

12. COMMUNITY FUNDING 2001/02

Officer responsible
Leisure Manager

Author
Peter Walls, DDI 941-8777

The purpose of this annual report is to inform the Council of the major details in respect of the main community funding round (2001/02) and to make recommendations in relation to the 2002/03 community funding process.

The principal funding round for 2001/02 has been completed and summary sheets and accountability forms have been forwarded to the Hillary Commission (now Sport and Recreation New Zealand) (SPARC) in respect of the Community Sport Fund.

Some Funding Committees have retained funds for late applications but the majority of the available resources have been allocated. The issue of unallocated resources at the end of the financial year needs to be closely monitored to ensure that the majority of these resources are allocated prior to the main funding round in the following year for which applications close at the end of March.

Laid on the table is a full list of the successful applicants responded to by the Metropolitan Funding Committee for the Community Development Scheme, Sport and Recreation New Zealand's Community Sport Fund and the Community Organisation Loan Scheme.

It is a requirement of SPARC that a list of successful applicants is made available to the local newspapers.

Resources Available Under the Various Schemes

Scheme	Source of Funds	2001/02
Community Development Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$421,000
Community Sport Fund	SPARC	\$347,643
Community Organisation Loans Scheme	Christchurch City Council	\$377,000

The Community Development Scheme was based on \$1.30c (for 2001/02) per head of population and this is inflation adjusted each year. The amount that is budgeted for in 2002/03 is \$432,000 based on 1.33c/head of population. The Community Sport Fund is based on \$1.07c per head of population (324,900 population).

Allocation of Resources

As Councillors will be aware, we have six funding committees based on Community Board areas and one Metropolitan Funding Committee. The funds are apportioned on the following basis:

Metropolitan Funding Committee

- (i) All loan funds
- (ii) 40% of the SPARC Community Sport Fund
- (iii) 45% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

The Six Community Funding Committees

- (i) 60% of the SPARC Community Sport Fund
- (ii) 55% of the Council's Community Development Scheme Funds

Note: The allocation of funds to the six community funding assessment committees is apportioned according to each community board's population.

Number of Project Applications

Applications/projects were received as follows:

Community Funding Committee	Community Sport Fund				
	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01	01/02
Hagley/Ferrymead	67	58	46	57	60
Spreydon/Heathcote	53	40	48	53	56
Riccarton/Wigram	75	57	42	45	52
Fendalton/Waimairi	80	75	51	39	46
Shirley/Papanui	51	59	40	36	35
Burwood/Pegasus	71	63	43	43	59
Metropolitan	190	170	187	166	142
Totals	587	522	457	439	450

Community Funding Committee	Community Development Scheme				
	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01	01/02
Hagley/Ferrymead	35	45	45	52	49
Spreydon/Heathcote	35	52	50	55	41
Riccarton/Wigram	27	35	45	60	42
Fendalton/Waimairi	25	36	35	31	30
Shirley/Papanui	26	25	28	23	26
Burwood/Pegasus	50	43	48	55	38
Metropolitan	135	154	131	137	120
Totals	333	390	382	413	346

Percentage Breakdown of Applications

	Community Funding Committees				
	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01	01/02
Community Sport Fund	68%	67%	59%	62%	68%
Community Development Scheme	59%	61%	66%	67%	65%

	Metropolitan Funding Committee				
	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01	01/02
Community Sport Fund	32%	33%	41%	38%	32%
Community Development Scheme	41%	39%	34%	33%	35%

SPARC Community Sport Fund

SPARC provides guidelines and priorities for the allocation of their resources and the top priority is for volunteer development (courses for coaches etc) and the Metropolitan Funding Committee allocates a greater proportion of its resources to the top priority than do the Community Board based Funding Committees who tend to provide a greater level of support to equipment etc for clubs and other local organisations.

With the decision by SPARC to cease contributing to this fund there is a need to address how the remaining funds are to be utilised. SPARC have advised that "Councils will be free to allocate these funds for purposes consistent with those for which they were received" this means that the balance of \$53,318.99 can be allocated in line with the guidelines issued by SPARC.

As these funds have been allocated on a population basis over the years it would seem to be appropriate for each of the funding Assessment Committees to retain their balances to address future applications.

SPARC have requested that we account for these funds by 31 December 2002. To reduce confusion to applicants in March next year when we will be advertising the Community Development Scheme and Community Organisation Loan Scheme, it would be beneficial if these funds were expended prior to 31 December 2002.

In meeting this tight time frame the three Community Board Assessment Committees who still have significant funds left will need to establish a process to call for applications and address them prior to this report being considered by the Committee which will pre-empt recommendation number five.

All organisations which applied for funding under the Community Sport Fund will be advised that the scheme will no longer operate and that they should contact either their national association or SPARC with any inquiries.

Community Development Scheme

The Community Development Scheme (55% community funding committees, 45% metropolitan) while not proportionate in respect of the number of applications that are received, better reflects requested amounts with the Metropolitan Committee dealing with significant city-wide organisations which in general request larger amounts.

The Community Development Scheme funds are, in theory, inflation adjusted each year and based on population but for ease of explanation the figure has been shown as an amount per head of population, ie \$1,33 per head for 2002/03. Several (4 of the 6) Community Boards provided extra funds for this scheme and in general demand is increasing in this area across the city.

This year the Council's Community Policy has been used to set priorities and guidelines for the consideration of applications under the Community Development Scheme, and this is working well.

Community Representatives on the Assessment Committee

The 2001/02 funding round was the third round of a three-year term for the community representatives on the various funding committees.

The three year term for these representatives is designed to link with the Council's three year elections and the timing means that in a worst case scenario only half of the committees could change at any one time, thus providing continuity in the process of assessment and allocation of resources under these schemes.

As this is the final round for these community representatives, nominations will be called for a further three year term (only for Community Development at this point) in October/November this year. Those community representatives on the Metropolitan Funding Committee for the Community Sport Fund will be advised that the fund is no longer operating and therefore we will not be calling for nominations later in the year.

Summary of Resources Allocations and Balances

The following table outlines the situation for each Funding Committee as at 30 June 2002. It should be noted that some Community Boards use their discretionary funds to add to the available resources and this is indicated in the comments column.

Assessment Committee	\$ Carry Forward 1900/01	Less Late 00/01 Allocations	Funds Available 2001/02	Funds Allocated 2001/02	Balance as at 30/6/2002	Comments
Metropolitan HC CDS	55.60 875.56		140,854.15 190,692.96	140,727 187,000	127.15 3,692.96	
Fendalton/ Waimairi HC CDS	3,285.50 28,145.89	2,858 12,536	35,015.50 53,097.89	34,880 47,246	135.50 5,851.89	
Burwood/ Pegasus HC CDS	7,195.92 981.69	1,765	41,368.92 40,766.69	33,916 33,667	7,452.92 17,099.69	\$10,000 from Com Bd
Shirley/ Papanui HC CDS	41,213.91 9,700.33	2,858 7,100	75,730.91 41,662.33	37,274 41,536	38,456.91 8,690.33	\$8,564 from Com Bd
Hagley/ Ferrymead HC CDS	4,443.50 735.84		38,755.50 38,825.84	38,565 49,661	190.50 7,660.84	\$18,496 from Com Bd

Assessment Committee	\$ Carry Forward 1900/01	Less Late 00/01 Allocations	Funds Available 2001/02	Funds Allocated 2001/02	Balance as at 30/6/2002	Comments
Riccarton/Wigram HC CDS	12,368.77 9,626.03	6,902 7,231	43,970.67 43,815.03	43,719 43,587	251.67 12,028.03	\$11,800 from Com Bd
Spreydon/Heathcote HC CDS	3,831.02 2,479.79	440	37,873.34 40,866.01	31,169 40,866	6,704.34 .01	
TOTALS						
HC	72,394.22	14,823	413,568.99	360,250	53,318.99	
CDS	52,545.13	26,867	449,726.75	443,563	55,023.75	

Funds available include the following returned cheques/funds where projects did not proceed or did not use all of the funds that were allocated.

Hillary Commission Community Sport Fund

Burwood/Pegasus	\$1,000.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$336.32
Metropolitan	\$1,741.55
Riccarton/Wigram	\$2,272.90
Hagley/Ferrymead	
Fendalton/Waimairi	\$818.00
Shirley/Papanui	\$2,186.00
Total	\$8,354.77

Community Development Scheme

Metropolitan	\$367.40
Burwood/Pegasus	\$1,000.00
Riccarton/Wigram	\$1,200.00
Spreydon/Heathcote	\$481.22
Fendalton/Waimairi	
Hagley/Ferrymead	
Shirley/Papanui	
Total	\$3,048.62

Loans

Eighteen loan applications were received, of which 13 were approved in full or part and a total of \$377,000 of loan funding has been allocated/committed. These funds are currently lent for a five-year term (and occasionally for up to 10 years) at 2% interest per annum.

Funding Database

The database has proved very successful and we have only encountered minor problems in terms of its operation. The benefits will compound so that in future years the time spent in administration and staff inputting will continue to be reduced.

The database is being further expanded to include grants made by Community Boards to community organisations from their discretionary funds and from other Council sources. This will provide a greater level of accountability and will also allow administrators to ascertain where organisations are accessing funds from within the Council. It is also planned to provide application forms and details on the Internet at some time in the future.

General

The overall procedures for operating the Community Funding Schemes now in place appear to be working successfully.

More organisations are taking a responsible attitude in respect of the allocations that are made and hence the increase in the number of cheques returned if projects do not use all the resources or if for any reason, they are not able to undertake the project. This process is encouraged by all those involved in administering the schemes and results in the maximum benefit being obtained from the resources available.

NATURAL + PEOPLE + ECONOMIC STEP ASSESSMENT

#	CONDITION:	Meets condition ✓✓0*	HOW IT HELPS MEET CONDITION:
The People Step			
P1	Basic needs met	✓✓	Grants support the community via a range of organisations to meet P1 to P5
P2	Full potential developed	✓✓	
P3	Social capital enhanced	✓✓	
P4	Culture and identity protected	✓✓	
P5	Governance and participatory democracy strengthened	✓✓	
The Economic Step			
E1	Effective and efficient use of all resources	✓	All organisation have to meet set accountability requirements.
E2	Job rich local economy	0	N/A
E3	Financial sustainability	0	N/A

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That the contribution for the Community Development Scheme be based on \$1.35 per head of population for the 2003/2004 financial year in line with inflation.
 3. That the Community Development Scheme resources be split 55% to the Community Funding Committees and 45% to the Metropolitan Committee for the 2002/2003 funding round.
 4. That the interest rate for the Community Organisations Loan Scheme remain at 2% per annum for the 2002/2003 funding round.
 5. That the balances of the Community Sport fund be allocated by the respective Assessment Committees prior to 31 December 2002 in line with the current guidelines.

(Note: Councillor Condon abstained from the discussion and voting on this clause.)