Australian Government
Australian Research Council

ARC Research Integrity and Other Misconduct Policy

Policy Name:	ARC Research Integrity and Other Misconduct Policy		
Policy Owner:	Policy and Performance Branch		
Effective from:	9 September 2026	**Version number:**	2026.1
Date for revision:	9/09/2028		

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): 10.83116/252k-hj20

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. The Australian Research Council

The Australian community expects research to be conducted responsibly, ethically and with integrity and the Australian Research Council (ARC) plays a vital leadership role in maintaining and promoting the responsible conduct of research. Management of research integrity in Australia is a shared responsibility that involves the ARC, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and a range of other institutions and entities.

As the principal Australian Government funder of fundamental and applied research across all disciplines outside of clinical and other medical research, the ARC's purpose is to grow knowledge and innovation for the benefit of the Australian community through providing support for the highest quality research, assessing the quality, engagement and impact of research, and providing advice on research matters.

1.2. Purpose of policy

Responsible research conduct is critical to the success of, and maintenance of public confidence in, Australia's research efforts. Research must be developed, undertaken and reported according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards in a research environment underpinned by a culture of integrity.

The *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018* (the Code) establishes a framework that provides a foundation for high-quality research, credibility and community trust in the research endeavour. As the ARC expects the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of research it funds, including in the application process, adherence to the Code is a prerequisite for the receipt of ARC funding.

It is also a requirement for ARC funding that researchers and institutions comply with all applicable Australian law.

The ARC further expects the highest standards of integrity among the individuals who conduct ARC business, including those who assess grant applications and serve on committees.

The purpose of this policy is to promote and support research and safeguard confidence in the value of publicly funded research by:

- making transparent the ARC's role in ensuring research integrity and addressing breaches of the Code;
- making transparent the ARC's role in other forms of misconduct which impact ARC research;
- establishing a framework to support the appropriate management of the National Competitive Grants Program, including peer review, grant selection and research evaluation processes, funding decisions and research; and
- raising awareness of the importance of excellent research and the possible consequences for research institutions and individuals if appropriate standards are not maintained.

1.3. Commencement, review and enforcement

The Research Integrity Policy (the policy) commenced on 13 April 2015, the date it was first publicly released. ARC Funding Rules/Grant Guidelines and Funding/Grant Agreements published after the commencement of the policy require ARC-funded institutions to comply with the policy.

This version of the policy (2026.1) will come into effect on 9 September 2026. It will not apply retrospectively.

The date of effect for any amendments to the policy will be the date on which an amended version of the policy is publicly released.

1.4. ARC roles and responsibilities

Research Integrity Office

The ARC Research Integrity Office is the point of contact for all matters within the scope of this policy and is responsible for all associated administrative arrangements within the ARC. Individuals or institutions with questions regarding any matters in this policy, or anyone wishing to notify the ARC of a matter within the scope of this policy, may contact the ARC Research Integrity Office via the details provided in section 5 (‘Contacts’).

Research Integrity Officer

The ARC Research Integrity Officer manages the Research Integrity Office and provides advice to the ARC Senior Research Integrity Officer. The Research Integrity Officer may apply precautionary actions as listed under section 2.7 and 3.5 of this policy. The Research Integrity Officer may close matters where the outcome is ‘allegation dismissed’.

Research Integrity Review Committee

The ARC Research Integrity Review Committee (RIRC) considers research integrity findings reported to the ARC by institutions, which have not been closed by the Research Integrity Officer. RIRC will make recommendations to the ARC Senior Research Integrity Officer on consequential actions under section 2.7 and 3.5 of this policy. This may include recommendations on reporting relevant findings to the Due Diligence Committee. RIRC is composed of senior ARC staff and chaired by the ARC Research Integrity Officer.

Senior Research Integrity Officer

The ARC Senior Research Integrity Officer is a senior member of ARC staff responsible for making decisions regarding consequential actions under section 2.7 and 3.5 of this policy. The Senior Research Integrity Officer is advised by senior ARC staff, the Research Integrity Officer, and Legal Counsel, as appropriate.

Due Diligence Committee

Based on RIRC recommendations approved by the Senior Research Integrity Officer, the Research Integrity Office may provide information regarding outcomes reported under this policy to the ARC Due Diligence Committee (DDC) during an application round. The DDC may provide advice to the appropriate decision-maker (the Minister for designated schemes, or the ARC Board for non-designated schemes) regarding current applications. The DDC is composed of senior ARC staff.

ARC Board

Based on internal advice, the Board may apply research integrity findings in its decision-making powers on current applications or projects for non-designated schemes, and in its recommendations to the Minister for designated schemes.

1.5. Scope

This policy outlines requirements for institutions to report research integrity matters and other related misconduct matters to the ARC, and the action the ARC may take in response.

It also describes how the ARC can refer research integrity concerns or complaints to research institutions, who, in accordance with the Code, are responsible for managing and investigating potential breaches of the Code.

The ARC does not investigate concerns or complaints about potential breaches of the Code unless the matter involves potential fraud, such as misuse of funding, and the ARC has obligations under the Commonwealth Fraud Control Framework.

ARC Grant Guidelines and Grant Agreements require compliance with this policy, the Code, the documents specified in section 2.2 of this policy, and any related successor documents.

The policy also applies to any other Commonwealth funding for research delivered through or by the ARC, such as those under the Research Grants Services (RGS) and Office of National Intelligence (ONI).

This policy is split into two parts. Chapter 2 explains its application to research integrity matters, and Chapter 3 explains its application to other research-related misconduct that impacts the management of ARC.

2. Research integrity matters

Research integrity refers to the principles and responsibilities that underpin appropriate, robust research practice, and promote trust and confidence in the research process. Research conducted with integrity is conducted ethically, responsibly, and with honesty, rigour, transparency, fairness, respect, and accountability. These principles apply to every stage of the research lifecycle and are the ethos that underpins the Code.

2.1. Application

This section of the policy applies to complaints about, and the outcomes of preliminary assessments and investigations into, breaches of the Code relating to:

- currently ongoing or completed ARC-funded projects;
- researchers currently receiving ARC funding, regardless of whether the matter relates to their current ARC-funded projects;
- ARC grant applications in current selection rounds;
- named applicants on ARC grant applications in current selection rounds, regardless of whether the matter relates to an ARC grant application; and
- anyone engaged on ARC business such as College of Experts members, committee members, panel members, external assessors and all other contractors.

Where a researcher did not fall within the scope of the policy at the outset of an assessment or investigation but comes within its scope by the time the matter concludes and an outcome is reached (e.g. by submitting an application for funding), notification requirements apply.

2.2. Breaches of the Code

For the purposes of this policy, and consistent with the Code and the *Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (the Investigation Guide), a 'breach' is defined as a failure to meet the principles and responsibilities of the Code.

The definition of a breach of the Code includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with any of the principles or requirements contained in the following and their successor documents:

- the NHMRC/ARC/UA *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2025)*

- the NHMRC *Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities: Guidelines for researchers and stakeholders (2018)*
- *the AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research (2020)*
- the NHMRC/ARC/CSIRO *Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, 8th edition (2013, updated 2021);*
- Australia Council for the Arts *Protocols for using First Nations Cultural and Intellectual Property in the Arts (2020)*
- any Commonwealth and/or State or Territory legislation where that legislation relates to research integrity.

Institutions are required to exercise judgement in determining whether there has been a failure to comply with the principles in the applicable documents and, therefore, whether a breach of the Code has occurred. Examples of breaches are outlined in section 2.1 of the *Investigation Guide*.

Breaches of the Code occur on a spectrum, from minor (less serious) to major (more serious). Where a breach is found, institutions are required to consider the factors outlined in section 2.2 of the *Investigation Guide* to determine the seriousness of the breach.

Definition of research misconduct

Research institutions are not required to use the term 'research misconduct'. For institutions that choose to apply the term, the Code provides the following recommended definition:

> *'Research misconduct is a serious breach of the Code which is also intentional or reckless or negligent.'*

Section 2.3 of *the Investigation Guide* provides guidance on using the term research misconduct.

2.3. Reporting requirements for institutions

The Code requires institutions to foster and support responsible research conduct, provide mechanisms for receiving concerns or complaints about potential breaches of the Code, and investigate and resolve potential breaches as they arise.

Under ARC Grant Agreements institutions are responsible for reporting to the ARC on potential and actual breaches of the Code in accordance with this policy. This section outlines the reporting requirements for institutions, including when and what to report to the ARC when research integrity matters fall in scope of this policy. For any questions regarding these requirements, please contact the ARC's Research Integrity Office (see section 5 'Contacts').

In line with the approach to research integrity matters set out in the *Investigation Guide*, the ARC considers institutions to have a continuing obligation to address a complaint about a potential breach of the Code even when a respondent leaves the institution following the complaint.

When is reporting required?

Unless otherwise agreed by the ARC, institutions are required to report the following to the ARC within **2 weeks**:

For preliminary assessments

- The outcome of all preliminary assessments related to researchers that fall in scope as per section 2.1 of this policy. This includes if the allegations are found to be unsubstantiated.
- Notification that a preliminary assessment has been completed and the matter is progressing to the investigation stage.

For investigations

- Notification that a preliminary assessment has been completed and the matter is progressing to the investigation stage.
- The outcome of all investigations related to researchers that fall in scope as per section 2.1 of this policy. This includes if the allegations are found to be unsubstantiated.

Institutions are required to report **within 1 week** the following to the ARC:

- Notification of any precautionary actions applied during a preliminary assessment or investigation that impact ARC projects, for example the suspension of funding or research activity, or removal of a researcher.
- Notification if the complaint or any evidence collected identifies an imminent or real risk to humans, animals, or the environment, and if the institution has suspended or intends to suspend research activity related to an ARC project because of these risks.

The ARC Research Integrity Office may contact the institution to request advice on the progress of a research integrity matter at any time.

Matters referred to institutions by the ARC

If the ARC becomes aware of a concern relating to research integrity (for example, if allegations are raised by a member of the public as per section 2.6 or raised during the normal process of ARC business as per section 2.5), the ARC Research Integrity Office may refer that concern to the relevant institution so they can address the matter and decide whether they should proceed with a preliminary assessment.

In these cases, within 2 weeks the institution is required to:

- Report the outcome of any complaint referred to an institution by the ARC Research Integrity Office, including if the institution decides to dismiss the allegations without progressing to a preliminary assessment.
- Notify the ARC Research Integrity Office if the matter is progressing to a preliminary assessment, and provide the outcome of that preliminary assessment as noted above.

When reporting is not required

Matters that relate to research administration that can easily be rectified at the local level and resolved prior to the need to consider a preliminary assessment do not need to be notified. Unintentional administrative errors, clerical errors or oversights are some examples of these types of matters. However, where a matter has been referred by the ARC, notification of the outcome is still required as per 'Matters referred to institutions by the ARC' above.

For further information about the stages and process of investigating research integrity complaints, please see the *Investigation Guide*.

2.4. Information required by the ARC

When notifying the ARC of the **outcome of a preliminary assessment** (where a complaint has been resolved and/or corrective actions implemented without the need for an investigation) or **an investigation**, the institution must provide:

- the name(s) of the individual(s) implicated in the potential or actual breach;
- their relationship with the ARC;
- an overview of the complaint or allegation(s);
- any identified risks to humans or animals;
- ARC project IDs for any ARC-funded projects or grant applications implicated in the potential or actual breach;

- notification of whether funding and/or research activity for any ARC-funded projects has been suspended by the institution;
- confirmation that the complaint has been, or is being, managed and investigated by the institution in accordance with the Code, either using the processes set out in the *Investigation Guide* or through other equivalent processes;
- an outline of and rationale for the outcome, and the decision about whether or not a breach (or potential breach, if reporting on the outcome of a preliminary assessment) has occurred. This should include sufficient information to enable the ARC to understand the facts and the seriousness of any breach, and consider any implications for ARC grants or grant applications; and
- an outline of any action being undertaken by the institution in response to the matter, including action to correct the public record and/or mitigate against repeated breaches.

When reporting that a complaint referred by the ARC Research Integrity Office has been dismissed without proceeding to a preliminary assessment, institutions should provide a brief overview of the reasoning behind the dismissal.

This information will allow the ARC to determine whether the allegations or outcome have the potential to undermine the integrity of ARC processes, funding decisions or research outcomes, or confidence in the value of publicly funded research. Should the institution consider that there is a legal reason why certain information cannot be provided, the institution must advise the ARC of its reasons.

Institutions are encouraged to provide copies of any reports created in the handling of a matter.

2.5. Reporting matters identified through ARC processes

ARC employees and anyone engaged in ARC business, such as ARC College of Experts members, committee members, external assessors, applicants and other contractors are required, as soon as practicable, to report to the ARC Research Integrity Office all potential breaches and any matter potentially affecting research integrity identified through the conduct of ARC business. For example, concerns identified in ARC funding applications in current selection rounds; or research integrity concerns relating to the conduct of assessors conducting peer review in current selection rounds.

The ARC will determine the best internal process for addressing complaints and may refer complaints to the ARC Research Integrity Office or other areas of the ARC as appropriate.

When raising research integrity concerns identified during ARC processes, sufficient information should be provided to allow the ARC to assess whether there is a basis for referring the matter to the institution; and to enable the relevant institution to progress a preliminary assessment (if required).

Individuals notifying the ARC of complaints relating to a potential breach must provide:

- their name and contact details;
- the name of the individual(s) who they allege has/have committed a breach;
- the name of the institution at which the potential breach may have occurred (in the case of applications, the Administering Organisation of the proposed project);
- the nature and details of the potential breach;
- when the potential breach occurred;
- ARC project IDs, where known, for any ARC-funded projects or grant applications implicated in the potential breach.

Subject to the ARC agreeing that a potential breach may have occurred, the ARC Research Integrity Office will refer the matter to the relevant institution for handling in accordance with the requirements of the Code and the *Investigation Guide*. To protect the confidentiality of the ARC's processes, the name of any assessor or committee member who raised the concern with the ARC will not be provided to the institution unless deemed necessary for the progression of the matter.

Where a matter relates to an allegation regarding an ARC peer review assessment, that assessment may be disregarded to ensure the integrity of the ARC application process.

Institutions are required to report to the ARC on matters that the ARC has referred to them in accordance with section 2.3 of this policy.

2.6. Concerns raised by members of the public

Members of the public may notify the ARC Research Integrity Office if they are concerned that a breach of the Code relating to ARC-funded research or ARC business may have occurred.

Sufficient information should be provided to allow the ARC to assess whether there is a basis for referring the complaint to the institution for management under their research integrity processes.

Individuals notifying the ARC of complaints relating to a potential breach must provide:

- their name and contact details, unless they wish to make an anonymous complaint;
- the name of the individual(s) who they allege has/have committed a breach and their relationship with the ARC;
- the name of the institution at which the potential breach may have occurred;
- the nature and details of the potential breach;
- when the potential breach occurred;
- ARC project IDs, where known, for any ARC-funded projects or grant applications implicated in the potential breach; and
- an indication of whether they consent to the ARC providing their contact details to the institution responsible for investigating the alleged incident(s).

Without sufficient information the ARC is unable to refer the matter to the institution.

If the ARC assesses that there is sufficient information to indicate that a breach may have occurred, the ARC has a responsibility to ensure the matter is appropriately addressed. The ARC may refer the matter to the relevant institution without express permission of the complainant or parties involved. In these instances, the ARC will treat these concerns as anonymous correspondence when possible.

The ARC will not provide further information to the complainant about a matter it has referred. Where, with the complainant's permission, the ARC has provided the institution with the name and contact details of the complainant, the ARC expects that the institution will contact the complainant and provide sufficient assurance that the matter has been addressed.

Anonymous correspondence or referrals will be considered, but without sufficient detail the ability of an institution to investigate a complaint, or provide feedback when the matter has been finalised, may be limited. While the ARC Research Integrity Office will maintain a complainant's anonymity to the best of its ability in the referral process, the ARC cannot guarantee that an institution will not surmise a complainant's identity during the complaint handling process.

Members of the public may also notify an institution directly if they are concerned that a breach of the Code may have occurred.

2.7. Processes for ARC actions

The ARC may take precautionary and/or consequential actions if it considers that a matter compromises or potentially compromises the integrity of its peer review processes, grant selection processes, funding decisions, and research outcomes, or if it has the potential to undermine confidence in the value of publicly funded research. The ARC will ensure a fair and robust process for making decisions regarding the nature and application of legally permissible actions.

Precautionary actions

Precautionary actions are temporary measures implemented while the investigation or institutional appeal process is underway with the purpose of mitigating risks to the ARC. The ARC may take precautionary actions while a matter is ongoing if it is deemed appropriate to protect the integrity of ARC processes and/or the management of ARC projects.

Precautionary actions may include, but are not limited to:

- requiring institutions to suspend ARC-funded projects while an investigation or appeal process is underway;
- placing conditions on grants that address or mitigate any potential or proven risks;
- suspending or ceasing the progression of ARC grant applications in accordance with the relevant Funding Rules;
- suspending the involvement of individuals in ARC assessment, peer review and committee activities.

Consequential actions

The ARC may take consequential actions once an outcome is reported. Actions taken by the ARC, and the duration for which they apply, will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any action will be proportionate to the nature and potential consequences of the matter and will take into account actions taken by the ARC in response to similar matters and any corrective measures already taken by the institution. The duration of ARC consequential actions will normally not exceed five years.

Consequential actions may include, but are not limited to:

- ceasing and/or recovering any or all ARC funding relating to a Grant Agreement(s) in accordance with the provisions in the relevant Grant Agreement(s);
- ceasing the progression of ARC grant applications in accordance with the relevant Grant Guidelines;
- placing conditions on the consideration of any future grant applications (such as additional certifications);
- placing eligibility conditions on ARC grant applications involving specific researchers, in accordance with the relevant Grant Guidelines. The ARC may deem an application ineligible if the ARC determines that a nominated researcher has committed serious misconduct or equivalent;
- placing conditions on current ARC grants that address or mitigate any identified risks (such as additional reporting);
- suspending the involvement of individuals in ARC peer review, assessment and committee activities for a set period of time.

Consequential actions will remain in place if an appeal (per section 2.8) is underway.

2.8. Appeals

If an institution wishes to appeal a precautionary or consequential action taken by the ARC under this policy, the appeal must be lodged, in writing, preferably through the relevant institution’s Designated Officer.

If an individual affected by a precautionary or consequential action wishes to appeal, they must make a request to their institution’s Designated Officer to do this on their behalf. Where an institution does not agree to the individual’s request to lodge an appeal, the individual may then appeal directly to the ARC.

The appeal must be received by the ARC within **four weeks** of the date the Administering Organisation is notified of a decision by the ARC to implement an action, or **six weeks** in the case of an appeal by an individual that is not supported by their institution. The appeal should be sent to the ARC research integrity office (see section 5 'Contacts').

Appellants should provide the ARC with all the information necessary to enable the appeal to be considered without the need for further written or oral explanation or reference to additional material. Appeals will be considered by an appropriate senior ARC officer who was not involved in making the original decision.

3. Other misconduct

3.1. Definition

For the purposes of this policy, other misconduct means:

- adverse comments or findings made by a court, commission, tribunal, or other statutory, professional or academic body, regarding the conduct or performance of an ARC-funded researcher that impacts, or could reasonably be perceived to impact, on the:
    - proper conduct of an ARC-funded project in accordance with the relevant Grant Agreement;
    - researcher's capability, fitness, or reputation, in connection with an ARC-funded project; or
- other significant matter, including the commencement of legal, regulatory or disciplinary action involving a Project Participant that might adversely impact on:
    - compliance with the relevant Grant Agreement, Commonwealth policy, or applicable laws;
    - the Commonwealth's reputation; or
    - the public interest or confidence in an ARC-funded project, any associated research, or the ARC's funding or support of a project or any associated research.

Note: this relates to the definition of Research Integrity Event in the 2026 and subsequent Grant Guidelines.

3.2. Application

The policy applies to other misconduct that relates to:

- active ARC-funded projects;
- completed ARC-funded projects;
- ARC grant applications in current selection rounds if the findings relate to or impact the application or proposed project; and/or
- College of Experts members and other committee members under contract with the ARC.

Where a researcher did not fall within the scope of the policy at the outset of an assessment or investigation, but comes within its scope by the time the matter concludes and an outcome is reached (e.g. by submitting an application for funding), notification requirements apply.

3.3. Reporting requirements for institutions

Who can report

Only Institutions (defined in the Code) can report other misconduct to the ARC. Members of the public should approach the relevant institution if they have concerns.

What to report

Institutions are required to notify the ARC Research Integrity Office and ARC Establish & Manage of any findings that fit the criteria described in section 3.1 that impact the management of ARC projects. For example, if a researcher is required to be removed from a project due to the outcome of court proceedings, the institution must submit a project variation (per the appropriate ARC processes) and notify the ARC Research Integrity Office and ARC Establish & Manage team that they have done so. Notifying the ARC Research Integrity Office is not a substitute for submitting a project variation.

If findings have not yet been made, but the institution is implementing precautionary actions that impact the management of ARC projects, the institution is also required to notify the ARC Research Integrity Office and ARC Establish & Manage. If the situation changes, the institution is required to provide appropriate updates.

When to report

If an institution is taking action that impacts the management of an ARC project in response to findings that fit the criteria described in section 3.1, they must notify the ARC Research Integrity Office within **2 weeks** of this action.

If the ARC becomes aware of findings that fit the criteria described above through the media, the course of normal ARC business, or other channels, the ARC Research Integrity Office may contact the institution to request advice on how they are addressing the matter.

Institutions may consult the ARC Research Integrity Office if uncertainty exists about notification requirements (see 'Contacts' in section 5).

3.4. Information required by the ARC

When notifying the ARC of findings that fit the criteria described in section 3.1, the institution must provide:

- the name(s) of the individual(s) implicated in the matter;
- ARC project IDs for any ARC-funded projects or grant applications associated with the researcher;
- an overview of the complaint, allegation(s), or findings;
- details of the action the institution is taking that impacts the management of ARC projects (e.g., removal of researchers, suspension of funding);
- any other relevant information about how the institution is handling the matter.

This information ensures that the ARC has appropriate context and awareness of potential issues impacting its projects, and allows the ARC to determine whether the findings have the potential to undermine the integrity of ARC processes, funding decisions or research outcomes, or confidence in the value of publicly funded research.

3.5. Processes for ARC actions

The ARC may take precautionary or consequential actions in response to notifications of findings related to misconduct as defined in section 3.1. Actions taken by the ARC, and the duration for which they apply, will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any action will be proportionate to the nature and potential consequences of the findings and will take into account actions taken by the ARC in response to similar matters and any corrective measures already taken by the institution.

3.6. Appeals

If an institution wishes to appeal a precautionary or consequential action taken by the ARC under this policy, the appeal must be lodged, in writing, preferably through the relevant institution's Designated Officer.

If an individual affected by a precautionary or consequential action wishes to appeal, they must make a request to their institution's Designated Officer to do this on their behalf. Where an institution does not agree to the individual's request to lodge an appeal, the individual may then appeal directly to the ARC.

The appeal must be received by the ARC within **four weeks** of the date the Administering Organisation is notified of a decision by the ARC to implement an action, or **six weeks** in the case of an appeal by an individual that is not supported by their institution. The appeal should be sent to the ARC research integrity office (see section 5 'Contacts').

Appellants should provide the ARC with all the information necessary to enable the appeal to be considered without the need for further written or oral explanation or reference to additional material.

Appeals will be considered by an appropriate senior ARC officer who was not involved in making the original decision.

4. Privacy and confidentiality

The ARC respects privacy and confidentiality. In managing all information related to research integrity and breaches of the Code, the ARC will manage personal information in accordance with the *Privacy Act 1988 and the ARC Privacy Policy*.

The ARC will not disclose any confidential information collected under this policy without the consent of the institution or individual the information relates to. However, the ARC will not have breached its obligations to the extent that the ARC discloses confidential information:

a) to its officers, employees, agents, external professional advisers or contractors solely to comply with obligations, or to exercise rights, under this Policy;
b) to its internal management personnel solely to enable effective management or auditing of a Grant Agreement, Scheme or the NCGP;
c) for a purpose directly related to the enforcement or investigation of a possible breach of any Commonwealth, State, Territory or local law;
d) to the Minister, or in response to a demand by a House or a Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament;
e) within the ARC, the Department or another Commonwealth entity or authority, where this serves the ARC's, the Department's or the Commonwealth's legitimate interests;
f) as required or permitted by any other law, or provided for under a contract; or
g) that is in the public domain.

All information reported by institutions to the ARC under the policy will be handled confidentially by the ARC Research Integrity Office. All information will be appropriately classified and only accessible to this Office. The information will be stored securely and in restricted areas of ARC IT systems. If ARC action is required in response to an allegation or finding of a breach of the Code, information that is essential to enabling and implementing decisions will be disclosed to appropriate ARC officers on a strictly need to know basis.

4.1. Access to personal information

Under Australian Privacy Principle 12 ('access to personal information'), in Schedule 1 of the Privacy Act 1988, individuals are entitled to obtain, on request, personal information about them that is held by the ARC. Requests to obtain personal information relating to matters reported under this policy can be made to the ARC Privacy Officer at *privacy@arc.gov.au*

5. Contact details

To notify the ARC of a breach or potential breach of the Code, or for any questions regarding this policy, please contact the ARC via the details below.

By email

You can email the Research Integrity Office at *researchintegrity@arc.gov.au*

By phone

You can telephone the ARC during business hours (except public holidays) on **02 6287 6600**. Please ask for the Research Integrity Office.

By mail

You can write to the ARC at:

Research Integrity Office
Australian Research Council
Level 4, West Wing Discovery House
47 Bowes Street
WODEN ACT 2606

In person

The ARC office is located at Level 4, West Wing Discovery House, 47 Bowes Street, Woden ACT. Appointments are recommended to ensure appropriate staff availability.

6. Version control

Version	Date Approved	Approved By	Brief Description
1.0	April 2015	CEO	Original version
2.0	December 2016	CEO	Review following initial release
3.0	June 2019	CEO	Revised to reflect the release of the updated Code
4.0 (2021.1)	July 2021	CEO	Bi-annual review
2023.1	September 2023	CEO	Bi-annual review
2026.1	July 2026	CEO	Revised to update and streamline reporting requirements for institutions, add 'other misconduct' reporting mechanism, and update ARC internal processes and consequential actions for consistency with new Grant Agreements and Grant Guidelines