

Kimba Consultative Committee and   
Kimba Economic Working Group Workshop

**Date:** Thursday 3 June 2021

**Time:** 12:00pm–3:00pm (local time)

**Location:** Eyre Business, 38 High Street, Kimba

**MINUTES**

**KCC Independent Convener:** Allan Suter

**KCC Deputy Convener:** Dean Johnson

**KEWG Chair:** David Schmidt

| **Item** | **Lead** | **Key points** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Welcome** | Convener | * Acknowledgement of Country * Housekeeping |
| 1. **Introduction** | Nic Crowther | * Outline of the workshop * Terms—what can and can’t be confirmed today |
| 1. **Round 2 Recap** | Business Grants Hub (BGH) | * What we did last time * Assessment criteria * KCC input * Conflicts of interest * Decision process |
| 1. **Round 3 Timelines** | BGH | * Indicative schedule |
| 1. **Round 3 KCC input** | BGH | * Discussion on recommended changes (if any):   + Broader community input   + Project detail provided   + Timeframes   + Conflicts of interest |
| 1. **Round 3 Guidelines discussion** | BGH | * Discussion on recommended changes (if any):   + Funding themes/priorities   + Geographic boundaries   + General |
| 1. **Other business** | Nic Crowther | * Economic Development Officer appointment * Committee renewal contracts |

| **Committee Member** | **Attendance** |
| --- | --- |
| Allan Suter (Convener) | Accepted |
| Dean Johnson (Deputy Convener) | Accepted |
| Symon Allen | Apology |
| Jeff Baldock | Accepted |
| Heather Baldock | Accepted |
| Pat Beinke | Accepted |
| Randall Cliff | Accepted |
| Kellie Hunt | Accepted |
| Sally Inglis | Apology |
| Jeff Koch | Apology |
| Meagan Lienert | Accepted |
| Kerri Rayson | Accepted |
| Toni Scott | Accepted |
| Peta Willmott | Accepted |
| Peter Woolford | Apology |
| Amy Wright | Accepted |
| David Schmidt (Chair KEWG) | Accepted |
| Laura Fitzgerald | Accepted |
| Debra Larwood | Accepted |
| Christine Lehmann | Accepted |
| Charlie Milton | Accepted |

Business Grants Hub

* Adam Comley, State Manager
* Kelly McGloin, Assistant State Manager/CBP Program Manager
* Tess Dempsey, Grants Manager

Australian Radioactive Waste Agency

* Nicholas Crowther, Manager, Community Engagement
* Clare Butterfield, Assistant Manager, Community Engagement
* Jim Haskett, Site Supervisor
* Maree Barford, Community Liaison Officer

## Outstanding action items

| **Item number** | **Detail** | **Status** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **KCC20200806/A04** | The department to organise for a range of presenters to attend a future KCC/KEWG meeting in order to discuss the options for the entity to control the community fund | **PENDING** |
| **KCC20200806/A07** | KCC/KEWG to discuss Economic Development Officer in a meeting after this round of CBP has been finalised | **PENDING** |
| **KCC20210304/A06** | Circulate overview of the CSDP prior to detailed consultation with the community | **PENDING** |
| **KCC20210304/A13** | ARWA to arrange for RDA-EP to present their draft report into visitor centre scenarios to the committee for their feedback, prior to finalising report | **PENDING** |
| **KCC20210422/A01** | Scope out the opportunity for long term social impact assessment research proposal and put on an agenda item for a future meeting. | **PENDING** |

## New action items

| **Item number** | **Detail** |
| --- | --- |
| **KCC20210603/A01** | BGH to provide definition of ‘familial’ in the context of conflicts of interest. |
| **KCC20210603/A02** | Committee to consider geographic boundaries and provide their preference to ARWA via email. Options are:   * Kimba LGA only (i.e. no change) * Kimba LGA and X km around Napandee and Lyndhurst * Kimba LGA and applications at the discretion of the delegate where material economic and/or social benefits derived for Kimba community.   ARWA to provide maps to assist consideration. |

1. **Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country**

The Convener opened the meeting at 12:00pm (local time). The Convener delivered an Acknowledgement of Country, before outlining housekeeping arrangements and proposed breaks throughout the day.

1. **Introduction**

The Convener invited Mr Nic Crowther, Manager, Community Engagement, to speak to the committee.

Mr Crowther expressed apologies for the absence of Ms Chard and Mr Osborne due to their Senate Estimates commitments. Mr Crowther informed members that ARWA has been made its own division within the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources, and Ms Chard is acting Head of Division. Mr Paul James will be acting General Manager—Policy and Governance while Ms Chard is acting HoD. This is another step in the process of ARWA becoming a non-corporate Commonwealth entity.

Mr Crowther introduced Mr Adam Comley, Ms Kelly McGloin, and Ms Tess Dempsey from Business Grants Hub (BGH), which administers the Community Benefit Program for ARWA, and encouraged members to participate in the conversation and raise issues. He advised that some issues will be able to be addressed in the room today, while others will need to be reviewed by BGH, ARWA, and the Minister.

# Recap

**What we did last time**

Ms McGloin advised members of the CBP roles held by her (Program Manager), Mr Comley (Program Delegate/decision maker) and Ms Dempsey (Grants Manager), and reiterated the deliberate arms-length arrangement between BGH and ARWA for administration of the CBP.

Members were encouraged to provide feedback on Round 2 and improvement suggestions for consideration in finalisation of Round 3 arrangements.

BGH summarised CBP Round 2 outcomes:

* 40 applications totalling $5.8 million, with $2 million grant funding available.
* Two ineligible applications.
* 33 applications merit-listed (‘fundable’), with the 18 top-ranked projects funded.
* Five eligible applications ‘unfundable’, having failed to meet at least one of the assessment criteria—capacity and capability to deliver, benefit to the community, or impact of grant funding.

**Assessment criteria**

BGH recapped the process for assessment of eligible Round 2 applications, including:

* The three assessment criteria, and maximum score allocation for each.
* Scoring framework, with scores allocated on a scale of *Strong* to *No Case* for each criterion and sub-criterion.
* Consideration of the project size, complexity, and grant amount sought.
* Applicants seeking grants of more than $250,000 were required to demonstrate strong evidence of community support (higher threshold).
* Preference given to projects focused on identified priority areas—health (particularly mental health), community infrastructure, economic development, expanding education and training, youth engagement, Indigenous business opportunities, and tourism).
* BGH assessment (team), quality assurance (team), moderation (Program Manager) and decision-making (Program Delegate) phases, and separation of each to ensure integrity and impartiality for each.

**KCC/KEWG input**

BGH emphasised the importance of committee input to assessment of CBP applications, specifically to capture local views on the likely benefits and impacts of each project on the community (Assessment Criterion 2). Member scores contributed 50 per cent of the merit score for Criterion 2, and 20 per cent of the overall merit score for each application.

Members were shown a breakdown of the final merit ranking and criterion scores for each (de-identified) application, as well as comparison of BGH and KCC/KEWG scores for Criterion 2. These scores were generally aligned for the higher and lower ranked applications, with a small number of variances in the mid-range as expected.

Questions were raised by the committee about some projects that were ranked highly by the committee and lower by BGH. BGH confirmed that respective scores were devised differently (against the three criteria, rather than solely the benefit to the community [Criteria 2]), so naturally would vary to some degree.

**Conflicts of interest**

BGH recapped the Conflicts of Interest framework applied for Round 2, and as a proposed starting point for Round 3:

* Members with a material interest with respect to an application:
  + were excluded from reviewing and scoring that application and
  + left the meeting room when the application was deliberated.
* In determining the materiality of member interests, BGH applied a common sense/practical approach given:
  + wide ranging business and familial interests held by members (over 100 interests were raised by members in Round 2) and
  + advisory nature of KCC/KEWG’s role in the assessment process.
* Material conflicts (around 25 for Round 2) therefore restricted to a *direct* interest held by a member in a particular application, by way of:
  + *organisational affiliation—*employee (or other remunerated position), or an unpaid office holder in the case of an executive or management committee. Simply put, if your organisation submitted an application (or is a project partner), a (perceived) material conflict exists.
  + *pecuniary interest* in the project, where a member stands to benefit financially (or otherwise) if an application is successful—for example as an owner of the applicant organisation, partner organisation or proposed supplier (where a quote has been provided).

A lengthy discussion ensued about conflicts of interest, how they were handled last time, and the ways in which improvements could be made for Round 3. Members agreed there was a need for the process to be consistent and fair across the board. BGH confirmed its heavy reliance on the information provided by members, in determining materiality of each interest. If members disagree with a decision to include or exclude a member, they are welcome to raise this with BGH (directly or via the Chair), so that the interest can be reassessed.

BGH clarified that material familial interests relate to immediate family members only (e.g. spouses/ partners, children, parents and grandparents). Members noted the impracticality of conflicting members on the basis of familial interest—in a small community there would have been too few members (if any) to advise on some applications.

Members suggested that organisational interests should not be considered material for some groups like Council, community groups, and the school, given nil personal gain. There was general agreement to this.

| **KCC20210603/A01** | BGH to provide definition of ‘familial’ in the context of conflicts of interest. |
| --- | --- |

# Round 3 Timelines

**Indicative schedule**

BGH outlined an indicative Round 3 schedule, which would see grant agreements in place (and initial payments made) by 30 June 2022, in line with program funding allocation. Members noted the indicative nature of the schedule, although generally supported the proposed:

* 12-week application opening period (reduced from Round 2).
* Closing date for application end November 2021.
* Committee assessment in early February 2022, with two weeks to review project information.

# Round 3 KCC input

**Discussion on recommended changes (if any)**

There was solid discussion about the scoring system and possible alternatives/amendments to provide community input to the assessment process, including:

* BGH make the decision on projects to be funded without community input (not broadly supported).
* Applicants be available on the day (of committee assessment) to answer project questions (not broadly supported).
* Alternatively, applicants be asked to submit supplementary information if required.
* Alternatively, applicants to include a ’sales pitch’ in the application, provide clearer information on the project, its benefit to the community, and the project outcome/s etc.

BGH agreed to consider these and other options to ensure that members had sufficient information available to reach informed views/scores for each project, while avoiding:

* Adding excessive complexity and time to the assessment process.
* Increasing the grant preparation burden for applicants.
* Exposing committee members to community/applicant lobbying.
* Building unrealistic expectations for applicants about funding prospects.

The Chair sought committee views on the following questions:

* Does the committee want to still be involved in the voting process? Yes (majority vote).
* Does the committee want to contribute to assessment score? Yes (majority vote).
* Should familial interests be counted as conflicts of interest for this round, regardless of pecuniary benefit? No (majority vote).

# Round 3 guidelines discussion

**Funding themes/priorities**

Members confirmed that priorities from Round 2 remain appropriate for Round 3, namely:

* Health
* Community infrastructure
* Economic development
* Expanding education and training
* Youth engagement
* Indigenous business opportunities
* Tourism.

Members agreed that specific reference to mental health was not required, and ‘health’ was sufficient.

**Geographic boundaries**

Members considered the geographic boundary applied for rounds 1 and 2 (e.g. Kimba District Council Local Government Area), and whether any change was warranted for Round 3.

Views varied, with some members recommending consistency with previous rounds, including to ensure maximum benefit for the Kimba community from the limited funds available.

Others were open to expanding the boundary, to allow projects located outside/close to the LGA to be considered if they would generate direct benefits to the Kimba community.

| **KCC20210603/A02** | Committee to consider geographic boundaries and provide their preference to ARWA via email. Options are:  • Kimba LGA only (i.e. no change)  • Kimba LGA and X km around Napandee and Lyndhurst  • Kimba LGA and applications at the discretion of the delegate where material economic and/or social benefits derived for Kimba community  ARWA to provide maps to assist consideration. |
| --- | --- |

**General**

A member sought clarification on eligible entity types for Round 3, particularly partnerships. BGH confirmed that partnerships, individuals, and sole traders would not be eligible entity types for Round 3, consistent with previous rounds and BGH practice. Members agreed this advice should be promoted, so that entities/individuals had an opportunity to explore options to apply for CBP funding (such as registering to become an eligible entity or partnering with an eligible entity in a joint application).

A member sought clarification on whether preference is given to community groups over private enterprises when projects are assessed. BGH confirmed no preference is made on the basis of entity type, with private and public enterprises able to apply for CBP funds.

# Other business

Mr Crowther informed members that ARWA hopes to be announcing the new Economic Development Officer shortly, he expects that they will start before the end of June.

Mr Crowther thanked members for verbally agreeing to continue their appointment on the KCC and KEWG, and advised that ARWA has been informed that the Minister has signed the renewal letters. These will be sent to Maree, who will be in contact with all members to get them signed.

# Meeting close

The Convener thanked members for their integrity and dedication to the project, and advised that he looks forward to their future engagement.

The Convener closed the meeting at 3:05pm (local time), thanking members for their attendance.