
Minutes of a meeting of the Community Investment Funding Panel

Held in Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency Boardroom, 39 Halifax Street, Nelson

On Friday 15 April 2016, commencing at 10.03am

Present: Chris Ward (Chairperson), Susan Hawthorne, Katy Steele, and Patricia Webster

In Attendance: Manager Community Partnerships (S Hermsen), Social Development Adviser (N Gausel), and Administration Advisers (L Canton and J McDougall)

Apology: Graeme Thomas

1. Apologies

Resolved

THAT apology be received and accepted from Graeme Thomas.

Steele/Hawthorne

Carried

2. Interests

Mr Ward advised an interest in the Open Home Foundation and Ms Steel advised an interest in Volunteer Nelson and Nelson Tasman Housing Trust. Both panel members said they would leave the meeting at the appropriate times.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

3.1 Community Investment Funding Panel – 23 October 2015

Document number A1452812, agenda pages 4-13 refer.

Resolved

THAT the minutes of a meeting of the Community Investment Funding Panel, held on 23 October 2015, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Steele/Webster

Carried

4. Process for selection of EOIs

4.1 Process for considering expressions of interest

Manager Community Partnerships, Shanine Hermsen outlined the selection process. She noted that the panel's comments on individual expressions of interest (EOI) would be passed on to applicants if they were asked to provide a full application.

Ms Hermsen confirmed that up to \$183,310 would be available for allocation to funding agreements at the panel's next meeting on 29 June 2016.

Social Development Adviser, Nicola Gausel tabled a late expression of interest from the Nelson Community Foodbank Trust (document A1540419) and asked whether the panel wished to consider it.

Resolved

THAT the panel receives and considers the late expression of interest from the Nelson Community Foodbank Trust (document number A1540519).

Ward/Hawthorne

Carried

It was noted that of the 32 EOIs, 17 were for amounts less than \$8,000. The panel considered whether the additional application process for a funding agreement was a good use of time for those applicants and suggested that they instead be directed to apply to the smaller Community Investment Fund Grant scheme.

Ms Webster tabled a document (A1540499) listing the reasons for not funding that were used in the previous funding round. The panel agreed that these reasons be used for the current round, and added a further reason that the application was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and would either be automatically referred by the panel at this meeting, or encouraged to apply separately.

4.2 Feedback on the expressions of interest process to date

It was noted that it may be difficult to describe more complex projects and sufficient context within the 200 word limit.

There was a discussion about the timing of funding allocation. Ms Hermsen advised that the aim was to eventually align funding with the Long Term Plan.

It was suggested that the next meeting include an agenda item to review how the conditions applied last year actually worked in practice.

During its discussion of individual EOIs, the panel noted that organisations may be intending to also apply for a Community

Investment Fund Grant for a separate project. It was suggested that, if an application was for one of a series of projects, the panel needed to see details of the full package.

The panel discussed the need for funding to be sufficient to deliver the required service standard in a sustainable manner. It was suggested that organisations may be applying for small amounts on the assumption that it made their application more likely to succeed. The panel discussed whether feedback to applicants could incorporate a question on whether the amount requested was sufficient to support effective and sustainable project outcomes.

5. Selection of Expressions of Interest

Document number A1517156 and A1519611, agenda pages 14-78 refer.

5.1 Age Concern Nelson Tasman

The panel discussed the EOI. The panel asked officers to consider whether any additional information was required and communicate this to the applicant.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The Panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be automatically referred, contingent on officers identifying to the applicant any additional information required.

5.2 Beneficiaries and Unwaged Workers Trust

The panel noted the partnership funding in place.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.3 Big Brothers/Big Sisters

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.4 English Language Partners

The panel noted that the project met social development objectives in the broader sense of community integration and belonging.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be encouraged to apply, noting that it needed to better demonstrate how the project fits with the Grant criteria.

5.5 Epilepsy Association of NZ

During a discussion it was noted the EOI did not identify how the project met the funding agreement criteria.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- Did not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

5.6 Food for families

The panel discussed the EOI and noted that one of the criteria was to show partnership, and this was done well.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.7 Health Action Trust

When discussing the EOI, the panel queried whether the project outcomes were sustainable and noted that the applicant should consider this in future applications.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be encouraged to apply, noting that the application would need to demonstrate sustainable project outcomes.

5.8 IHC New Zealand Incorporated

The panel confirmed that social coordination for the purposes outlined was within the funding criteria. During discussion, it was noted that a full application would need to: address how the project outcome was sustainable, given that the proposed salary was below the living wage level and funding was only for one year; demonstrate partnership funding; provide greater detail on the social coordinator's duties.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.9 Kidpower Teenpower Fullpower Trust

The panel discussed the EOI and questioned how the effectiveness of outcomes would be demonstrated.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be encouraged to apply, noting that the application would need to demonstrate effective project outcomes.

5.10 Life Linc Nelson Inc

The panel discussed the project's fee structure in the context of client buy-in noting that the full application should address the justification for 10 free sessions rather than a sliding scale fee structure, and should include the number of people benefitting from the service.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.11 Magenta Creative Space Charitable Trust

In response to a question, Ms Gausel outlined her knowledge of the Trust, explaining it was targeted at drop-in art therapy for clients with various forms of mental illness. The panel agreed that the organisation be requested to consider whether Community Investment Fund Grant would be more appropriate, or alternatively to ensure it demonstrated matched funding in its grant application.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.12 Neighbourhood Support Nelson

The panel discussed the EOI and noted that the application should include detail of outcomes rather than outputs, and whether coordination is duplicated across areas.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.13 Nelson Community Christian Night Shelter Trust

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be automatically referred.

5.14 Nelson Community Patrol

The panel noted that the EOI did not provide evidence of partnership funding or a social development aspect and did not address health and safety aspects.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- does not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

Attendance: Katy Steele left the meeting at 11.11am.

5.15 Nelson Tasman Housing Trust

The panel acknowledged there was a need for the service, but noted the application needed greater detail on the number of clients and how clients would be identified. It was also noted that, if the Youth and Community Trust EOI was also approved, the panel would like to see the two organisations identify any synergies.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.16 Volunteer Nelson

The panel noted that while Volunteer Nelson supported the work of Community and Whanau, it was important to understand that Community and Whanau was a separate entity.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

Attendance: Katy Steele returned to the meeting at 11.17am.

5.17 Nelson Tasman Pasifika Community Trust

The panel considered that the project related to an appraisal process for community need. It was felt that the shortfall of \$30,000 for operating costs was high and this should be addressed in the application along with an explanation of specific outcomes sought. It was also noted that a definition of 'Nelson region' was required.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.18 Nga Wahine Tamariki Punanga o Whakatu – Nelson Women's and Children's Refuge

The panel noted that the full application should show links with other similar community projects.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

Attendance: Chris Ward left the meeting at 11.22am.

5.19 Open Home Foundation – Nelson

The panel noted that the full application needed to detail the number of foster parents required in the region to quantify need, and provide details of whether this service was previously government funded.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

Attendance: Chris Ward returned to the meeting at 11.24am.

5.20 Peacemakers Ministries

The panel considered the project did not meet the funding criteria and asked officers to consider whether and where the applicant could be directed to access other support.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- does not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

5.21 Post Natal Depression Support Network Nelson Inc

The panel noted that the application may be more appropriate for a Community Investment Fund grant. It was suggested that a full application for a funding agreement would need to demonstrate the organisation's sustainability.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**, subject to the organisation considering an application for a Community Investment Fund grant instead.

5.22 Project Litefoot Trust

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- does not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

5.23 Q-Youth

The panel noted that a full application would need to demonstrate a community need for the project, to clarify the organisation's connection to the Maori community, and to demonstrate how the project was different from the work Nelson City Council is already funding the organisation to carry out, and demonstrate how the funding will be used effectively.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.24 Rutherford St Kindergarten

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- does not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

5.25 Sexual Abuse Support & Healing (SASH-Nelson) Inc

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.26 SVS–Living Safe

The panel discussed the wider community benefit of the project for a small client base and noted that 10 clients was a realistic number. It

was noted that the full application would need to show whether anyone else provides similar services or outcomes and if so, how they fit with this project.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.27 Tahunanui Community Centre Inc

The panel discussed the EOI, noting that the project addressed an important area but needed to demonstrate a tighter focus with an emphasis on outcomes.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.28 The Nelson ARK

The panel discussed the EOI and noted that the phrase 'Nelson area' need to be defined.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.29 The Salvation Army Nelson Tasman Bays Corps

During a discussion of the EOI the panel expressed that the project was aligned with health rather than social development outcomes.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- does not align closely with its priorities and funding criteria.

5.30 Victory Boxing Charitable Trust

The panel considered the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **declined**. The panel considered the EOI:

- was more appropriate to be funded by a Community Investment Fund Grant and the organisation would be encouraged to apply.

5.31 Victory Community Centre

The panel discussed the EOI.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.32 Youth and Community Trust

The panel noted that a full application would need to detail other funding sources. It further noted that a whole-funded project could be applied for, contingent on the application detailing the wider context of the project and its outcomes, and the sustainability of organisation.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

5.33 Nelson Community Foodbank Trust - late application – document A1540519

The panel noted that the full application needed to demonstrate the sustainability of the service.

It was agreed that the EOI be **approved**.

Resolved

THAT the following groups who have provided Expressions of Interest be asked to provide a full application to the Community Investment Funding Panel:

- *Beneficiaries and Unwaged Workers Trust*
- *Big Brothers/Big Sisters*
- *Food for families*
- *IHC New Zealand Incorporated*
- *Life Linc Nelson Inc*
- *Magenta Creative Space Charitable Trust*
- *Neighbourhood Support Nelson*
- *Nelson Tasman Housing Trust*
- *Volunteer Nelson*
- *Nelson Tasman Pasifika Community Trust*
- *Nga Wahine Tamariki Punanga o Whakatu – Nelson Women’s and Children’s Refuge*
- *Open Home Foundation – Nelson*
- *Post Natal Depression Support Network Nelson Inc*
- *Q-Youth*
- *Sexual Abuse Support & Healing (SASH-Nelson) Inc*
- *SVS–Living Safe*
- *Tahunanui Community Centre Inc*
- *The Nelson ARK*
- *Victory Community Centre*
- *Youth and Community Trust*
- *Nelson Community Foodbank Trust*

Ward/Hawthorne

Carried

6. Agreement Funding Allocation Meeting

Patricia Webster advised her intention to resign following the Agreement Funding Allocation Meeting in June.

The panel agreed to defer further discussion on this item to the next meeting.

7. Grant Funding

The panel agreed to defer discussion on this item to the next meeting.

8. Priority Setting for 2017/18

The panel agreed to defer discussion on this item to the next meeting.

Attendance: Susan Hawthorne left the meeting at 12.25pm.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.30pm.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings:

_____ Chairperson _____ Date