework.
  - These contain requirements for effective grants administration, including consideration on whether a project or activity would be an efficient, effective, economical, and ethical use of funds.

## Questions to ECAJ

### Request for comment sent on 15 June 2026

Dear Executive Council of Australian Jewry media team,

We have several follow up questions regarding the administration of security grants awarded to ECAJ.

1. Are any funds received under the Enhancing Security for Jewish Communities Program being used, either directly or indirectly, to support ECAJ's lobbying, advocacy, legal, media or public communications activities? If so, please provide details.

2. We have been informed that ECAJ has engaged consulting firm Advisen Consulting to assist with the administration and assessment of grant applications. Can ECAJ confirm:

- Whether Advisen has been engaged in relation to the program;
- The scope of Advisen's role;
- Whether the engagement was subject to a tender or procurement process; and
- The total amount of grant funding that has been spent, or is expected to be spent, on administration, consulting or advisory fees, including payments to Advisen?

3. Given ECAJ's role as both an advocacy organisation and the administrator of a publicly funded grants program, what safeguards are in place to ensure that applications from Jewish organisations that are not represented by ECAJ, or which may hold differing views, are assessed independently, impartially and free from actual or perceived bias?

4. We have spoken with the president of a synagogue who raised concerns regarding the transparency of the assessment process. Can ECAJ outline:

- The criteria used to assess applications;
- Whether applicants are provided reasons for unsuccessful applications;
- Whether there is a review or appeal process for funding decisions; and
- How ECAJ ensures transparency and accountability in the allocation of public funds?

5. Can ECAJ provide figures showing:

- The total number of applications received to date;
- The total number approved and rejected;
- The total amount of funding distributed; and
- The amount of funding retained for administration and program management?

Request for comment sent on 20 May 2026

Dear Executive Council of Australian Jewry media team,

According to publicly available grant information, on 22 April 2026 the Department of Home Affairs awarded a grant of \$112.2 million to the Executive Council of Australian Jewry for the purpose of enhancing security for Jewish communities. In addition, on 13 November 2023 the Department awarded a separate grant initially valued at \$27.5 million, which has subsequently increased in value and is now listed as \$63.8 million.

The grants were awarded to an ACT incorporated association registered as:

- Name: Executive Council Of Australian Jewry
- ABN: 17 162 489 951

We seek your response to the following questions:

1. Why was the incorporated association used as the recipient entity for the grants rather than the ACNC-registered charity, *The Trustee For ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund* or the ASIC-registered entity *ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund Limited* (ACN: 141 710 250)?
2. Will ECAJ publicly disclose how the funding is allocated and spent?
3. What specific activities, programs or security measures will the funding be used for?
4. How will the funding be distributed and administered in practice? For example, will funds be provided onward to schools, synagogues, community organisations or security providers? If so, what oversight arrangements apply to those distributions?
5. Has ECAJ engaged external consultants, contractors or security firms in connection with the grants? If so, which organisations?
6. What governance, auditing and accountability measures has ECAJ put in place to manage the funding?
7. Does ECAJ intend to publish audited financial statements or other reporting relating to the grants?
8. ACNC records for The Trustee For ECAJ Harm Prevention Fund indicate the charity has reported receiving \$0 in government grant revenue over the past decade. Can ECAJ clarify the relationship between the incorporated association and the charity, and explain why government grant funding does not appear in the charity's reporting?