



Christchurch City Council

METROPOLITAN FUNDING COMMITTEE AGENDA

FRIDAY 11 JULY 2008

AT 8.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, GROUND FLOOR, CIVIC OFFICES

Committee: The Mayor, Bob Parker (Chairperson),
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Ngaire Button, Barry Corbett, David Cox,
Yani Johanson, Claudia Reid, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Mike Wall, Sue Wells,
Chrissie Williams and Norm Withers.

Principal Adviser
Michael Aitken
Telephone: 941-8986
Fax: 941-8572

Council Secretary
Clare Sullivan
Telephone: 941-8533
Fax: 941-8696

INDEX

1. APOLOGIES
2. METROPOLITAN STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND 2008

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Mike Wall.
Leave of absence: Councillor Gail Sheriff.

2. METROPOLITAN STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUND 2008

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Penelope Goldstone, Metropolitan Community Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Metropolitan Funding Committee (MFC) to allocate the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund 2008.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The strategy incorporated the Community Group Grants Review which provided the framework, principles and funding outcomes for the new Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme.
3. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four new funding schemes, which supersede all previous community group grant schemes, sub-schemes and categories.
4. The new schemes are:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Projects Fund
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme
5. The new funding schemes enable the Council to support and provide leverage opportunities for not-for-profit, community focused groups seeking funding in support of their community endeavours.
6. 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
7. 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

2 Cont'd

8. Core criteria for applicants to the Strengthening Criteria fund are:
- Not-for-profit, community-focused groups/organisations;
 - Legal status;
 - Based in CCC area and programmes primarily for CCC residents;
 - No unresolved previous accountability requirements and no overdue debts to CCC;
 - Must provide evidence of the project need;
 - Must have appropriate financial management, accounting, monitoring & reporting practices;
 - Applications must show evidence of authorised approval to seek funding from CCC; and
 - Must have sound governance, operational capacity & capability to deliver.
9. Councillors have the option to give one, two or three year funding terms to applicants that demonstrate competency and have a track record in operating and delivering projects according the above criteria. No recommendations, with the exception of the KLO nominees, have been made for more than one year of funding.

THE DECISION MATRIX

- 10.1 Information on the applicant's projects will be presented in a Decision Matrix. To ensure consistency, the same Decision Matrix format and presentation will be provided to Community Boards, at their local Strengthening Communities Funding seminar meetings and decision making meetings.
- 10.2 The Decision Matrix names the organisation applying for funding and describes the individual project applied for, including up to four project goals nominated by the applicant that will be delivered through undertaking the project.
- 10.3 Under the Strengthening Communities Funding Scheme, organisations were invited to make applications for 'project-based' costs, in order to show where ratepayer funded monies were to be applied and what outcomes were being achieved. Applicant organisations were able to submit one or more applications depending on whether they had one single composite project or separate discrete projects through which they delivered their service(s) or programme(s).
- 10.4 In making recommendations, and in seeking to provide consistency with assessments and recommendations with regard to applications, staff held inter-unit collaboration meetings. At the collaboration meetings, individual applications were discussed and critically assessed. The meetings included staff members from the Art Gallery, Community Development team and Recreation and Sport Unit.
- 10.5 All applications appearing on the Decision Matrix have been assigned a Priority Rating. The Priorities Ratings are as follows:
- P1. Meets all eligibility and criteria and contributes **significantly** to Funding Outcomes and Priorities and is highly recommended for funding. (See 10.6 below for more explanation).
 - P2. Meets all eligibility and criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. (See 10.7 for more explanation).
 - P3. Meets all eligibility and criteria and has **minimum** contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities or is the predominant responsibility of other more appropriate funding sources such as central government or other funding agencies. Funding is not recommended.

2 Cont'd

10.6 With regards to Priority One (P1) recommendations, staff have used the following criteria to determine whether or not an application can be deemed significant:

- Impact the project has on the city
- Reach of the project
- Depth of the project
- Political sensitivity
- Value for Money
- Best Practice
- Innovation
- Strong alignment to Council Outcomes and Priorities
- Noteworthy leverage or partnership/match funding from other organisations or government departments.

10.7 During the assessment process, it was identified that there were a large number of Priority Two (P2) applications. To assist in decision-making, staff have made a further split for Priority Two applications into Priority 2.1 and Priority 2.2 recommendations. The following criteria have been used:

- Value for money
- Impact of the project (both reach and depth of project)
- Best Practise
- Innovation
- Alignment to Council Outcomes and Priorities
- Noteworthy leverage or partnership/match funding from other organisations or government departments.

Where a project is deemed to meet the above criteria to a greater extent, it has been rated as a Priority 2.1 and funding is recommended.

Where a project is deemed to meet the above criteria to a lesser extent, it has been rated as a Priority 2.2, and funding is not recommended due to insufficient funding.

KEY LOCAL ORGANISATIONS

11.1 The Decision Matrix includes applications nominated by Community Boards as Key Local Organisations (KLOs). Community Boards met in the period 19 to 30 May 2008 to agree their respective recommendations.

11.2 An organisation recognised as a KLO is one which:

- Has a proven track record with Council in providing a high quality level of service;
- Provides a significant contribution towards the Council's Funding Outcomes and Priorities;
- Demonstrates leadership and innovation;
- Demonstrates best-practice and collaboration.

11.3 The agreed process to determine if a "local" funding application should be processed as a KLO was detailed in the report adopted by Council on 4 October, 2007.

2 Cont'd

11.4 The process for considering KLOs is as follows:

- i. Community Boards nominate and prioritise their KLOs and make a recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee
- ii. The Metropolitan Funding Committee makes decisions on Board recommended KLOs
- iii. Successful KLOs are allocated funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund
- iv. Unsuccessful KLOs are returned to the Community Board for consideration under the local Strengthening Communities Fund

11.5 Community Boards have been advised that where candidates for KLO funding consideration are successful in receiving funding from the Metropolitan Funding Committee, then there can be **no** further call on the Board for that project.

11.6 This is also the case, where a successful candidate is funded to a lower level than has been recommended by the Board. This reflects the "Funding Constraints" criteria agreed by the Council in Appendix F of the 4 October 2007 report which states that "Groups receiving funding at a Metropolitan level may only receive Local level funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the Metropolitan level".

11.7 As detailed in the report adopted by the Council on 4 October, 2007, the Metropolitan Funding Committee will make KLO decisions based on affordability and the following priorities:

- Strengthening Communities Strategy Principles and Goals;
- Funding outcomes and priorities as set out in Strengthening Communities Strategy;
- Alignment to local Community Board objectives;

AND

- Projects deliver benefits to the city outside of the local Board area;
- Key community issues contemplated under Goal 2 of the Strengthening Communities Strategy.

EXISTING COMMITMENTS

12 The Decision Matrix includes projects which have existing Council resolutions for multiple year funding:

- Youth and Cultural Development, \$70,000 until 30 June 2010 (resolved on 15 July 2003);
- OSCAR Support, \$40,000 until 30 June 2012 (resolved on 8 April 2002 and 16 July 2002);
- Community House, \$161,750 until 30 June 2011 (resolved on 27 September 2001)

INELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS

13 Four ineligible applications were received. Two were received after the closing deadline for application and two were for funding requests that were outside the scope of the fund.

2 Cont'd

SEMINAR FOLLOW-UP

- 14 A seminar was held on 13 and 16 June to go through the applications received in order to clarify any issues or questions about applications. Suggested changes to recommendations have been incorporated in the final Matrix. Original staff recommendations are listed in black and suggested changes from the seminar are written in red.

Staff also made recommendations as requested on the balance of the funding available. These are listed separately in the document attached and are included in the final matrix written in green.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

15. N/A

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

16. Yes

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

17. None

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

18. N/A

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

19. Aligns with Community Support Activity

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

20. Yes – Community Grants

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

21. Strengthening Communities Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

22. Yes

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

23. N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approve the recommendations contained in the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund Decision Matrix.

ATTACHMENT 1

Staff Recommendations for Balance of Funding

	Requested	Project	Recommended
	Amount	Cost	Amount
Aranui High School			\$20,000
Canterbury Worknet Charitable Trust (ZooDoo)	\$21,000	\$120,000	\$5,000
Cholmondeley Children's Home	\$25,000	\$32,000	\$5,000
Christchurch Beautifying Assn	\$28,820	\$28,820	\$15,000
Community Law Canterbury	\$70,000	\$212,500	\$5,000
Gain Canterbury	\$40,000	\$46,950	\$20,000
Keep Christchurch Beautiful	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$15,000
New Zealand Conservation Trust (Willowbank)	\$95,339	\$132,444	\$20,000
Seabrook McKenzie Centre (TRUST)	\$15,000	\$52,000	\$5,000
Tramway Historical Society Inc	\$13,770	\$16,970	\$0
Woolston Brass Inc	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$15,000
Okains Bay Maori and Colonial Museum	\$113,000	\$113,000	\$10,000
Christchurch Christmas Parade Trust	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$50,000
Christchurch Early Intervention Centre	\$45,000	\$1,560,646	\$0
Family Help Trust	\$50,000	\$50,097	\$0
Southern DC3 Charitable Trust	\$110,000	\$110,000	\$0
St Albans Residents Assn (KLO)			\$23,000
Rowley Resource Centre (KLO)			\$10,000
Cross Over Trust (KLO)			\$20,000
	Total recommended		\$238,000
	Amount available		\$270,870
	Balance		\$32,000