

## 2. ALLOCATION OF BURWOOD/PEGASUS PROJECT AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDING FOR 2006/07

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Board Principal Adviser, Burwood/Pegasus
<b>Author:</b>	Roger Cave, Community Secretary

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the process for allocation of the Board's Project and Discretionary Fund for the 2006/2007 year, and to seek the Board's consideration and approval of the funding applications contained in the attached matrix document.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have received a number of applications for consideration by the Board for its 2006/2007 Project and Discretionary Funding.
3. The attached matrix document was created to allow staff to evaluate the applications and provide the Board with streamlined information to enable efficient and effective decision making. Staff reviewed the project funding process used for 2005/06. Graeme Nicolas, the Council's internal auditor, also reviewed the process and identified some issues that have been reflected in the attached matrix and the process used for 2006/07. Staff evaluation is based on standard criteria and then entered into the matrix for comparative purposes with other applications. All relevant staff then meet to agree to priority ratings for the applications which guide the final staff recommendations to the Board. The matrix contains the following information for each application for funding:

<b>Group</b>	Name of the unit or group responsible for the project or service.
<b>Project/Service Description</b>	A brief description of the project or service.
<b>Amount Requested</b>	The amount of funding requested by the group/unit.
<b>Board Objective</b>	Board objectives to which the project/service can be linked.
<b>Expected Outcome of Project</b>	What the project is expected to achieve.
<b>Policy/Strategy</b>	The Council policy or strategy to which the project/service can be linked.
<b>Need Supported By</b>	Any relevant research or other evidence that identifies a need for the project/service.
<b>Financial Risk</b>	Assessment of the project's/service's financial risk. Shown by a high/medium/low rating.
<b>Delivery Risk</b>	Assessment of the unit's/group's ability to complete the project or supply the service. Shown by a high/medium/low rating.
<b>Funding History</b>	Outlines whether the unit/group has received funding from the Board before or other Council funding; and whether accountability reports are on file.
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	Describes the precise decisions that staff are recommending.
<b>Staff Priority</b>	<p>Staff met to determine a staff priority rating for each request.</p> <p>The following grading criteria has been used by staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meets Board objectives/community outcomes - priority to fund, major contribution to social need and development.</li> <li>2. Meets Board objectives/community outcomes - requires a funding contribution.</li> <li>3. Meets 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 funding.</li> <li>0. Does not meet any of the above criteria - staff recommend not funding.</li> </ol>

4. The individual applications have come from various sources – community groups and/or individuals, board members and staff. A city-wide, publicly-advertised request for applications was carried out in late 2005/early 2006 for all community boards.
5. The total amount of funding requested through the applications was approximately \$768,000 and it has therefore required considerable staff effort to make recommendations totalling close to the \$390,000 available. Staff have not recommended above the \$390,000 available and where an application is assessed as lower than priority one, the staff recommendation is only for the board to “consider” funding.
6. To assist the Board with allocation of its Project and Discretionary Fund copies of the Board’s 2006/2009 Objectives have been circulated separately.
7. Accountability reporting of the current year’s funding allocation is being prepared and will be brought to the Board for consideration later in 2006.
8. The full individual applications will be available at the meeting if board members require them.

#### **FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. Each year the Board is provided with a total of \$390,000 for allocation as follows:
  - Strengthening Communities (SCAP) \$40,000 – specific projects can be designated as SCAP projects.
  - Discretionary Fund for disbursement throughout the year at the Board’s discretion (can be up to a maximum of \$60,000).
  - Project Fund for allocation to projects that align to the Board’s/community’s outcomes and Council policies - \$50,000 of which is to be specifically tagged for supporting the salary of community workers.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Board consider the attached information and staff recommendations regarding applications to its 2006/2007 Project and Discretionary Fund.
2. That the Board confirm its allocation of the Project and Discretionary Fund for 2006/07.