

**RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD**

**AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 16 MARCH 2010**

**AT 4.45PM**

**AT LA VIDA CONFERENCE AND COMMUNITY CENTRE  
34A HANSONS LANE, RICCARTON**

**Community Board:** Peter Laloli (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Judy Kirk, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

**Community Board Adviser**

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941-6501

Email: [liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz)

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

**CLAUSE**

<b>PART B</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 2 MARCH 2010</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>PETITIONS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>5.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>6.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>7.</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>8.</b>	<b>APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE SCHEME– ILAM-UPPER RICCARTON RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATION</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>9.</b>	<b>SMALL GRANTS FUND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE - COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>10.</b>	<b>RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2010/11 – BOARD BIDS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>11.</b>	<b>2008/09 STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND, SMALL GRANTS FUND, AND DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – END OF PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>12.</b>	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>13.</b>	<b>MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 2 MARCH 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 2 March 2010 are **attached**.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 2 March 2010 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

## 8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE SCHEME – ILAM-UPPER RICCARTON RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, , DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Marie Byrne, Community Engagement Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose for this report is to present a further funding request from the Ilam-Upper Riccarton Residents' Association for technical assistance with their submission to a Notified Resource Consent Application by Foodstuffs Ltd.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Foodstuffs Ltd have submitted a notified resource consent for the construction of a supermarket and retail units at 47C and 57 Peer Street, Upper Riccarton. This site is part of the old Feltex factory site. The Ilam-Upper Riccarton Resident's Association have made a formal submission against this and wish to receive funding towards technical expertise to assist them when they appear at the resource consent hearing.
3. The technical assistance they are seeking is from an independent planner and an independent traffic engineer.
4. The Association's concern with the proposed development is over the size and proposed hours of the operation and the traffic that will consequently be generated. They are of the view that alongside the proposed Vision Senior developments, this will be over development of the site. They have expressed concern that there are already two other supermarkets within a kilometre radius and this will be over supply.
5. The submission period has closed to the Consent application. Council's Senior Planner handling the consent, Clare Revell, advises that she expects a hearing to be held in March 2010 once further information requested has been received.
6. The Ilam-Upper Riccarton Residents' Association previously applied to the Riccarton-Wigram Community Board for financial assistance for this project, seeking \$7,000. At the Board's 16 February meeting the Board allocated \$408 to the Association.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The \$408 allocated was thought to be the remainder of the Board's Discretionary Fund. Since that date a further amount has become available. The Ilam-Upper Riccarton Residents' Association has requested consideration for further funding from the remaining funds.
8. The Association has just over \$2000 in their bank account; \$450 is tagged for their costs already incurred, \$200 for their annual barbecue costs, and \$300 is for their administration costs. The latter two amounts were funded by the Riccarton Wigram Community Board from Strengthening Communities and Small Projects Funds respectively.
9. Under the Strengthening Communities Strategy, Community Board Discretionary Response Fund is one of the Council's grant funding schemes. This funding request meets the criteria set out for Discretionary Response Funding.

### Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

10. From page 184 of the LTCCP, under Community Funding the Riccarton Wigram Community Board has discretionary funds for allocation during the 2009/10 financial year.

8. Cont'd.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. Advice has been sought from the Council's Legal Services Unit. Regard should be taken to Peter Mitchell's memo to elected members of May 2008. Part 1 states;

1. *"That it shall in general be the Council's policy not to make specific grants to individuals or community groups to assist them in making submissions / appeals on applications or scheme changes under the Resource Management Act 1991. Any exception to that policy shall be by specific resolution of the Environmental Committee, and only in circumstances where it is warranted in the wider public interest, or because of Council ownership of land, or because of particular circumstances applying.*

12. However the memo does go on to state:

2. *That this policy shall not debar Community Boards from making grants from their discretionary funds to recognised community residents groups within their area.*

*Regarding number 2 it has been the practice of Community Boards since 1992 to make grants to resident groups for hearings either at Council level or at the Environment Court. Often those requests for grants are made in order to fund the payment by the residents group of expert planning advice or legal representation.*

*It should be noted that such payments are to be made to "recognised community residents groups" within a Board area. I take this to mean the groups recognised by a Community Board in respect of the Council's "Residents Association - Formation and Recognition Policy"*

*If the Community Board decides to make such a grant then it is funded from the \$60,000 per annum discretionary funding that the "City" Community Boards are provided by the Council.*

*Grants can be made by Community Boards for a Council level hearing and hearings in the Environment Court or the higher Courts.*

*Boards may be asked to make a grant for a hearing that has already occurred or for one yet to occur.*

*Where a grant is to be made for a Council level hearing that is yet to occur the Board needs to make it clear to the applicant for the grant that the Board's decision does not imply any view by the Board regarding the merit of the application. The Board will also need to make a judgement regarding the fact that a grant could be seen to be funding one group of ratepayers to contest an application usually made by another ratepayer.*

13. The Legal Services also states that while the group has applied for technical costs rather than legal costs, it is also arguable that the costs are for a legal process and in this case they could fall into the criteria of the Discretionary Fund which does state that legal costs shall not be eligible.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. Under the Community Grants Activity Management Plan, funding for this project aligns under the Community Grants Funding Priorities and Outcomes, but may not align with the Discretionary Response Fund guidelines.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

15. As above.

**8. Cont'd.**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

16. Funding for this project aligns with the Council's A Safe City and A Healthy City, Community outcomes as well as Healthy Environment and Liveable City strategic outcomes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Nil

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

18. It is recommended that the Riccarton-Wigram Community Board consider revisiting the funding application from the Ilam-Upper Riccarton Residents' Association and consider increasing the funding allocated to the Association.

## 9. SMALL GRANTS FUND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE - COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Denise Galloway, Community Development Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek a decision from the Riccarton Wigram Community Board regarding the appointment of community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11 funding round.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 10 December 2009, a report to the Council from the Grants Working Party on Community Funding Criteria Changes recommended that:

***Recommendation H: Small Grants Fund - Community Representation on Small Grants Funding Committees***

*No community representatives on Small Grants Fund Metropolitan decision making body.*

*Individual Community Boards to decide if they wish to retain community representatives.*

***Recommendation I: Small Grants Fund - Metropolitan Small Grants Funding Committee***

*Metropolitan Small Grants Subcommittee be comprised of a maximum of five Councillors, with full delegated authority.*

*As per the Recommendation H , the Committee would not include any Community Representatives.*

3. As a result of these recommendations, the Council resolved to:
 

*"Disestablish the Metropolitan Small Grants Funding Subcommittee comprising both Councillors and community representatives from 31 May 2010";*

*"Establish a Metropolitan Small Grants Fund Subcommittee comprising Councillors Johanson, Shearing, Wall, Button, Corbett and Buck (with the Deputy Mayor as ex officio) to take effect from 1 June 2010 to allocate the Small Grants Fund – Metropolitan, to eligible applicants whose projects are consistent with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy and LTCCP."*
4. As per recommendation H (above) in the *Grants Working Party Criteria Changes* Report, Community Boards have the opportunity to decide if they wish to continue to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11, funding rounds.
5. If the Community Board wish to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, staff will begin the nomination process for representatives. After nominations have been received, staff will report back to the Community Board (Public Excluded Report) with details of nominees in order for the Board to decide upon their chosen representatives.
6. If the Community Board wish to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, it is recommended that four to six community representatives be appointed for a one year term for the 2010/11 funding round.

## 9. Cont'd

7. It is further recommended that in considering the appointment of community members to this Committee, the Board should consider the make up of the local community. In the past, the following involvement areas/skills have been advertised when calling for community nominations and are seen as a guideline to assist in covering the various sectors within your local community:
  - Disabled, sport and recreation, arts and culture, welfare and social services, Maori, ethnic groups, environment and heritage.
  - Interest and involvement in community issues/groups.
  - Some experience in committee processes.
  - Knowledge of various communities of interest.
  - The ability to be articulate and assertive.
8. The Board, in 2008, established its Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee and appointed six community representatives for the period June 2008 to May 2010. At that time all Community Board Members were appointed to the Committee with a term of three years, for the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 funding rounds.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

### Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Community Board funding.

## LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

### Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. Yes. Under the 2002 Local Government Act, a Council, or Community Board, may appoint committees, subcommittees other subordinate decision making bodies and joint committees (clause 30, Schedule 7). Council's and Community Board's also have the power to appoint or discharge any member of a committee (clause 31(1)). Such committees, etc are ***"subject in all things to the control of the local authority [or read community board], and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given in relation to the committee or other body or the affairs of the committee or other body"*** (clause 30(3)).
11. The minimum number of members for a "committee" is three, with a quorum being two (One of whom must be an elected member), or the quorum can be a greater number, as determined by the Community Board. At least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the Community Board, but an employee of the local authority cannot be a member (if they are acting in the course of their employment). Clause 31 also provides:
 

*"(3) The members of a committee or subcommittee may, but need not be, elected members of the local authority [community board], and a local authority or committee may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local authority or committee if, in the opinion of the local authority, that person has the skills, attributes, or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee."*
12. Clause 26(3) is also relevant, as it provides that the Council/Community Board may appoint a member of a committee to be the Chairperson of the committee, or if a Chairperson is not appointed then the power of appointment may be exercised by the committee. A Deputy Chairperson can also be appointed to act in the absence of a chairperson (clause 26(4)). This person will preside at any meeting if the Chairperson is absent from a meeting. However, if a Deputy Chairperson has not been appointed or if they are also absent then the members of the committee that are present must elect one of their number to preside at the meeting.

**9 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

13. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

14. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch Community Boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board decide whether or not they wish to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11 funding round.



# 10. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2010/11 – BOARD BIDS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services Group 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Acting Unit Manager Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Marie Byrne, Community Engagement Adviser

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to agree to the projects that will be put forward on behalf of the Board to the Strengthening Communities Fund for 2010/11.
2. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board decision-making meeting is scheduled for 19 July 2010.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. At the Council meeting dated 10 December 2009 the Council resolved to amend the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Operational Procedures for the Strengthening Communities Fund, Small Grants Fund and Discretionary Response Fund Local, effective for the 2010/11 Funding round, by adding the following:

*“That the Council officers be instructed that as a matter of future policy they are not to apply for funding from this source for Council projects.”*

4. In previous years, Council Units have made applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund for local projects including community events and various recognition awards. Following the decision by the Council, applications to the fund for these types of projects will now need to come from the Elected Members.
5. Attached to this report is a table that outlines potential projects that the Board may wish to consider putting forward for consideration for the 2010/11 Strengthening Communities Fund (**Attachment 1**). These projects have been agreed as part of Unit work programmes. Also attached is a list of local Board projects which received funding from the two previous years funding rounds (**Attachment 2**).
6. Subsequent to the Board identifying which projects it would like to put forward as applications, staff will assess each project and include these on the decision matrix along with the other applications received for Strengthening Communities Fund.
7. The Riccarton/Wigram Board Funding Workshop on 17 June 2010 will give Community Board Members the opportunity to go through all applications received from the community and Elected Member bids, in order to clarify any issues or seek further information about any of the projects. This seminar is public excluded.
8. If an Elected Member would like to put forward other local projects for consideration as part of the Strengthening Communities Fund, the Elected Member will need to complete an Elected Member Bid Application Form. This application will then be assessed by staff and considered at the Strengthening Communities Fund workshop and decision meetings, alongside all other applications. Staff will be available to assist Elected Members in completing the application form, if required.

**10. Cont'd.**

9. At the Council meeting dated 10 December 2009 the Council further resolved to amend the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Operational Procedures with the following:

*"Amend the Strengthening Communities Strategy and the criteria for the Strengthening Communities Fund - Local to allow Community Boards to create a Youth Development Fund to allocate funding for Youth Development Grants."*

*"Amend the Strengthening Communities Strategy and the criteria by removing the "cap" of up to \$10,000 for the Youth Development Fund."*

10. In previous years Boards' have been able to establish a Youth Development Fund (YDF) of up to \$10,000 from their Discretionary Response Fund.
11. Most Boards fully spent their allocation with some Boards further topping it up during the year dependant on demands on the fund.
12. From 2010 Boards can choose to establish a YDF from their Strengthening Communities Fund and the option still remains to also use their Discretionary Response Fund for this purpose.
13. Boards desiring to have a YDF for 2010 from the Strengthening Communities Fund should include this as a Board bid following the process outlined above.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

14. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

15. Yes. Community Board funding decisions are made under delegated authority from the Council.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

16. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

17. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch community boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. Not required

**10. Cont'd.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in **Attachment 1 – Projects to Consider 2010/2011** and approve a list of projects to be submitted as applications to the 2010/11 Strengthening Communities Fund.

**BACKGROUND**

**STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES STRATEGY**

19. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
  - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
  - (b) Small Projects Fund
  - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
  - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme
20. The following funding outcomes have been used to evaluate and assess applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund:
  - Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups
  - Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups, programmes and local events
  - Increase community engagement in local decision making
  - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
  - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
  - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
  - Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need
13. The following funding priorities have been taken into consideration when assessing applications:
  - Older Adults
  - Children and Youth
  - People with Disabilities
  - Ethnic and Culturally Diverse Groups
  - Disadvantaged and/or Socially Excluded
  - Capacity of Community Organisations
  - Civic Engagement
22. The following criteria must be met by all applicants:
  - A community based not-for-profit community, recreation, sporting, arts, social service, environment or heritage organisation.
  - All groups applying for more than \$2,000 must be incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908 or the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 or be a legal entity registered for charitable purposes.
  - Be based in the Christchurch City Council area with funded programmes or services being provided primarily for Christchurch City Council residents.
  - Must have provided accountability reports for all previous Council funding and have no unresolved or outstanding accountability issues including outstanding debt to the Council.
  - Must have had the funding application approved at a properly convened committee meeting and in writing.
  - Must provide evidence of the need for the project.
  - Have appropriate financial management, accounting, monitoring and reporting practices.

**10. Cont'd.**

- Have sound governance and appropriate operational capability and capacity to deliver to the level as agreed.
- Be able to commit to collaboration and partnering, where appropriate.
- Groups receiving Council funding at a metropolitan level may only apply for local funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the metropolitan level.
- Community Boards may decide in conjunction with Council Units to deliver activities to their local communities.

**TIMELINE AND PROCESS**

23. Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Strengthening Communities Funding for their respective wards. The Board's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting. All groups will then be informed of the decisions and funding agreements will be negotiated where relevant. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2010.

# 11. 2008/09 STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND, SMALL GRANTS FUND, AND DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – END OF PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services , DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Denise Galloway, Community Development Adviser

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Riccarton Wigram Community Board with an end of year accountability report for projects that received funding from the 2008/09 Strengthening Communities Fund (SCF), Small Grants Fund (SGF) and Discretionary Response Fund (DRF).

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The amount of the Council's Strengthening Communities Fund allocated by the Board for the 2008/09 financial year was \$280,000.
3. Successful applicants of the Strengthening Communities Fund are required to submit a six month accountability report and an end of project accountability report. Attached to this report, (**Attachment 1**), is a matrix detailing the information received on the end of project accountability reports.
4. In 2008/09 a new reporting system using a Results Based Accountability framework was introduced. This system uses three key questions to measure the impact and efficacy of projects.
  - How much did you do?
  - How well did you do it?
  - Is anyone better off?
5. The amount of the Council's Small Grants Fund allocated by the Board for the 2008/09 financial year was \$85,000.
6. Successful applicants of the Small Grants Fund are only required to submit an end of project accountability report. Attached to this report (**Attachment 2**) is a matrix detailing which projects have returned an accountability report and includes staff comments where necessary.
7. The amount of the Community Board's DRF for the 2008/09 financial year was \$60,000.
8. Successful applicants of the DRF are also only required to submit an end of project accountability report. Attached to this report, (**Attachment 3**), is a matrix detailing the information received on the end of project accountability reports.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. On 22 July 2008, the Board allocated its Strengthening Communities Funding (\$280,000) across twenty-two projects.
10. On 13 August 2008, the Board allocated its Small Grants Funding (\$85,000) across fifty-nine projects.
11. During the period of 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009, the Board allocated a total of \$60,000 from its Discretionary Response Fund across twenty-one projects.

## Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

12. Yes, see LTCCP pages 99 and 100 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

**11 Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

13. There are no direct legal issues involved in this review process.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

14. Yes, see LTCCP pages 99 and 100 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

15. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch Community Boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.
16. Funding allocations made contributed to fulfilling the Council's 2006-16 Strategic Objectives (Strong Communities) and Community Outcomes (Governance and Community), are aligned with the Strengthening Communities Strategy 2007 and contribute to meeting the Board's Objectives for the 2006-09 period.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

17. Yes, as per paragraph 15 above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board receive the information.

**BACKGROUND**

**End of Project Accountability Reports**

19. In total, 102 projects received a grant in 2008/09 from Riccarton Wigram Community Board's Strengthening Communities Fund, Small Grants Fund, or the Discretionary Response Fund.
20. Staff are following up with any group that has not completed their end of project accountability report. It should be noted that groups who were allocated funding for the 2009/10 year did not have their funding released until an accountability report for 2008/09 had been received.

**New accountability measures – Results Based Accountability**

21. In 2008/09, a new accountability system, based on a Results Based Accountability framework developed by Mark Friedman, was implemented to better measure the impact and efficacy of the projects funded.

**11 Cont'd**

22. Results Based Accountability starts with the desired 'ends' and works backward, step by step, to the 'means'. For example – for communities, the ends are conditions of well-being for children, adults, families and the community as a whole such as residents with good jobs, a safe neighbourhood, or a clean environment.
23. The system uses three basic questions:
  - How much did you do?
  - How well did you do it?
  - Is anyone better off?
24. Mark Freidman is a speaker, consultant and author of the book *'Trying Hard Is Not Good Enough: How to Produce Measurable Improvements for Customers and Communities'*. Mr Friedman directs the Fiscal Policy Studies Institute (FPSI) in Santa Fe, New Mexico. His work has been used in over 40 states in America and countries around the world, including Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway.
25. Mark Freidman gave a presentation on the Results Based Accountability System for Elected Members on 10 June 2009 at Civic Chambers.
26. All groups that received funding in the 2008/09 year were invited to attend a seminar with Mark Friedman on 5 December 2008. The seminar explained the reasoning behind Results Based Accountability and showed groups how to measure their project's outcomes in this way.
27. Staff have also been trained on the Results Based Accountability System and have been available to groups to help them to complete their accountability reports.

**16. 3. 2010**

**- 16 -**

**12. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**13. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**