

2. RICCARTON/WIGRAM SMALL GRANTS FUND REPORT 2011/12

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, Ph 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Community Support
Author:	Pen Goldstone, Community Grants Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee to allocate the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund for 2011/12.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report provides information to Committee members on the applications received for the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund for 2011/12.
3. The total pool available for allocation in 2011/12, as outlined in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP), is \$72,529. Applications totalling \$123,762 were received. Staff Recommendations totalling \$70,576 have been made.
4. Attached is the Decision Matrix (**Attachment 1**), which outlines the projects that funding is being sought for. Staff have ranked all projects as either Priority 1, 2, 3 or 4 and have made recommendations as to funding.
5. Under the Small Grants Fund, organisations are asked to make applications for individual projects. As such, organisations may have made more than one application in order to fund separate projects and deliver a range of services.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

6. 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?

7. Yes. Community Board funding decisions are made under delegated authority from the Council. On 24 July 2008, the Council made the following resolution:

That each of the Community Boards' 'Small [Grants] Fund Assessment Committees' have full authority to determine final funding decisions for their respective Community Board's 'Small [Grants] Fund Scheme' subject to full compliance with the Council's rules, policies and criteria for the 'Small [Grants] Fund Scheme.'

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?

8. 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?

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee:

- (a) Consider the projects contained in the attached Decision Matrix and approve allocations from the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund for 2011/12.
- (b) Delegate authority to the Committee Chairperson and a member of the Committee to confirm the minutes of the meeting.

BACKGROUND

Strengthening Communities Strategy

11. 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 Grants Fund (Previously Small Projects Fund)
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme
12. For detailed information on the Strengthening Communities Strategy's Outcomes and Priorities please see **Attachment 2**. The specific criteria for the Small Grants Fund is also attached, as **Attachment 3**. Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Objectives have also been used to assess projects, please see **Attachment 4**.

The Decision Matrix

13. Information on the projects is presented in the Decision Matrix , attached as **Attachment 1**. To ensure consistency, the same Decision Matrix format and presentation has been provided to the Metropolitan Small Grants Fund Subcommittee and all local Small Grants Fund Assessment Committees.
14. Applications are project-based; information is provided that relates specifically to the project for which funding is being sought, not the wider organisation.
15. All applications appearing on the Decision Matrix have been assigned a Priority Rating. The Priority Ratings are:
 - Priority 1** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Highly recommended for funding.
 - Priority 2** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Recommended for funding.
 - Priority 3** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications. Not recommended for funding.
 - Priority 4** Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities; or Insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Advisor); or Other funding sources more appropriate. Not recommended for funding.
16. Staff have used the following criteria to determine whether an application is a Priority One:
 - Impact the project has on the city
 - Reach of the project
 - Depth of the project

- 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.

17. Small Grants Fund Assessment Committees have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Small Grants Fund for their respective wards. The Committee's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting and approval of the minutes. All groups will then be informed of the decisions and funding agreements will be completed. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2011.