

# **Community Grants**

## **Activity Management Plan**

### **Long Term Plan 2015–2025**

17<sup>th</sup> October, 2014

**Note**

The information in this activity management plan was prepared in conjunction with elected members as part of the development of the draft long term plan and its associated consultation document.

Key information has since been condensed into the statements of services provision in the Group of Activities section of the draft long-term plan.

## Quality Assurance Statement

Christchurch City Council Civic Offices 53 Hereford Street PO Box 73015 Christchurch 8154 Tel: 03 941 8999	<b>Version</b>	<b>V 1 14 October 2014</b>
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Draft</b>
	<b>Portfolio Councillor:</b>	
	<b>Activity Manager: Lincoln Papali'i</b>	
	<b>Chief / Director: Mary Richardson</b>	
	<b>Asset Manager:</b>	
	<b>Finance Manager: Katherine Harbrow</b>	

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
List of Tables .....	ii
List of Figures .....	iii
<b>1</b> Key Issues for the Community Grants Activity .....	1
1.1 Community Outcomes .....	1
1.2 Effects of growth, demand and sustainability .....	1
1.3 Key Challenges and Opportunities for Community Grants .....	2
<b>2</b> Proposed changes to activity.....	5
<b>3</b> Activity description.....	6
3.1 Focusing on what we want to achieve.....	6
3.2 How we will know we are achieving the outcomes .....	6
3.3 What services we provide .....	6
3.4 Our key customers.....	6
3.5 Benefits and Funding Sources .....	7
3.6 Key legislation and Council strategies.....	7
<b>4</b> Levels of service and performance measures .....	8
<b>5</b> Summary of Cost for Activity .....	12

## List of Tables

Table 1-1: Key Challenges and Opportunities for Community Grants.....	2
Table 2-1: Proposed changes to activity.....	4
Table 4-1: Levels of service and performance.....	7

## List of Figures

Figure 7-1: Summary of Costs for Activity.....	8
Figure 7-2: Community Grants Cost.....	19

## 1 Key Issues for the Community Grants Activity

The Council operates a contestable community grants programme scheme that is available at a city-wide and local community ward level to assist the community focused initiatives undertaken by not-for-profit community organisations and communities of interest working for the benefit of Christchurch residents and communities. Strong communities investment includes community development, engagement and funding to support the development and delivery of activities, resources and supports to strengthen the skills, capacity, capability and confidence of people, community groups and communities of interest to enable them to take effective action and lead roles in their lives and that of their community and city.

### 1.1 Community Outcomes

Everything that the Council does in its day-to-day work is focused on achieving community outcomes. All activities outlined in this plan aim to deliver the results required to achieve these outcomes, contribute to Council strategies and meet legislative requirements. Likewise, all Council capital and operating expenditure is directed towards a level of service that moves the community closer to these outcomes now or at some future point.

The effective management of Community Grants for Christchurch means achieving the community outcomes that:

- Services are available locally within the urban areas
- Cultural and ethnic diversity is valued and celebrated
- Arts and culture thrive in Christchurch
- People have strong social networks
- People have the information and skills to enable them to participate in society.
- There is increasing participation in recreation and sporting activities

Section 4 shows how these outcomes flow down into and influence the Council's activities and levels of service in relation to Community Grants.

### 1.2 Effects of growth, demand and sustainability

Describe how our population growth and demand effects the decisions Council will make in delivering services to ensure that they are sustainable and will meet the needs of the people of Christchurch into the future.

#### **Population Growth and Demand:**

The Christchurch population has decreased as a direct result of the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes, including migration from the east of the city to the west following red zone announcements. Notwithstanding the decrease and the shift, the community grants schemes are still experiencing an increase in funding applications and more noticeably, the community applicants continue to cite an increase in the uptake of their services as well as an increased intensity in the demands of clients and service users as a direct result of the earthquake impacts. This has been further compounded by the secondary effects of having to deal with damaged houses, prolonged EQC and insurance settlements, accommodation shortages and increased rental costs and continuing pressures around neighbourhood quality of life with regards to the long lead times required to complete necessary and critical infrastructure & facility repairs and rebuilds.

The earthquakes and the loss of communities, income, friendships, schools, sports clubs, service providers, facilities, and usual community gathering places has meant that communities are now, more than ever, working actively to bond, link and bridge within their communities, to seek some redress and balance to rebuild the loss and change of social capital

#### **Sustainability:**

The Local Government Act 2002 requires local authorities to take a sustainable development approach while conducting its business. Sustainable development is the fundamental philosophy that is embraced in Council's Vision, Mission and Objectives, and that shapes the community outcomes. The levels of service and the performance measures that flow from these inherently incorporate the achievement of sustainable outcomes.

### 1.3 Key Challenges and Opportunities for Community Grants

In working towards the community outcomes and influenced by population growth and demand, Council faces the challenge of making decisions that prioritise resources to deliver the best mix of services at the right level and in a sustainable way. The key challenges and opportunities that have been priorities by Council are below in Table 2-1.

**Table 1-1**

Key Issue	Discussion																																
<b>Differing post earthquake effects and impacts on communities and communities of interest</b>	<p>The 2010 and 2011 earthquakes resulted in differing degrees of damage to communities right across the city. The unequal damage resulted in some communities and their community organisations wishing to continue their community undertakings with relatively little change, while in other communities, new groups and community organisations emerged to sit alongside some long-standing organisations. Likewise, some groups fell away in this period as the members sought to focus on their immediate family response and recovery issues. Some existing groups and organisations also sought to deliver new or additional initiatives in addition to, or instead of, their usual services.</p>																																
<b>Community capacity and demands on limited funding resources.</b>	<p>The earthquakes and resultant community effects initially saw a spate of community initiatives flourish with many groups receiving financial contributions from one or more of the government or philanthropic funding schemes that emerged to support communities in the aftermath of the earthquakes.</p> <p>During this time many groups and their members responded to supporting communities, however the sustained and intensive nature of the response, the continuing after-shock sequences and personal and familial pressures caused burn-outs of both organisations and personnel.</p> <p>The Council continued to provide community grants throughout this period on the same basis as pre-quake with the view that there were a number of new earthquake specific funds available to provide more specific earthquake response activities and the fact that the Strengthening Communities Grants Programme outcomes were broad enough to support earthquake applications.</p> <p>Most of these additional funds have now run their course and no further funds, with the exception of the remaining Red Cross New Zealand monies and the Canterbury Community Trust monies will be available for community organisations seeking post-earthquake response funding.</p> <p>Community groups have also asked why the Strengthening Communities Grants Programme budget has not been inflation-proofed, which they contend has led to a loss of spending power in real terms, against which they note that costs have risen, particularly for rent and salaries and wages..</p> <p>Using the 2009/10 year as a base, and 2013/14 as the last full year of activity, the number of applications to the Strengthening Communities Grants Programme rose by 24% (1,130 applications to 1,403). Over the five year period 2009 – 2013, the Council's grants programme has been able to fund 52% of the funding requests that it received for a budget envelope that averaged \$7.5 million. It is anticipated that the oversubscription of funding requests will continue to rise once the full effect of earthquake specific funds are withdrawn or are closed as a result of being fully expended.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Financial year</th> <th>Total Applications Received</th> <th>Increase on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)</th> <th>% Increase / Decrease on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009/10</td> <td>1,130</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010/11</td> <td>1,486</td> <td>356</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011/12</td> <td>1,238</td> <td>108</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012/13</td> <td>1,468</td> <td>338</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>1,403</td> <td>273</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15 (4 months)</td> <td>1,112</td> <td>-18</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Applications Received</td> <td>7,837</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In 2011/12 there was an understandable dip in the number of applications received and this period also coincided with the influx of new earthquake focused funds which came into the city. However, since then the number of applications has moved well beyond the 1,130 received in 2009/10.</p>	Financial year	Total Applications Received	Increase on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)	% Increase / Decrease on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)	2009/10	1,130			2010/11	1,486	356	32%	2011/12	1,238	108	10%	2012/13	1,468	338	30%	2013/14	1,403	273	24%	2014/15 (4 months)	1,112	-18	-2%	Total Applications Received	7,837		
Financial year	Total Applications Received	Increase on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)	% Increase / Decrease on 2009/10 Year Applications (Base)																														
2009/10	1,130																																
2010/11	1,486	356	32%																														
2011/12	1,238	108	10%																														
2012/13	1,468	338	30%																														
2013/14	1,403	273	24%																														
2014/15 (4 months)	1,112	-18	-2%																														
Total Applications Received	7,837																																

Key Issue	Discussion																									
<p><b>Withdrawal of earthquake centric grants funding</b></p>	<p>As at the 2014/15 funding year, nearly all the additional grants funds that were established to support community groups and organisations has been fully spent or disestablished with the exception of the remaining Red Cross New Zealand earthquake donation monies and the Canterbury Community Trust funds set up to support earthquake recovery initiatives..</p> <p>One of the issues with this is that some groups or initiatives that were funded through these funds are now looking to other sources of funds to maintain or continue their work adding to the over-subscription experienced not only by the Council but all other funders in Christchurch.</p>																									
<p><b>Decision making and Eligibility</b></p>	<p>The Council currently makes grants available at a city-wide level with grants decisions made by Councillors, and at the Community Board level with decisions made by the Community Board members. Eligibility to receive a grant is limited to not-for-profit groups and organisations that must have legal status such as being an Incorporated Society or registered with Charitable status. The Council will also recognise groups without legal status as long as they have a bank account in the name of their group and understand that their maximum grant will be \$2,000 or less.</p> <p>The Strengthening Communities Grants Programme currently comprises the Strengthening Communities Fund which opens on 15<sup>th</sup> February and closes 31<sup>st</sup> March with grants decisions made in July with funding paid out in August for the 12 month period of September to August. The Small Grants Fund (for applications \$5,000 and under) opens on 15<sup>th</sup> April and closes 31<sup>st</sup> May with grants decisions made in August with funding paid out in late August / early September for the 12 month period September to August. The Discretionary Response Fund opens on the 1<sup>st</sup> July and runs through to the 30<sup>th</sup> June or earlier if the fund is fully expended before the 30<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>The Council may wish to consider amending the delegations for making grants decisions to speed up the grants process or it may wish to add an additional funding round within the year.</p>																									
<p><b>Funding Pool envelopes</b></p> <p><b>(2014/15 Budget Envelopes)</b></p>	<p>The current funding pools (2014/15) are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="408 1055 1414 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Metropolitan</th> <th>6 x City-based Community Boards – allocation per Community Board</th> <th>Banks Peninsula Community Boards</th> <th>Total Grants Envelope</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strengthening Communities Fund</td> <td>\$4,428,534</td> <td>\$238,918</td> <td>L/M - \$38,398 A/W - \$29,865</td> <td>\$5,930,305</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Grants Fund</td> <td>\$341,311</td> <td>\$72,529</td> <td>L/M - \$11,946 A/W - \$6,826</td> <td>\$795,257</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Discretionary Response Fund</td> <td>\$145,057</td> <td>\$51,197</td> <td>L/M - \$12,799 A/W - \$12,799</td> <td>\$477,837</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$4,914,902</td> <td>\$2,175,864</td> <td>L/M - \$63,143 A/W - \$49,490</td> <td>\$7,203,399</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The overall allocation to the Strengthening Communities Fund is \$5,930,305 (82%), with Small Grants comprising \$795,257 (11%) and Discretionary Response Fund being \$477,837 (7%).</p> <p>The budget allocation budget split for Metropolitan is \$4,914,902 (68%) and Local - \$2,288,497 (32%).</p> <p>When these budgets were apportioned between the three funding schemes and between Metropolitan and Local, they were done on the basis that the Council could re-apportion the budget depending on the issues, the need and the demands from the community on the funds.</p>		Metropolitan	6 x City-based Community Boards – allocation per Community Board	Banks Peninsula Community Boards	Total Grants Envelope	Strengthening Communities Fund	\$4,428,534	\$238,918	L/M - \$38,398 A/W - \$29,865	\$5,930,305	Small Grants Fund	\$341,311	\$72,529	L/M - \$11,946 A/W - \$6,826	\$795,257	Discretionary Response Fund	\$145,057	\$51,197	L/M - \$12,799 A/W - \$12,799	\$477,837		\$4,914,902	\$2,175,864	L/M - \$63,143 A/W - \$49,490	\$7,203,399
	Metropolitan	6 x City-based Community Boards – allocation per Community Board	Banks Peninsula Community Boards	Total Grants Envelope																						
Strengthening Communities Fund	\$4,428,534	\$238,918	L/M - \$38,398 A/W - \$29,865	\$5,930,305																						
Small Grants Fund	\$341,311	\$72,529	L/M - \$11,946 A/W - \$6,826	\$795,257																						
Discretionary Response Fund	\$145,057	\$51,197	L/M - \$12,799 A/W - \$12,799	\$477,837																						
	\$4,914,902	\$2,175,864	L/M - \$63,143 A/W - \$49,490	\$7,203,399																						
<p><b>Capital grants funding</b></p>	<p>The Council does not have a capital development fund that is able to be accessed by community organisations to support facility development, particularly in the wake of the earthquakes. However, this must be balanced by the Council's financial position.</p> <p>To date, the Council has been able to utilise the Christchurch Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund where groups align with the fund criteria to support grant funding requests relating to facility rebuilds or the Community Organisations Loan Scheme which allows larger financial requests to be satisfied but does not involve large capital granting in a constrained financial environment.</p>																									



Key Issue	Discussion
<p><b>Funding arrangements</b></p>	<p>Funding arrangements have had a negative impact on some community agencies. Many funders provide short term funding, requiring frequent re-approval and/or re-application for funds. This multiplies compliance costs. It forces organisations into limited-life projects and/or reactive practices which are not cost effective. Organisations are forced to run down assets, undermine their investment in future service development and pay salaries that are inadequate to sustain the positions. It therefore jeopardises the long-term viability of the sector.</p> <p>For the most part, central government has generally moved away from providing <i>grants</i> for community initiatives towards '<i>purchasing services</i>' from voluntary and community organisations. Contracts mean that the voluntary organisation is doing what the funder wants to be done. They focus on ensuring the provision of services to meet government priorities and therefore tend to stress specific outputs or outcomes. They tend to include complex accountability and performance requirements.</p> <p>The focus on purchasing narrow easily measurable outputs often undermines more holistic programmes shaped around individual and family needs; it frequently mirrors a 'silo' approach from separate government departments or agencies in the community organisations that are funded. Organisations are often required to <b>structure their services artificially in order to fit funders' criteria</b></p> <p>In many instances the amount of funding available from a single agency is insufficient to meet the full costs of a service or activity. Community organisations are therefore forced to deal with multiple funding bodies, each with their own funding, monitoring and reporting processes.</p> <p>There has been an under-investment in community infrastructure and capacity building. Under a competitive tendering approach there is evidence that training, research and development shrink, with an increasing short term focus. Furthermore there is a risk that where 'capacity building' is funded, it tends to be capacity to act as a contractor (for example meet accountability and reporting requirements), rather than actually improve organisational or community capacity in the areas important for facilitating stronger communities – such as leadership, participation, co-operation, advocacy etc.</p> <p>A purchase-of-service approach encourages a focus on accountability, verification, control and compliance. There is little evidence that government inspired measurement of outcomes/outputs of community organisations has contributed to greater effectiveness, transparency or accountability. Ironically the evidence suggests that, as a result, real organisational learning and proper accountability to boards and members can be effectively undermined by an increasing emphasis on funder-imposed compliance</p> <p>Council has recognised the need to minimise transaction and compliance costs for community organisations, while maintaining appropriate levels of accountability.</p> <p>The challenge is to the Council is to identify a strategic focus without losing the potential flexibility and responsiveness. Merely to mimic central government approaches to 'purchase-of-service' contracting could achieve a specific focus but at the cost, and would ultimately undermine the very objectives of a social investment approach. This would be a hollow victory of neatness over impact. Implementing a social investment approach to funding, would require that the Council tightly define its overall strategy and objectives, but be very flexible on negotiating the best means of achieving these objectives. Such an approach provides opportunities to address important social issues in Christchurch.</p>
<p><b>Variable donations</b></p>	<p>Voluntary Welfare organisations report that donations are variable and diminishing. However, there is no data available to confirm this. Organisations also reported that they find it difficult to control or anticipate donations as these can fluctuate from year to year. Revenues from individual contributions, corporate donations or even special events frequently double in size or decline by more than half from year to year.</p>

## 2 Proposed changes to activity

1. Are the things we currently do need to change to reflect the new environment? Earthquake recovery, elected member expectations?
2. How do we propose to address these changes through new ways of working?
3. How are the impacts of these choices going to be reflected in supporting programmes, such as delivery of levels of service, capital projects, budgets, and how will these changes be cascaded to contractors and providers?

Table 2-1 summarises the proposed changes for the management of the Community Grants activity since the Three Year Plan 2013-16 Activity Management Plan.

*In recording these changes also identify what investigations will be needed, highlight the level of significance for the change and identify appropriate options for consultation and engagement.*

**Table 2-1 Proposed changes to activity**

Key Change	Reason	Level of significance? What investigations are needed?	Options for consultation and engagement
The Council has expressed a desire to alter the current grants framework to provide a sharper focus on community participation and localised decision making.	The Council wishes to encourage communities to be leaders of their own development aspirations with a view to becoming stronger, more informed, prepared, confident and resilient communities.	Completion of the grants review to identify what new grants schemes and processes will need to be introduced.	Consultation with stakeholders and wider community may have to be undertaken as part of the Draft LTP public consultation. This will depend on the timing of the final decisions on the recommendations of the Grants Review Working Party's recommendations.
Seek opportunities to provide a faster processing work stream through end-to-end processing, where appropriate, increased delegation of decision-making, more specific and focused funding schemes, smaller more responsive funding schemes and more focused funding outcomes and funding priorities.	While the current community grant calendar is well known and accepted by the city's community groups and organisations, there is always the opportunity to fine-tune and amend the existing processes to provide improved and enhanced support for the community as it enters the fourth year of recovery and rebuild post earthquakes..	Completion of the grants review to determine the new and amended grants funding schemes and dialogue on the timings required to ensure that the most efficient, effective and appropriate processing framework can be developed and implemented to ensure transparency, robust, accountable and auditable systems are in place.	Primarily internal processing amendments. No consultation required.

## 3 Activity description

### 3.1 Focusing on what we want to achieve

Council undertakes activities in order to deliver on the community outcomes for Christchurch. The outcomes that relate most directly to the management of the city's Community Grants are that:

- Services are available locally within the urban areas
- Cultural and ethnic diversity is valued and celebrated
- Arts and culture thrive in Christchurch
- People have strong social networks
- People have the information and skills to enable them to participate in society.
- There is increasing participation in recreation and sporting activities

### 3.2 How we will know we are achieving the outcomes

We will know we are achieving the above outcomes when we see the following results:

- **Community-based, not-for-profit organisations**, including a range of cultural and linguistically different communities, **provide** diverse events, services, initiatives and activities for the benefit of their communities and communities of interest.
- **Arts and cultural programmes, events and initiatives in the city are supported** by the Creative Communities Scheme on behalf of Creative New Zealand.
- **Local groups organise events, activities** and initiatives that bring together and connect local people, **and** increase their capacity to **work together in times of need or crisis**.
- **People have opportunities to learn new skills and gain knowledge**, through community-based classes and programmes, that can help them take part in society.
- **Sports and recreation organisations provide opportunities for participation**.

The activities that follow in section 4 and the levels of service within them are all linked to the above results to ensure Councils stays focused on moving towards the community outcomes. This link aims to confirm why we are doing the activities – that they will realistically move us closer to our goals – and that service delivery remains relevant to strategic direction.

### 3.3 What services we provide

This activity includes the following services:

- **Delivery of the Council's Community Grants Schemes and the community loans scheme**
- Manage and administer the Mayoral Funds
- Manage and administer other grant funds as appropriate on behalf of the Council or other funding bodies

The current grants programme includes the Strengthening Communities Fund (SCF), the Small Grants Fund (SGF), the Discretionary Response Fund (DRF) and the Youth Development Fund (YDF), the Creative Communities Scheme, the Mayor's Welfare Charitable Trust Fund, the Christchurch Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund and the Capital Endowment Fund: Special One-off Projects Scheme. In all, there are forty grants funding pools being managed.

### 3.4 Our key customers

Customers include the wider community, communities of interest and target population groups and sectors who will benefit from the funding and capacity-building support provided to not-for-profit community groups and organisations who work within the community developing and delivering community-led programmes and initiatives that support the vulnerable, the isolated, those who may be disadvantaged through circumstance and the residents of Christchurch who seek to actively participate in community life through arts, recreation, learning, community safety and volunteerism.

Individuals such as high-achieving young people who are assisted to pursue positive endeavours through the Youth Development Fund.

Individuals and families who face acute financial hardship may be eligible for assistance through the Mayor's Welfare Fund.

Elected members, Government Departments and Agencies, Members of Parliament, Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority, other Territorial Local Authorities and Philanthropic funding bodies.

### 3.5 Benefits and Funding Sources

Who benefits?	
Individual	Some
Identifiable part of the community	Majority
Whole community	Some

Who pays?

Funding – Fees / User Charges	Other revenue Grants & Subsidies	General rate	Targeted rate
0%	2%	98%	
		Full	

### 3.6 Key legislation and Council strategies

Local Government Act 2002, Strengthening Communities Strategy, Safer Christchurch Strategy, Arts Policy and Strategy, Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy, Youth Strategy.

## 4 Levels of service and performance measures

Table 4-1 summarises the levels of service and performance measures for the Community Grants activity. Shaded rows are the levels of service and performance measures to be included in the Long Term Plan. Non-shaded rows are non-LTP management level measures, agreed with and reported to Council but not included as part of the community consulted document.

Table 4-1

Performance Standards Levels of Service (we provide)	Results (Activities will contribute to these results, strategies and legislation)	Method of Measurement (We will know we are meeting the level of service if.....)	Current Performance	Benchmarks	Future Performance (targets)			Future Performance (targets) by Year 10 2024/25	
					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3		
					2015/16	2016/17	2017/18		
<b>Delivery of the Council's Community Grants Schemes and the community loans scheme</b>									
2.3.1	Effectively administer the grants schemes		<p><i>Community Grant Funding is an enabler and capacity-building support used by Council, at both the metropolitan and local ward level, to assist community-led projects and initiatives that build and develop stronger communities.</i></p> <p><i>The Council also works with and shares community information and analysis with other funders such as the Canterbury Community Trust, Red Cross New Zealand and other philanthropic funders as appropriate. We</i></p>	<p><i>Council provides contestable grants schemes. Each of these schemes has their allocations determined by their respective delegated committees. This includes the 3 schemes under the Strengthening Communities Grants programme</i></p> <p><i>The Council may also determine grants through the LTP or AP process.</i></p> <p><i>The Council also administers grants through the Mayoral</i></p>	<p><i>Auckland Council: The introduction of their new schemes has been delayed. All former schemes remain in force.</i></p> <p><i>(LOS) Provide local community development resources, funds and programmes that build community wellbeing.</i></p> <p><i>(Perf. Meas) % of community groups satisfied with assistance &amp; advice provided.</i></p> <p><i>2014 onwards: 75%</i></p>	2.3.1.1	2.3.1.1	2.3.1.1	2.3.1.1
						100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes
						2.3.1.2	2.3.1.2	2.3.1.2	2.3.1.2
						The distribution of community grant funding enables at least 550,000 volunteer hours to be contributed each year	The distribution of community grant funding enables at least 550,000 volunteer hours to be contributed each year	The distribution of community grant funding enables at least 550,000 volunteer hours to be contributed each year	The distribution of community grant funding enables at least 550,000 volunteer hours to be contributed each year

Performance Standards Levels of Service (we provide)	Results (Activities will contribute to these results, strategies and legislation)	Method of Measurement (We will know we are meeting the level of service if.....)	Current Performance	Benchmarks	Future Performance (targets)			Future Performance (targets) by Year 10 2024/25
					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	
					2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
		<i>continue to work with the Canterbury Earthquake Appeal Fund in finalising its grants allocations and are a member of the Funding Leaders Across Government Group.</i>	<i>Funding schemes.  2013/14: 90% (Council Annual Point of Contact Survey)  2012/13: new measure</i>	<i>(Perf. Meas). % of community funding / grant recipients meeting grant obligations  2014 onwards 75%</i>	<i>2.3.1.3  Each \$1 of grant given leverages more than \$2.00 worth of services</i>	<i>2.3.1.3  Each \$1 of grant given leverages more than \$2.00 worth of services</i>	<i>2.3.1.3  Each \$1 of grant given leverages more than \$2.00 worth of services</i>	<i>2.3.1.3  Each \$1 of grant given leverages more than \$2.00 worth of services</i>

### Manage and administer the Mayoral Funds

2.3.3	Effectively manage and administer the Mayoral Funds	<i>The Mayor's Welfare Fund (MWF) is a fund of last resort to provide assistance to individuals and families who face acute financial hardship. Applicants must first seek assistance from Work and Income NZ and have either been declined or only partially assisted before they can seek the support of the MWF. The Mayor's Welfare Charitable Trust operates under a Deed of Trust and the Council is the settlor. The MWF annual grants budget comes</i>	<i>Mayor's Welfare Fund (MWF) assisted 728 clients to the value of \$224,336 in 2013/14.  Christchurch Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund (116 applications) [Approx. \$1.7 million remaining under management]</i>	<i>Wellington CC - \$20k p.a. – City Mission manage  Selwyn DC - \$2k p.a. (6 to 8 assisted p.a)  Red Cross  [\$65+ million under management]  Canterbury Earthquake Appeal Trust  [\$100+ million under management  Philanthropic</i>	2.3.3.1	2.3.3.1	2.3.3.1	2.3.3.1	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	made to Council/Committee
-------	---	--	---	--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

Performance Standards Levels of Service (we provide)	Results (Activities will contribute to these results, strategies and legislation)	Method of Measurement (We will know we are meeting the level of service if.....)	Current Performance	Benchmarks	Future Performance (targets)			Future Performance (targets) by Year 10 2024/25
					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	
					2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	

*from grants and donations.* *sector*

*The Earthquake Relief Funds are donation-based funds and support leverage and development recovery opportunities to assist individuals and families, communities and community organisations to rebuild and recover from the effects of the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes.*

**Manage and administer other grant funds as appropriate on behalf of other funding bodies**

2.3.4	Effectively manage and administer all other grant funds under management.	<i>Grant funding is an enabling and leverage mechanism used by funders to support not-for-profit community-based and community-focused organisations to build capacity and capability to deliver services and activities that strengthen and develop strong communities.</i>	<i>All other grants schemes are managed and administered in accordance with each schemes criteria, eligibility and funding rules.</i>	<i>Audit review</i>	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes	100% compliance with agreed management and administration procedures for grants schemes
			<i>Funds include Flooding Relief Fund, Community Arts Development Fund and a joint collaboration with the New Zealand Red Cross and the Canterbury Community Trust to support a</i>					

Performance Standards Levels of Service (we provide)	Results (Activities will contribute to these results, strategies and legislation)	Method of Measurement (We will know we are meeting the level of service if.....)	Current Performance	Benchmarks	Future Performance (targets)			Future Performance (targets) by Year 10 2024/25
					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	
					2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	

*Community-Led Recovery Grant initiative,*

*All funds are managed within current resources.*



## 5 Summary of Cost for Activity

Figure 5-1

RESILIENT COMMUNITIES - COMMUNITY GRANTS					<i>Funding splits exclude EQ Costs from all calculations</i>					
	Funding Caps in 2015/16 Dollars				Funding - User Charges	Other revenue	General rate	Targeted rate	Period of Benefit (years)	Comments
	2014/15 Annual Plan	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18						
	000's									
<b>Operational Budget</b>										
Manage/Administer Mayoral Funds	79	80	69	68						
Contestable Grants & Loan Schemes	8,067	7,818	7,563	7,417						
Creative Communities Scheme	214	206	202	198						
Manage/Administer Other Grant Funds	1,568	1,511	1,481	1,451						
<b>Activity Costs before Overheads</b>	<b>9,928</b>	<b>9,615</b>	<b>9,315</b>	<b>9,134</b>						
Earthquake Response Costs	-	-	-	-						
Corporate Overhead	529	494	477	445						
Depreciation	-	-	-	-						
Interest	-	-	-	-						
<b>Total Activity Cost</b>	<b>10,457</b>	<b>10,109</b>	<b>9,792</b>	<b>9,579</b>	0%	2%	98%	Full		
<b>Funded By:</b>										
Fees and Charges	-	6	6	6						
Grants and Subsidies	224	224	224	224						
Earthquake Recoveries	-	-	-	-						
<b>Total Operational Revenue</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>230</b>						
<b>Net Cost of Service</b>	<b>10,233</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>9,562</b>	<b>9,349</b>						
<b>Funded by:</b>										
<b>Rates</b>	<b>10,233</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>9,562</b>	<b>9,349</b>						
Earthquake Borrowing	-	-	-	-						
	<b>10,233</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>9,562</b>	<b>9,349</b>						
<b>Capital Expenditure</b>										
Earthquake Rebuild										
Renewals and Replacements										
Improved Levels of Service										
Additional Demand										

Figure 5-2

