



Phase 5: Significant
Community Based Projects
Fund

Independent Assessment

Final Funding
Recommendation

{Insert name of Applicant}

Funding Round: 2006/2007

Distribution List:
SCBPF Secretariat
Interdepartmental Advisory Group (IAG)

May 2007



Contents

Contents	2
1 Executive Summary	3
1.1 Overview of the Project	3
1.2 Cabinet Approval	3
1.3 Final Funding Recommendation	3
1.4 Summary of Risks	4
1.5 Summary of Recommendations	4
2 Verification of Project Costs	5
2.1 Conclusion	5
3 Verification of Funding	6
3.1 Conclusion	7

This KPMG report was produced solely for the use and benefit of Department of Internal Affairs and cannot be relied on or distributed, in whole or in part, in any format by any other party. The report is dated 15/05/2007 and KPMG accepts no liability for and has not undertaken work in respect of any event subsequent to that date which may affect the report.

Any redistribution of this report requires the prior written approval of KPMG and in any event is to be complete and unaltered version of the report and accompanied only by such other materials as KPMG may agree.

Responsibility for the security of any electronic distribution of this report remains the responsibility of Department of Internal Affairs and KPMG accepts no liability if the report is or has been altered in any way by any person. © 2007 KPMG, a New Zealand partnership, is part of the KPMG International network. KPMG International is a Swiss cooperative. All rights reserved. The KPMG logo and name are trademarks of KPMG.



1 Executive Summary

The Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) has engaged KPMG to review the application to the Significant Community Based Projects Fund (SCBPF) for the *{Insert applicant name}* and to provide a final recommendation of the funding level to be granted to the *{Insert applicant name}*.

The SCBPF has been established to support community-based projects and events of regional and national significance which have been unable to progress, either because they cannot access appropriate funding or the available funding is insufficient. Projects must meet a range of eligibility criteria as determined by the CAB Min ((05) 19/1) and DIA Operational Policy.

1.1 Overview of the Project

{Insert brief description of the applicant, project background and the objectives of the project}. {Outline the stages of the project and identify clearly what stages the applicant is seeking funding for}.

Table 1: Overview of Project

	Total project cost per application \$	Total Funding Raised \$	Funding required \$
Total Project Costs		0	
Stage 1 <i>{Cost}</i>			
Stage 2 <i>{Cost}</i>			
Stage 3 <i>{Cost}</i>			

1.2 Cabinet Approval

In April 2007, Cabinet agreed to fund up to *{insert figure agreed by Cabinet}* plus GST for the *{insert applicant name}* to complete *{insert stages or description of what the money is for}*, subject to the Interdepartmental Advisory Group (IAG) being satisfied with the final figures.

This sum of *{Insert sum}* plus GST is based on figures provided by the Trust in its application where the total cost of the project was forecast at *{ \$ } plus GST of which *{ \$ } (%) funding/donations has been raised by the applicant.**

The IAG made its recommendation of *{insert amount}* plus GST based on the Phase 2 Independent Assessment Report together with an evaluation of national/regional benefits in February 2007. Refer Appendix 1.

1.3 Final Funding Recommendation

KPMG has verified the financial information provided by the *{insert applicant name}*. Based on the Cabinet approval of (*"up to $\$<>$ " or $\$(insert dollar amount)$*) KPMG recommends that



the IAG accept and confirm the maximum level of the grant approved by Cabinet of **\$(Insert amount to receive)** plus GST for this project. This leaves a difference of $\$(\quad)$ to be funded by the {insert applicant name}.

The final funding recommendation is based on the financial information provided and verified:

- a) at the date of the application (1 December 2006),
- b) during the site visit (May 2007) and
- c) subsequent information.

The total cost of the project is forecast to be $\$(\quad)$ plus GST of which $\$(\quad)$ funding/donations has been raised by the applicant. Refer Table 2.

Table 2: Final Funding Recommendation

	Per application \$	Calculated by IAT \$	Difference \$
Project Costs			
Less Fundraising by Trust	()	()	()
Amount for which Funding is required			()
Funding approved by Cabinet		()	
Funding Shortfall/Surplus			
Recommended Funding Level			

1.4 Summary of Risks

The IAT identified the following risk which supports the final funding recommendation:

- *{Provide a brief description of the finding ie where differences are identified, and include a reference to the relevant section of the report for further detail}*

1.5 Summary of Recommendations

The IAT has made a number of recommendations in relation to the risks identified to this project:

- *{Provide a brief description of the recommendation which addresses the cause of the risk identified in 1.4 above }*



2 Verification of Project Costs

{Describe the current process and controls the applicant has in place to determine project costs}

The risk to the DIA is that the applicant has under or overstated the project costs required to complete the project. This would result in the project being over/under funded. Previously the IAT assessed the risk of project costs to be **{High, Moderate, Low}**. As a result of the site visit and subsequent information the IAT considers the risk of the project not being completed as a result of under/overstated project costs to be **{High, Moderate, Low}**

The IAT has/hasn't identified the following risks:

Risk	Rating
	High/Mod/Low

The application indicated total budgeted project costs of \$ $\{ \}$. Based on documentation supplied, IAT has calculated the total costs for the project to be \$ $\{ \}$. This figure is based on costs incurred to date and projected costs for the remaining stages of the project. The calculated costs are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Project Costs

Stage	Costs per Application \$	Calculated by IAT \$	Difference \$
{Describe project cost}			(a)
{Describe project cost}			(b)
{Describe project cost}			(c)
{Describe project cost}			
Total	\$	\$	\$

The differences identified relate to:

- (a)
- (b)
- (c)

2.1 Conclusion

Based on the assessment of information and sampling of documentation the IAT can conclude that the project budgets and costs have/have not materially changed since the Phase 2 assessment. The IAT recommend that the DIA consider the following



3 Verification of Funding

{Describe the current process and controls the applicant has in place to obtain funding and the mechanism for tracking it}

The risk to the DIA is that the applicant has over or understated the funding banked and promised for the project. This would result in the project being over/under funded. Previously the IAT assessed the risk of funding to be **{High, Moderate, Low}**. As a result of the site visit and subsequent information the IAT considers the risk of the project not being completed as a result of under/overstated funding to be **{High, Moderate, Low}**. The IAT has/hasn't identified the following risks:

Risk	Rating
	High/Mod/Low

The application indicated total funding of \$*{ }*. Based on documentation supplied, KPMG has calculated the total funding received to be \$*{ }*. This figure is based on funds banked to date and promised funds for the remaining stages of the project. The calculated funding is shown in Table 5.

Table 4: Project Funding

Type	Amount of funding \$	Percentage of total project costs %
Banked		
Promised		
Total	\$	\$

The *{insert applicant name}* has achieved significant financial support from the community of around *{insert percentage of support}*% of the total project cost.

Table 4: Project Funding

Source of Funding	Costs per Application \$	Calculated by IAT \$	Difference \$
<i>{Insert description of who the funding is from}</i>			(a)
<i>{Insert description of who the funding is from}</i>			(b)
<i>{Insert description of who the funding is from}</i>			(c)
Total	\$	\$	\$



The differences identified relate to:

- (a)
- (b)
- (c)

3.1 Conclusion

Based on the assessment of information and sampling of documentation the IAT can conclude that the committed funds remain/do not remain secure and promised funds are/are not tracking to target and have/have not materially changed since the Phase 2 assessment.



Appendix 1: Phase 2 Independent Assessment Report