

2. ALLOCATION OF PROJECT FUNDS 2006/07

The purpose of this seminar is to provide the Board with an initial opportunity to consider the various applications received for the Board's project funding for 2006/07.

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation & Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Anusha Guler, Secretariat Manager
Author:	Emma Davison, Community Secretary, DDI 941-5112

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the process for allocation of the Board's Project (and Discretionary) funding for the 2006/07 year, and to seek initial feedback from the Board on the funding applications received.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The key milestone for allocation of 2006/07 funding is 18 May 2006; the date by when all Boards need to have made their decisions on the allocation of their project funding. This date (which is later than required in previous years) is based on requirements to meet both internal accounting and LTCCP processes and timeframes.
3. To meet the milestone of 18 May, all Boards are holding a preliminary, non-decision making meeting (seminar format or otherwise) to give initial consideration to all of the funding applications received, and to seek any further information from staff as required.
4. Staff have evaluated all applications and completed the **attached** matrix document, which provides the Board with streamlined information to enable efficient and effective decision making. Staff evaluation is based on standard criteria and then entered into the matrix for comparative purposes with other applications.

Group	The name of the Unit or the Group responsible for the project or service.
Project/Service	A brief description of the project or service.
Amount	The amount of funding requested by the group/unit.
Board Objectives	Board objectives to which the project/service can be linked.
Expected Outcome of the Project	Whether the project/service will have a positive or negative affect on social, economic, environmental or cultural wellbeing.
Policy/Strategy	The policy or strategy to which the project/service can be linked.
Need Supported By	Any relevant research or other evidence that identifies a need for the project/service.
Financial Risk	Assessment of the project's/service's viability and sustainability eg unlikely to be viable as there are insufficient funds available to complete the project.
Delivery Risk	This section reports on an assessment of the unit's/group's ability to complete the project or supply the service.
Funding History	Outlines whether the unit/group has received funding from the Board before or other Council funding; and whether accountability reports are on file.
Staff Recommendation	Describes the precise decisions that staff are recommending.
Priority	Staff have determined a priority rating for each request. The following grading criteria has been used by staff: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet Board objectives/community outcomes – priority to fund: major contribution to social need and development. 2. Meet Board objectives/community outcomes – require a funding contribution. 3. Meet criteria to a lesser degree but more suitable for group to seek funding elsewhere – board funding support not needed or could be funded from another scheme eg Metropolitan. 0. Did not meet any of the above mentioned criteria – staff recommend not to fund.

5. Projects on the matrix have come from community groups and staff. Additional information will be available at the Board's seminar meeting on 10 April, if required.
6. The 2006/09 Community Board Objectives are also **attached** for the Board's reference.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. The Board has funding available of \$390,000 for 2006/07, that comprises:
 - up to \$60,000 discretionary funding to be allocated at monthly meetings during the year
 - up to \$40,000 strengthening communities funding (SCAP)
 - \$290,000 for allocation to local projects or activities.
8. A total of 53 project proposals have been received. A summary of the staff recommendations and funding implications is as follows:

Total funding **available** for project/discretionary funding: \$390,000

Total funding **requested** from applications received: \$603,423.75

Clearly there is a shortfall (\$213,423) even before funds are set aside for discretionary funding (although the major factor contributing to that shortfall is one application for \$100,000). Taking discretionary funding into account, staff recommendations are as follows:

Total recommended for retaining as Discretionary Fund: \$40,000

Total recommended for consideration for Project Funding: \$357,060
(comprising: Priority One: \$283,060, Priority Two: \$74,000):

Potential shortfall \$7,060

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board gives initial consideration to the **attached** matrix of requests for its 2006/07 Project and Discretionary Funding, and seeks any additional information from staff as required.