

COMMUNITY FUND 2013/14 – FUNDING APPROVAL
WDA 31/13

Recommendation

That Members:

1. In light of the evaluation outcome Members determine which of the three options detailed at paragraph five they wish to proceed with and approve the required increase in the Community Fund budget with the current financial year.
2. Cancel the funding of the programme in Funding Stream 3, as an application in the top six of Funding Stream 1 will, if approved, deliver a similar programme of activity to schools.
3. Delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, to award funding to the next highest scoring application above the minimum threshold, should any applicant withdraw, or to the next project listed that can be delivered within the financial year up the amount of funding available under the option chosen by Members.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

COMMUNITY FUND 2013/14 – FUNDING APPROVAL**WDA 31/13****Report of the Chief Executive****1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Community Fund applications received and the evaluation process; and
- 1.2 Seek approval to cancel the funding of the programme in Funding Stream 3, as an application in the top six of Funding Stream 1 will, if approved, deliver a similar programme of activity to schools.
- 1.3 In light of the quality of applications and the financial position of the Authority to seek Members approval to allocate the required funds within the current financial year, to whichever Option is selected by Members. The Options are set out in paragraph 5.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Authority's Revenue Budget was approved by Members on 1st February 2013 and Members agreed the Community Fund 2013/14 of £120,000. Veolia E.S has also provided a contribution to the Community Fund through the WMRC contract. Veolia's contribution of £10,000 means the fund has £130,000 available for 2013/14.
- 2.2 Members approved a policy framework for the Community Fund and this year's application criteria of the Fund for 2013/14 (WDA/12/13). The breakdown of the scheme approved is:
 - Funding Stream 1: £110,000 to support up to six large scale projects of £20,000. This includes £10,000 additional funding which may be awarded at the discretion of Members;
 - Funding Stream 2: to support up to six medium sized projects between £5-10,000 should any reserve schemes be awarded.
 - Funding Stream 3: £20,000 for up to 10 education packages with a value up to £2,000 each based on any one of four thematic options (food, textiles, growing/composting/recycling champions) to be

considered on a first come first served basis but would need to contain proposals to implement behavioural change.

3. Community Fund 2013/14

3.1 Funding stream 1 of the Community Fund 2013/14 was launched on 20th May 2013. A series of workshops were held at venues in all six local authority areas by MRWA officers working with the Districts to host the events and engage with local organisations as potential applicants. The workshops informed organisations about the funding procedure and provided detailed guidance to help improve the standard of applications received.

3.2 A total of 66 people registered prior to briefing workshops. 85 people attended over the nine briefing workshops from fifty one different organisations. (See Table 1 below). An event at Venture Housing community room in Liverpool was cancelled at the last minute due to flooding of the venue.

Table 1: Community Fund Workshops

Authority	Venue	Date	No. of people attended	Organisations attended
MRWA	Mann Island, Liverpool	20 May	10	8
SEFTON	Sing Plus Community Centre, Crosby	22 May	5	4
LIVERPOOL	Venture Housing, Liverpool	23 May	0	0
ST HELENS	St Helens Town Hall	28 May	10	4
WIRRAL	Floral Pavilion , New Brighton	29 May	18	11
MRWA	Mann Island, Liverpool	30 May	6	5
HALTON	Halton Stadium, Widnes	3 June	9	4
KNOWSLEY	Wildflower Centre, Huyton	6 June	16	10
LIVERPOOL	Unity Centre, Liverpool	11 June	11	5

3.3 Applications were accepted between 3rd June and 1st July 2013. Unfortunately, despite the workshops and promotions undertaken, no applications were received from Sefton and only one each from Halton and St Helens.

3.4 22 applications for funding were received with a total value of £352,421 and significantly over-subscribed for the available budget. A breakdown of the areas of Merseyside proposed to be supported by these applications is at Table 2 overleaf.

Table 2: Distribution of Applications

Districts	Number of Submissions	Value of all submissions £s per district	% Share
Merseyside and Halton	5	107,424	30.4
Halton	1	9,210	2.6
Knowsley	4	77,601.75	22.0
Liverpool	4	64,876	18.4
Liverpool/Knowsley	1	18,750	5.3
St Helens	1	20,000	6.0
Sefton	0	0	0
Wirral	6	54,549.77	15.4
Total	22	352,421.52	

4. Evaluation Process

4.1 Applications received for Funding stream one have been evaluated using the policy framework and 2013/14 Evaluation Criteria as agreed by members (WDA/12/13). The principles set out in the policy are that the Community Fund will:

- Be limited to achieving the aims and objectives of the Authority's Corporate Plan;
- Not go beyond the Authority's incidental powers for Local Authority Collected Municipal Waste;
- Eligible bodies will be restricted to community and voluntary sector not for profit organisations including social enterprises;
- Community fund applications will not be supported for the same schemes that are already being funded by the Authority in the same financial year;

4.2 It was also agreed that:

- Approval of awards over £20,000 are subject to Member approval by the whole Authority;

- All awards are subject to the Authority's Financial Procedural Rules including the mechanism for recompense (clawback) should the agreed project outputs not be met; and
- Community awards are limited to annual funding. An eligible organisation can apply for funding for a scheme in consecutive years but will be subject to competition and the revised or reaffirmed evaluation criteria established each year that the Community Fund exists.

- 4.3 An evaluation panel was established of four senior officers from MRWA and Veolia to score the applications independently. (Director of Strategy and Resources, Director of Finance, Waste Strategy Manager and the Director of Veolia Environmental Services Merseyside and Halton).
- 4.4 A meeting was held on 17th July to moderate the scores where agreement was reached that the three projects which failed to meet the minimum scoring thresholds should not be progressed.
- 4.5 Of the remaining 19 applications, the panel agreed that questions of clarification should be sent to 10 applicants. Scores were reviewed based on the responses received and the panel reconvened on 26th July to agree the final list to present to Members.
- 4.6 Applications were scored out of 100 and are ranked in order in the list in Appendices 1 to 3.

5. Funding Options

- 5.1 The panel considered that a significant number of quality projects were received but the Authority only has £130,000 available to fund six large scale projects and a schools project. In order to maximise the value and outputs of the applications received Members are asked to consider the following options:

5.2 Option One

- The top six applications listed at Appendix 1 are considered for community fund awards based on the evaluation process approved in Authority report WDA12/13;
- No applications scored above 80 in the evaluation, therefore, as per this year's agreed criteria, the additional £10,000 funding at the

discretion of Members should not be considered for award to a single project;

- Two of the six applications bid for more than £20,000, so it is proposed to cap these applications to £20,000 each (Ref: CF6 and CF7 in Appendix 1). This will be subject to clarification at project agreement stage that the reduction does not significantly impact on the outputs against which each application was evaluated and therefore the evaluation outcome;
- The Energy Projects Plus SWAP application (Ref:CF16) ranked fourth in the evaluation scoring is a major schools project to be delivered across Merseyside and Halton by four key delivery partners – Energy Projects Plus, Faiths4Change, Liverpool World Centre and Rotters Community Composting. This project is similar in nature to the schools package proposed for Funding Stream 3 in implementing behavioural change to recycle and reduce waste in school communities. Funding Stream 3 proposed to support 10 schools on a first come first served basis but the SWAP proposal will engage with 40 schools to enable them to reduce waste sent to landfill by at least 25%. 28 schools will commit to deliver a textile recycling campaign (similar to the one supported by the Community Fund last year) and 20 schools will receive support to develop school waste action plans. 8 of the schools engaged will receive intensive support.
- It is proposed, therefore, that given the SWAP project is being recommended for Funding Stream 1 then to avoid duplication there is no longer a requirement to continue with a package in Funding Stream 3.
- Three of the schemes, Bulky Bobs (Ref: CF1), Energy Projects Plus and the Children's Food Trust (CF6), cover the whole City Region partnership and will therefore benefit all six Districts;
- Should any of the successful applications fail to complete the project agreement or withdraw, and sufficient funding is available, Members are asked to approve the delegation to officers to award funding to the next highest scoring application listed in Appendix 1 or the next project that can deliver their programme of activity up to the amount of funding available.

- Members may wish to consider the following options for the £20,000 which remains available in Funding Stream 3:
 - To award up to £20,000 to the seventh application (Ref: CF 14) listed in Appendix 1 to support a scheme in Knowsley and Liverpool;
 - To cancel Funding Stream 3 and save the Authority £20,000.

5.3 **Option Two**

As Option One above for the top seven projects plus:

- At the year-end 2012-13 there has been a windfall additional saving which means there are additional funds in the General Fund which Members may choose to allocate to additional Community Fund projects to ensure that there are projects funded in all districts where applications were submitted.
- This increase would require an additional £50,145 which would increase the Community Fund to a total of £180,145.
- With the additional funding, awards may be given to the top seven identified in Option One and offered to the next five projects with the amendments proposed to the submitted projects for reduced funding as listed overleaf and in Appendix 2 which Officers believe would maximise Value for Money from those projects.
- Members are asked to delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, the following changes to awards:
 - No applications to be awarded more than £20,000 as in Option A.
 - Projects Wirral FUSS (CF9), Wirral Community Meals (CF11) and Tomorrow's Women Wirral (CF3) relate wholly or in part to textile re-use and recycling on Merseyside and therefore meet the objectives of the Merseyside Textile Forum. It has been agreed with the Chair of the Forum to consider these three projects for support from the Forum budget up to a maximum of £11,343 which will require budgetary agreement

from MRWA officers subject to appropriate agreements being put in place with the relevant organisations.

- Reductions in the funding awards to be made for the following applications;
 - Birkenhead Early Excellence CIC (CF4) from £20,856.77 to £14,150 (£6,706.77 reduction)
 - Magenta Living (CF2) from £8,200 to 8,000 (£200 reduction)
 - The Style Factory Collective (CF5) from £9,210 to £8,910 (£200 reduction)
 - ECO (Environmental Community Group) (CF13) from £20,000 to £10,975 (£9,025 reduction);
 - Faiths4Change (CF20) from £18,780 to £8,100 (10,680 reduction)
- The recommended reductions in funding have been identified as various elements of the projects particularly those outputs that would not be delivered within the financial year, duplication of existing activities, being outside the remit of the Community Fund or not delivering value for money in line with similar projects scoring higher in the evaluation process.
- The twelve awards listed in Appendix 2 enable the Fund to support projects across the City Region as well as in each district where applications were received. These projects maintain a high level quality of outputs and deliver value for money identified through the evaluation criteria;
-

5.4 **Option Three**

As Option One above for the top seven projects plus:

- Members may wish to consider and agree to an increase in the Community Fund budget to support the full funding requested for all

projects which have scored 52 or higher in the evaluation process to a maximum of £20,000 per application.

- This option adds a further project in Stockbridge Village, Knowsley and will support the three Wirral textile projects bringing the total projects to be funded to 16 as listed in Appendix 3.
- The increase would be an additional £105,986 which would increase the Community Fund to a total of £235,986.
- Recipients will be required to agree project completion in this financial year or would be subject to a reduced offer and Members are asked to agree to delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairperson, any changes to awards following negotiations with applicants prior to project agreement.
- The three projects which fall below the 52 score are not recommended for funding as there remain significant issues with value for money, duplication of activity or deliverability and would require an additional £52,376 to the Community Fund budget (if subject to the £20,000 cap for projects).

6. Risk Implications

Identified Risk	Likelihood Rating (L)	Consequence Rating (C)	Risk Value (L x C = RV)	Mitigation	Mitigated Risk Value
Option 1 Challenge by unsuccessful applicants for the grant	2	3	6	Members approved a policy framework and evaluation methodology that has been applied equitably to all applications. Funding stream 3 outputs will be achieved by funding an application in Option One before Funding Stream 3 has formally opened. The likelihood of	6

Identified Risk	Likelihood Rating (L)	Consequence Rating (C)	Risk Value (L x C = RV)	Mitigation	Mitigated Risk Value
				<p>challenge is small.</p> <p>Members do however have to consider the political implications of the geographical distribution of proposed successful applicants</p>	
<p>Option 1</p> <p>Ensure process control measures are appropriate to ensure quality and value for money applications are awarded in order to comply with the Authority's Best Value duties.</p>	2	3	6	<p>The policy framework approved by Members has clear criteria, delegations to officers as appropriate and minimum scoring thresholds below which awards would not be made.</p> <p>Funding has been determined as part of the overall budget setting process.</p>	6
<p>Option 2</p> <p>Challenge by unsuccessful bidders / reduction in grant funding offered</p>	3	3	9	<p>As for option 1 but removes the political Geographical distribution risk.</p> <p>Opportunity to reduce risk of challenge by offering to fund a number of textile projects from the waste prevention fund</p> <p>Additional risks in the reduction in funding allocation to schemes on a</p>	9

Identified Risk	Likelihood Rating (L)	Consequence Rating (C)	Risk Value (L x C = RV)	Mitigation	Mitigated Risk Value
				VFM basis and their ability to deliver within financial year; and the determination of a change to the fund total post the application process.	
Option 2 Ensure process control measures are appropriate to ensure quality and value for money applications are awarded in order to comply with the Authority's Best Value duties.	3	3	9	As for option 1 By adjusting the funding allocation the risk of reduced quality from applications is mitigated as it is proposed additional projects are funded only to maximise VFM.	9
Option 3 Challenge by unsuccessful bidders	4	3	12	The setting of the fund to accommodate the applicants post the application process and not applying any reduction to bids on the basis of VFM may lead to unsuccessful applicants to believe they have been treated inequitably by the determination of a change in the funding limit by project rather than VFM.	12
Option 3 Ensure process control measures are appropriate to ensure quality	4	3	12	The determination of budget post event has a higher risk of being construed as being arbitrary in	12

Identified Risk	Likelihood Rating (L)	Consequence Rating (C)	Risk Value (L x C = RV)	Mitigation	Mitigated Risk Value
and value for money applications are awarded in order to comply with the Authority's Best Value duties.				nature rather than VFM.	

7. HR Implications

- 7.1 The changes to the process and the way the Community Fund applications are determined have reduced the overall number of submissions but improved the overall quality of applications and resulted in greater senior officer and Member involvement in the evaluation process due to the greater financial sums involved.

8. Environmental Implications

- 8.1 The recommended list of applications aim to deliver corporate objectives and ultimately the Authority's vision which is "To improve people's quality of life by ensuring that waste is sustainably managed to bring about the best combination of environmental, economic and social benefits". All three options provide environmental improvements but this is only marginal in Option Three.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 The proposals to remove Funding Stream 3 are to address the fact that the Energy Projects Plus SWAP project is recommended in Funding Stream 1. This application offers a package which can be provided to more schools across the City Region and can be delivered earlier than previously anticipated. The project also adds value in the development of sustainable procurement actions plans to reduce waste generated in schools which can assist in financial savings. This recommendation, therefore, prevents duplication within the Community Fund Programme.
- 9.2 At the year-end 2012-13 the Authority had provided for the anticipated cost of compliance with the government's landfill allowance scheme. When the actual cost of that compliance was realised it was significantly less than anticipated and the Authority was able to benefit from a windfall saving of almost £600k

which has allowed an additional contribution to the General Fund. If Members agree then additional contributions may be made from the General Fund in 2013-14 to support option 2 or option 3 without impacting negatively on the Authority's financial position compared with the 2013-14 budget.

- 9.3 A summary of the financial options is illustrated below in Table 3. Increases in the Community Fund budget would be funded from additional General Fund contributions if Members approved either option two or three.

Table 3: Financial Options

	Budget (£)	Additional Cost (£)	Total Cost (£)
Option One (7 projects)	130,000	0	129,660
Option Two (12 projects)	130,000	£50,145	180,145
Option Three (16 projects)	130,000	105,987	£235,987

10. Conclusion

- 10.1 The policy framework agreed and implemented for the Community Fund 2013/14 has provided more effective control measures which protect the public purse and meet Best Value requirements.
- 10.2 The workshops undertaken to promote the Fund were successful in providing advice and guidance which helped to ensure a range of quality applications were submitted. Further analysis will be undertaken by officers to support an increased number of submissions from across the city region in future.
- 10.3 The schemes being proposed for approval in Option One will deliver a range of sustainable waste management projects being undertaken across Merseyside and Halton which offer value for money, environmental, social and economic benefits to the region.
- 10.4 Option Two offers Member the opportunity to fund a longer list of applications which will benefit all six districts on a VFM basis but at an additional cost to the Authority.

- 10.5 Option Three gives Members the chance to increase the number and amounts of the awards but at a significantly higher additional cost and somewhat higher risks to project delivery within the financial year.
- 10.6 Table 4 below provides a summary of the key anticipated outputs from applications based on their evaluated submissions.

Table 4: Summary of Key Anticipated Project Outputs

Output Criteria	Option 1 (Budget £129,660)	Option 2 (Budget £180,145)	Option 3 (Budget £235,987)
Estimated Landfill Diversion	884 tonnes	1235 tonnes	1266 tonnes
CO2e Diversion	1006 tonnes	2526 tonnes	2688 tonnes
Jobs Full Time Equivalent	73 FTE	88 FTE	100 FTE
Price per contact for engagement	£8.79	£15.98	£18.06
Value of return per £1 invested	£0.41	£0.38	£0.32

The contact officer for this report is: Stuart Donaldson
7th Floor
No 1 Mann Island
Liverpool L3 1BP

Email: stuart.donaldson@merseysidewda.gov.uk
Tel: 0151 255 2570
Fax: 0151 228 1848

APPENDIX 1: Option One

Total Funding Awards: £129,660

Top 7 Projects evaluated and supported to maximum of £20,000 per project

Organisation	Project	Score	Funding Request	Proposed Award	Area of Project
1. Groundwork Cheshire (CF10)	Project UP: to re-use and up-cycle furniture and unwanted goods for families in need	76	£14,150	£14,150	Wirral
2. Bulky Bob's Furniture World (CF 1)	Fresh Start: 221 Furniture packs to families in crisis.	71	£20,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
3. Granby Toxteth Development Trust (CF12)	Making L1578 Greener: to work with the Toxteth community to improve recycling	67	£19,000	£19,000	Liverpool
4. Energy Projects Plus (CF 16)	SWAP+ (School Waste Action Programme): reduce waste to landfill, textile recycling, develop sustainable procurement action plans to reduce waste in schools.	67	£17,760	£17,760	Merseyside and Halton
5. Can Cook (CF 7)	Teaching Liverpool to Cook Don't Throw it out ,Throw it in campaign for schools and communities	66	£25,000	£20,000	Liverpool
6. The Children's Food Trust (CF6)	Mersey Waste Munchers: training established school and community based cooking clubs to reduce food waste.	65	£28,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
7. Neighbourhood Services Co Ltd (CF14)	Reuse and Recycling at Larkin's Farm: food and wood waste as integral part of a community carbon neutral project	64	£18,750	£18,750	Knowsley & Liverpool
Totals			142,660	£129,660	

Summary of Financial Distribution of Funds in Option One

Districts	Number of Projects	Value of Projects £s per district	% Share
Merseyside and Halton (all six districts)	3	57,760	44.5
Halton	0	0	0
Knowsley	0	0	0
Liverpool	2	39,000	30.1
Liverpool/Knowsley	1	18,750	14.5
St Helens	0	0	0
Sefton	0	0	0
Wirral	1	14,150	10.9
Total	7	129,660	

Summary of Anticipated Outputs from Option 1 Projects

Estimated Landfill Diversion	884 tonnes
CO2e Diversion	1006 tonnes
Full Time/Safeguarded Job Equivalents	73 FTE
Average Price per contact for engagement	£8.79
Average value of return per £1 invested	£0.41

APPENDIX 2: Option Two

<p>Total Funding: 180,145 for 12 Projects</p> <p>Projects cover all districts. Supported to maximum of £20,000 per project</p>

Organisation	Project	Score	Funding Request	Proposed Award	Area of Project
1. Groundwork Cheshire (CF10)	Project UP: to re-use and up-cycle furniture and unwanted goods for families in need	76	£14,150	£14,150	Wirral
2. Bulky Bob's Furniture World (CF 1)	Fresh Start: 221 Furniture packs to families in crisis.	71	£20,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
3. Granby Toxteth Development Trust (CF12)	Making L1578 Greener: to work with the Toxteth community to improve recycling	67	£19,000	£19,000	Liverpool
4. Energy Projects Plus (CF 16)	SWAP+ (School Waste Action Programme): reduce waste to landfill, textile recycling, develop sustainable procurement action plans to reduce waste in schools.	67	£17,760	£17,760	Merseyside and Halton
5. Can Cook (CF 7)	Teaching Liverpool to Cook Don't Throw it out , Throw it in campaign for schools and communities	66	£25,000	£20,000	Liverpool
6. The Children's Food Trust (CF6)	Mersey Waste Munchers: training established school and community based cooking clubs to reduce food waste.	65	£28,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
7. Neighbourhood Services Co Ltd (CF14)	Reuse and Recycling at Larkin's Farm: food and wood waste as integral part of a community carbon neutral project	64	£18,750	£18,750	Knowsley & Liverpool
8. Birkenhead Early Excellence (CF4)	Establish a Baby Swap Shop and Sweet Cheeks Nappy Information Service	63	£20,856.77	£14, 500	Wirral
9. Magenta Living (CF2)	Magenta Living Composting Project	62	£8,200	£8,000	Wirral
10. Faiths4Change (CF20)	Eco Parents "Educate" bespoke practical support to 4 schools	59	£18,780	£8,100	Knowsley

Organisation	Project	Score	Funding Request	Proposed Award	Area of Project
11. ECO (CF13)	Rainhill Community Garden created using recycled materials	56	£20,000	£10,975	St Helens
12. The Style Factory Collective (CF5)	Runcorn Regenerate: recycling unwanted clothes	52	£9,210	£8,910	Halton
13. Wirral Community Meals (CF11)	Wirral Community Meals: Establish a retail outlet for reusable goods to subsidise meals for the elderly	60	£2,800	3 Projects to be supported by the Merseyside Textile Forum	Wirral
14. Tomorrow's Women Wirral (CF3)	Tomorrow's Women Recycling Today	56	£6,693		Wirral
15. Wirral Fuss (CF9)	FUSS (Free Uniforms for Secondary Schools)	53	£1,850		Wirral
Totals			231,049.77	£180,145	

Summary of Financial Distribution of Funds in Option 2

Districts	Number of Projects	Value of Projects £s per district	% Share
Merseyside and Halton (all six districts)	3	57,760	32.0
Halton	1	8,910	5.0
Knowsley	1	8,100	4.5
Liverpool	2	39,000	21.7
Liverpool/Knowsley	1	18,750	10.4
St Helens	1	10,975	6.1
Sefton	0	0	0
Wirral	3	36,650	20.4
Total	12	180,145	

Summary of Anticipated Outputs from Option 2 Projects (based on submitted costs)

Estimated Landfill Diversion	1235 tonnes
CO2e Diversion	2526 tonnes
Full Time Job Equivalents (including Safeguarded and Volunteers)	88 FTE
Average Price per contact for engagement	£15.98
Average value of return per £1 spent	£0.38

APPENDIX 3: Option Three

<p>Total Funding: 235,986.75 for 16 Projects</p> <p>Evaluated projects scoring minimum of 52 given requested funding to a maximum of £20,000 per project</p>

Organisation	Project	Score	Funding Request	Proposed Award	Area of Project
1. Groundwork Cheshire (CF10)	Project UP: to re-use and up-cycle furniture and unwanted goods for families in need	76	£14,150	£14,150	Wirral
2. Bulky Bob's Furniture World (CF 1)	Fresh Start: 221 Furniture packs to families in crisis.	71	£20,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
3. Granby Toxteth Development Trust (CF12)	Making L1578 Greener: to work with the Toxteth community to improve recycling	67	£19,000	£19,000	Liverpool
4. Energy Projects Plus (CF 16)	SWAP+ (School Waste Action Programme): reduce waste to landfill, textile recycling, develop sustainable procurement action plans to reduce waste in schools.	67	£17,760	£17,760	Merseyside and Halton
5. Can Cook (CF 7)	Teaching Liverpool to Cook Don't Throw it out ,Throw it in campaign for schools and communities	66	£25,000	£20,000	Liverpool
6. The Children's Food Trust (CF6)	Mersey Waste Munchers: training established school and community based cooking clubs to reduce food waste.	65	£28,000	£20,000	Merseyside and Halton
7. Neighbourhood Services Co Ltd (CF14)	Reuse and Recycling at Larkin's Farm: food and wood waste as integral part of a community carbon neutral project	64	£18,750	£18,750	Knowsley & Liverpool
8. Birkenhead Early Excellence (CF4)	Establish a Baby Swap Shop and Sweet Cheeks Nappy Information Service	63	£20,856.77	£20,000	Wirral
9. Magenta Living (CF2)	Magenta Living Composting Project	62	£8,200	£8,200	Wirral

10. Faiths4Change (CF20)	Eco Parents "Educrate" bespoke practical support to 4 schools	59	£18,780	£18,780	Knowsley
11. ECO (CF13)	Rainhill Community Garden created using recycled materials	56	£20,000	£20,000	St Helens
12. The Style Factory Collective (CF5)	Runcorn Regenerate: recycling unwanted clothes	52	£9,210	£9,210	Halton
13. Wirral Community Meals (CF11)	Wirral Community Meals: Establish a retail outlet for reusable goods to subsidise meals for the elderly	60	£2,800	£2,800	Wirral
14. Tomorrow's Women Wirral (CF3)	Tomorrow's Women Recycling Today	56	£6,693	£6,693.00	Wirral
15. Wirral Fuss (CF9)	FUSS (Free Uniforms for Secondary Schools)	53	£1,850	£1,850.00	Wirral
16. Stockbridge Community (SCIP) (CF15)	The Sewing Café: reduce waste, make savings, keep warm	52	£18,793.75	18,793.75	Knowsley
Totals			249,843.52	235,986.75	

Summary of Financial Distribution of Funds in Option 3

Districts	Number of Projects	Value of Projects £s per district	% Share
Merseyside and Halton (all six districts)	3	57,760	25.0
Halton	1	9,210	3.9
Knowsley	2	37,573.75	15.9
Liverpool	2	39,000	16.5
Liverpool/Knowsley	1	18,750	7.9
St Helens	1	20,000	8.5
Sefton	0	0	0.0
Wirral	6	53,693	22.8
Total	16	235,986.75	

Summary of Anticipated Outputs from Option 3 Projects (based on submitted costs)

Estimated Landfill Diversion	1266 tonnes
CO2e Diversion	2688 tonnes
Full Time Job Equivalents (including Safeguarded and Volunteers)	100 FTE
Average Price per contact for engagement	£18.06
Average value of return per £1 spent	£0.32

APPENDIX 4: Other projects evaluated but not recommended

Organisation	Project	Evaluation Score	Funding Requested	Area of Project
17. Salvation Army Trading Co (CF8)	Timeless Fashion: textile recycling banks at secondary schools	50	£21,684.00	Merseyside
18. Stockbridge Village Tenants Forum (CF19)	Village Recycling Project: establish shop for exchange of re-usable goods from the community	48	£20,028.00	Knowsley
19. Alt Housing Co-operative Ltd (CF18)	Pocket Rocket Community Composting around Lodge Lane	48	£12,376.00	Liverpool
Total			54,088	