

Attachment C

Further analysis of the options for future use of the residual Hillary Commission fund

Options	1. Develop a new region wide contestable grants programme	2. Allocate as part of the new Community Grants Policy (CGP) Regional Sport & Recreation Grants Programme	3. Allocate towards the implementation of Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASRSAP) priority initiatives	4. Allocate as part of a proposed Sport and Recreation Community Access Scheme to address inequities across sport and recreation in Auckland
	<p>A new contestable grants programme could be established. It could provide a wider criteria for achieving sport and recreation outcomes including facility or capital, and operational and programme related funding. It would need to be considered how this would fit with the regional and local grants programme including the new local discretionary capital fund.</p>	<p>The new regional sport and recreation grants programme that has been established as part of the Community Grants Policy (CGP) has a budget of \$508K per annum. This funding could be split across the first three years and added to the current budget, for distribution against the criteria in the CGP.</p>	<p>The funding could be used to deliver on some of the focus areas of ASRSAP, for example, addressing inequity in sport and recreation support, sustainability of sport work programme, and the Sport Facility Network Plan implementation. Progress and outcomes would be reported via ASRSAP annual reporting.</p>	<p>This would increase the budget available to support community access to non-council facilities in areas of demand and provide operational support to new or existing sport and recreation facilities, including multisport hubs, for example, supporting netball hubs, and incentivising new multisport/co-location. This is a big gap area for sport and recreation funding support and would support and increase the sustainability of sport and recreation facility provision</p>
Analysis	<p>This option would provide an opportunity to target other priorities and leverage existing funding and opportunities for partnership.</p> <p>However, this option would create duplication of other grants programmes, confusion for applicants and would not be the most efficient use of resources.</p>	<p>This option would support an established policy and process, provide efficient use of resources, with no additional cost to administer, and provide an opportunity to leverage existing funding and opportunities for partnership.</p> <p>Funding outcomes have already been set for the regional sport and recreation grants programme and this would restrict the distribution of this funding and potentially duplicate with other funders.</p>	<p>This option would support the strategic action plan of council and identified needs for sport and recreation, and implementation of an agreed work programme approach. It could also provide an opportunity leverage more partner funding into implementation actions.</p> <p>Work would be required to establish the priorities to fund and there is a large number of initiatives to support that would limit allocation of funding to community sport and recreation organisations</p>	<p>This option supports the core role of council (facility provision) and would help address inequity of access. It would be possible to shift funding priorities over time and create leveraging and partnership opportunities. The funding could support the Sport Facility Network Plan implementation. The funding could be used to target efficient use of resources through multi-sport options and support sustainability of facility provision.</p> <p>Prioritisation criteria would be essential including preference to identified need in the legacy Waitakere and Auckland City areas. .</p>