



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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgement of Country Housekeeping
2. Introduction	Nic Crowther	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline of the workshop Terms—what can and can't be confirmed today
3. Round 2 Recap	Business Grants Hub (BGH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What we did last time Assessment criteria KCC input Conflicts of interest Decision process
4. Round 3 Timelines	BGH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicative schedule
5. Round 3 KCC input	BGH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on recommended changes (if any): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broader community input Project detail provided Timeframes Conflicts of interest
6. Round 3 Guidelines discussion	BGH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on recommended changes (if any): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding themes/priorities Geographic boundaries General
7. Other business	Nic Crowther	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic Development Officer appointment Committee renewal contracts

OFFICIAL

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	<p>Committee to consider geographic boundaries and provide their preference to ARWA via email. Options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>ARWA to provide maps to assist consideration.</p>

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.

2 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.

3 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.
-----------------	--

4 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.

5 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).

6 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.

7 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.

8 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.