Community Gaming Grants Survey 2017/18: Qualitative Final Report

AUTHORS

Latoya Blackwood, Tiffany Gordon-Wilson, Deborah Cooper

CONTACT

Deborah.Cooper@gov.bc.ca

PUBLISH DATE

August 31, 2018

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Background

In 2017, the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) branch contacted BC Stats to assist in the evaluation of the CGG program with a view to supporting future improvements. Two separate surveys were produced: one for Applicants, and the other for Non-Applicants. Both surveys were administered online by BC Stats between March 2 and March 25, 2018.

Samples of 5,515 recent Applicants and 6,000 Non-Applicants (organizations identified as member-funded societies) were invited to complete the surveys. A total of 2,303 completions were obtained for the CGG Applicant survey with a response rate of 42.2%. A total of 1,353 completions were obtained for the Non-Applicant survey with a response rate of 23.7%.[1]

To complement the data tabulated for the quantitative responses to the surveys, this qualitative report explores participants' responses to 35 open-ended questions between both surveys. This helped to reveal trends that may not have been apparent from the quantitative data alone. The qualitative data revealed a deeper understanding of the barriers not-for-profit societies face when it comes to considering or submitting an application for a CGG. It also provided a better understanding of the improvements the respondents were seeking.

1.2. Key Findings Overall

A detailed examination of the comment themes across questions revealed some common trends that emerged from both Applicants and Non-Applicants.

Both Applicants and Non-Applicants suggested ways to streamline the application process as they found the overall application process time consuming, onerous and complex.

The most common theme related to dissatisfaction with the overall application process. Whether a respondent had recently applied for a CGG, had previously applied, or had heard of them, this was a prominent theme.

---

[1] Response rates were calculated based on all respondents who answered question 1, including the 24 Applicant and 71 Non-Applicant respondents who indicated that they did not know whether they had applied recently for a Community Gaming Grant, which then ended the survey for them. 'Respondents' in this report refer to those 'Yes' ("Applicants") and 'No' ("Non-Applicants") in response to Q1 *"Did your organization recently apply for a Community Gaming Grant?",* and who also finished the survey.

Some comments in this theme indicated the application process was especially onerous for small organizations that have fewer financial resources, time and expertise to attempt a successful grant application. Respondents expressed a desire for improving and simplifying the process for applicants at the outset, such as reducing duplication of information required for an application, providing guidelines in plain language and improving the online GOS application tool.

Both Applicants and Non-Applicants requested increased clarity and broadening of the eligibility guidelines.

Applicants and Non-Applicants shared comments regarding confusion and frustration with interpretation of CGG eligibility guidelines. Those who had contemplated applying were uncertain if they were eligible or believed their organizations or programs to be ineligible (and did not want to risk going through the detailed application process only to be turned down).

Some respondents who had been granted funding in the past were later unsuccessful, sometimes claiming they duplicated past applications over the years and this time received a different result. Several applicants who had been refused funding reported not understanding why their application had been turned down, and were unable to get further clarification from the CGG branch, which affected their confidence in understanding the CGG eligibility guidelines to produce a successful application in future. They reported that the uncertainty of CGG funding, sometimes so key to their organization or program, created instability of the organization or program itself. Both Applicants and Non-Applicants suggested eligibility of capital funding or projects as another way to increase stability.

Both Applicants and Non-Applicants recommended new or extended funding sectors.

Both Applicants and Non-Applicants found the funding sectors restricted their organization's ability to deliver direct impact in their communities, indicating the need for either new or extended funding sectors or categories.

Respondents from both surveys found the current funding sectors too '*rigid*' for many of their programs, creating confusion as to where they might fit a program that caters to multiple sectors. There was also frustration when they did not see their organization or program fitting in any of the sectors, when they could clearly see that their services benefitted their community. Respondents recommended that by at least extending the sectors, organizations with programs on the fringes would be given a greater chance of meeting the CGG's criteria and increase their ability to enrich the lives of their clients/participants.

1.3. Key Findings: Applicants

The majority of Applicants expressed frustration with the inability to pause, save and return to an incomplete online application form.

Applicants were asked for recommendations about possible improvements to the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program website and accessibility of the Gaming Online Services (GOS). A theme across the Applicants' responses noted the limited technical aspect of the application process. Whereas only 8 or 10% of respondents indicated technical issues when asked what information was missing from the CGG website (Q22), over half of respondents who were asked if they had any suggestions for improving accessing the GOS services had technical suggestions (76 or 55.1% - Q23).

Respondents found it difficult completing the application in one sitting and wished there was an option to pause, save and return at a later date or time. Another reason for the request was the ability to share a draft of the application with others such as board members to obtain approvals and/or to allow them to fill in parts of the application.

> **"It would be wonderful to be able to save the application so you could come back to it later. Most other online grants are working with that model and it takes a lot of the stress off when applying."**

The unreliability of the website and GOS platform was another reason for the request to be able to save the online application form. Respondents noted the webpage freezing and crashing, or "timing out", while completing the application. As respondents could not save completed work, they would have to start over.

Other comments found the inability to format, view and print the application at any time made the application process harder, especially for those new to the process, requiring input from others in their organization to complete the application.

Applicants requested more engagement with the Community Gaming Grants branch.

Applicants found it difficult to engage with the CGG branch, whether it was for online webinars (Q27B), regional in-person presentations (Q27A), or in general (Q28).

Respondents who indicated that they were aware of the 2017 CGG series of regional in-person presentations and online webinars but indicated they did not attend an online webinar were asked why not (Q27B). The top reason provided was not knowing about them at the time (195 or 36.9%), while the second-most prevalent reason was that they could not attend, due to resources or the inconvenient workday timing of the webinar (141 or 26.7%).

> **"We have to keep trying and maybe one day, the program will better understand our needs. Communication is key."**

Those who were aware of, but could not attend a regional in-person presentation (197 or 60.2%), often indicated the geographic barriers and time when attempting to attend an in-person presentation, especially when not held in close proximity to the organizations' community (Q27A). With many of these organizations being small and/or relying on volunteers, finding time in the middle of one's busy work schedule was challenging.

When asked specifically for comments about opportunities for engagement with the CGG Branch in Q28, 263 or 34.2% suggested more communication with the CGG branch. Increased and more effective communication was also discussed in comments across questions relating to many aspects of the application process. Respondents requested more reliable, polite and responsive telephone and email communication in response to their queries, especially during the application process. Later in the process, when Applicants were waiting for a decision on their application, they found that they were wanting for a more timely and consistent interpretation of applications. They revealed the need for more correspondence from the CGG branch throughout the year to learn of any changes to the program or upcoming deadlines.

1.4. Key Findings: Non-Applicants

Half of Non-Applicants had not applied for Community Gaming Grants as they had never heard of it.

In the survey, Non-Applicants were asked in a variety of ways why their organization had not applied for a Community Gaming Grant (CGG). Of those who indicated that they had never applied for a Community Gaming Grant but indicated they applied for other governmental or non-governmental grants, half (173 or 49.9%) of comments cited a lack of knowledge of the CGG program as their main reason (Q8).[2]

When respondents who did not apply for any kinds of grants were asked why their organization did not regularly apply for grant funding (Q7), responses were broken out by those organizations that received public donations only (Q7A) and those organizations that neither applied for any type of grant funding, nor received public donations (Q7B). Of those respondents who indicated they received public donations, 72 or 38.1% of their comments expressed a lack of knowledge about the CGG or its eligibility criteria (Q7A). This figure is consistent with organizations that have neither applied for CGG funding or public donations with close to one-third or 31.4% (128) of comments echoing a lack of knowledge of the CGG and its guidelines (Q7B).

To raise the profile of the Community Gaming Grants, some Non-Applicants suggested that non-profit organizations receive regular emails and newsletters. Some respondents also indicated that a great start to improved communication was the survey itself, which increased their awareness of the CGG program.

> **"I believe that just being involved completing this survey has made me aware of options that I knew existed but didn't know anything about. Doing this exercise has stimulated my interest in the possibility of trying to access funding…."**

---

[2] Other reasons cited in Q8 for not applying for a Community Gaming Grant were believing they were ineligible based on organizational, program, and/or financial guidelines (82 or 23.6%), the resources required to complete the application process (55 or 15.9%), respondents having other sources of funding (28, or 8.1%) and those ethically opposed to gambling (6 or 1.7%).

2. Introduction

To complement the statistical data tables from the 2017/18 Community Gaming Grants Surveys (a survey of Applicants, and a survey of Non-Applicants), this qualitative report summarizes survey participants' responses to all open-ended questions. In addition to a background section that describes the surveys from inception through survey administration, the subsequent methodology section describes what to expect in this report.

3. Background

In 2017, the Community Gaming Grants Branch contacted BC Stats to assist in evaluating the Community Gaming Grants program to support future improvements to the program. The Community Gaming Grants program distributes funds from commercial gambling revenues to not-for-profit community organizations throughout British Columbia. The program is intended to provide all eligible community organizations in the province with fair and equitable access to funding for the direct delivery of approved programs to their communities.

Two surveys were developed – one for recent Community Gaming Grant Applicants and one for Non-Applicants. These two surveys were administered, by BC Stats, online between March 2, 2018 and March 25, 2018. An invitation email was sent as well as two reminder emails. The introduction of the surveys stated that the person within the organization with the most knowledge of the Community Gaming Grants program or about accessing grant funding would be the best person to complete the survey.

The survey of recent Community Gaming Grant Applicants specifically targeted those organizations that applied in 2015, 2016, 2017 and/or 2018, and included organizations whose applications were denied funding. The contact information for these Applicants was provided directly to BC Stats by the Community Gaming Grants branch.

The survey of Non-Applicants used a sample of not-for-profit societies registered with BC Registries and Online Services as this was deemed the best available source of contact information. These organizations were matched to the list of Applicants to ensure that they were not known to have recently applied for a Community Gaming Grant. A total of 3,211 organizations were in fact matched and removed from the Non-Applicants sample. The contact information for these Non-Applicants was provided directly to BC Stats by BC Registries and Online Services.

To gain access to the contact information for both surveys, BC Stats entered into separate Information Sharing Agreements with the Community Gaming Grants branch and BC Registries and Online Services. The Community Gaming Grants branch provided a list of 5,693 organizations, and a list of 28,447 organizations registered under the BC Societies Act was provided by BC Registries and Online Services.

For the Applicant list, BC Stats cleaned the records to remove any duplicates as well as any records with unusable contact information, and this resulted in a final sample of 5,515 organizations to be surveyed as recent Community Gaming Grants Applicants.

For the Non-Applicants list, BC Stats also removed organizations identified as member-funded societies (i.e., organizations that exist primarily for the benefit of their members), organizations with addresses outside of British Columbia, and records with missing or duplicated email addresses. The remaining 18,367 records were then randomly sampled by each economic development region, which resulted in a final sample of 6,000 organizations to be surveyed as Non-Applicants.

Records for both lists were also excluded by BC Stats to ensure that an email address was only used once, and any records removed for this reason used a random selection process.

The two surveys were designed for organizations to self-identify as having recently applied for a Community Gaming Grant or not, regardless of which sample they were in. Based on their response to the first question they were seamlessly redirected to the most appropriate survey to complete; therefore, some original Applicants completed the Non-Applicants survey and vice versa. The survey also redirected any organizations who did not know whether their organization had recently applied for a Community Gaming Grant or not to terminate the survey at the first question.

A total of 2,303 completions were obtained for the Community Gaming Grant Applicant survey resulting in a response rate of 42.2%, and a total of 1,353 completions were obtained for the Non-Applicant survey resulting in a response rate of 23.7%.[3]

---

[3] Response rates were calculated based on all respondents who answered question 1, including the 24 Applicant and 71 Non-Application respondents who indicated that they did not know whether they had applied recently for a Community Gaming Grant, which then ended the survey for them. 'Respondents' in this report refer to those Applicants and Non-applicants who responded yes or no to Q1 and also finished the survey.

4. Qualitative Methodology

Each comment provided by respondents was reviewed and classified into one, or up to three, themes. Each theme was based on a commonly expressed phrase or concept that summarized a group of comments provided by respondents. Across questions, some common themes emerged in various proportions.

This report is organized by Applicant and Non-Applicant survey questions. Although there are unique questions that warrant alternate formats for displaying and discussing the responses, for the most part, the report is organized as follows:

For each comment question, the context of the question within the survey is introduced. These statements refer to questions that show the path of the respondents that lead them to the comment question being analyzed. Note that quantitative questions were often asked on a 5-point scale (e.g. agreement). The end points for the 5-point scale were labelled from the most negative response as '1 *Strongly Disagree',* with the most positive '5 *Strongly Agree'.* Any suggestion that the other points in the scale were labelled (e.g. 2 *Disagree, 3 Neutral, 4 Agree)* is just to provide interpretation in the text of this report.

The text then provides overall insights from the comment coder about the open-ended responses. These insights are followed by two tables that provide information specific to each theme.

The first table is organized by the most frequently mentioned theme to the least frequently mentioned theme, and followed by *No Response.* Themes are presented on the far left-hand side of each table, followed by a description of the theme. The total *Number of Responses* coded to that theme is presented. The *Percentage of Comments* column displays the number of responses for that theme as a percentage of the total number of respondents to the question. Because it is possible that a single respondent could have provided a response that was coded into up to three themes, the percentages do not sum 100%.

No Response themes include respondents who provided a response that could not be coded (e.g., feedback was not prevalent enough to warrant its own theme and may not have related directly to the question, or was not an adequate response). *No Response* in this report does <u>not</u> include those respondents that selected the pre-set *Don't Know/No Response* button in response to the question, and therefore did not attempt to answer the open-ended question.

Up to three example comments for each theme are then displayed in a subsequent table. The comments are to illustrate the types of feedback or suggestions respondents had. The

examples were carefully selected through an assessment of how representative each statement was of the corresponding theme. Comments selected for inclusion in this report have been edited for readability and to remove any information that could identify the respondent. Edits are indicated by square brackets […].

5. Applicant Survey

5.1. Why did your organization not receive a Community Gaming Grant in <year>? For example, what was the reason(s) provided by the Community Gaming Grants branch in your notification letter? (Other, Please Specify)(Q5)

All 2,303 respondents were asked the first question: "*Did your organization <<Applicant Organization>> recently apply for a Community Gaming Grant?*" There were 1,985 (86.2%) responses for '*Yes, in 2017*'; 1,376 (59.7%) responses for '*Yes, in 2016*'; and 1,272 (55.2%) responses for '*Yes, in 2015'*. Respondents that selected one or more of these responses were then prompted to answer Q2.

Of the 2,139 respondents prompted to answer Q2: (Using the most recent year) "*Did your organization receive funding through the Community Gaming Grants program in <<YEAR>>?*" 206 or 10% said '*No*'.

Those 206 respondents were then asked Q5 "*Why did your organization not receive a Community Gaming grant in <<YEAR>>?*" Feedback was provided by 198 respondents, and 73 respondents selected *Other, please specify.* For the most part, in *Other, please specify* comments, respondents elaborated on themes that they could and might have selected as other closed-ended responses to this question. As with the closed-ended options, they discussed financial eligibility most frequently, followed by program and organizational eligibility, and compliance.

Twenty-one or 28.8% of the 73 respondents cited financial eligibility as being the main reason, with denials stemming from the balance in their bank account to finances not being in order.

Another main concern cited by almost one-quarter or 24.7% of respondents was program eligibility, with rejections stemming from the ambiguity of categories to a program being in operation for less than the specified time period required.

Organizational eligibility was also cited as a reason by almost one-quarter again, or 23.3% of respondents. Issues ranged from being too closely associated with a for-profit business to needing to change the constitution.

A number of respondents, or 20.5%, underlined the issue of incomplete applications, where supporting documentation did not meet the requirements outlined or financial supporting documents contained errors.

Compliance was another reason referred to by 15.1% of respondents. Issues ranged from holding funds for multiple years for another project, to meeting the 12-month deadline for expenditure of funds.

TABLE 1: Q5 COMMENTS: WHY DID YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT RECEIVE A COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT IN <YEAR>? FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT WAS THE REASON(S) PROVIDED BY THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH IN YOUR NOTIFICATION LETTER? (OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY)

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Financial Eligibility	The application did not meet financial guidelines criteria.	**21/73**	**28.8%**
Program Eligibility	The application did not meet the program guidelines criteria.	**18/73**	**24.7%**
Organizational Eligibility	The application did not meet the organizational guidelines criteria.	**17/73**	**23.3%**
Incomplete Application	A portion of the application was incomplete.	**15/73**	**20.5%**
Compliance	The organization was not compliant with CGG guidelines.	**11/73**	**15.1%**
Other	No reason was given. Did not apply.	**9/73**	**12.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**73**	**-**

TABLE 2: Q5 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Financial Eligibility	*"They stated we had a Financial Eligibility Issue, we do not have 50% of operating cost for [year] and none generated through licensed gaming events."*
	"Denied due to balance in association's bank accounts."
	"Financial house not in order."
Program Eligibility	*"Program had been operating for less than a year when the application was made."*
	"We did not fall into a specific category for the Community Gaming Branch. They wanted us in […], and we felt we are more of a […] group."
	"We were told that we had no eligible programs."
Organizational Eligibility	*"Had to change our constitution."*
	"The Gaming Branch did not recognize our organization as a not-for-profit. This branch

	is the only government sector that does not recognize our status."
	"It appeared the society was too closely associated with a for-profit business."
Incomplete Application	*"Supporting documentation: […]. We attached a [letter of confirmation] (the [official] document had not yet been finalized)." Financial Considerations: […]. We provided a detailed […] and an estimate for the project budget, prepared by professionals in the industry, including input from a […] professional Project Manager." […]. The cost estimate […] was developed by professional[s] working on the project. […].*
	"Some of the financial information supporting the application had errors in it."
	"We do not know why - we did not receive any correspondence about our application but when we phoned up about it we were told that we had failed to submit something."
Compliance	*"Our organization has funds that have been held for [several] years for an upcoming project."*
	"Questions regarding completion of project and expenditure of gaming funds within 12 months. […]."
	"Did not like the bank form showing our Gaming Account, wanted an actual cheque."
Other	*"No reason was given in first [few] years - very difficult to get an answer. Last year [we were given a reason we verified as invalid]. No idea why we continue to not receive support."*
	"We did not apply - lack of personnel to submit application or follow up."
	"No reason given."

5.2. As previously stated, your organization did not receive a Community Gaming Grant in <either or all of 2015, 2016, 2017>. (Q6A) What was the amount of funding your organization was applying for? (Q6B)What was the amount of funding that your organization applied for in < either or all of 2015, 2016, 2017>, but did not receive?

Of the 2,303 Applicants who were asked in Q1 "*Did your organization recently apply for a Community Gaming Grant?*", 2,139 respondents provided 4633 responses to a combination of the following annual application cycles: 2015, 2016, and 2017.[4] Those 2,139 respondents were then asked in Q2: (Using the most recent year) "*Did your organization receive funding through the Community Gaming Grants program in <<YEAR>>?*'" A total of 1908 or 89% indicated '*Yes*' versus 206 or 10% who indicated '*No*'.

The 206 respondents who indicated they did not receive funding were then asked in Q6A: "*What was the amount of funding your organization was applying for?*" and 156 provided amounts (see Table 3). Over half of the respondents who answered this question (84 or 53.8%) had applied for funding under $25,000.

The 1908 respondents who stated '*Yes*' they did receive funding were then asked in Q4: "*Did your organization receive the full Community Gaming Grant amount requested in <<YEAR>>?*'" Nearly half (914 or 48%) selected '*No (Partial amount of requested grant received).*' [5]

The 914 respondents who stated they received partial amount of requested grant fund were then asked in Q6B '*What was the amount of funding that your organization applied for in <<YEAR>>, but did not receive?*' and 863 respondents provided amounts (see Table 4). As with those who had applied for funding and were denied, over half of respondents (460 or 53.3%) reported denial of partial funding for amounts under $25,000.

Responses were grouped to maintain confidentiality and provide meaningful analysis.

---

[4] This question is a check all that apply, therefore respondents could have selected one or all three years in question.
[5] An equal amount, (48% or 914), selected '*Yes*' (full amount of requested grant received), and 4% (80) chose '*Don't Know/No Response*'.

TABLE 3: Q6A COMMENTS: WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING YOUR ORGANIZATION WAS APPLYING FOR?

LEVEL OF CGG FUNDING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
$0-$24,999	84/156	53.8%
$25,000-$49,999	29/156	18.6%
$50,000-$99,999	23/156	14.7%
$100,000-$300,000	17/156	10.9%
No Response	3/156	1.9%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	156	100.0%

TABLE 4: Q6B WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING THAT YOUR ORGANIZATION APPLIED FOR IN <YEAR>, BUT DID NOT RECEIVE?

LEVEL OF CGG FUNDING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
$0-$11,999	251/863	29.1%
$12,000-$24,999	209/863	24.2%
$25,000-$49,999	175/863	20.3%
$50,000-$99,999	138/863	16.0%
$100,000-$224,999	73/863	8.5%
$225,000-$300,000	13/863	1.5%
No Response	4/863	0.5%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	863	100.0%

5.3. Why does your organization's program(s) not easily align with the current funding sectors of the Community Gaming Grants program? Does your organization see a need to establish new funding sectors and/or to extend or change the existing sectors? (Q14B)

Of the 2,303 Applicants asked if their organization's program(s) easily aligned with the current funding sectors of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program, 54 or 2.3% of them responded *'No'* (Q14A). When those 54 respondents were then asked to explain why not and also whether they saw a need to extend or change existing sectors or establish new ones, 50 comments were provided.

The most common reason given by almost half or 44% of respondents was that Applicant programs that aligned with the mission of the CGG often met the criteria of numerous sectors, and could not be obviously or exclusively slotted under any one sector. Also, Applicant organizations might run numerous programs that have a variety of focuses, so could not be placed under one sector. It was suggested that changing existing sectors to recognise '*social innovation and programming across diverse areas*' could help to cover intersecting needs.

Almost one third (15 or 30%) of respondents suggested extending the sectors. A common observation that emerged was that the Sports sector could be extended to incorporate recreational activities, especially where they were inclusive of the entire community, providing added social and health benefits.

'Our Recreation programs fit under several of the categories: [some of our programs] tend to fit under Arts; [others, yet more numerous,] fit under Sport; [another] fits under Environment; and [a number of our programs] fit under Human and Social Services. Therefore we have applied for grants under Human and Social Services, even though the examples do not necessarily match our programs. We would prefer that the existing sectors clarify where 'Recreation programs' would best fit.'

Just over one-quarter (13 or 26%) of respondents suggested creating new sectors such as '*science and education*' or '*early childhood education*' and '*education*', as Human and Social Services is too broad a category. Another suggestion was to add a sector that recognised community outdoor recreational activities.

TABLE 5: Q14B COMMENTS: WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATIONORGANIZATION'S PROGRAM(S) NOT EASILY ALIGN WITH THE CURRENT FUNDING SECTORS OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM? DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION SEE A NEED TO ESTABLISH NEW FUNDING SECTORS AND/OR TO EXTEND OR CHANGE THE EXISTING SECTORS?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Program(s) Cater to Multiple Sectors	Respondents indicated their organization provided programs that met the criteria of numerous sectors.	**22/50**	**44.0%**
Extend Sector	Respondents suggested extending existing sectors.	**15/50**	**30.0%**
Create New Sector	Respondents suggested creating a new sector or category.	**13/50**	**26.0%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**5/50**	**10.0%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**50**	**-**

TABLE 6: Q14B COMMENTEXAMPLES BY THEME

Program(s) Cater to Multiple Sectors	*"Our organization works with a number of food-related programs and often they do not fit into the human/social services sector - but they also do not completely fit into education, agriculture, or environmental sectors either. A lot of our work focuses on community building and re-skilling. Changing existing sectors to recognize social innovation and programming across diverse areas would foster a better environment for organizations to focus on complex problems like food security and poverty."*
	"We do not align because we have 2 events that are Arts & Culture […], but 1 that is Human Services […]."
	"We run a variety of programs, including social, environmental, arts, cultural, heritage, and public safety […]. As a rural organization, we provide it all. So it's hard to know where we fit but we definitely improve the quality of life for people in this area in all those areas."
Extend Sector	*"In that community radio is a reflection of the community it belongs to, Arts & Culture may be applicable. If volunteer-created radio does fall within the Media Arts, then it also may be appropriate to keep in the Arts & Culture category. Perhaps the category description needs to be expanded in order to be clear."*
	"We maintain a […] trail for […] recreational purposes and, fitness activities for all age groups. There is nothing presently to help non-profit societies such as ours."
	"Engages [a cultural group] into projects for seniors, families and provides activities that support youth, especially youth that may be tempted to experiment with drugs. Supports healthy living with a focus on families."
Create New Sector	*"We do science and education and it would be useful to have a category that specifically addresses that."*
	"Our programs are in Early Childhood Education and Education. The Human and Social Services sector is too large."
	"[…] There should be a funding sector to cover community outdoor activities."

5.4. What barriers has your organization experienced in accessing Community Gaming Grant funding? (Q17)

Of the 2,303 Applicants asked if their organization had experienced any barriers to accessing Community Gaming Grant (CGG) funding, 497 or 21.6% responded '*Yes*' (Q16).Those 497 respondents were then asked to explain what barriers their organization had experienced, and 484 respondents provided comments.

Overall, the most significant barrier indicated by 194 or 40.1% of respondents was the whole application process. Smaller organizations in particular found the process '*time-consuming, complex and onerous.*' Many underlined both a lack of knowledge in completing the application and a lack of assistance from CGG staff to be barriers.

Another noteworthy barrier cited by 145 or 30% of respondents was stringent financial eligibility requirements. Respondents felt that being financially responsible (or setting aside funds for a rainy day) forced their organizations to become ineligible.

At the same time, 70 or 14.5% of respondents with a critical need for funding could not receive assistance due to their lack of savings.

Respondents pointed to the '*surplus funds rule*', which disadvantaged organizations whose fiscal year differed from that of the CGG, because unspent funds remained in their accounts.

A further 44 or 9.1% of respondents indicated they had no idea why they had been denied funding, either for a first-time application or after numerous years of having successful applications. The rationales behind the rejections were not clearly communicated and Applicants were left bewildered, especially if they felt they had submitted a good application.

Some 31 or 6.4% of respondents mentioned their programs did not fit into existing sectors. They wanted clarity on the guidelines, and more examples of programs that met the criteria.

TABLE 7: Q17 COMMENTS: WHAT BARRIERS HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCED IN ACCESSING COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process	Respondents found the process daunting and complex, and CGG staff advice was inconsistent.	194/484	40.1%
Eligibility Requirements	Respondents indicated that the eligibility requirements (program, organizational, financial) were too stringent.	145/484	30.0%

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Lack of Funds	Respondents reported receiving a reduced or uncertain amount of funding a barrier.	**70/484**	**14.5%**
Uncertain Why Denied Funds	Respondents pointed to absence of an explanation for declined application.	**44/484**	**9.1%**
Program Did Not Fit Into Sectors	Respondents were informed or felt they were not eligible based on funding sectors or categories. Respondents wanted clarity on guidelines and examples of programs that met criteria.	**31/484**	**6.4%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**13/484**	**2.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**484**	**-**

TABLE 8: Q17 COMMENTEXAMPLES BY THEME

Application Process	*"Language: it would be great if we can submit our application in French as it is an official language in Canada."*
	"Mainly administrative issues. Requirements are very complex. Needs someone with considerable knowledge not always available with novice volunteers. Not always clear why and affects the outcome. Access to info and guidance not user-friendly. Online form cannot be saved, making it cumbersome to complete within the time frame. Not much room for error or fixing them without considerable effort."
	"Documents that we thought were uploaded were not and we were not advised. Our grant application was refused and we had to submit reconsideration. The result was not known until after our fiscal year-end which meant no funding for the current year. On more than none occasion, we have tried contacting BC Gaming for clarification and the answer was very slow in coming – the last one took [several] months."
Eligibility Requirements	*"As a volunteer organization we have not always been able to present the required support documentation in the form the BC Gaming requests. However, all information has been supplied but sometimes in a different format. Our other barrier is that most of our funds are raised during [one season] – the funds are used [during another season] – but our financial year end is [in between] – our financial statement often looks like we have too much money.*
	"To apply for funding, we need to have a program up and running for a year, which we cannot afford without funding. Catch 22."
	"CGG is not for core funding, but if item is required for program then it is ok. What is core funding and why cannot everything we do to attain our mission be included? We had a capital plan but after [several] years had to take it into surplus. We had to stay with a grant system from [another level of] government."
Lack of Funds	*"We have had our gaming funding reduced by about half, and having such huge swings in funding makes it incredibly difficult to plan a program. Having reserves helps but the gaming grant has such restrictions that it makes having reserves difficult. If I do not get gaming, or I do not get the amount of funding requested, I use up ALL my reserves and*

then worry for the next year that I may or may not be able to operate as a going concern."

"We do not often receive the amount that we request, even though those amounts of request come from careful budget consideration that allows us to cover costs in a sustainable way. Not receiving full funds means we have to put fundraised dollars towards programs we feel should be covered by Gaming in full."

"Despite our repeated requests for funding increases, while demonstrating increased use of funds and increased client impacts, our funding increase requests have consistently been denied."

Uncertain Why Denied Funds	*"We did not receive the funds requested [recently] and had no response to requests for reasons."*

"One of our programs that had been receiving funding for many years was cut off. Never understood the rationale for cutting the program off. I think various adjudicators have different opinions and or understanding of what is acceptable and what is not. In our case nothing changed about this program and […] the answer was no, the program does not meet the requirements."

"We submitted a good application and have no idea why it did not get accepted, we are run by volunteers, there was no assistance that we could see and it was impossible to phone the administrators for help or follow up. A very difficult process for voluntary organizations."

Program Did Not Fit Sectors	*"Clear qualification criterion has been difficult to pin down. It has taken us a few years of applying to determine exactly which category we fell into for the amount of funding available to us. […]"*

"[…] we are a charitable organization that is supporting [our community in an innovative way] and we are penalised because we do not fit any of the established categories."

"We support foster families in the community. We were told that does not support the community in any way that makes us eligible for gaming grants."

5.5. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: *The website had the information I needed*. What information is missing from the Community Gaming Grants program website? (Q22)

Of the 2,303 Applicants prompted to provide an opinion on the statement in Q21C "*The website had the information I needed*" 90 either selected '*Disagree*' or '*Strongly Disagree*'. Subsequently, 80 provided additional feedback on what they felt was missing from the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) website.

Over half or 58.8% of the 80 respondents found it difficult to locate information about the application process on the website. When respondents did find information, they found it confusing or inadequate. Some respondents suggested that samples of completed forms would be useful as a reference tool to support the application process.

Almost one-third (26 or 32.5%) of respondents found it difficult to find information about the CGG eligibility guidelines. Some respondents would have liked more specific information on what matters might be considered eligible versus ineligible. Respondents found the web-based information on eligibility criteria to be lacking, vague, and hard to understand.

Eight respondents or 10.0% experienced technical issues with the CGG website, from '*freezing*' mid-application to '*falling off line*' during the application process. This meant Applicants were having to re-do applications sometimes up to three times. Others would have liked the ability to print off the application form upfront to allow for more effective preparation, however this was not possible.

TABLE 9: Q22 COMMENTS: WHAT INFORMATION IS MISSING FROM THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM WEBSITE?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process	Information on the application process was difficult to find, and what was there was confusing.	47/80	58.8%
Eligibility Guidelines	Information on eligibility criteria was lacking or vague.	26/80	32.5%
Technical Issues	Technical issues arose resulting in the website crashing or freezing. Not possible to print forms.	8/80	10.0%
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	6/80	7.5%

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**80**	**-**

TABLE 10: Q22 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Application Process	*"A great deal of information was missing or insufficient. We had many questions and called for clarification and assistance. Found some staff of community gaming branch excellent and very helpful, but others not so competent, and one specifically very rude and offensive in tone and language. Some questions resulted in referral to more senior staff or advisors. Sometimes answers not helpful e.g. I do not know; or we are very busy."*
	"So much information it is hard to sort through what is needed. Gaming keeps asking for more forms and information to be submitted to get a grant it is a huge undertaking to submit the grant; time wise and preparation. Volunteer hours/ activity /information form was latest form to be added to everything else they want."
	"Information about specifics. Perhaps in developing responses and samples it might be useful to have groups that are facing challenges work with Gaming Staff to post samples and do an FAQ section."
Eligibility Guidelines	*"I would like to see more specific information pertaining to what kinds of work is considered in kind labour. Our organization only hires one to two people […]. We do not hire anybody else to do registration, accounting, fundraising etc. and it's not clear to us which type of work is considered appropriate for this calculation."*
	"We find that the eligibility criteria and the information about what is allowable and information about the financial reporting to be vague and difficult to understand. This is critical information for us in filling in the application."
	"All matters of disqualification are not listed, so when you submit thinking you have everything completed correctly, the rejection is something that was not verified in the guidelines."
Technical issues	*"The website is currently set up so that you must complete the whole application all at once. I experienced a "freezing" of the website mid-application which resulted in first being uncertain as to whether the application had been processed, needing to consult with the […] representative for assistance with the web application, and then re-starting the application from the beginning to ensure that it was properly completed."*
	"The website kept falling off line had to attempt 3 times to get it done. It is not friendly to use."
	"It seemed impossible to print out the forms so that we could prepare our application in advance of inputting it which would have made it easier for us. Also having to post in supporting documents rather than submitting them electronically could lead to problems."

5.6. Does your organization have any suggestions for improvement regarding accessing the Gaming Online Service (GOS)? (Q23)

Of the 2,303 Applicants asked to provide an opinion on the statement in Q21F: "*The Gaming Online Service (GOS) was designed so that I could access it without difficulty*", 139 or 6% selected '*Disagree*' or '*Strongly Disagree*'.

The 2,303 respondents were also asked to provide an opinion on the statement in Q21H: "*Overall, I was satisfied with the ease of accessing the Gaming Online Service (GOS)*" and 147 or 7% '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*'.

The respondents who either '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*' with the above two statements were then asked in Q23: "*Does your organization have any suggestions for improvement regarding accessing the Gamine Online Service (GOS)?*", and 138 offered suggestions.

Of those 138 respondents, over half (76or 55.1%) suggested the Community Gaming Grant (CGG) GOS be updated to allow Applicants to save and return to incomplete applications.

Another key suggestion from close to half (66 or 47.8%) of the respondents was simplification of the application process. In particular, the ability to download the entire application upfront, so Applicants could prepare it before finishing it online.

A combination of responses from 12.3% of respondents underscored the importance of broadening the CGG program sectors so they were not so prescriptive. Respondents addressed the need to engage more with the CGG staff, but saw that as a challenge unless or until more CGG staff was hired. Respondents suggested more telephone support with '*competent staff*' going forward.

TABLE 11: Q23 COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT REGARDING ACCESSING THE GAMING ONLINE SERVICE (GOS)?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Technical Issues	Provide the ability to save and return to incomplete applications.	**76/138**	**55.1%**
Simplify Application	Keep the language simple; provide templates for easy and accurate completion of application.	**66/138**	**47.8%**
Increase CGG Engagement and Clarification of CGG	Broaden program sectors and increase CGG branch engagement with respondents.	**17/138**	**12.3%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Guidelines			
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**4/138**	**2.9%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**138**	**-**

TABLE 12: Q23 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Technical Issues	*"We have had a lot of trouble using the form. We use Macs. Maybe that has something to do with it. The sessions frequently time-out. We have had to fill in forms sometimes 10 times and submit by email to get everything in because it makes us restart and restart and restart. Sometimes it redirects us to weird places. Generally, submitting anything using your online services takes way longer than it's supposed to because of all the redirection."*
	"Our application froze and we were unable to submit online and had to email in our grant. Increased capability to deal with high volume periods is required."
	"It is very dated, clumsy and awkward to access. It is important to be able to save work and come back to an application at a later time. It is also helpful to be able to properly format work, use spell check, etc. it is just really old school and clunky."
Simplify Application	*"Please make the financial application and reporting easier. Send reminders when the reports are due."*
	"Yes, make it easier for groups that do amazing and good work that impact communities like we do that do not have grant writers or full time staff (one part time who is now laid off because we didn't get this funding) to apply for these easier and to fully see the scope of what Provincial money going into an account means. It does not always mean it benefits the society."
	"Please add a downloadable template of the application so that all the sections and questions are available without having to page through the application filling in placeholder info in order to access the next pages. Links to the forms, templates and supporting docs that are icons instead of text-based."
Increase CGG Engagement and Clarification of CGG Guidelines	*"More categories that non-profits can fit into the group/categories are too narrow. Our specific group can fit into three different categories but not specifically one."*
	"Better and more competent telephone support. Beware the temptation to replace competent staff with on-line words. Sometimes a dialogue with competent staff can complement and buttress and improve the on-line service and experience."
	More staff hiring. Obvious that the gaming grants department is understaffed. Customer response systems are non-existent. No customer support tools like Zendesk."

5.7. Why did your organization not attend a regional in-person presentation in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants branch? (Q27A)

Of the 2,303 Applicants asked Q24: "*Was your organization aware that in 2017 the Community Gaming Grants branch hosted a series of regional in-person presentations and online webinars?*", 917 or 40% said '*Yes*'[6].

The same 2,303 respondents were also asked in Q25G whether they had ever used or been involved in '*regional in-person presentations*' with the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) branch, and 1,515 or 66% said '*No*'.[7]

The 374 respondents who were both aware of the presentations and indicated they had *not* been involved in them were then asked Q27A: "*Why did your organization not attend a regional in-person presentation in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants Branch?*" and 327 Applicants commented.

Of the 327 responses, well over half (197 or 60.2%) cited timing and geographic location as being reasons why they did not attend. The workday timing was problematic for people at work.

Just over one-quarter (84 or 25.7%) of responses explained that they had attended presentations in the past and therefore had no need to attend.

Some 35 or 10.7% of responses said they were not aware they had taken place, and had not received any notification about the opportunity to attend.

Some 16 or 4.9% of responses explained they had no plans to submit an application; had otherwise attended a presentation by another organization; or had gleaned sufficient information from a webinar they had attended.

TABLE 13: Q27A COMMENTS: WHY DID YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT ATTEND A REGIONAL IN-PERSON PRESENTATION IN 2017 WITH THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Could Not Attend	Time /work conflicts prevented respondents from attending.	**197/327**	**60.2%**

---

[6] 1,278 or 55% said '*No*' and 108 or 5% said '*Don't Know/ No Response*'.
[7] 573 or 25% said '*Yes*' and 215 or 9% said '*Not Applicable/ Don't Know/ No Response*'.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Attendance Not Needed	Respondents attended a session in the past and/or felt it was not necessary to attend.	**84/327**	**25.7**
No Prior Knowledge	Respondents had no prior knowledge of the in-person presentations.	**35/327**	**10.7%**
Other	Respondents either had no intentions of applying in 2017 or attended webinar/presentations hosted by other organizations.	**16/327**	**4.9%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**2/327**	**0.6%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**327**	**-**

TABLE 14: Q27A COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Could Not Attend	*"It involved four hours of driving (round trip) plus the presentation time. I was not able to leave the office for that amount of time."*
	"It was in a different community and it did not fit in with my schedule that day."
	"It was presented during business hours and the majority of our board is at work during those hours so unable to attend. If there was an evening session it would have [had] higher attendance."
Attendance Not Needed	*"I had already completed a number of applications and did not find any difficulty in doing so."*
	"Not needed as we have successfully applied for the grant in the past."
	"We have lots of experience with the application process and did not feel that a presentation was necessary for our volunteers."
No Prior Knowledge	*"Did not see any information about a regional in-person presentation."*
	"We did not hear about it until after the fact. I don't recall getting any information about it."
	"We were not aware of them."
Other	*"[Another organization] provides seminars to volunteers applying for Gaming Grants."*
	"We did not have a project for which to apply for a grant in 2017."
	"We were able to get a sufficient amount of information from the webinar hosted by [another organization]."

5.8. Why did your organization not attend an online webinar in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants branch? (Q27B)

Of the 2,303 Applicants asked Q24: "*Was your organization aware that in 2017 the Community Gaming Grants branch hosted a series of regional in-person presentations and online webinars?*", 917 or 40% said '*Yes*'[8].

The same 2,303 respondents were asked in Q25H whether they had ever used or been involved in '*online webinars*' with the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) branch, and 1,859 or 81% said '*No*'.[9]

The 674 respondents who were both aware of the webinars and indicated they had not been involved in them were then asked Q27B: '*Why did your organization not attend an online webinar in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants branch?*' and 529 Applicants commented.

Of the 529 responses, over one-third (195 or 36.9%) explained they were not aware of the opportunity to attend a webinar, or simply found out too late.

Just over one-quarter (141 or 26.7%) who did not attend a webinar cited a range of issues from scheduling conflicts to inadequate technology or resources to the lack of interactions and opportunity for discussion in a webinar.

Just over one-fifth or (112 or 21.2%) of responses explained that they did not need to attend, having gained enough information from past sessions or being already very experienced with the application process and expectations around it.

A total of 82 or 15.5% of responses indicated they had attended an in-person presentation so had no need to attend a webinar, or they were not aware of the webinar alternative.

Some 8 or 1.5% of responses cited no interest in submitting an application, due to lack of success in the past or ineligibility.

TABLE 15: Q27B COMMENTS: WHY DID YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT ATTEND AN ONLINE WEBINAR IN 2017 WITH THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
No Prior Knowledge	Respondents had no prior knowledge of the online webinars.	**195/529**	**36.9%**

---

[8] 1,278 or 55% said '*No*' and 108 or 5% said '*Don't Know/ No Response*'
[9] 174 or 8% said '*Yes*' and 270 or 12% said '*Not Applicable/Don't Know/ No Response*'

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Could Not Attend	Respondents could not attend due to scheduling conflicts and lack of resources.	**141/529**	**26.7%**
Attendance Not Needed	Respondents had enough information from past sessions and/or found information easily accessible.	**112/529**	**21.2%**
Attended an In-Person Session	Respondents had attended an in-person presentation.	**82/529**	**15.5%**
No Interest in Applying	Respondents had no interest in attending; some were discouraged by the CGG process.	**8/529**	**1.5%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**12/529**	**2.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**529**	**-**

TABLE 16: Q27B COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

No Prior Knowledge	*"Did not receive or missed the notification email."*
	"I didn't know they were available."
	"Unaware. Found out too late."
Could Not Attend	*"Timing did not work out. Online webinars are very difficult on my computer."*
	"Webinars are not interactive and do not allow people to discuss issues, etc. I prefer the in-person workshops for that reason."
	"We are running an extremely busy office and due to lack of financial resources we are always extremely short staffed and unable to make time for these learning opportunities."
Attendance Not Needed	*"We did not feel it was necessary this year as we had all the information we required in order to submit and follow up on our application."*
	"We have been accessing gaming funds for [many] years and feel reasonably well versed on the procedure."
	"Satisfied with the process and didn't have any questions. Have applied for the Gaming grant for many years and have been successful."
Attended an In-Person Session	*"We attended the in-person seminar instead."*
	"Unaware of webinars. Attended an in-person presentation."
	"I attended a Community Gaming workshop in-person […] and believed I received all of the information I required there."
No Interest in Applying	*"We've given up on Gaming Grants. We do not have the manpower to apply and maintain the program."*
	"Did not feel like it was a good use of time since we had been unsuccessful in the past and our circumstances hadn't changed and we did not hear about them."
	"We knew that we would not qualify for a Community Gaming Grant."

5.9. Does your organization have any suggestions for improvement regarding application resources or to increase the opportunities for engagement with the Community Gaming Grants branch? (Q28)

Of the 2,303 Applicants who were asked if their organization had any suggestions for improvement regarding application resources to increase the opportunities for engagement with the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) branch, 768 indicated 'indicated '*Yes*' and provided responses.

Just over one-third of the 768 respondents (263 or 34.2%) highlighted the need for enhanced opportunities for engagement with the CGG branch, including more geographically accessible workshops; and a more active '*mailing list*' to advice about forthcoming workshops, and to support the application process with timeline reminders or advice on form-filling.

Just over one-quarter (202 or 26.3%) of respondents underlined the need for a simplified application process using language that was easier to comprehend and that provided more detailed instructions on precisely which supporting documents to submit.

Just over one-fifth (164 or 21.4%) of respondents asked for the CGG website to be updated to ease the application process. For instance, the ability to save an application and go back in at a later date to continue or to provide a character count in text boxes with limits requested.

Fifty-nine or 7.7% of respondents requested an increase in overall funding, with a return to 3-year funding. In terms of the eligibility funding, an additional 38 or 4.9% of respondents suggested a broadening of funding sectors to incorporate such things as increased '*diversity*'. As well, respondents suggested an expansion of guidelines so that funds might be held for needs beyond the core program.

Thirty-three or 4.3% of respondents would like more one-on-one contact with an evaluation officer at the CGG branch, so they could review their application with them before submission, and have a go-to contact for questions. It was suggested that a named person be assigned to each Applicant.

Thirty-two or 4.2% of respondents had no suggestions, and were happy with the support they had received by phone, and the increased engagement by CGG with Applicants.

TABLE 17: Q28 COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT REGARDING APPLICATION RESOURCES OR TO INCREASE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Increase CGG Engagement	Increase the opportunity for engagement with the CGG branch.	**263/768**	**34.2%**
Clarify Application Process	Simplify the language used and provide detailed examples.	**202/768**	**26.3%**
Update CGG Webpage	Update of the CGG webpage to increase user-friendliness/improve application process.	**164/768**	**21.4%**
Improve Funding	Increase overall funding; return to 3-year funding.	**59/768**	**7.7%**
Expand Eligibility Guidelines	Broaden funding sectors; expand the guidelines for use of funds.	**38/768**	**4.9%**
Communicate Evaluation Process	Provide one-on-one contact with an evaluation officer to articulate and/or clarify on any discrepancies.	**33/768**	**4.3%**
Satisfied	Pleased with the opportunities for engagement with the CGG branch.	**32/768**	**4.2%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**21/768**	**2.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**768**	**-**

TABLE 18: Q28 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Increase CGG Engagement	*"Have a mailing list to advise of or announce presentations and workshops available, where and when."*
	"Considering that volunteers are likely to be new to Gaming policies, possibly each year, it would be nice to have kind reminders of when and how to fill in forms and accountability reports, so that mistakes/errors aren't made."
	"Regional workshops seem to be held in locations which are too distant for us to consider attending."
Clarify Application Process	*"Please clarify all the tiny specifics, especially ones that eliminate Applicants due to language misunderstandings, different usage of language."*
	"Most documents use too much "government-ease" words and therefore at times it is difficult to comprehend the exact meaning of the information. "
	"It would be helpful to have a more detailed description of what we need to submit when explaining where we are using the funds provided. For example, if we say "staff wages", do we need to submit specific numbers regarding staff wages or pay stubs? Thanks!"
Update CGG Webpage	*"The ability to save the application document and then go back to it rather than having to fill it all in at one sitting would be a massive improvement."*

	"Providing a character count for the text boxes that have a character limit would be helpful."
	"It would be very helpful when using fillable pdf forms; [if] we could save and start where we left off on the reports before sending to gaming. It seems we cannot save and have to restart again. [...] to upgrade to a pdf program that will save our reports. Is it possible to submit summary and event reports online?"
Improve Funding	*"For regular support - why does it need to be an annual application? Every 3 years would be more cost effective for such a place like ours [...]."*
	"Community has many needs so an increase in budget for grants would help immensely."
	"While we are very grateful to receive some of the amount requested it would be beneficial to our [organization] to know the specific reasons why we did not receive the full amount applied for. This information would be very helpful for the next year's application."
Expand Eligibility Guidelines	*"Rules for what can (and cannot) be spent are very strict, and we understand why; still, if a larger percentage of the funding could be used for admin (office requirements, salary, etc.) that would help. #2: Gaming grants also require that an association is already providing a service (for example, when we expanded our travel region to include [...]) before an increase in funding is allowed, but this makes it difficult, because how does one expand a program without the funding?"*
	"Broaden categories to accommodate diversity and focus."
	"It would be nice if there was more flexibility in the holding of funds for projects outside of the core program. Non-profits rely on funding to run their program and it is difficult to not have any back up funding for when funding is not available or for when projects are taking some time to complete."
Communicate Evaluation Process	*"It would be helpful if we could be given the opportunity to have some contact with the person reviewing the application so that we could explain or add to section of our applications that the reviewer finds to be deficient."*
	"Would be helpful if we had one person handling our file, or at least someone named on the award letter. The award letter comments are often difficult to interpret. It is hard to call in and get clarification on specific issues raised."
	"With all the changes in the application process/eligibility it would be great to be able to review the application with someone at the Gaming Office before submitting the application. I am afraid to submit it in case I have left something out or made an error, once submitted it cannot be changed. It may leave our Association ineligible for the year, which could potentially be detrimental to the Association."
Satisfied	*"We were very happy to see the increase in engagement from the Community Gaming Branch."*
	"I have in the past called their office for some answers to questions if I did not understand something and they were very helpful."
	"I appreciated phone support when I had questions about the gaming account summary report and individual gaming licences for raffles."

5.10. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: Guidelines for the Community Gaming Grants program were complete. What information is missing from the guidelines for the Community Gaming Grants program? (Q30)

Of the 2,303 Applicants, 99 or 4.3% of them 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with the statement "The guidelines for the Community Gaming Grants program were complete." (Q29G). Those 99 respondents were then asked what information they felt was missing from the guidelines and 84 respondents provided additional feedback.

Nearly half of the 84 respondents (36 or 42.9%) raised concerns related to a lack of clarity on eligibility criteria, particularly around organizational and financial requirements. Respondents found the wording vague, and the lack of examples left respondents questioning their eligibility.

Another area found lacking by just over one-third (29 or 34.5%) of respondents was the assistance provided by Community Gaming Grants (CGG) staff. Although advice over the telephone was appreciated, respondents still felt 'stuck' and 'on their own' when assistance was required out of office hours, which is when many Applicants had the time to work on the application. Comments also pointed to the need for a guide or reference tool, particularly when encountering technical issues, so something akin to a troubleshooting guide.

Nine or 10.7% of respondents found the method of program evaluation vague and immeasurable and wondered how CGG measured the benefits their program brought to the community.

Table 19: Q30 COMMENTS: YOU INDICATED THAT YOU DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT: GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM WERE COMPLETE. WHAT INFORMATION IS MISSING FROM THE GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Improve Qualification Guidelines and Procedures	Respondents found the eligibility criteria vague and without critical information. CGG staff explanations were inconsistent.	**36/84**	**42.9%**
Increase Application Process Support	Respondents reported that assistance during the application process was inadequate or lacking. Respondents suggested a guide might be useful.	**29/84**	**34.5%**
Clarify Evaluation Criteria	Respondents requested more insight into how CGG evaluates and measures the community 'benefits' of	**9/84**	**10.7%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
	a given program.		
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**11/84**	**13.1%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**84**	**-**

TABLE 20: Q30 COMMENTEXAMPLES BY THEME

Improve Qualification Guidelines and Procedures	*"There are numerous sections which were vague, unclear, or did not specify what needed to be done."*
	"The guidelines are a bit vague and it can be challenging to determine what expenses an organization can use the funds for."
	"Guideline - "cannot exceed 75% of the actual operating costs". It would be helpful if there was more clarity that this means: 75% of the program's actual operating costs from a previous completed fiscal year, and not from the current fiscal year, or the fiscal year for which you are seeking a grant?"
Increase Application Process Support	*"No information on what to do if problems encountered during completion of online forms. Printing was a problem, as information was missing which disappeared at time of submission and no remedy was made available."*
	"We were unaware of any assistance available, there was no overall guide to the process, there was no way of printing off the application form so we could prepare in advance of online system. It was very difficult to follow up and see where we were at, and we were not updated on our application. Overall, I got the impression that the program was deliberately difficult especially for first time Applicants."
	"The forms can be difficult to complete and the expectations on volunteers to understand the documents can be hard. The help line when you call is great, but often the people completing the forms are volunteers and cannot call for help during regular hours."
Clarify Evaluation Criteria	*"The determination that an organization is an indirect benefit to the community seems rather arbitrary."*
	"Community benefit - what are you measuring?"
	"Evaluation terms are missing. Example: I was told community engagement is very important, but not of a particular community, but 'the community at large.' I am not sure what this means, and it seems problematic for the Branch to decide who is the general community at large? Where is this information written, how is it being evaluated?"

5.11. Why was <<Q33 Response>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34)

Of the 2,303 respondents who were asked in Q33: "*Thinking through the whole application process for a Community Gaming Grant, which part of the process did your organization find the most challenging and/or difficult?*", 1,575 Applicants provided a valid response.

Of the 1,575 respondents who were then asked Q34 '*Why was <<Q33 Response>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization?*' 1,420 offered comments.

Those comments were divided into Q34A, Q34B, Q34C, Q34D and Q34E based on the five possible responses to Q33: organizations that had difficulty…

Q34A) '*Accessing Information*' (68 comments)
Q34B) '*Understanding Program Guidelines/Eligibility Criteria*' (472 comments)
Q34C) '*Completing Online Application Form (Gaming Online Service (GOS))*' (396 comments)
Q34D) '*Submitting Supporting Documents (Using Email, Mail or the Gaming Online Service (GOS))*' (378 comments), and
Q34E) '*Contacting the Community Gaming Grants branch for Help*' (106 comments).

5.11.1. Why was <<accessing information>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34A)

Of the 74 Applicants who indicated '*accessing information*' was the most challenging or difficult part of the whole Community Gaming Grants (CGG) application process (Q33), 68 of them commented (Q34).

Two main themes emerged. A small majority of comments (27or 39.7%) underlined difficulties in finding pertinent information like the correct forms to fill in, or which category to align your organization with. A further 26 comments or 38.2% of responses highlighted issues around accessing information on the website. Observations included getting lost in navigating the site, including printing – especially for people for whom it is necessary to use adapted technology.

Almost a quarter (16 or 23.5%) of comments stated difficulties in understanding the information required by the CGG branch. This included issues with the language used, to understanding the grounds for assessment.

Some 13.2% of responses (9) highlighted difficulties in getting assistance from the CGG staff. Also underlined was the inconsistent advice and recommendations received from CGG staff.

TABLE 21: Q34A COMMENTS: WHY WAS <ACCESSING INFORMATION> OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS THE MOST CHALLENGING AND/OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Difficulty Finding Information	Respondents reported difficulty finding forms and pertinent information.	**27/68**	**39.7%**
Technical Issues	Respondents indicated there was difficulty accessing information on the website.	**26/68**	**38.2%**
Difficulty Understanding	Respondents commented there was difficulty understanding information presented by the CGG and required for organizations.	**16/68**	**23.5%**
Difficulty Receiving Assistance	Respondents found that receiving consistent information is difficult.	**9/68**	**13.2%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**2/68**	**2.9%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**68**	**-**

TABLE 22: Q34A COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Difficulty Finding Information	*"A clear definition of categories is not information that is freely given. You have to make applications then guess what area you fall under for eligible funding amounts. This requires many years of applying and trying to guess what the necessary back up is to prove what range of funding you qualify for."*
	"Sometimes I could not find the correct documents I needed and if I needed a few different documents related to the same application, each document was in a different location."
	"Finding the actual form online to fill out and print out."
Technical Issues	*"Not always printer friendly, difficult for someone who uses adapted technology on their computer, difficult to go back and add something. "*
	"You had to click on a link that took you to a page where you had to read through 20 pages to click on a link that took you back to the first page then click on something else that took you somewhere else....nothing was easy to find, and even when we did find things we were never sure we were using the right thing."
	"Too many menus to drill down through. Too many menus led away from what we were seeking information and help on. Way too much to read and comprehend."

Difficulty Understanding	*"More correctly stated our problem was understanding information. I/we simply do not think the way you do."*
	"Understanding the financial limitations and on what grounds proposals are assessed. Easy to access the website but difficult to figure out how to start the application. Wording not clear how to start the application."
Difficulty Receiving Assistance	*"It is tough to get a hold of people there and there seems to be some inconsistencies in the process. Honestly all of it is complicated."*
	"There were different opinions and recommendations from different staff around our questions and challenges. "
	"Follow up information was hard to receive. No updates provided until completed."

5.11.2. Why was <<understanding program guidelines/eligibility criteria>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34B)

Of the 536 Applicants who indicated '*understanding program guidelines/eligibility criteria*' was the most challenging or difficult part of the whole Community Gaming Grants (CGG) application process (Q33), 472 of them commented (Q34).

The most significant by a relatively small margin, but constituting one-quarter (118 or 25.0%) of responses underlined issues with the overall application. Respondents felt the language included jargon, the guidelines complex, the criteria confusing and the time required to reach a basic understanding of the guidelines too time-consuming.

Just over one-fifth (96 or 20.3%) of responses highlighted issues related to program eligibility. This included mention of the inflexibility of the criteria such that funding could not be used to expand or change programs to meet the evolving needs of the community; but only to fund existing programs. Sometimes those programs were simply not recognised against CGG criteria, despite being arguably of benefit to a particular community. It was also contended that funding of an '*administration*' stream be allowed, and non-program operational expenses be funded as well.

Close to one-fifth (91 or 19.3%) of responses underscored issues related to financial eligibility. This included references to a lack of clear definitions on '*in-kind contributions*', to organizations not having sufficiently qualified volunteer staff to understand the accounting terms and financial reporting requirements. The rule around reserve of funds was also felt to be inequitable to smaller organizations.

A further 67 or 14.2% of responses said they did not understand the CGG's expectations, and that it would be useful to understand what the analysts were looking for in the applications, and to have that communicated.

An additional 53 or 11.2% of responses explained how difficult it was to understand how funds could be used, as it was unclear and created confusion. Some expressed they did not understand how additional funds could be applied for successfully, as an explanation was not always given when top-up funds requested were not granted.

Some 38 or 8.1% of responses cited inconsistent interpretation of applications as an issue. Responses referenced how the same application from one year to the next could suddenly be considered incomplete or simply rejected following years of success. Responses also mentioned the inconsistent approach from analyst to analyst, especially in relation to how one might define or understand '*benefit to a community*'.

A further 26 or 5.5% highlighted inadequate communication in relation to changes to eligibility criteria or submission requirements. Responses mentioned that guidelines might not include factors presented in a rejection letter, which was felt to be unfair. Some cited how small annual changes added to the guidelines detrimentally affected the outcome of applications.

Some 10 or 2.1% of responses mentioned organizational eligibility as the most challenging aspect. Respondents underscored how difficult it could be to meet the structural requirements, or how after changing the constitution an organization might still be rejected. Meeting the requirements was time-consuming and frustrating, especially if unsuccessful.

TABLE 23: Q34B COMMENTS: WHY WAS <UNDERSTANDING PROGRAM GUIDELINES/ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA> OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS THE MOST CHALLENGING AND/OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Overall Application & Language Used	Guidelines were confusing, complex and difficult.	**118/472**	**25.0%**
Program Eligibility	Respondents had difficulty understanding how programs fit into criteria and how to define "direct impact" to the community.	**96/472**	**20.3%**
Financial Eligibility	Respondents had trouble completing and understanding financial reporting.	**91/472**	**19.3%**
Understanding CGG Expectations	Respondents wondered what criteria the CGG branch is looking for.	**67/472**	**14.2%**
Understanding Use of Funds	Respondents had difficulty understanding where funds can be used and how to request more funds.	**53/472**	**11.2%**
Inconsistent Interpretation	Respondents had challenges understanding the inconsistent interpretation of applications.	**38/472**	**8.1%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Communication	Changes to guidelines were not clearly announced prior to application process.	**26/472**	**5.5%**
Organizational Eligibility	Respondents had trouble demonstrating compliance with organizational eligibility guidelines.	**10/472**	**2.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**17/472**	**3.6%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**472**	**-**

TABLE 24: Q34B COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Overall Application & Language Used	*"Guidelines are very long, many details to consider. It takes almost an hour to go through the guidelines. Is there a way you can simplify the program so eligibility is less complex?"*
	"Bureaucratic language and jargon, poorly organized. The documentation should be tested on people not familiar with the subject matter."
	"Confusing language, confusing criteria, criteria too general for organizations of different types that operate differently."
Program Eligibility	*"Not all our needs fit within a "program"; these areas are what we need funding the most but without fitting into a "program" we cannot get funding. There needs to be an administration stream that enables a NPO to apply for a % of total operating budget for "non-program" expenses."*
	"Ability to have the "programs" accepted, there should be flexibility here as each organization in the community have individual service requirements and client needs. We know our communities best and can promote the product and service if we had more flexibility."
	"The restrictions about not providing funding for the expansion of programs and only funding existing programs. In reality programs change and grow to meet community needs and the eligibility criteria is extremely limiting."
Financial Eligibility	*"Felt that the in-kind contributions weren't explained. The in-kind should show on the revenue and expense sheet. No information on what we should be charging for our volunteer hours. Will be contacting gaming branch."*
	"The application of percentage of funds retained vs spent in fiscal year is punishing small charities that provide more material support to clients, using vast volunteer resources. Having funds retained for approximately. 6 months operating capital is the minimum any charity should prudently have in reserve."
	"We have always used persons to apply for these grants who have no accounting background. There is always the requirement to submit documentation done to a level of GAAP. These same folks also get lost in the terminology used for accounting. Most of the people we have volunteered to do the applications, accounting capabilities are at the level of balancing the house/family budget."
Understanding CGG	*"We find it challenging to understand the specifics of the application - what staff is*

Expectations	*looking for and how it is best answered. We have worked with other groups and it seems we all have the same questions. This makes it challenging."*
	"There are so many nuances that can be challenging to understand which components of our programs are or are not eligible, and how to accurately convey that. We feel that understanding how to convey it is the most challenging part, as often we found we were eligible, but simply unsure how to convey it in the way in which gaming wanted it conveyed."
	"Although the Program guidelines were clear with what was written, I still felt I had many scenarios and questions that there were no written answers for. The talk I attended […] was very informative and went beyond the written guidelines. My biggest question is "What are the evaluators looking for?" It may be that I meet some unmentioned criteria but I have not highlighted it, or have not expressed it at all, or have not expressed it well, and therefore I am turned down for funds even though my project might be a valid recipient."
Understanding Use of Funds	*"The guidelines have all the information but as a PAC [we] have to figure out which rules apply, whether or not an item we want to pay for is extracurricular and community use, whether it is too close to being a direct school item. Also what happens if an item is purchased for intent of a use for extracurricular activities and then that doesn't happen? The guide lines should be more exact on what we can pay for with gaming funds and what we cannot. Should be no uncertain area."*
	"Figuring out what PAC programs could be funded with gaming money and what could not. The criteria are on the vague side and leave a lot of room for interpretation."
	"We heard that we could apply for more funding if needed; we like most are struggling to keep up with the mounting increase of expenses. We applied for more funding and while we were very appreciative of receiving the same amount as last year, there was no mention of why our request wasn't granted or what we could do to have a more successful application next funding period."
Inconsistent Interpretation	*"Our organization is mostly funded by grants. We […], and some of the grant money goes for that purpose. While I try to provide complete information, it seems that one year the information is deemed complete, and the next year's information, which is substantially the same, is not considered to be complete. Does this mean that the individual person making decisions on the application changes from year to year; or does it reflect some change in our application? I am not sure! Unfortunately, when the critique also tells us that the problem could impact future eligibility, and this is the only source of operating funds that we currently have, it causes a lot of stress to the grant writer!"*
	"Community benefit remains an ambiguous definition that changes year to year, analyst by analyst. Criteria and scrutiny of programs and their deliver changes with each year the application is submitted."
	"As stated before, the program is inconsistent. A program that we have consistently received funding for in the past can be turned down without any notice the following year and it makes it difficult to participate in the program because organizations rely on the funding."
Communication	*"Changes affecting eligibility not known until after application submitted."*
	"There were elements of our denial letter which explained things in detail I found were

	missing from the original guidelines and eligibility information.”
	“It seems that some minor changes occur annually which could potentially inhibit the positive outcome of Gaming Grants.”
Organizational Eligibility	*“After many changes in our constitution to qualify our team was still rejected and we were not told what we needed to correct.”*
	“The requirement of having a separate board from our regular non-profit board creates more hoops than we have time or energy to jump through.”
	“Not clear how to demonstrate that organization is run democratically.”

5.11.3. Why was <<completing online application form (Gaming Online Service (GOS)>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34C)

Of the 436 Applicants who indicated '*completing online application form (Gaming Online Service (GOS)*' was the most challenging or difficult part of the whole Community Gaming Grants (CGG) application process (Q33), 396 of them commented (Q34).

Two main issues were identified in the comments. The first with 152 or 38.4% of comments was that the process was time-consuming and stressful for Applicants, as a rejected application could reflect badly on the individual who took responsibility for completing it. Overall, the application process was felt to be a huge amount of work, with no guarantees at the end of it. Again a little over one-third of comments (137 or 34.6%) of them underlined issues with the GOS system, citing timing-out, lost information, or work not being submitted. The system was not compatible with certain browsers and Applicants had had to re-apply and submit everything all over again.

Just over one-fifth (87 or 22.0%) of comments highlighted difficulties entering information, citing the limit on characters in text boxes as challenging. Applicants felt there was not enough space or text allowance to write what they needed to say.

Some 30 or 7.6% of comments underlined difficulties with finding information and navigating the webpages, maintaining it was hard to locate necessary forms and information (e.g. long-form version of the application). It was felt not to be user-friendly, even by those with years of experience using the system and submitting applications.

TABLE 25: Q34C COMMENTS: WHY WAS <COMPLETING ONLINE APPLICATION FORM (GAMING ONLINE SERVICE (GOS)> OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS THE MOST CHALLENGING AND/OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Process is Time Consuming, Stressful, Difficult	Process is time consuming, confusing and stressful to Applicants.	**152/396**	**38.4%**
Issue with the GOS System	System timed out; unable to save and return.	**137/396**	**34.6%**
Difficulty Entering Information	Limit on characters is difficult.	**87/396**	**22.0%**
Difficulty Finding Information/Navigating	It is a challenge to locate forms and information.	**30/396**	**7.6%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**19/396**	**4.8%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**396**	**-**

TABLE 26: Q34C COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Process is Time Consuming, Stressful, Difficult	*"When you are the person applying it is nerve racking because "what if the club didn't receive any funds"! All those children and organizations we give funds to would be without."*
	"This was the most onerous task of the selections - making sure that I was answering each question with the necessary information while pitching our organization's need for funding."
	"Setting aside staff time, ensuring that information provided is complete and accurate and that a clear portrait of our fiscal position is offered on the application. It is a tremendous amount of work."
Issue with the GOS System	*"The program does not save and the information gets lost - although we prepare in advance it is not always possible (unless working out of usual hours when there are no interruptions) to complete the application in the time allocated. It is also difficult to see the print button at the end prior to submitting as it is so small and it is unclear at which point to print the application (as one fills it in)."*
	"We completed the online application then hit "send." It did not work and the site timed out. We called the Branch and were told that some browsers do not work, so we had to fill in all the information (and upload all the supporting documents) all over again. "
	"I could not find out how to save the work I had already completed when I needed to find more information or create a spreadsheet. The system timed out and I had to repeat all that data entry. Most other private and government agencies allow the user to save the grant application for later completion and provide a user Id and Password."
Difficulty Entering Information	*"Not enough characters allowed in the 'how the grant funds will be used' section. Was difficult to convey all of the pertinent information."*
	"The amount of characters allowed in each field was too small and required a large amount of time to edit down to the allowable amount and made it difficult to express

	the purpose of the grant application as clearly as possible."
	"This was the most challenging in part because the other options listed in the previous question were so easy. The most frustrating part with the Gaming Online Service is the limitations to formatting. Working with volunteer board members, we tried to make our application clear and readable using things like bullet points, headings, etc. but the online form removed all of those, making for a less-than-optimal user experience. Even line breaks seem difficult to include."
Difficulty Finding Information/Navigating	*"The process is not user friendly, even after [many] years of submitting applications, I still struggle with navigating the site and the application; I could not imagine what frustrations and confusion a new Applicant would face."*
	"Had difficulty finding the long form version of application."
	"I find it unclear sometimes what is actually required for the application and do not find the wording of the requirements very clear."

5.11.4. Why was <<submitting supporting documents (using email, mail or the Gaming Online Service (GOS)>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34D)

Of the 411 Applicants who indicated '*submitting supporting documents (using email, mail or the Gaming Online Service (GOS)*' was the most challenging or difficult part of the whole application process (Q33), 378 of them commented (Q34).

Two top issues emerged from the comments. Over one-third (149 or 39.4%) of comments cited issues sending documents electronically, including technical glitches and sometimes a lack of knowledge on how to do so. The same proportion (148 or 39.2%) of comments cited the timeframe to complete and submit the supporting documents as being an issue. In a situation where an organization had to apply for more than one program, they were submitting three separate applications with much of the same supporting documentation. It was suggested it might be better to submit one application for all three programs. It was further submitted that it might be more efficient to attach one document at the very end instead of repetitions of the same throughout.

Some 46 or 12.2% of responses underlined difficulties caused by a lack of acknowledgement from the CGG branch upon receiving documents, as some Applicants had not known documents were not received until their application was rejected.

A total of 42 or 11.1% of responses cited a lack of instructions in creating difficulties. Responses pointed to the absence of a template or checklist either upfront or at the end of the application upon completion. Applicants felt there was no way to ensure they had all the required documents ready for submission, nor could they do due diligence by checking for any omissions at the end.

Twelve or 3.2% of responses underscored difficulties with sending documents via mail, as even tracked items had sometimes not been received, or ended up in the wrong place. Some responses suggested electronic submission as a preferred option.

27: Q34D COMMENTS: WHY WAS <SUBMITTING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (USING EMAIL, MAIL OR THE GAMING ONLINE SERVICE (GOS)> OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS THE MOST CHALLENGING AND/OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Issues Sending Documents Electronically	Technical glitches and knowledge gaps made it difficult to send documents electronically.	**149/378**	**39.4%**
Time Consuming	Compiling and sending documents was time consuming and complicated.	**148/378**	**39.2%**
Confirmation of Received Documents	Comments in this theme describe a lack of acknowledgment of received or incomplete supporting documents during application process.	**46/378**	**12.2%**
Lack of Instructions	Comments in this theme outline a lack of examples/templates/checklists for respondents made it difficult to submit documents.	**42/378**	**11.1%**
Issues Sending Documents via Mail	The mailing process was time consuming with inconsistent results.	**12/378**	**3.2%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**11/378**	**2.9%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**378**	**-**

TABLE 28: Q34D COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Issues Sending Documents Electronically	*"I found that if I attached a document, and then had to go back somewhere in the application, I could not tell if it was still attached and sometimes it dropped the attachment."*
	"Our organization is primarily Seniors who are not as computer literate as many others. It is a challenge for them to submit these documents by e mail."
	"System would sometimes not allow uploads in certain formats or "timeout" without any notice your document had been successfully uploaded."
Time Consuming	*"We apply for three separate programs so it is really a pain in the neck to have to submit the financial information separately for each program. Also, Gaming is the only grant, either regional, provincial or federal that requires us to change our financial reporting to meet their requirements."*
	"It was the prep of the supporting documentation that was difficult, i.e. preparing and submitting balance sheets for a volunteer organization are sometimes very complicated and a lot of work. It is understandably necessary, but a lot of work just the same."
	"We shouldn't have to attach the documents at each step of the application. We should

	be able to attach the documents as a whole at the end of the application. Our budgets are all in the same document, which we need to attached 3 times. It's not efficient."
Confirmation of Received Documents	*"I sent off documents and they were not received. I never found out until we were denied."*
	"Not sure if documents were received. Would be nice if applications were acknowledged as received."
	"It was difficult for me to feel confident that the documents were received."
Lack of Instructions	*"Having the resources ready to go was the problem. A checklist of the items needed prior to online submission would be helpful."*
	"Every year there is something in my supporting documents that are not exactly what Gaming was looking for. There needs to be more clarity on what format and specific information is needed. It would be good if there were more templates available showing what is expected."
	"It is not clear where additional supporting documents or responses to Gaming are attached in the online application. We have included them in any field that allows for an attachment in the past but it would be great to have a prompt before we get to the end of the application."
Issues Sending Documents via Mail	*"Inconsistent. Multiple mailing addresses. Un-received materials (even when tracked and received)."*
	"One year I overnight couriered my supporting documents and they ended up on the wrong floor. [Another] year I used regular mail and was told they were never received. [Then] we had a time issue that was completely our fault. Is it possible to submit supporting documents by email later rather than mailing?"
	"If you forget to attach a document and the application is uploaded, you have to mail in the attachments and hope they find their way to your application."

5.11.5. Why was << contacting the Community Gaming Grants branch for help>> of the Community Gaming Grant application process the most challenging and/or difficult for your organization? (Q34E)

Of the 118 Applicants who indicated '*contacting the Community Gaming Grants branch for help*' was the most challenging or difficult part of the whole Community Gaming Grants (CGG) application process (Q33), 106 of them commented (Q34).

Almost half of responses (48 or 45.3%) cited difficulty in contacting the CGG branch via telephone as the line was so busy or no-one responded to their call at all.

Almost one-quarter (25 or 23.6%) of responses stated difficulties in finding contact information for the CGG branch, as it was not clearly available.

Just over one-fifth (23 or 21.7%) of responses cited challenges in dealing with CGG staff due to an inconsistency in who they dealt with. Some callers felt intimidated or patronised by the staff member they got on the line.

Some 19 or 17.9% of responses cited difficulties contacting the CGG branch via e-mail, as they received no response. For Applicants with disabilities, for whom the e-mail channel might be their only option, found they were unable to access the help they needed.

TABLE 29: Q34E COMMENTS: WHY WAS <CONTACTING THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH FOR HELP> OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS THE MOST CHALLENGING AND/OR DIFFICULT FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Telephone	Some respondents had difficulty contacting the CGG branch via telephone.	**48/106**	**45.3%**
Finding Contact Information	These respondents had a hard time finding information to contact the CGG branch.	**25/106**	**23.6%**
Staff	Some respondents had issues when dealing with CGG branch staff.	**23/106**	**21.7%**
Email	These respondents had difficulty contacting the CGG branch via email.	**19/106**	**17.9%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**6/106**	**5.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**106**	**-**

TABLE 30: Q34E COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Telephone	*"Just not a user friendly phone system. No one answers when you are transferred from receptionist and then you leave a message and no one calls you back."*
	"The telephone is very busy."
	"When you do not get people they either take too long to call back or do not at all."
Finding Contact Information	*"We could not find anyone to phone or any other information about getting help or guidance with our application."*
	"Hard to find contact information."
	"We found it difficult to see whom we could contact for assistance. Information is not clearly available."
Staff	*"I have never felt comfortable contacting gaming branch staff, over the years when I have done so I felt as though I was being lectured, and or being talked down to. I was left with the impression that I was bothering them unnecessarily."*
	"The officer I spoke to was abrupt and did not appear to be interested in helping me resolve my concern."
	"We seem to get different staff for different issues and it can become confusing. It would be ideal to have one staff assigned to our file and that contact could be consistent. Response times were slow."
Email	*"It was difficult and challenging at the same time, they had an general phone number*

for us to contact, but we [have a disability] and they could not call back and that forced us to use the email to communicate and this takes a while of our and the gaming's time."

"I emailed them with questions and got no response."

"A detailed email was sent outlining the specific situation faced by the Society I volunteer for asking for clarification of the rules. I did not receive a reply."

5.12. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: *The application process did not place an unreasonable burden on my organization.* What burdens did the application process place on your organization? (Q35A_2)

Of the 2,303 respondents who were asked in Q35A_1C whether they agreed with the statement "*The application process did not place an unreasonable burden on my organization*", 331 '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*'. Those 331 respondents were then asked Q35A_2: "*What burdens did the application process place on your organization?*" and 303 provided feedback.

Two-thirds (202 or 66.7%) of respondents referred to the overall application process as being onerous and a burden on organizations due to the length of time required preparing, completing and submitting an application.

One-third (101 or 33.3%) of respondents again highlighted the time-consuming work required in compiling supporting documentation. It was suggested that once an organization had proven its accountability over a number of years that they not be required to submit such a full application every single year ongoing.

Some 21 or 6.9% of respondents drew attention to difficulties with interpretation of the guidelines, and the fact that the appeals process was such a lengthy process. As such, some responses called for more communication during the application process to avoid the need for an appeal altogether.

A total of 9 or 3.0% of respondents called for the return of multi-year funding to alleviate the burden on clients of having to apply every year. Comments highlighted a sense of instability, and difficulties with planning ahead when not knowing whether the funding would be available.

TABLE 31: Q35A_2 COMMENTS: THE APPLICATION PROCESS DID NOT PLACE AN UNREASONABLE BURDEN ON MY ORGANIZATION. WHAT BURDENS DID THE APPLICATION PROCESS PLACE ON YOUR ORGANIZATION?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process Overall	The application process was onerous and a burden on organizations.	**202/303**	**66.7%**
Required Documents	Compiling the supporting documents required was a length process and inconsistent with other funding programs.	**101/303**	**33.3%**

Guidelines: Interpretation and Appeals	Interpretation of the guidelines and length appeal process was a burden.	21/303	6.9%
Funding Allocation	Return the multi-year funding to alleviate burden of applying every year.	9/303	3.0%
No Response	The responses could not be coded	5/303	1.7%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**303**	-

TABLE 32: Q35A_2 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Application Process Overall	*"It took 9 hours to add our pre prepared content to the online application only to find we still had to edit. Inability to save and come back. Our word document character count does not match the forms. To pre-prepare our content it required 28 hours of requesting letters of support, building several budgets, seeking signatures, having the absolutely accurate existing account that charges us $5 a month in fees to hold an empty account and compiling engaging text content to make our application stand out."*
	"The application requires a significant amount of volunteer time every year to complete. With limited volunteers available, it takes us away from actually delivering the program to assemble the application."
	"I have been doing the Gaming Grant application each year for at least the last [several] years. I can never get through the whole process in less than 8 hours! Please simplify the process."
Required Documents	*"I do not think the amount of information requested is unreasonable for the first couple of times applying for the grant. In fact I think it makes perfect sense. Once an organization has proven they are accountable and successful, it becomes a burden having to submit that much information each year."*
	"The documents required are different in format and detail than other government documents, so we are required to do basic things twice. For example, for the board of directors we have to create 3 different docs, as different columns are required."
	"For a small organization it is difficult to break down our accounting into separate programs. This separation of interconnected programs took a lot of time and effort for staff that has many other tasks aside from being responsible for the application process."
Guidelines: Interpretation and Appeals	*"Decisions are made and given at the end of the process. I agree that we can appeal, but it is after everything is over. It would be better if there was more communication during the process."*
	"Delayed decision and reduced funding created challenges for program implementation."
	"We needed to understand how our organization fit into the new eligibility criteria. This placed a funding burden on our organization since we no longer fit the criteria and we have had to find new sources of funding."
Funding Allocation	*"Grant application preparation takes considerable time each year to compile the information, write the grant. The option to not reapply every year but instead to access a 2-year cycle with guaranteed funding at the same rate for 2 years (similar to BC Arts Council) with just an interim summary report would be much easier to deal with for a*

small organization."

"The BC Gaming program used to provide the ability to apply for support over a 3 year term for established organizations. Having to apply annually has created a sense of instability if our program will continue to receive support. This instability creates challenges when it comes to planning our pending years programs in a timely fashion, as we do not know what financial support we will receive, if at all. As a large community program, planning is imperative to our continued success in providing our program to the community."

"Please consider multi-year grants as the 12-month funding cycles are very disruptive to clients and community. Multi-year granting would allow for improved outcomes and sustainable qualified staff and volunteers."

5.13. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: *The B.C. government's framework for administering the Community Gaming Grants program meets the needs of my organization.* Why does your organization not agree with this statement? (Q35B_2)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked if the B.C. government's framework for administering the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program meets the needs of their organization, 311 or 13.5% of respondents *'Disagreed'* or *'Strongly Disagreed'*.

Of those 311 respondents, 285 provided comments. Of the 285 who commented, 116 or 40.7% felt the allocation of funds was inconsistent, and that despite requesting the same funding over successive years, awards received fluctuated every time. This provoked questions around how those amounts were determined.

Just over one-fifth of the 285 respondents (64 or 22.5%) found the application process too complex, with the demand for paperwork overly time-consuming. It was suggested that the process was biased against organizations whose fiscal years did not align with the CGG deadlines. Some respondents further indicated they received no explanation for their declined applications.

Forty-four or 15.4% of respondents found the financial guidelines too stringent, and felt it was unfair that their organization was put at risk due to uncertainty around the outcome of their application. Concern was raised about the restricted use of the CGG finances for core funding.

Forty-two or 14.7% of respondents found the program guidelines too restrictive, with some suggesting the program sectors were too rigid for programs that integrated various groups and activities. As a result these respondents wanted to see sectors expanded to incorporate more wide-ranging programs.

Some respondents highlighted the need for a new sector that covered social initiatives, and proposed a growth in funding for such programs.

TABLE 33: Q35B_2 COMMENTS: THE B.C. GOVERNMENT'S FRAMEWORK FOR ADMINISTERING THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM MEETS THE NEEDS OF MY ORGANIZATION. WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Funding Allocation	CGG's allocation of funds was inconsistent and the methodology for determining amounts unclear.	**116/285**	**40.7%**
Application Process	Application process was onerous and complex and the deadline did not coincide with Applicant's fiscal year. A lack of CGG staff support.	**64/285**	**22.5%**
Financial Guidelines	The financial guidelines were too stringent for organizations. The inability to allocate funds for core funding initiatives was a concern.	**44/285**	**15.4%**
Program Guidelines	The restrictions placed on programs prevented organizations from expanding their programs to benefit the community more.	**42/285**	**14.7%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**24/285**	**8.4%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**285**	**-**

TABLE 34: Q35B_2 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Funding Allocation	*"Given the size and scope of programs our organization delivers, we feel that our programs are underfunded. We would appreciate information on how the funds are allocated and how we can grow our support from Gaming."*
	"We have provided the same program for [many years] yet have experienced reduced awards for the last [few years] even though the basis for reduced awards was impacted by branch staff not fully analyzing the application and submissions."
	"I sit on many community groups that used to receive funding through local sources, which do not get any support from gaming. There is no rhyme or reason why some do and some do not. I complete upwards of 30 applications every year and it is a crap shoot as to which will be funded and which seem to be nit-picked in order to not fund. Additionally, in comparison to revenue gaming generates and the level of need in the community vs. the funds that get placed outside gaming there is huge inequality."
Application Process	*"Too onerous paperwork for volunteer staff. There are so many guidelines and rules you need a professional grant-writer to push the process through."*
	"Because we didn't get a grant even though we seemed to meet all of the criteria. We have not been told why we didn't get a grant and have had no contact with anyone."
	"The application period is unsuitable based on my organization's financial year-end."
Financial Guidelines	*"It is difficult to take the risk of using all the funds in account to meet the financial requirement when, if you do not receive the grant, leaves the organization in a difficult spot for the upcoming year financially. We were 1% over the financial limits but had reserved funds just in case to make sure our programs could run but were denied because of that."*
	"Core funding should be eligible as this is almost impossible to find support for."
	"The guidelines are putting unnecessary restrictions on the organization. For example limiting the funding to 75% and forcing us to raise 25% and if we raise 26% our grant

gets cut. The limit of internally restricted funds is another issue. […] we need to have internally restricted funds for […] and unexpected expenses. What does our restricted funds for other operational needs have to do with Gaming grant for a specific project? These are some examples."

Program Guidelines   *"Childcare needs to be a separate category and as a category needs to be considered for the crisis state that we face in finding qualified, quality staffing who can be paid a living wage. We need to be valued as the educators that we are for the next generation of children in our society. There used to be so much more gaming money allocated to childcare that allowed centres to function with the operational support that those funds provided. We are a non-profit childcare centre in a [rural area]. We need the support from gaming funds to continue to provide excellent childcare for our community."*

"We only qualify for children's programming vs adult programming. It would be much preferred if it was integrated as we have an integrated community."

"We do a variety of activities that do not necessarily fit under our category, e.g. arts activities under the environment category. I would appreciate funding for new programs or pilot projects. I find it frustrating that I can't say that I want funding to expand the program, but it is OK to say that we are going to enhance the program."

5.14. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: All eligible not-for-profit organizations in B.C. have fair and equitable access to gaming funds to support the delivery of programs that benefit their communities. Why does your organization not agree with this statement? (Q35B_3)

Of the 2,303 respondents who were asked if all eligible not-for-profit organizations in B.C. have fair and equitable access to gaming funds to support the delivery of programs that benefit their communities, 268 respondents either '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*'. When those respondents were asked why their organization did not agree with the statement, 232 provided additional comments.

Ninety-one or 39.2% of those 232 respondents suggested the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) allocation of funds was inequitable. Respondents pointed to a lack of feedback on why funds allocated to organizations providing the same services fluctuated to the extent it did.

Close to one-third of respondents (74or 31.9%) found the application process too complex, and because of this it prevented certain Applicants from submitting successful applications. Frustrations were expressed about the weight of supporting documentation required, and many suggested this presented an unfair advantage to organizations that could afford a professional grant writer.

Some Applicants cited as problematic the lack of internet access to complete the on-line application or supporting documentation. Some found the language used in the application hard to understand, which made the process more challenging.

Just shy of one-fifth of respondents (46 or 19.8%) found that the stringent program and financial guidelines prevented fair and equitable access to gaming funds. Some respondents advocated that organizations which provided a community service under a defined '*program*' should be considered for CGG funding.

Furthermore, it was felt that organizations that demonstrated financial responsibility should not be denied on that basis, as CGG funding was unpredictable and inconsistent, and organizations wanted to be prepared for '*rainy day*' situations.

TABLE 35: Q35B_3 COMMENTS: ALL ELIGIBLE NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN B.C. HAVE FAIR AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO GAMING FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS THAT BENEFIT THEIR COMMUNITIES. WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Funding Allocation	The lack of information around why they are awarded the amounts they get, and how funds are allocated to other organizations unfair.	**91/232**	**39.2%**
Application Process	Complexity of the application excluded certain groups from successfully applying for grants.	**74/232**	**31.9%**
Stringent CGG Guidelines	The stringent guidelines (program, financial, organizational) prevented fair and equitable access to gaming funds.	**46/232**	**19.8%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**24/232**	**10.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**232**	**-**

TABLE 36: Q35B_3 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Funding Allocation	*"A similar […] the same size as us servicing the same size city was awarded $[…] more than us. I am not sure why."*
	"Some organizations are able to access significant funds, where others are only able to access small amounts of funds or not at all. It is unclear why there is a disparity in the community about whom and how much is granted."
	"Because the proportion of gaming funds going to small organizations in small rural communities is too low. We have to compete with large non-profit organizations that have multiple professional staff members. Access depends on organizational capacity."
Application Process	*"[…] there are complaints about people with no internet access; people with disabilities etc. are not able to have equal access to the process."*
	"There are many eligible organizations that do not have the capacity to apply for the funding or do not have the expertise to write such a cumbersome application therefore it is not fair to all. It's only good for those that have a lot of experience writing grants and a lot of time to write them."
	"For many (isolated areas, ESL, etc.) accessing and understanding the required information and subsequently completing the application process can be very difficult."
Stringent CGG Guidelines	*"We have several not-for-profit organizations that provide services to our community that are valued and that benefit the community. Those organizations are supported by the community but they do not have a 'program'. They do provide a valuable service…..they should be eligible to receive a gaming grant."*
	"Some agencies that are fiscally responsible (e.g. have a strong working capital/rainy day fund) are ineligible. We should be promoting good financial management. Of course, Gaming funds should not be used to invest or hold, but if an org is using the money that should be satisfactory."
	"Our organization would have truly benefited but were turned away due to […] % over financials."

5.15. How does your organization prefer Community Gaming Grant funding be allocated? (Q35B_4)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked whether they agreed with a number of statements related to the funding model of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program, 647[10] or 28.1% 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with the way the current allocation or funding model of the CGG program works. Of those who disagreed and were then prompted to answer how their organization prefers CGG funding to be allocated, 433 provided comments.

A small majority of just over one-fifth or 21.5% of responses called for CGG to allow funds to be allocated to 'core' operational expenses not just program expenses.

Close to one-fifth of responses (82 or 18.9%) called for funds to be allocated to the organization that demonstrated the most 'need' and that full funds requested be approved. Respondents felt frustrated having to prove financial need through the mandatory reports, only to then not receive the funds.

An additional 67 or 15.5% of responses mentioned that they did not understand the allocation formula, and wanted to see a more transparent process. Responses seemed to point to a perception that smaller organizations were less favourably considered for larger amounts of funding, or that some organizations were 'grand-fathered' to large pools of money.

A further 39 or 9% of responses remarked on the need for increased funding against inflationary pressures, and a perception that since its inception, the pool of money had not grown, but the number of Applicants had, so the level of funding per organization had been depleted.

Some 32 or 7.4% of comments called on the continuation of merit-based allocation of funding, whereas others suggested the allocation formula be more competitive.

Another topic in 27 or 6.2% of suggestions related to the return of multi-year grant allocation. Respondents believed this would help alleviate the frustration and uncertainty of filing an application every year.

---

[10] Respondents who indicated 1 *Strongly Disagree* or 2, in response to either or all of the following 3 statements: Q35B_1D: *"The allocation of Community Gaming Grant funding to organizations that directly deliver programming in the community is suitable."*; Q35B_1D: *"The allocation of Community Gaming Grand funding based on the actual cost to deliver specific programs meets the needs of my organization."*; Q35B_1F: *"A non-competitive funding model, where all Community Gaming Grant applications meeting the minimum eligibility criteria receive some level of funding, meets the needs of my organization."*

Another 27 or 6.2% of suggestions called on a more holistic view of '*benefit to community*' to be considered, as in more consideration of how many people in the community are reached or benefit from a program, rather than the size of membership.

Some 16 or 3.7% of responses called for certain groups to be recognised, including search and rescue and marginalised youth.

Eleven or 2.5% of responses called for more funding to be directed to '*grassroots*' organizations that understand where the greatest impacts are in their community.

Nine or 2.1% of responses highlighted more practical concerns such as deposits by cheque or direct deposit, to seeing a shorter timeline between approval and receipt of funding.

TABLE 37: Q35B_4 COMMENTS: HOW DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION PREFER COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING TO BE ALLOCATED?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Flexibly	Respondents wanted CGG to allow funds to be allocated to "core" operational expenses rather than just programs.	**93/433**	**21.5%**
Based on Needs	Respondents wanted the full amount of funds requested, not just a small percentage.	**82/433**	**18.9%**
Transparently	Respondents did not understand the allocation formula and wanted a more transparent process.	**67/433**	**15.5%**
Increase Funding	Respondents wanted an increase in overall funds. Some respondents noted an increase in overall gaming revenues but no change to the funding levels of gaming grants.	**39/433**	**9.0%**
Improve the Selection Process	Respondents wanted a review of the selection process. A majority insisted on merit-based screening, and others a competitive process.	**32/433**	**7.4%**
Bring Back Multi-Year Funding	Respondents wanted a return to the multi-year format, whereby one application was submitted to receive funding over a 3-5 year period. Respondents believed this would alleviate time and resource issues around annual application process, as well as provide heightened financial security.	**27/433**	**6.2%**
Based on the 'Impact to Community'	Respondents wanted organizations that benefit the "whole" community to receive more funding.	**27/433**	**6.2%**
Prioritize Certain Groups	Respondents insisted that certain "specialty" groups receive priority. Examples included: Search and Rescue groups; youth, and marginalized youth; and physically and cognitively disabled.	**16/433**	**3.7%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Provide Grassroots Funding	Respondents wanted funds directed to local "grassroots" organizations with greater understanding of work done in their community.	**11/433**	**2.5%**
Other	Respondents requested funds be delivered via cheque or direct deposit, and wanted a reduction in time between approval of application and receipt of funding.	**9/433**	**2.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**63/433**	**14.5%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**433**	**-**

TABLE 38: Q35B_4 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Flexibly	*"I would prefer to see funds provided to organizations for core funding each year instead of programming. Yearly application for specific programs is not only cumbersome, it does not allow for any real planning or future thinking. These funds would better serve organizations through greater flexibility of use. Having to justify yearly why we deserve a few thousand dollars for a small program as a long-time non-profit is ridiculous."*
	"It is best to support core operating funding as this is the key element of any cultural service delivery. Core operating funding is what enables community programs to exist. Gaming funds are essential to operational financial health."
	"We use the funds for our programs; however, in the final analysis the funds are used to keep the doors open which in turn allows to programs to happen. I would venture to say if the wording of the process were changed to allow for core funding of smaller organizations that the doors of those organizations would then be opened to more opportunities for program development."
Based on Needs	*"If the funding allocated is significantly less than required, the organization may not be able to continue its work. Giving everyone 'a little' does not always turn out to be the best use of the funds."*
	"I believe that if the organization shows financial need and it is well documented that the organization is not funded well, then BC Gaming should make up the difference completely".
	"Based on needs in areas. Core funding is essential for the running of organizations that provide innumerable services to their communities. This is not recognised in the grants as the emphasis is on providing only programming and does not take into account the services that are provided without funding for staff by organizations such as ours."
Transparently	*"We would prefer it to be fair in comparison with other organizations of similar size, scope, and impact. It is common to hear (even first hand) that certain organizations have been somewhat "grand-fathered" in to high dollar amounts."*
	"By looking at organizations' "books" and finances -- when people are receiving money for organizations that are supposed to be run (through the Society Act) by volunteers, and people are being paid for the running of the organizations through creative wording of the positions. Then why do they receive all the gaming that they do??"

	"It seems that smaller organizations do not have as much of an opportunity to receive the larger amounts of funding even though it is said to be possible. Perhaps just making it clearer on what an organization really needs to show in order to receive the funding requested would help."
Increase Funding	*"Needs to be some recognition that we face inflationary pressures and leaving the grant amount the same year over year is slowly starving our organization."*
	"When the BC Lottery was started, 100% of the net profits were to go toward supporting amateur sport and fitness. However over time, more 'uses' were allowed, which was good. However, now all the eligible 'uses' only receive about 25% of available funding, while the BC Government now takes 75% or more of the net profits, leaving some eligible 'uses' underfunded. This was not the original intent of the BC Lottery!"
	"The […] funding […] has not changed in the [past few years] […] however the costs for which it can be used have significantly increased. […]."
Improve the Selection Process	*"Merit based funding decisions that covers the spectrum of services British Columbians need and appreciate make the most sense to me. To date we have experienced that there are well qualified staff at Gaming making the decisions."*
	"Based on merit of the program being funded, not simply meeting minimum criteria; some Gaming Branch judgement should be involved to ensure adequate funds are going to those NFPs with highly meritorious programs."
	"On a competitive basis; or in conjunction with BCAC monies."
Bring Back Multi-Year Funding	*"Three-year application process so we can breathe for a moment, knowing our funding is guaranteed at least in the short term. Stop giving it to service clubs. Give it to the charities that help the most vulnerable - addictions, mental health, and homelessness. I support the arts and kids sports, but there is a crisis in the province right now that needs to be addressed immediately."*
	"Multi-year grant, conditional, that would provide organizations with two or three year financial stability, vis a vis one source of funding known. "
	"Funding what organizations really struggle with getting - having recurring 3-5 year grants so we do not have to spend our precious time always constantly looking for funding and filling out the same applications each year and never knowing if we will be able to hire enough staff to fulfill our mandates."
Based on 'Impact to Community'	*"Most of the current evaluation criteria seem fair and reasonable, but I would encourage an evaluation of community impact based not only on size of membership, but also on numbers of people reached."*
	"To organizations who are actually helping others rather than individuals who are getting personal gain without sharing their skills with the community."
	"Our organization has a massive impact on our community in helping children […]. Having such large social and future financial impacts on our society should have an impact on how funding is allocated."
Prioritise Certain Groups	*"As mentioned previously, [our type of] groups need an evaluation process to ensure requests are prioritized and appropriate. Whether this is internal to the [Association] or [the lead organization] (or both) is up for discussion."*
	"Community Gaming Grant funding should work to facilitate equity and justice. Accordingly, the pressing funding needs of grassroots efforts led by and for systemically marginalized communities should be prioritized."

	"I think that the allocation should be done more on the value of an active lifestyle being enhanced to make these children better adults that are continually active throughout their life with the sport."
Provide Grassroots Funding	*"We would like more funding directed to local service clubs, for distribution within their communities."*
	"On equitable base in regions with local regional; reps overseeing shared responsibility for quality selection of programs with equal weight for all services."
	"Should be allocated to any grassroots organization to supports its community programs and services otherwise if we are denied all the time, how could we give programs and services to the members of the community that deserves it?"
Other	*"Shorten the time between application and approval."*
	"Ideally, disbursement would be in August or early September. If the timeline requires disbursements to be made in October, please just specify the date upon application so we can plan."
	"Direct deposit is fine."

5.16. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: *Grant awards are fair, consistent and well documented.* Why does your organization not agree with this statement? (Q35B_5)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked if Community Gaming Grants (CGG) were fair, consistent and well documented 225 '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*'. Those respondents were then asked to elaborate on why their organization does not agree with that statement, and 199 provided comments.

Of those 199 respondents, over one-third or 35.7% found funding amounts received inconsistent. Respondents indicated that despite providing documentation that demonstrated a need for the funds requested, they did not receive the amounts asked for; nor did they receive an explanation as to why not.

Over one-fifth of respondents (46 or 23.1%) considered as unfair and inconsistent the lack of transparency around allocation of CGG funds. Many respondents had no knowledge of how funds were allocated, whether or not a formula was applied, or how funds were distributed.

Thirty-eight or 19.1% of respondents believed that the interpretation of applications was ambiguous and inconsistent. Some respondents cited that after having received the CGG funding for years, they were suddenly informed they were ineligible without an explanation.

Thirty-three or 16.6% of respondents pointed to inconsistent communication, and expressed a desire for more personal communication between Applicants and CGG staff during the submissions period. With more reliable communication, respondents felt they could more readily resolve any discrepancies in their reports, and provide any necessary clarifications for the CGG staff assessing their applications.

TABLE 39: Q35B_5 COMMENTS: GRANT AWARDS ARE FAIR, CONSISTENT AND WELL DOCUMENTED. WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Inconsistent Funding	The amount requested was inconsistent with the amount received without explanation.	**71/199**	**35.7%**
Funding Allocation Transparency	Documentation on allocation formula (how funds are distributed) was lacking.	**46/199**	**23.1%**
Evaluation of Applications	Inconsistent evaluation process and lack of	**38/199**	**19.1%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
	documentation as to why some organizations qualified one year, but were ineligible the next.		
Communication During Application Process	Poor communication during the application process made the process unfair.	**33/199**	**16.6%**
No Responses	The responses could not be coded.	**32/199**	**16.1%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**199**	**-**

TABLE 40: Q35B_5 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Inconsistent Funding	*"The grant awards initially were fair. But each year decreases by $[…]. When inquired with gaming staff, was not given a specific reason as to why. The same […] programs are being delivered, and accurately. Each year amounts are taken away from each of the programs. Reporting is on time. At times was told […]. The online application has gotten better; but still experiencing decreases."*
	"My main issue is the documentation to explain the difference between the request and the amount received. Some years we get the full request and other years we get a reduction. I am not clear on why the difference from year to year."
	"Our grants have been totally inconsistent despite no significant changes in programming, and despite a request for funding to increase access to the public. We did not receive funding for […]."
Funding Allocation Transparency	*"Unclear of how amounts are formulated. It would be nice to understand the formula. i.e. is it based on how many people served, the value of the service provided, is it proportional to the overall budget, does the amount of in-kind directly affect the funding amount, etc. The rating scale is not clearly communicated to Applicants."*
	"Not sure how they can be fair if you don't know how much other organizations get. Everyone is always going to have their own opinion and thus it will never be fair in the eyes of everyone so I don't think there's any point in aiming for fairness. However within an organization it would be nice if we got better explanations as to why we got a certain amount. It seems our funding needs are always the same but how much we receive year to year is just an arbitrary number. Did we get more or less due to our individual application? Or was there less gaming money to go around and everyone got less? Has the provincial government made certain decisions about what sectors funding will be focused etc. etc. You have no idea why you got the amount you did."
	"Having been in the sector long-term, I am aware that funds are not provided fairly or consistently as some non-profits receive a major amount of funding while others do not despite doing good work. I am also unaware of any place that outlines how much each organization receives."
Evaluation of Applications	*"Criteria appear ambiguous. Never, in my opinion, can we do the same thing twice without having some difficulty."*
	"After receiving support for many years with regard to our […] Program, and with no changes to what was and how it is delivered, funding was withdrawn [a few years] ago."

Communication During Application Process

"An organization that has been providing the same service for years can suddenly be considered ineligible. The process for receiving help and clarification is flawed. The application of eligible criteria can seem arbitrary."

"Grant awards were not fair. We submitted an application before the deadline, then they ask […], then they said we are late, so we have to wait […] now they process our application and they found some items and deny the application. They could have told us earlier, we could fix those […], but no choice was given to us."

"There needs to be more personal communication and interaction between gaming and the organizations making application. It will assist better with both parties understanding."

"Awards are often denied for technical reasons easily overcome if addressed in early stages of adjudication."

5.17. Please briefly describe the positive contribution to communities in British Columbia as a direct result of your organization receiving Community Gaming Grant funding in <year>. (Q39)

At the beginning of the survey, 2,303 respondents were asked to indicate whether their organization had applied for a Community Gaming Grant (CGG) in 2015-2017, and 1908 respondents indicated '*Yes*'. Those 1908 respondents were then asked to provide an opinion on Q35CB: "*As a direct result of receiving Community Gaming Grant funding in <<year>>, my organization provided a positive contribution to communities in British Columbia*" to which 1832 indicated '*Agree*', or '*Strongly Agree*'.

Those 1832 were then asked in Q39 to "*briefly describe the positive contribution to communities in BC as a direct result of your organization receiving CGG funding in <year>*" of which 1,682 provided additional descriptions.

Of those 1,682 respondents, 671 or 39.9% indicated they delivered programs that significantly enhanced the quality of life in their community.

Among those, 319 or 19.0% pointed to their successful delivery of sports and competitive physical activity.

An additional 301 or 17.9% highlighted their ability to consequently provide public access to and/or preservation of arts and culture in their community putting on events from theatre productions to music concerts.

A further 225 or 13.4% of respondents underlined how their programs benefited K-12 students through enhanced extracurricular opportunities. This included affordable access to field trips for children in low-income communities.

Eighty-three or 4.9% respondents indicated their organization delivered programs that both enhanced and supported public safety initiatives, including disaster relief and emergency preparedness.

Some 58 or 3.4% underscored their ability to support British Columbia's environment and protection of the welfare of domestic animals and/or wildlife. Examples ranged from delivering field trips for children, to providing critical services for homeless people.

TABLE 41: Q39 COMMENTS: PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO COMMUNITIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AS A DIRECT RESULT OF YOUR ORGANIZATION RECEIVING COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING IN <YEAR>.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Human & Social Services	Respondents reported that their organization's programs delivered programs that significantly enhanced quality of life in their communities.	**671/1682**	**39.9%**
Sports	Respondents indicated their organization's programs delivered community-based youth and/or amateur sports programs for organised, competitive physical activities.	**319/1682**	**19.0%**
Arts & Culture	Respondents added that their organization's programs provided public access to and/or preservations of the arts, heritage or culture.	**301/1682**	**17.9%**
PAC & DPAC	Respondents commented that their organization's programs benefited K-12 students through enhanced extra-curricular opportunities.	**225/1682**	**13.4%**
Public Safety	Respondents said their organization delivered programs that enhanced and supported public safety initiatives, and disaster relief and emergency preparedness within British Columbia.	**83/1682**	**4.9%**
Environment	Respondents indicated their organization's programs delivered programs that supported British Columbia's environment or protected the welfare of domestic animals and/or wildlife.	**58/1682**	**3.4%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**25/1682**	**1.5%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**1682**	**-**

TABLE 42: Q39 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Human & Social Services	*"With our Community Gaming Grant we are able to provide quality early learning to children ages 3-5. The Community Gaming Grant allows us to keep fees to parents low while still being able to pay our staff a living wage. Our center is a positive environment for the children, parents and staff who spend time there."*
	"We are able to provide both a comprehensive […] program to individuals and families and a […] program because of the CGG. This results in [many…] sessions and [many] workshops."
	"BC Gaming allowed us to hire additional staff for our […] program that provides […] services for [many] seniors across BC. These services ensure our clients, […] are not taken advantage of […]."
Sports	*"[A broad range of ages of] boys and girls participating in a [sports] program for $[…]/player. [Numerous] athletes receiving [many hours] of […] training in core […] skills […]."*

	"Without supplemental funding from the CCG, our organization would not be able to provide sport specific programs […] for persons with […] disability - [...]. We are only able to meet about 50% of our operating budget with local fundraising."
	"We have been able to purchase equipment and provide programs for an expanded age group […]. We have increased our enrolment […]. We are able to provide more fun activities for the entire community to enjoy (outside of our membership)."
Arts & Culture	*"We worked intensely with [some] youth to put on an [event] with [many] youth participants. We worked with […] performers on creating a work in their community […] to tell their stories. Additionally [we …sold or gave away [many] subsidised tickets to [numerous] performances."*
	"In [recent years], [many] people in our community had access to quality theatre programming and [numerous] volunteers were able to participate in the direct creation and delivery of our theatre productions. [Some residents from the Lower Mainland] were also provided the opportunity to take workshops in theatre production & performance. Through our programming, we provided a higher quality of life in our community."
	"The Gaming grant enabled [our organization] to reach [many] elders in long term care with [numerous music concerts], greatly contributing to their quality of life."
PAC & DPAC	*"As a [low-income] school, with many of our parents and caregivers living on or below the poverty line, our PAC struggles with fundraising. The PAC grant has allowed us to provide things […] for sports teams, that kids at other schools take for granted."*
	"The gaming grant is an essential source of funding that allows for educational, cultural, social and physical enrichment for students in […]. It allows for affordable access to field trips and programs that the students may not otherwise be able to attend."
	"We've been able to enrich the school life of children from throughout our area through better recreational equipment, informational speakers and technical equipment. Extra-curricular and informational activities have helped parents and children alike."
Public Safety	*"We engage the community while delivering [...] programs throughout [our community in the Lower Mainland]. Our volunteers have contributed [many] hours towards the enhancement of safety in [our community]. [Many] volunteers contributed to the safety [in our community in recent years.].*
	"The contributions we received have enabled us […] reduced response time to incidents by 50%."
	"We have been able to assist the community with the provision of volunteer […] services to [many] events this year. We have assisted [numerous] volunteers by subsidizing their training to provide volunteer [… services]."
Environment	*"We have been able to provide critical [services that benefit] people who are homeless and low income. Our work helps keep people […] out of the shelter system."*
	"Gaming funding contributed to our organization delivering [numerous] programs to over [many] participants in [recent years]. [Our Lower Mainland community] has the highest level of [this type of environmental programming], and Community Gaming funding has been a key contributor to that."
	"We were able to deliver [numerous] field trips for children and their families all across BC which gave youth an opportunity to learn about the [environment from knowledgeable individuals]."

5.18. Does your organization have any concerns related to eligibility requirements of the Community Gaming Grants program? (e.g. organizational, program and financial eligibility requirements as set out in guidelines for the Community Gaming Grants program) (Q43)

Of the 2,303 survey respondents asked, 486 or 21.1% answered '*Yes*' they had concerns related to the eligibility requirements of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program.[11] Those 486 respondents were then asked to specify their concerns.

Of the 486 respondents, 204 or 42.0% cited concern about the organization's financial eligibility. Many organizations felt disadvantaged by the application intake period because their fiscal year directly conflicted with that of the CGG. This manifested in incomplete budget projections and skewed financial data which deemed them ineligible for funds, because they showed a surplus.

Some 77 or 15.8% of responses highlighted program eligibility; respondents felt the '*75/25*' requirement created a barrier especially for smaller organizations that could not raise the mandatory 25% on their own.

Some 45 or 9.3% of respondents suggested adding more examples to the guidelines as a means to clarify which programs were and were not eligible. Some respondents remained unclear as to how they might access assistance, or they found the CGG staff unhelpful.

A further 39 or 8.0% of respondents also found '*Section 7.1 Appropriate Use of Funding*' to be a barrier; many wanted to use funding for other means such as capital and operational expenses to assist the community and their programs. There was also confusion about why certain organizations received more or less than other organizations that operated the same or similar programs.

A further 37 or 7.6% of respondents from small communities and organizations felt the required number of voting members difficult or impossible due to the size of the community, or nature of their work.

Some 35 or 7.2% of respondents cited issues with the application process, which was biased against organization whose fiscal year differed from that of the CGG. This surplus funds rule rendered many organizations ineligible.

---

[11] Note that 1628 or 70.7% of survey respondents answered '*No*' they did not have concerns related to the eligibility requirements of the CGG program.

Some 18 or 3.7% of respondents cited issues with the 75/25 policy and gaming, and suggested it was not fair to expect small organizations to find the 25% when they did good work that had a positive impact.

TABLE 43: Q43 COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY CONCERNS RELATED TO ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM? (E.G. ORGANIZATIONAL, PROGRAM AND FINANCIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AS SET OUT IN GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM)

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Organization's Financial Eligibility	Applicant organizations found it difficult to provide next fiscal year budget, due to conflict with that of CGG fiscal year. Budget projections could not be completed or showed an inaccurate surplus. The surplus percentage rule encouraged organizations to be financially irresponsible.	**204/486**	**42.0%**
Program Eligibility	Respondents highlighted that the stipulation for a12-month mandatory delivery of program prior to receipt of funding created a barrier to using grant for the organization's core funding.	**77/486**	**15.8%**
Guidelines and CGG Support	Respondents wanted clarity on guidelines, with examples that helped define eligibility. When respondents needed assistance, they either could not find it, or CGG staff was unhelpful.	**45/486**	**9.3%**
CGG Funds (Capital Acquisitions)	Vis-à-vis *Section 7.1 Appropriate Use of Funding*. Respondents viewed this as a barrier when organizations wanted to use funds for other means to assist community or their program. There was confusion around how fund amounts were allocated across organizations.	**39/486**	**8.0%**
Organization's Structural Eligibility	Respondents raised issues around board structure, the number of voting members, democratic processes, or whether member-funded.	**37/486**	**7.6%**
Application Process	Respondents found application process troubling (e.g. intake periods conflicted with the fiscal year of many organizations). Many organizations reported being ineligible for funding, due to this conflict and surplus in funds.	**35/486**	**7.2%**
Program's Financial Eligibility	Respondents found the 75/25 policy, and the gaming grant account to be barriers.	**18/486**	**3.7%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**66/486**	**13.6%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**486**	**-**

TABLE 44: Q43 COMMENTEXAMPLES BY THEME

Organization's Financial Eligibility	*"Allow for some organizational cost. There are some organizational costs incurred to keep the organization operating which are not directly related to program delivery."*
	"The concept of not carrying over more than 50% of expenditures from one year to another, while well intended, has sometimes impaired our ability to maximize sustainability. Gaming money arrives shortly after our season ends, so our previous year-end always needs to carry over money in case we do not get gaming, and to cover high-expense years [...]."
	"A major difficulty for [certain] organizations needing expensive assets [to accomplish their goals where such assets] must be periodically replaced is funding such assets. If 50% rule is problematic when your organization fiscal year ends [between the seasons when your funding is generated and spent]. Funding cannot be set aside for major future purchases by carry forward, and the charitable organization has to raise a substantive portion of the money from other sources. This is a major problem, particularly in small isolated communities where access to donors and sponsors is very limited. Long-term community safety asset procurement is an issue, particularly if policy is changing to make this more difficult in future."
Program Eligibility	*"The ineligibility to help fund new programs. New programs need to be running for a year before gaming monies can be used to help and this can prevent many new and needed programs from getting started in a timely manner."*
	"The program does not allow Applicants to make the case for increased funding for program growth - everything is based on the previous year's costs. This makes it hard to expand and improve programs. Also, the requirement of a program being in operation for more than 12 months is limiting as it is often difficult to initiate new programs without funding. A suggestion might be to start a new program stream related to innovation or new programs to address this need and opportunity, similar to what you have done with the new capital project program."
	"Greater clarification of program parameters would be helpful without making them too difficult to access funding - in particular those programs that are custom-designed to meet the needs within our community."
Guidelines and CGG Support	*"We would just like clarity on what is required. We thought we made the changes needed to be eligible only to be told [...] that there was more that need to be changed to become eligible. Just want the line to jump over to be stable...."*
	"We have found that some of the wording in the guidelines is not completely clear. One of our applications was denied because we did not understand one of the instructions, so submitted incorrect information."
	"Our organization had to clarify our eligibility [...] because [one] did not understand our explanations to eligibility requirements, but the [other] reviewer [...] did understand our explanations. There is some discrepancy in reviewers understanding eligibility?"
CGG Funds (Capital Acquisitions)	*"The issue of technology costs at schools is a big issue and only continues to increase as we move towards a technology based society. Funding from [...] schoolboard[s] is insufficient to meet the technology needs of the students [...], and yet the gaming grant cannot be used for this purpose either. Therefore, PACs have to raise tens of thousands of dollars to provide laptops, iPad carts, and mini iPad carts for our students. These devices need to be routinely serviced or replaced as technology upgrades move very*

	quickly, creating a substantial financial burden on PACs."
	"The guidelines and check lists provide a good basis for judging what the funds we administer can be used for. A glossary may be helpful to back up the guidelines. The glossary could be a live part of the website similar to the frequently asked questions part of the website that can be referred to."
	"The criteria for determining the amount of the grant being provided are not clear. It is felt that if the grant we receive was larger, we could do more. It is not clear if the issue is with us or withe the program."
Organization's Structural Eligibility	*"The requirement to have a voting membership double the size of the board is not feasible for us."*
	"As noted earlier, consideration those sizes of membership not hold as much weight in the evaluation process as a key indicator of community impact and benefit."
	"Our membership is low because the nature of our work requires confidentiality for our staff and clients. We are an isolated small community where confidentiality has to be priority."
Application Process	*"Wording sometimes is legal jargon and hard to understand and might restrict what we can apply the funding too."*
	"The annual application process and resulting uncertainty about gaming funding hampers our efforts at advance planning for our programs. The previous 3-year cycle was far more manageable and program-friendly."
	"The timing is a bit off for some sport programs - apply in April, wait until September. Difficult if you run a summer program or need to have things in place in August for a fall/winter sport."
Program's Financial Eligibility	*"The only concern we have is meeting your funding percentage requirements from other sources. We are in a small rural area with limited funding resources and this can be challenging to obtain a full grant from BC Gaming without receiving a reduced approved grant."*
	"Some of our in-kind contributions are beyond our control and affect the balance of 25/75 budget presentation. We cannot always adjust our budget if changes happen between Nov and Feb (submission and notice)."
	"We believe that 25% community support is too high; we provide valuable services to underserved youth in our community, but directly raising funds or in-kind support from non-government agencies can be a burden to a small organization."

5.19. Does your organization have any concerns related to per-Applicant annual funding maximums? (Q44)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked '*Does your organization have any concerns related to per-Applicant annual funding maximums?*' 214 respondents expressed their concerns over the per-Applicant annual funding maximums.[12]

Over half of those 214 respondents (125 or 58.4%) wanted to see more funding overall. Respondents believed if the government allocated more than 10% of gaming revenues towards the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program, it could increase annual funding maximums and provide funding to meet the full needs of more organizations.

Some respondents underlined the need to increase funding in general, as they believed funding had not kept pace with inflation, increased wages, hydro, rent, etc.

Thirty-nine or 18.2% of the respondents suggested clarification on the criteria defining local, regional and provincial programs. Some organizations believed they qualified for a higher category and therefore should have been eligible for more funding.

Twenty-nine or 13.6% of the respondents suggested greater transparency on funding allocation. Respondents were curious as to how and why certain organizations received maximum levels of funding when their organization, which provided the same service did not. Respondents wanted to understand the allocation formula during the evaluation process.

TABLE 45: Q44 COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY CONCERNS RELATED TO PER-APPLICANT ANNUAL FUNDING MAXIMUMS?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Funding Levels	Increase funding to meet organizational needs, and boost overall funding amounts to all levels.	**125/214**	**58.4%**
Defining Programs	Provide clarity on the criteria that defines an organization as serving local, regional or provincial needs.	**39/214**	**18.2%**
Funding Transparency	Improve transparency around why some organizations receive more than others.	**29/214**	**13.6%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**25/214**	**11.7%**

---

[12] Note that 1,855, or 80.5% of respondents indicated '*No*' they did not have any concerns related to per Applicant annual funding maximums.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**214**	**-**

TABLE 46: Q44 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Funding Levels	*"As the scope of service of our organization has grown we have not been able to secure the increased funding to match it, i.e. regional to province wide. It is not helpful to have a funding maximum if Gaming will not provide increased funding when our scope dramatically increases because of limited funding."*
	"Only 10% of Gaming proceeds go to community programs. If the percentage is higher, each level of organization will be able to have more funding to perform better."
	"For organizations that have received consistent funds over a number of years, there has been no increase to the amount received from Community Gaming Grant to adjust for inflation and wage increases. Over time this results in a reduction in levels of staffing needed to deliver programs and activities."
Defining Programs	*"There needs to be better definition of which organizations would fall into each category as well as what the criteria of these programs are."*
	"Our [organization] serves a large geographic area, [and we serve people] who do not live directly within our town limits. We are still considered a local program, but we serve a much greater area, and it seems that qualifying for a regional program will not be possible for us so this is very limiting in our funding opportunities."
	"With respect to funding limits, what constitutes providing service provincially? Currently, we are considered a local non-profit (by BC Gaming), however we do provide our programs and services in communities around BC. Certainly, the vast majority of our work is done in [the lower mainland], but every year, we go to communities [outside the lower mainland]. Some clarity around the definition of local, regional, and provincial would be helpful."
Funding Transparency	*"I am not sure if the allocations are equitable within the communities. Do some receive significantly or proportionally more than others."*
	"Are close to those maximums given out? I would like to know what factors allow some organizations to receive such large allocations. Is some of the merit based on maintaining historical funding allocations? It seems like newer applicants do not receive large quantities."
	"We really do not know how applicable these funding maximums are because we do not know how much various organizations are getting. We do know, however, that our own [...] programs are getting less than [$...] per year from gaming grants, so the $250,000 maximum seems rather strange to us."

5.20. Does your organization have any suggestions related to performance measures for the Community Gaming Grants program to enable stakeholders to better understand and measure success for the program? (Q46)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked whether they had '*any suggestions related to performance measures for the Community Gaming Grants program to enable stakeholders to better understand measure success for the program*', 282 shared their thoughts.[13]

Over one-fifth of respondents (64 or 22.7%) called for more transparency on whether funds allocated were used for their intended purposes. In so doing, it was felt that public awareness could be enhanced, and any abuse of Community Gaming Grants (CGG) funds addressed.

Just over one-fifth of respondents (58 or 20.6%) suggested simplifying the application process and increasing the presence of CGG staff in the community.

Forty-two or 14.9% of respondents were unsure what performance measures the CGG program had in place and asked that this information be accessible for organizations.

Respondents highlighted the need for more active engagement by CGG staff in helping organizations complete their applications, thus averting repeated rejections. In addition, respondents wanted to see CGG staff visit organizations, so they could see for themselves how communities benefited, in a way not always possible to demonstrate in writing.

The same proportion of respondents (42 or 14.9%) wanted to see the use of qualitative tools such as performance measure indicators. Respondents pointed to the need for surveys such as this one, being created to help determine the success of programs.

Respondents also highlighted the desire to showcase the positive impacts their program(s) had on their communities. Testimonials, photos, and stories were suggested as means to help not just stakeholders appreciate the full success of their programs, but the general public as well - especially those ethically opposed to the use of gambling revenues.

An additional 30 or 10.6% of respondents wanted to see more published data on the distribution of grants, especially requested vs. actual amounts received per organization; and the distribution of funds by sector, which could potentially demonstrate an equitable spread.

---

[13] Note that 1576 or 68.4% of survey respondents indicated '*No*', their organization did not have any suggestions related to performance measures for the Community Gaming Grants program to enable stakeholders to better understand and measure success for the program.

A further 20 or 7.1% of respondents wanted to show how administrative and operational costs could be a financial burden on organizations, especially smaller ones. By comparing the administrative and/or operational costs to the grant awarded, it was suggested the CGG might better understand the need for increased funding for certain groups. Increased funding could assist in the growth of program(s) whilst enhancing benefits to the community.

TABLE 47: Q46 COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM TO ENABLE STAKEHOLDERS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND AND MEASURE SUCCESS FOR THE PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Use of Funds	Statistical information could be provided on whether organizations are using funds for purposes intended (serving clients, providing activities, etc.)	**64/282**	**22.7%**
Application Process	A simplified application process and increased CGG staff engagement would increase the quality of the decision-making process.	**58/282**	**20.6%**
CGG Performance Indicators	Provide clarification on CGG's performance indicators.	**42/282**	**14.9%**
Qualitative Reporting	Provide qualitative reporting tools (surveys, stories) to help stakeholders and general public understand the successes of the programs/organizations.	**42/282**	**14.9%**
Funding Distribution	Increase transparency on the distribution of funds requested vs. received and distribution of grants by sector funded.	**30/282**	**10.6%**
Running Costs	Consider organizational running costs (administrative/operational costs) when deciding on amount of funding.	**20/282**	**7.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**33/282**	**11.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**282**	**-**

TABLE 48: Q46 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Use of Funds	*"Not directly but it seems more of an audit of not 'spending wrong' rather than 'impact' - making sure we spent on the right kinds of approved things rather than demonstrating the impact of that spending narratively."*
	"The measurement could be according to the number of clients who received help and the kind of help. In our case, there have been years where the increase in the number of clients had been [significantly higher than the year before]."
	"All organizations should have to submit a checks and balances showing exactly where gaming funds went, along with all other funds raised to show how much goes to administration and how much goes to community."

Application Process	*"I would suggest that the analyst have better communication and presence to fully understand the community programs. Who are these analysts? What experience do they have to assess the various sectors? Are they able to fully analyse a program if they have never attended a program?"*
	"As per my answer to the question previously it would [be better] to provide assistance prior to submitting the application and to confirm receipt of the application and confirm the required content was included before the eligibility is determined."
	"Provide more frequent feedback on applications, during the consideration period."
CGG Performance Indicators	*"I do not know what the performance measures are for the Community Gaming Grants program. So perhaps it would be helpful to better share this information?"*
	"Our organization is concerned by this question because we do not have a good understanding on how the Community Grants Program collects information on measuring success of programs."
	"Do not know what the performance measures are. If they are published they should be included in the notification of amounts granted, or not granted."
Qualitative Reporting	*"Follow-up on recipients' successes. Publish how organizations have contributed in their communities for community awareness."*
	"I would imagine surveys like this will be very useful. We survey our program participants and their feedback guides us in improvements and staying relevant."
	"A set of criteria should be setup to assess performance measures via surveys and feedback from organizations. The feedback should be mandatory for all organizations that receive funding. Each organization should be asked on a mandatory basis to self-assess the effectiveness and the progression of their programs on a regular basis."
Funding Distribution	*"Provide access to the amount of funding given to each organization on your website."*
	"Better communication on adjudication criteria. Publication of amounts asked for and amounts received (generally, not identifiable to individual organizations)."
	"Would like to see statistics that detail the aggregate, average and median funding requests, the percentage of funding requests that are fully funded; the percentage that are partially funded, and when partially funded, what level of funding was provided relative to the original request (e.g. if requested $10000, and funded for $4000, CGG funded at 40% of requested amount."
Running Costs	*"Consider organizations that travel throughout the province and the distances which they must travel to participate. We believe the costs these groups experience are significantly higher."*
	"To promote the importance of Admin costs to the organization and allow non-profits to use more funds for basic office needs."
	"We think it needs to be stressed that one of the most important, if not THE most important aspects of this program, is that it can be used to cover some organizational overhead costs. If this program becomes too "project oriented" it will lose much of its effectiveness in communities. This however makes performance measures more nebulous. Sometimes the continued existence of a small but important community organization is a valid performance measure!"

5.21. What final suggestions for improvements, if any, does your organization have for the Community Gaming Grants program? (Q51)

Of the 2,303 respondents asked if their organization had any '*final suggestions for improvements*' for the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program, 905 provided feedback.

Of those 905, over one-third (309 or 34.1%) wanted more assistance during the application process, as they found it difficult, and the conflict in fiscal year created complexities.

More generally, 160 or 17.7% of the respondents wanted the CGG to broaden its eligibility criteria, so more organizations could be eligible for funding. Organizations that depended on the CGG for funding expressed concerns about not being able to build a '*reserve fund*' as a safety net, and called for some level of '*guaranteed support*'.

A further 146 or 16.1% were happy with the CGG program and expressed gratitude for the great work the program and its staff provided across the province.

An additional 127 or 14.0% requested greater engagement of the CGG branch with organizations and the general public. They hoped for more training sessions, e.g. on grant writing; or better communications on available support. On a rudimentary level, respondents sought more access to the analysts who evaluated their applications.

Some 93 or 10.3% believed that the CGG should showcase some of the great work enabled in the community because of the funding, and further hoped that funding might be increased to build on the '*works of … charities*' across the province.

Some 68 or 7.5% of respondents believed the allocation of funding was not fair and was '*urban-centric'*. They called for more feedback on rejected applications for increased funding, to advantage any future applications for the same. Some organizations believed they were being underfunded compared to other Applicants, and called for fair and equal measures.

TABLE 49: Q51 COMMENTS: WHAT FINAL SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY, DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process	The application process was difficult, and did not align with fiscal year of some organizations, creating problems.	**309/905**	**34.1%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Eligibility Guidelines	Broaden eligibility guidelines, e.g. surplus funds rule, to allow more organizations to be eligible, and others to ensure sustainability or a 'safety net'.	**160/905**	**17.7%**
Positive Feedback	These comments indicated some Applicant organizations were happy with, and grateful for the CGG program.	**146/905**	**16.1%**
CGG Engagement	Respondents recommended increasing presence and engagement of the CGG, e.g. enhanced support communications and training.	**127/905**	**14.0%**
Funding Levels	Respondents suggested increasing funding to build on work of organizations across the province.	**93/905**	**10.3%**
Funding Allocation	Comments under this theme suggested a more fair and equitable process, with more feedback for Applicants to work off.	**68/905**	**7.5%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**75/905**	**8.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**905**	**-**

TABLE 50: Q51 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Application Process	*"The application process is too difficult and requires too many hours of work. We receive [$...] worth of funding. The grant payoff is not worth the investment of time and energy required for our volunteer run society. We apply anyways because funding is so scarce."*
	"Simplify the application process through the website would be a great improvement. Improve the short form process for organizations that apply for the same programs and funding levels annually. Allow for a cost of living increase in the short form budgets."
	"If there was some way to align the gaming grant with our organization's fiscal year we would not be in a position of having a large surplus at the end of the fiscal year due to the receipt of gaming funds. These funds are not spent until the following fiscal year."
Eligibility Guidelines	*"Community Gaming is our main/stable source for core funding. Without assured knowledge of continued support building the important sustainable business plan and maintaining key staff is difficult. It would be helpful to have the option for a reserve fund without fear of being unfunded or having a somewhat "guaranteed level of support" providing certain parameters are met."*
	"In the Guidelines, provide some examples for the eligibility calculation (not having more than 50% of operating expenses on hand unrestricted). It's not really clear based on the description, so a few examples might help. Every year when we apply, we're never really sure if we meet the 50% cut-off or not!"
	"Broaden your criteria of accepting applications and allow more organizations to be eligible and receive funding."
Positive Feedback	*"I actually don't have further suggestions. I just wanted to thank you for your interest and support!"*

	"My experience has been overall very positive. The community grants gaming staff have been professional and supportive and knowledgeable."
	"I have no suggestions for improvement. It is a very well run program, with knowledgeable staff, and great policies. It's a model for good government public service. Thanks!!"
CGG Engagement	*"Being able to directly speak with our own analyst post the outcome of our application whilst considering an appeal. We had a discussion with your front desk person who did not understand our questions but could just repeat what the denial letter stated. Not helpful. After the discussion with the analyst, we would have fully understood the denial or disagreed and appealed if necessary."*
	"I was not aware of the online webinar/support aspect. I would love to get a heads-up via a blanket email when that is available online. We very much appreciate the workshops you put on each year, they are very helpful."
	"More grant writing training sessions (never heard of the ones mentioned earlier in this survey). Send notices of grant writing training sessions directly to the email that is used to submit applications (especially applications that have not been as successful as one could wish). Perhaps get notification of these opportunities into community papers or sent to addresses for non-profit societies. Somehow make the grant application less arduous - it takes a long time especially when one is a volunteer not trained in business or accounting. We do our best to show the need."
Funding Levels	*"Grants should consider the unique challenges of rural communities and increase funding to those communities accordingly. For example, the cost of transportation for [our clients] to participate in regional or provincial programs is prohibitive. [Our clients] are at a disadvantage […] because we live in a rural area."*
	"To increase the overall percentage acquired by the BC Government from BC Lotteries revenue allocated to distribution as Gaming Grants."
	"Increases to the overall funding to Gaming are always welcome to support the good works of the charities in the Province. I think it would be good to showcase some of this great community work so the general public becomes more aware of the good work that is being done by Direct Access/Gaming in supporting so many organizations in BC."
Funding Allocation	*"It would be nice to know why any increase asked for does not materialize in more funding. Receiving feedback on the points considered for increases would be helpful."*
	"Make it fair and equal because at the present time it is not. We will continue to apply for the same amount of funding that we have the past two years because we can see clearly we are being underfunded in comparison to other organizations."
	"Same $ amount for all eligible applicants within a $bracket. More equitable amounts for orgs. No favouritism about programs and projects and which ones benefit a community. Less urban centric and less based on high populations. This would eliminate competiveness that these grants perpetuate in small towns and between organizations."

6. Non-Applicant Survey

6.1. Thinking about the last time your organization applied, what year was this? (Q2XB)

Of all the 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents who were asked "*Has your organization ever applied for a Community Gaming Grant*?"(Q2), 164 or 12% said '*Yes*'[14]. Those respondents who indicated that at some point they had applied for a Community Gaming Grant were then asked to specify the last year their organization applied, and 94 provided a response. Responses were grouped to maintain confidentiality and provide meaningful analysis.

TABLE 51: Q2 COMMENTS: THINKING ABOUT THE LAST TIME YOUR ORGANIZATION APPLIED, WHAT YEAR WAS THIS?

FUNDING YEARS	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
Before 2000	5/94	5.3%
2000-2009	27/94	28.7%
2010-2012	24/94	25.5%
2013-2014	33/94	35.1%
2015-2017[15]	5/94	5.3%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	**94**	**100.0%**

---

[14] 992 (73%) of the respondents said '*No*' and 197 (15%) indicated '*Don't Know/No Response*'.

[15] A few respondents who indicated that they had not recently applied for a CGG (which screened them into the Non-Applicant survey instead of the Applicant survey) did write having applied between 2015-17 when they were asked to specify the last time their organization applied.

6.2. Why did your organization not receive a Community Gaming Grant that year? For example, what was the reason(s) provided by the Community Gaming Grants Branch in your notification letter? (*Other, please specify*)(Q3XC)

When all 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents were asked whether their organization ever applied for a Community Gaming Grant (CGG), 164 or 12% said '*Yes*' they had (Q2XA). Of those who said they had, less than half (70 or 43%[16]) indicated they did not receive CGG funding that last time they applied (Q3XA). When asked why their organization did not receive a CGG that year, 60 respondents selected up to 6 valid responses, one of which could be '*Other, please specify*' (Q3XC). Twenty-two respondents specified multiple themes in their comments which will be analyzed here.

Due to the limited number of qualitative responses and due to confidentiality, all additional information about *Other, please specify comments* is incorporated into Table 52. Note that most of the comments relate to existing quantitative responses for Q3XC.

TABLE 52: Q3 COMMENTS: WHY DID YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT RECEIVE A COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT THAT YEAR? FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT WAS THE REASON(S) PROVIDED BY THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH IN YOUR NOTIFICATION LETTER? (OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY)

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Program Eligibility Issue	The program already has too much government funding, program provides an indirect benefit to the community, program is delivered on contract, etc.	**7/22**	**31.8%**
Financial Eligibility Issue	E.g., an organizational surplus greater than 50%, too much money generated through licensed gaming events.	**5/22**	**22.7%**
Other	Respondents did not apply, were not aware of the CGG program.	**3/22**	**13.6%**
Compliance Issue	Incomplete or missing information from organization, funds spent on ineligible items, failed to spend previous grant in 12 months, etc.	**2/22**	**9.1%**
Incomplete Application	The application was missing supporting documents.	**1/22**	**4.5%**
Organizational Eligibility	The issue related to board structure and processes,	**1/22**	**4.5%**

---

[16] 67 or 41% said '*Yes*', they did receive funding, 27 or 16% selected '*Don't Know/No Response*'.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Issue	how organization is funded, etc.		
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**3/22**	**13.6%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**22**	-

6.3. What <provincial government/federal government> grant programs does your organization regularly apply for? (Q5B)

All 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents were asked whether their organization regularly applied for various types of grant funding and were asked to select all that apply (Q5XA). Among other responses selected, 218 organizations indicated Provincial Government grant funding, and 184 organizations indicated Federal Government grant funding.

Those 292 respondents who had indicated either applying regularly for Provincial and/or Federal Government grant funding were then asked Q5B: "*What <provincial government/federal government> grant program does your organization regularly apply for?*", and 255 responses were received that specified funding sources.

Of the 255 responses, over half of respondents (143 or 56.1%) reported regularly applying for federal grants and under half (112 or 43.9%) cited applying for provincial grants. Other government or community sources amounted to 78 or 30.6% of responses, and included regional, municipal, and other grants.

TABLE 53: Q5B COMMENTS: WHAT <PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT/FEDERAL GOVERNMENT> GRANT PROGRAMS DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION REGULARLY APPLY FOR?

THEMES	COUNT	PERCENTAGE[17]
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT	**112/255**	**43.9%**
BC Arts Council Program	**20/255**	**7.8%**
BC Community Gaming Grant (PAC, Sports, Arts & Culture)	**9/255**	**3.5%**
BC Housing (Maintenance and Improvement, Subsidy, Home Construction)	**8/255**	**3.1%**
BC Rural Dividend Fund	**7/255**	**2.7%**
Civil Forfeiture & Victims Fund	**7/255**	**2.7%**
Ministry of Children and Family Development	**5/255**	**2.0%**
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General (Community Accountability Program, Victim Services and Crime Prevention)	**5/255**	**2.0%**
BC Child Care Operating Fund	**4/255**	**1.6%**
BC Multiculturalism Grant	**4/255**	**1.6%**

---

[17] Respondents listed multiple grant sources.

THEMES	COUNT	PERCENTAGE[17]
Destination BC	**4/255**	**1.6%**
Ministry of Agriculture (Grow Local Grant, Humane Slaughter Program)	**4/255**	**1.6%**
Ministry of Health	**4/255**	**1.6%**
BC Air Access Program (BCAAP)	**2/255**	**0.8%**
BC Touring Council Grant (BC Community Presenters Assistance	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Community Living British Columbia (CLBC)	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training – Community Adult Literacy Program	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Ministry of Education Operating Grants	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations & Rural Development	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Ministry of Jobs, Trade and Technology – Essential Skills and Mentorship	**2/255**	**0.8%**
Recreation Sites and Trails BC	**2/255**	**0.8%**
B.C. Rural Development Fund	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Canada 150	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Emergency Services	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Hydro Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Law	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Parks	**1/255**	**0.4%**
BC Tech Co-op Grant	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Childcare Minor Grant	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Choice in Supports for Independent Living (CSIL)	**1/255**	**0.4%**
First Peoples' Cultural Council	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Ministry of Education Special Education Grant	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Ministry of Education French Grant	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction	**1/255**	**0.4%**
Ready, Set, Learn	**1/255**	**0.4%**
WorkSafe BC Small Initiative Funding	**1/255**	**0.4%**
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	**143/255**	**56.1%**
Canada Summer Jobs	**33/255**	**12.9%**

THEMES	COUNT	PERCENTAGE[17]
Canadian Heritage (Celebrate Canada, Commemorate Canada, Canada 150, Inter-Action Multicultural, Legacy, Aboriginal Languages Initiative)	15/255	5.9%
New Horizons for Seniors Program	15/255	5.9%
Canada Council for the Arts Grant	9/255	3.5%
Environment and Climate Change Canada Habitat Stewardship Program	8/255	3.1%
Canadian Heritage - Young Canada Works Program	7/255	2.7%
Eco Action Community Fund	7/255	2.7%
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada - Legislative Review Process Funding	4/255	1.6%
Justice Canada (Indigenous, women, youth, elders etc.)	4/255	1.6%
Building Communities Through Arts and Heritage	3/255	1.2%
Fisheries & Oceans Canada Salmon Enhancement Program Public Involvement Program	3/255	1.2%
Infrastructure Canada - Federal Gas Tax	3/255	1.2%
Service Canada Grants	3/255	1.2%
Civil Forfeiture	2/255	0.8%
Employment and Social Development Canada – Homelessness Partnering Strategy	2/255	0.8%
Employment and Social Development Canada - Literacy and Essential Skills	2/255	0.8%
Fisheries and Oceans Canada - Public Involvement Program	2/255	0.8%
Health Canada – First Nations Environmental Contaminants Program	2/255	0.8%
Western Economic Diversification – Canada 150 Community Infrastructure	2/255	0.8%
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	1/255	0.4%
Aquaculture Collaborative Research and Development Program	1/255	0.4%
Canadian Environment Assessment Agency – Canadian Environment Assessment Act Review	1/255	0.4%
Corrections Services Canada	1/255	0.4%
Ecological Gift Program	1/255	0.4%
Environment and Climate Change Canada National	1/255	0.4%

THEMES	COUNT	PERCENTAGE[17]
Wetland Conservation Fund		
Environment and Climate Change National Wetland Conservation Fund	1/255	0.4%
Fisheries and Oceans Canada – Aboriginal Aquatic Resources and Oceans Management (AAROM)	1/255	0.4%
Fisheries and Oceans Canada – Oceans Contribution Program	1/255	0.4%
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	1/255	0.4%
Indigenous Services Canada – Post Secondary Partnership Program	1/255	0.4%
National Research Council – Industrial Research Assistance Program	1/255	0.4%
Natural Resource Canada – Indigenous Forestry Initiative	1/255	0.4%
Parks Canada - Parks and Heritage	1/255	0.4%
Public Safety Canada – Indigenous Community Corrections Initiative	1/255	0.4%
Telefilm Canada	1/255	0.4%
Veterans Affairs Canada – Commemorative Partnership Program Community Engagement Funding	1/255	0.4%
OTHER GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY	**78/255**	**30.6%**
Regional District Funding	12/255	4.7%
Columbia Basin Trust	7/255	2.7%
Northern Development Initiative Trust Program	7/255	2.7%
City/Town Grants	5/255	2.0%
Creative BC	3/255	1.2%
First Nations Health Authority	2/255	0.8%
Metis Nation BC	2/255	0.8%
Surrey Multicultural Grant	2/255	0.8%
Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) - Community Works	2/255	0.8%
United Way	2/255	0.8%
BC Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres	1/255	0.4%
Brian Injury Alliance	1/255	0.4%
Burnaby Festivals Grant Program	1/255	0.4%
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation	1/255	0.4%

THEMES	COUNT	PERCENTAGE[17]
Child Care Resource and Referral	1/255	0.4%
Children First	1/255	0.4%
Columbia Kootenay Cultural Alliance – Arts and Culture	1/255	0.4%
Community Foundation of South Okanagan	1/255	0.4%
Community Trust Fund	1/255	0.4%
Creston Public Library Summer Reading Program	1/255	0.4%
Federation of BC Woodlot	1/255	0.4%
Forest Enhancement Society BC	1/255	0.4%
Habitat Conservation Trust Foundation (HCTF)	1/255	0.4%
Housing First / Non Housing First	1/255	0.4%
Island Health Community Grant	1/255	0.4%
Lu'uma Native Housing	1/255	0.4%
Metro Vancouver Aboriginal Stream Funding	1/255	0.4%
Nakusp & Area Community Foundation	1/255	0.4%
National Trails Coalition (NTC)	1/255	0.4%
Northern Health Drug, Alcohol & Mental Health	1/255	0.4%
Northern Health Healthy Communities Grant	1/255	0.4%
Northern Health's Imagine Grant	1/255	0.4%
Ontario Trillium Funding	1/255	0.4%
Pacific Salmon Foundation	1/255	0.4%
Respite Care	1/255	0.4%
Rotary International	1/255	0.4%
Sport Hosting Vancouver	1/255	0.4%
United Way Active Aging	1/255	0.4%
Upper Kootenay Ecosystem Enhancement Plan	1/255	0.4%
Vancouver Coastal Health	1/255	0.4%
Vancouver Foundation	1/255	0.4%
Vancouver Island Health Authority Capital Grant	1/255	0.4%
ViaSport – Hosting BC Grant	1/255	0.4%
YMCA French Student Program	1/255	0.4%
No Response	22/255	8.6%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	**255**	-

6.4. Why does your organization not regularly apply for grant funding? (Q7)

All 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents were asked Q5A: "*Does your organization regularly apply for grant funding and/or receive public donations?*" Of those,

- 221 respondents indicated their organization received public donations but did not indicate they regularly apply for grant funding,
- 480 organizations said '*No'* they did not regularly apply for grant funding and did not receive public donations, and
- 51 indicated '*Don't Know/No Response'*.

These 752 respondents were then asked a supplementary question asking them to explain why their organization does not regularly apply for grant funding (Q7).

Comment responses were divided between Q7A and Q7B based on the two valid[18] responses to Q5A:

Q7A) '*Yes, organization receives public donations*' (and did not indicate that they regularly apply for grant funding -189 comments) and

Q7B) '*No, organization does not apply for grant funding and does not receive public donations*' (408 comments).

6.4.1. Why does your organization not regularly apply for grant funding? (those who receive public donations but do not regularly apply for grants) (Q7A)

Of the 189 comments received from organizations that receive public donations but do not apply for grants, the most frequently-mentioned topic underlined a lack of knowledge about Community Gaming Grants (CGG) or its eligibility criteria as the reason they had not applied for grants (72 or 38.1%).

Just over one-quarter of the comments (50 or 26.5%) cited their ineligibility for funding after having looked at the various CGG guidelines.

One-fifth of comments (38 or 20.1%) said they did not need the funding at the present time.

Some 21 or 11.1% of comments pointed to the application process as being the reason why they had never applied. It was felt to be too time-consuming and onerous, and organizations that relied on volunteers simply did not have the people hours to devote to it. Others felt there were easier ways to raise the funds needed.

---

[18]There were 39 open-ended comment responses from those that responded '*Don't Know/No Response*' to question 5A. Most of these comments described how organizations were new or had recently had turnover, and how either the organization or the individual did not have experience, or were aware of, or knew how to apply for grants.

TABLE 54: Q7A COMMENTS: WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT REGULARLY APPLY FOR GRANT FUNDING? (ORGANIZATIONS THAT RECEIVE PUBLIC DONATIONS ONLY AND DO NOT APPLY FOR GRANTS)

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Lack of Information	Respondents had no knowledge of the CGG or its eligibility criteria.	**72/189**	**38.1%**
Eligibility Guidelines	Organizations were deemed ineligible for funding due to the various CGG guidelines.	**50/189**	**26.5%**
Do Not Need Funding	Respondents did not need CGG funding for the time being.	**38/189**	**20.1%**
Application Process	Application process was daunting and time consuming for respondents.	**21/189**	**11.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**10/189**	**5.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**189**	**-**

TABLE 55: Q7A COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME (ORGANIZATIONS THAT RECEIVE PUBLIC DONATIONS ONLY AND DO NOT APPLY FOR GRANTS)

Lack of Information	*"Do not know what the eligibility criteria or application process is for grant funding."*
	"We were not aware of any grant available but we know now."
	"We were not aware of various programs for which we would qualify to receive funds that would help us to better serve our community."
Eligibility Guidelines	*"We were given to understand that we did not qualify due to surplus funds situation; we try to keep at least one year's worth of operating revenue ahead as we are unable to predict revenues year to year due to the nature of our enterprise: […]."*
	"Purely because we are very new, and are still working on our initial programmes and projects."
	"We need more core funding and most grants do not allow this. For BC gaming grants we have been told we could not apply."
Do Not Need Funding	*"We have been financially successful so far and have not needed to."*
	"We currently have all the funds that we need, if our organization grew larger to support the manpower needed to run other programs, then we might consider applying for public funding."
	"They have not been needed."
Application Process	*"The process seemed daunting, we did not know if we would qualify, we did not know what we would have to do to qualify; a request for specific information from the ministry was answered, but very generically."*
	"The process of applying for grants is very long and [they] do not necessarily get accepted. Moreover, as a community-based organization, our first mission is to bring value to our community, so we choose to spend our time and energy with them."
	"No one willing to write usually complicated applications that take more time and money to get for what they are worth."

6.4.2. Why does your organization not regularly apply for grant funding? (those that do not receive public donations nor regularly apply for grant funding) (Q7B)

Of the 408 comments received from organizations that indicated they neither apply for Community Gaming Grants (CGG) funding nor receive public donations, two main themes emerged. Just over one-third (141 or 34.6%) said they simply did not need the funding at this time. They were either already self-sufficient or had no programs that might benefit from the grant. Almost one-third of comments (128 or 31.4%) cited a lack of knowledge about the CGG program as to why they had never applied in the past. They had no idea whether they might be eligible.

Nearly one-fifth or 19.1% of comments underlined eligibility as a reason for not applying. Reasons highlighted ranged from being a new organization (so not having tried to submit an application yet), to not being able to raise the other half of project funds as required in the guidelines.

Some 32 or 7.8% of comments mentioned the application process as the reason why they had never applied. It was felt to be too time-consuming and organizations did not have the resources they could utilise to complete the application.

A combination of other responses (16 or 3.9%) cited reasons ranging from ethical, related to perceptions of gambling and its impact on communities, to simply never having tried.

TABLE 56: Q7B COMMENTS: WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT REGULARLY APPLY FOR GRANT FUNDING? (ORGANIZATIONS THAT NEITHER APPLY FOR GRANT FUNDING NOR RECEIVE PUBLIC DONATIONS)

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Do Not Need Funding	Respondents were either self-sufficient or do not have a program that needs additional funding.	**141/408**	**34.6%**
Lack of Information	Respondents had no knowledge of the CGG program or how they might qualify.	**128/408**	**31.4%**
Eligibility Guidelines	Respondents could not fulfill CGG guidelines criteria.	**78/408**	**19.1%**
Application Process	Respondents found the application process time consuming, complex and difficult to complete for small organizations.	**32/408**	**7.8%**
Other	Respondents either never applied in the past but plan to do so in the future, or will not apply for ethical reasons.	**25/408**	**6.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**16/408**	**3.9%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**408**	-

TABLE 57: Q7B COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME (ORGANIZATIONS THAT (ORGANIZATIONS THAT NEITHER APPLY FOR GRANT FUNDING NOR RECEIVE PUBLIC DONATIONS))

Do Not Need Funding	*"We have enough members to look after our costs and do not plan manger fund programs."*
	"We have not felt that we had projects that required funding at this time."
	"We have taken it upon ourselves to do our own private fundraising and have never considered applying for grant funding."
Lack of Information	*"Never knew that any funding was available."*
	"I do not know anything about the grant funding, or the rules associated."
	"We do not have any knowledge of grants that would be applicable to our society."
Eligibility Guidelines	*"We have trouble generating our half of project funding in order to apply for grants for the rest."*
	"As far as I know, grant funding is usually not available to our category of sport organization."
	"We are […] new […] and so are unable to until we are in our second year (at least that is our understanding). […]."
Application Process	*"The process is daunting and very time consuming. Nobody in our organization wants to take on the challenge. Some members have had experience applying for grant funding on behalf of other organizations and the general consensus is that we can raise funds in our club in other less complicated ways."*
	"As a very small, volunteer-based organization we often do not have the time to pull together an application for funding. In fact, many of us do not even believe we would qualify for a grant of any kind. The research around who qualifies hasn't been done as the process simply seems too onerous."
	"Too much hassle for a small group, "staff" is all volunteer - no time for application and reports."
Other	*"We have not applied in recent memory. Not sure about availability in our Rural area. I cannot recall any recent applications."*
	"The church community has some concerns about the potential for gambling to negatively impact some citizens and associated families."
	"We have not tried yet."

6.5. Thinking specifically about the Community Gaming Grants program, why has your organization never applied for a Community Gaming Grant? (Q8)

Of the 1,353 total Non-Applicant survey respondents, 389 or 28.8% said they had never applied for a Community Gaming Grant (CGG) but that they had regularly applied for other government and non-government grants (Q2 & Q5A). Those 389 respondents were then asked why they had never applied for a CGG, and 347 respondents provided comments.

Close to half of those respondents (173 or 49.9%) did not apply because they were not aware of the CGG program, with many hearing about it for the first time through this survey. Close to a quarter (82 or 23.6%) mentioned that due to eligibility requirements they were unable to apply. Some respondents explained that their organization had multiple programs in operation, causing their banking information to disqualify them from consideration. Others could not meet the organizational membership requirements due to the small scale of their organization or region.

Fifty-five or 15.9% of respondents cited the application process as too complex and time-consuming as a reason for never having applied. Many highlighted their lack of resources - time and personnel - to confidently complete an application. Lastly, having the application form only in English was a barrier for some respondents.

Twenty-eight or 8.1% of respondents had no need for CGG funding, as they either received funding from other provincial or federal government agencies; or received funds from local fundraisers or members.

Some 13 or 3.7% of respondents felt uncomfortable receiving money from the CGG branch due to their views of the negative impact gambling on individuals and society.

TABLE 58: Q8 COMMENTS: THINKING SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM, WHY HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION NEVER APPLIED FOR A COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Not Familiar with the CGG Program	Respondents were not aware of the CGG program, or the application process.	**173/347**	**49.9%**
Not Eligible	Respondents were not eligible based on the organizational, program and/or financial guidelines.	**82/347**	**23.6%**
Application Process	Respondents found the application process onerous and time-consuming.	**55/347**	**15.9%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Grants Not Needed	Respondents had no need for the funds as already in receipt of funds from other agencies, their members, or their program has no requirement.	**28/347**	**8.1%**
Ethically Opposed	Respondents were ethically opposed to Community Gaming Grant funds.	**13/347**	**3.7%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**6/347**	**1.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**347**	

TABLE 59: Q8 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Not Familiar with the CGG Program	*"We have never thought about this, but we plan to apply this year."*
	"We were not aware of or that we could apply for this grant."
	"We were not aware that Community Gaming Grant is available to apply until this survey."
Not Eligible	*"I attended a presentation in [a rural area] a few years ago to learn about the grants. The main problem seemed to be that our Society has various programs and because we had money in the bank for the operation of the society."*
	"Our organization does not currently meet requirements related to membership structure and we receive contracted government funding for our programs."
	"Still going through criteria and found when we looked at it last year we had to have too much money set aside to qualify. We needed extra put aside which we did not have."
Application Process	*"Application process seems too bureaucratic; necessity of maintaining a separate bank account for Gaming funds; definition of what constitutes programming is obtuse; last time we looked, Gaming seemed to only support ongoing programming, rather than support new programming."*
	"Gaming grant criteria are too onerous and restrictive in both its application and distribution processes."
	"Difficult for me to apply because English is my second language."
Grants not Needed	*"We are self-funded with respect to operations and most capital projects."*
	"We understand that to apply for funding for a program, we need to have been conducting that program for at least a year. Although our organization has been around for [several] years, we have yet to focus upon the program we would like to apply for funding for."
	"We are a very small group of overworked volunteers working with a small budget. We can't mount any big projects or provide community services beyond education and [animal health and welfare]. A raffle or a 50/50 sale is about our speed."
Ethically Opposed	*"Gambling is sensitive subject which has impacted a number of people in unpleasant ways. So we have chosen not to apply."*
	"We feel that promotion of gambling is not good for society and that it would be hypocritical of us to make use of the funds."
	"This organization is opposed to obtaining funds provided through commercial gambling revenues."

6.6. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: *The website had the information I needed.* What information is missing from the Community Gaming Grants program website? (Q12)

All 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents were asked whether their organization had accessed the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) website within the past year (Q10). When those169 respondents who had indicated using the website in the past year were asked if *'the website had the information I needed'*, 8 respondents *'Disagreed'* or *'Strongly disagreed'* (Q11C), and 6 of those provided feedback about what was missing from the website (Q12). table 60 displays all 6 comments.

Feedback requested clearer and simplified language, yet more detailed information on the CGG application guidelines. In addition to the challenges with the website layout and navigation, respondents found the overall application process time-consuming and difficult to use.

TABLE 60: Q12 COMMENTS: WHAT INFORMATION IS MISSING FROM THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM WEBSITE? (ALL COMMENTS)

"Clear directions on eligibility and the application process."
"Detailed rules regarding the requirements for running weekly 50/50 draws."
"How a volunteer organization can make these applications without hiring a professional."
"The layout it not easy to navigate as with many government websites. The due dates and process of application is also much more difficult and convoluted than many non-government application processes."
"Unclear whether or not our not-for-profit organization is eligible for funding."
"We applied for a gaming license. The site did not tell me about all of the various documents I needed to provide to demonstrate that our society has active programs and is a valid entity. This gap caused us to lose valuable time in running our raffle and was also extremely inconvenient for me."

6.7. The Current funding sectors of the Community Gaming Grants program include: Arts and Culture, Sport, Environment, Human and Social Services, Public Safety, PAC and DPAC. Does your organization see a need to establish new funding sectors and/or extend or change the existing funding sectors? (Q15A)

Of the 1,353 total Non-Applicant survey respondents who were asked if their organization sees a need to establish new funding sectors and/or extend or change the existing funding sectors, 381 or 28.2% responded '*Yes*' and provided their suggestions.[19]

Just over one-quarter of respondents (106 or 27.8%) suggested a need for new sectors or categories such as science, technology, agriculture, small business support, housing, and tourism. A similar proportion (99 or 26.0%) also expressed a need to extend the current sectors. In addition, respondents mentioned a need for clarity on what fitted where, and why certain things were ineligible.

Some 43 or 11.3% of respondents recommended sectors or categories that upon review of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) guidelines seemed to already exist.

A small group of respondents (15 or 3.9%) found their programs could be slotted into multiple sectors and had difficulty figuring out which sector to select. Respondents expressed the need to select multiple sectors so they could accurately describe their program whilst avoiding a rejected application.

TABLE 61: Q15A COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION SEE A NEED TO ESTABLISH NEW FUNDING SECTORS AND/OR EXTEND OF CHANGE THE EXISTING FUNDING SECTORS?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Create New Sectors	Add new sectors or categories.	**106/381**	**27.8%**
Extend Sectors	Respondents wanted to expand sectors to include criteria to make them eligible.	**99/381**	**26.0%**
Recommendation Already Exists	Respondents suggested sectors that are identical to, or resemble existing sectors provided by the CGG program.	**43/381**	**11.3%**
Create Multi-Sector	Respondents suggested the need for a category	**15/381**	**3.9%**

[19] Note that 591 or 43.7% of Non-Applicant survey respondents indicated '*No*', their organization did not see a need to establish new funding sectors and/or extend or change the existing funding sectors.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Category	that caters to organization with multiple sectors.		
No Responses	The responses could not be coded. Unable to articulate whether they wanted to establish new funding sector or change existing sectors. The majority expressed a need for funding. Included respondents who either had no issue with current funding sectors or had no suggestion.	**137/381**	**36.0%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**381**	**-**

TABLE 62: Q15A COMMENTEXAMPLES BY THEME

Create New Sectors	*"Clarity needs to be provided for Environment and Human and Social Services. For example, does either of these extend to providing opportunities for networking, social interaction, education and physical activities for seniors?"*
	"We provide housing for low income senior citizens. Given the current state of affordable housing in [urban areas], our facility is in very high demand. Turnover of tenants as they move to their next level of care adds to our cost to maintain our facility. Affordable housing projects should be part of the funding sectors."
	"Tourism industry development; Tourism education and communications; Tourism industry research; Tourism marketing and economic development; Tourism Events."
Extend Sectors	*"Even though childcare falls under Human and Social Services sector, while attending a local workshop on Gaming Grants we were informed we would be excluded."*
	"Recreation and trails."
	"I am not sure if building trails within the Community Forest qualifies perhaps in the Sport or Environment Sector?"
Recommendation Already Exists	*"We operate pre-school and camps for children, and youth at risk. "*
	"Animal welfare."
	"First Nations (may come under cultural)."
Create Multi-Sector Category	*"Recognize intersectionality of work. We are a predominantly Indigenous-led organization working at the intersection of Indigenous rights, community well-being, and environmental stewardship."*
	"In our situation, as a campus/community radio station, we do not sit exclusively in any of these six sectors, although we do touch on all of them at various times. It would be good to see some kind of extension of some of these categories or development of an over-riding category into which we would fall."
	"We work in a grey area between Arts and Culture and Education - our work is […] focused on music education and is provincial in reach."

6.8. Does your organization have any concerns related to eligibility requirements of the Community Gaming Grants program? (Q15B)

Of all the 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked if their organization had any concerns related to eligibility requirements of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program, 293 or 21.7% responded '*Yes*' and provided additional feedback.[20]

Eighty-two or 28.0% of those 293 respondents expressed concerns about the organizational guidelines, specifically stipulations related to: voting member numbers; the democratic basis for membership of the board; and remuneration rules for board members.

Some respondents expressed concern that their organization was structured under hereditary appointments going back generations; or their organization was too small to have a voting membership twice that of the board. Other respondents believed paid positions to be a necessity for the continued survival and success of their program.

Eighty-two or 28.0% of respondents aired concerns about the CGG program requirements. Numerous respondents referred to the inflexibility of the sectors and how the CGG program defined whether their program benefited the community or not.

Fifty-one or 17.4% of respondents expressed concerns over the financial eligibility guidelines. Respondents found the '*surplus funds rule'* to be a barrier, as well as the inability to allocate grants to core funding or capital projects.

Forty-five or 15.4% of the respondents had no knowledge of the eligibility requirements.

Fifteen or 5.1% found the application process financially straining, time-consuming and onerous.

TABLE 63: Q15B COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY CONCERNS RELATED TO ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Organizational Structure	Respondents expressed concerns regarding voting quorum requirement, and restriction of funded members.	**82/293**	**28.0%**
Program Eligibility	Respondents expressed concerns regarding rigidity	**82/293**	**28.0%**

---

[20] Note that 616 or 45.5% of respondents indicated '*No*' they had no concerns related to eligibility requirements of the CGG program.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
	of sectors, and interpretation of benefits to the community.		
Financial Eligibility	Respondents expressed concerns regarding financial restrictions on surplus, as well as the inability to allocate funds towards capital projects.	**51/293**	**17.4%**
CGG Knowledge Gap Requirements	Respondents had no knowledge or clear understanding of the CGG program and guidelines.	**45/293**	**15.4%**
Application Process	Respondents expressed concerns regarding the difficulty of completing the application.	**15/293**	**5.1%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**33/293**	**11.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**293**	**-**

TABLE 64: Q15B COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Organizational Structure	*"I am only concerned if the voting membership/democratically elected piece excludes First Nations with hereditary Chiefs."*
	"I believe board members should be paid. There is a long-standing belief that charity and non-profit work cannot be paid, although that also makes the programs susceptible to closure when the personal interest of a volunteer is no longer. To make programs sustainable, volunteers need to be supported with paid staff and board members."
	"We are a small organization and just don't have the large membership that can vote so this category excludes us from applying for gaming grants."
Program Eligibility	*"Yes. We have programs to assist with long term [...] care patients that are not funded through [...] but benefit the well-being of our residents. These programs do not fit the box of Community Gaming grants as they only benefit a small sector of our society."*
	"Poverty reduction and affordable housing are not included in gaming guidelines but are cornerstones of both Provincial and Federal Government emerging social programs."
	"Sport category is limited to competitive sports - our club [...] and organizes non-competitive events, including group [trips], skills training programs and development programs for children - while we do organize one race per year and support other community organized races, our members have clearly stated an interest in non-competitive organized events that encourage broader participation in the community."
Financial Eligibility	*"We have some reservations with the 50% operating budget limit. If we do not have these monies at the end of a year and do not get a grant, we may be leaving our Group in financial distress."*
	"For Major Capital Grants, the requirement is that the organization must have 50% of the funding in place prior to applying. This is wholly unfair for small organizations trying to get a major project off the ground. We have found that when a major government

	player comes to the table, others will follow. The Gaming Grants branch needs to relax or eliminate the 50% requirement so that our major capital projects become eligible for funding…"
	"Maintenance and replacement costs seem to be excluded from grants. With equipment [many years old, our club needs to replace $high worth of stuff] according to new safety rules imposed by Work Safe BC. […]. [Our organization] is owned and operated by volunteers, with anyone welcome. Will have to close if no financial help forthcoming."
CGG Knowledge Gap	"This is the first contact we have had about the program, so more public approach is needed to reach organizations like ours."
	"We just aren't aware of any of the requirements or our eligibility to funding to apply in the first place."
	"It is unclear in [our community] whether or not more than one organization can qualify for a grant in any given year."
Application Process	"We run [our project] on a very limited budget. The administrative and accounting costs required in getting charitable status and of setting up additional accounts, cheques and hiring an accountant, etc. to follow through with financial records at this point are beyond our means."
	"We applied three times before finally being approved. It was hard for us; indeed the application should be streamlined to encourage organizations with less capacity to apply. The paper work is too much, and the supporting documents are so demanding to collect. I think an easier process for organizations which have succeeded, can make thing easy for more organizations."
	"The guidelines are neither clear nor written in a manner that is easy to understand...and there are too many of them. Like I said before...applying for a grant takes too much time because there is so much reading and responding involved."

6.9. Does your organization have any concerns related to the application process of the Community Gaming Grants program? (Q15C)

Of all 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked if their organization had 'any concerns related to the application process of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program',194 or 14% shared their concerns and thoughts.[21] The predominant concern related to the complexity of the application process, and the amount of time required completing it. Almost half of respondents (86 or 44.3%) highlighted the difficulties experienced in completing the application, with many finding the language itself difficult to understand and guidelines unclear, or highlighted being unable to save their application part-way through. Some respondents underlined how easy it was to have their application rejected after investing considerable time and energy.

Almost one-third of respondents (63 or 30.9%) underscored a lack of familiarity with the application process as a concern. Many wanted more information about the CGG program, and guidance on how to make a grant application. Not all respondents had prior experience with this type of submission, despite delivering programs that benefited their community.

Thirty-two respondents or 16.5% believed the guidelines were too restrictive, making them ineligible. Some respondents from organizations already struggling with finances found it difficult to then find they were ineligible for funding.

Fifteen respondents or 7.7% from smaller organizations underlined their lack of resources or expertise to complete an application. They called for more support and guidance for the volunteers they relied upon to finish the application. Respondents also raised concerns about a lack of access to the internet and/or the requisite skills to handle an online application.

TABLE 65: Q15C COMMENTS: DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY CONCERNS RELATED TO THE APPLICATION PROCESS OF THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Complexity of Application Process	Keep language simple, allow the website to save the application part-way through, and provide guidance for successful completion.	**86/194**	**44.3%**
Unfamiliarity with	Respondents require more information on the CGG	**63/194**	**30.9%**

---

[21] Note that 666 or half of respondents (49.2%) selected '*No*', they did not have any concerns related to the application process of the CGG program, when asked under Q15C.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process or Grants	program. Who qualifies? How to apply? Etc.		
Guidelines/Eligibility Too Limited	The sectors are unclear and restrictive.	**32/194**	**16.5%**
Challenging for Small Organizations	Small organizations do not have the resources or expertise to complete the application process.	**15/194**	**7.7%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded. Includes respondents reiterating that they had not applied and/or were deemed ineligible in the past.	**11/194**	**5.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**194**	**-**

TABLE 66: Q15C COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Complexity of Application Process	*"I have heard from partners who receive Community Gaming Grants that it is a very difficult application process and involves a lot of administrative work once awarded. This has deterred our organization from applying."*
	"My personal experience through a different [organization] that I volunteered with is that the application process is extremely challenging. It is time consuming to write up and if there is the slightest error the application can be rejected and all that work was for nothing. Others in [our organization] have had a similar experience."
	"The language used in application guidelines is often […] difficult to understand. I would appreciate straightforward questions and requests for information rather than bureaucratic [speak]. Please do not try to intimidate your applicants."
Unfamiliarity with Application Process or Grants	*"We would like to have more information on how to apply for grants."*
	"I am not familiar with how to apply for grants with the Community Grants Program."
	"As we were not aware of any such availability of grants, we definitely will have a challenge for any future application process as we are not well versed in grant process, requirements and related deliverables. […]. We have done many programs benefitting […] youth and community."
Guidelines/Eligibility Too Limited	*"The ineligibility of "projects" for gaming funding such as […]. These projects only support the community and should be eligible."*
	"Some of the restrictions make it difficult for organizations who are financially struggling to get ahead."
	"We have not applied in the past few years because of not knowing what programs are funded. Clarification would be helpful with understanding before applying."
Challenging for Small Organizations	*"Too cumbersome. Precludes smaller, worthy organizations from applying because the process is so difficult. If these are the requirements, then it would be good to offer assistance to smaller organizations that do not have experienced volunteers or staff."*

"It is very labour intensive for volunteers and difficult for them to become competent grant writers. Again, this is in a very small community, so knowledge and experience with the Gaming Grants process is limited."

"In the past, we have considered this funding opportunity, but, as we are a small group, with mostly senior members, we have not the person power to work through the process. Also as everything has moved into the world of computers, many of our senior members are not willing to work with the computer.....leaving fewer and fewer people able and willing to continue with such processes. This is a comment not just on the application process, but also on the aging population in at least our organization."

6.10. What barriers has your organization experienced in accessing Community Gaming Grant funding? (Q20)

Of all 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked '*has your organization experienced any barriers to accessing Community Gaming Grant funding*' (Q19), 190 or 14% stated '*Yes*'.[22] Of those, 184 provided comments.

Of the 184 respondents that indicated they experienced barriers accessing Community Gaming Grants (CGG) funding, 54 or 29.3% of them pointed to the application process, which they found too long and complex. Respondents with limited resources and skills found the grant writing process challenging.

Just shy of one-quarter (45 or 24.5%) of respondents pointed to the financial restrictions of the CGG guidelines, and expressed a need to be financially prepared for unforeseen events (e.g. fire, equipment damage, etc.) in the future. As a result they were denied funding due to the surplus they carried over year-to-year.

Forty or 21.7% of respondents cited the CGG organization guidelines as a barrier. Many highlighted the difficulties of meeting a large enough voting membership to be eligible. Others noted the rule on having a democratically elected board as a barrier to organizations with hereditary members.

Thirty-fine or 21.2% of respondents found the rigid criteria of the program sectors to be a barrier.

TABLE 67: Q20 COMMENTS: WHAT BARRIERS HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCED IN ACCESSING COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Application Process	The grant writing and additional reports were time-consuming and complex.	**54/184**	**29.3%**
Financial Guidelines	The inability to carry a surplus in account year-to-year was a barrier.	**45/184**	**24.5%**
Organization Guidelines	Voting memberships more than double the size of board are problematic, as well as exclusively having democratically-elected board members.	**40/184**	**21.7%**

---

[22] Note that 561 or 41.5% of respondents indicated that '*No*' their organization had not experienced any barriers to accessing Community Gaming Grant funding.

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Program Guidelines	The inelasticity of the program sectors was a barrier.	**39/184**	**21.2%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**16/184**	**8.7%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**184**	**-**

TABLE 68: Q20 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Application Process	*"The application forms and process are very long and complex, and is definitely a barrier to applying for Community Gaming Grants."*
	"Application process is extensive and onerous - beyond what volunteers from our organization are willing to invest."
	"Lack of knowledge of our volunteers, to successfully write grants, a simple application would benefit not for profit organizations that have no paid positions, only volunteers which is time-consuming".
Financial Guidelines	*"We have a small but healthy surplus, therefore ineligible to apply."*
	"Told we have too much money. Since all our funding is community based we need to have enough on hand to deal with something catastrophic like […] or major equipment repairs. This means we do not qualify to apply."
	"It seems that our investment funds make us ineligible for monies, even though long term viability and survivability of our organization is only assured if we recruit enough volunteers to run our programs, govern our establishment and run our admin side which includes compliance with [specific regulations, financial reporting and other things. Being able to hire a staffer would make our organization sustainable over the long term and some money for this would help, so too the ability to retain some grant money to build up a nest egg for the future or endowments to deliver our programs far into the future."
Organization Guidelines	*"A voting membership has been our greatest barrier in meeting eligibility to access Community Gaming Grants."*
	"Due to the nature of our membership and the abilities of the clients we serve many are not confident in becoming voting members. This presents as an issue when applying for funds as it is difficult to get voting members to attend the AGM."
	"In the past, we were told that we did not meet the criteria because some of [our Board members are hereditary and not democratically elected.]"
Program Guidelines	*"Sector specific to economic development/tourism."*
	"The barriers are related to the narrow definition of the categories (which do not include our main mandate – […])."
	"Our […] project does not qualify. We have been turned down on all applications [over numerous years]."

6.11. Why is your organization not likely to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future? (Q22A)

Of all 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked Q21: "*How likely is your organization to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future?*", 396 indicated '*Not Likely*' or '*Not at all Likely*'.

Those 396 respondents were then asked Q22A: "*Why is your organization not likely to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future?*", to which 349 respondents provided feedback.

Two prominent reasons were shared by respondents for not being likely to apply for funding in the future. Over one-third (126 or 36.1%) said they did not need the CGG funding as their revenue needs were met via alternate financial streams; of particular note were membership fees. A further 120 or 34.4% of responses cited financial and/or organizational ineligibility as the main reasons for not being likely to submit an application. Issues ranged from '*surplus cash reserves*' and '*board structure*', to the nature of their program.

In addition, some 27 or 7.7% of responses referred to an inability to slot their programs under the existing six categories, thus making them ineligible to apply in the foreseeable future.

Some 23 or 6.6% of responses underlined the challenges related to the application process, including the length of time required to complete and submit. The amount of supporting documentation required was considered '*onerous*' and organizations lacked the resources to dedicate to the application process.

Some 22 or 6.3% of responses cited ethical reasons for not being likely to apply, as they did not wish to '*profit*' from gambling, preferring instead to stand in '*solidarity*' with those who were gambling addicts; or they simply did not feel comfortable being associated with gambling.

A combination of some 13 or 3.7% of responses named reasons including the need for more '*consistent and reliable funding*' and the fact that the CGG funding is not guaranteed. Others mentioned not being aware of the CGG funding source previously, so they might investigate its potential, while others said they did not know how to find out more about it or whether they would even be eligible.

TABLE 69: Q22A COMMENTS: WHY IS YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT LIKELY TO APPLY FOR COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING IN THE FUTURE?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Do Not Need Funding	No CGG funds are required.	**126/349**	**36.1%**
Do Not Meet CGG Guidelines Criteria	Organizations do not meet CGG financial and organizational guidelines criteria.	**120/349**	**34.4%**
Do Not Fit Into CGG Program Sectors	Organizations do not fit into the 6 funding sectors.	**27/349**	**7.7%**
Application Process	The application process is onerous	**23/349**	**6.6%**
Refuse CGG for Ethical Reasons	Organizations refuse CGG funding due to personal ethical beliefs.	**22/349**	**6.3%**
Other	Organizations either had no prior knowledge of the CGG program or find the funding inconsistent.	**13/349**	**3.7%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded	**29/349**	**8.3%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**349**	**-**

TABLE 70: Q22A COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Do Not Need Funding	*"Our activities are funded by memberships. We do not anticipate expanding our activities to an area requiring further income."*
	"We do not require funding via this avenue as we are adequately funded via membership dues and events we hold throughout the year."
	"We are currently self-funded through membership fees and course revenues."
Do Not Meet CGG Guidelines Criteria	*"Because we are ineligible due to our surplus cash reserves."*
	"Because we do not run a specific program which would qualify under the current guidelines."
	"We are ineligible to apply because of our board structure."
Do Not Fit Into CGG Program Sectors	*"Because our organization does not fall under one of the 6 areas of funding."*
	"Our activities do not fit directly into the existing categories - we would be happy to discuss this."
	"It does not appear that we fit well into any of the current 6 categories of eligible organizations."
Application Process	*"Funding applications are too long and complex and we do not have anyone on the board of directors that has the time to commit to this. We are a small working board and all of our energy goes into helping families […] we just don't have extra time to do the applications."*

	"The annual application process and the fact that revenue is never clear until late in the year makes it complicated and onerous."
	"The process is too demanding and lengthy. The application needs are too time consuming to collect."
Refuse CGG for Ethical Reasons	*"Out of solidarity with those battling gambling addiction, we choose not to tap into this funding stream, even though we would qualify and it would benefit us financially."*
	"We feel that gaming is wrong. In most cases, it takes advantage of people, and we would not wish to profit from that."
	"The funding is from gambling revenues and it is something that our organization is not comfortable with."
Other	*"We need consistent and reliable funding and I do not want to jeopardize the funding we have."*
	"We have only just learned of the existence of Community Gaming Grant funding programs and will be investigating our eligibility to apply for such funding to help support our activities."
	"We have no idea if we qualify or not, nor do we know how to access an application."

6.12. Why is your organization likely to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future? (Q22B)

Of all 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked Q21: "*How likely is your organization to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future?*", 828 indicated the middle selection on the 5-point scale ('3'), '4' (*Likely)* or '5 *Extremely Likely*' to apply for Community Gaming Grant (CGG) funding in the future.

Of those 828 respondents who were then asked Q22B "*Why is your organization likely to apply for Community Gaming Grant funding in the future?*" 754 provided feedback.

The most significant reason that was cited in 288 or 38.2% of responses was the fact that organizations needed the funds to sustain their organizations.

Over one-quarter (211 or 28.0%) of responses mentioned the need for funds to expand their programs and bring more awareness to their organization and benefit to their community.

Until now 123 or 16.3% of respondents indicated they had not been aware of the CGG program and would now look into submitting an application. Some mentioned they were already exploring new potential avenues for funding.

A further 120 or 15.9% of responses cited the need for additional funds to cover expenses for capital projects, equipment or building maintenance, as the associated costs were '*going up*'.

Some 19 or 2.5% of responses indicated an intention to apply, but they first needed to make some changes to areas like organizational structure or reserve fund levels to ensure eligibility.

TABLE 71: Q22B COMMENTS: WHY IS YOUR ORGANIZATION LIKELY TO APPLY FOR COMMUNITY GAMING GRANT FUNDING IN THE FUTURE?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Need Funding to Assist/Sustain Organization	Organizations require funds to sustain current projects/programs.	**288/754**	**38.2%**
Expand Program(s)/Project(s)	Organizations require funds to expand programs/projects.	**211/754**	**28.0%**
No Prior Knowledge, Will Apply Shortly	Organizations had no prior knowledge of the CGG program and will apply in the near future.	**123/754**	**16.3%**
Funds Needed for Capital Projects, etc.	Organizations require for capital projects, building repairs and equipment.	**120/754**	**15.9%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Will Apply After Changes	Organizations need to make changes to adhere to CGG guidelines before applying.	**19/754**	**2.5%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**15/754**	**2.0%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**754**	-

TABLE 72: Q22B COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Need Funding to Assist/Sustain Organization	*"Our organization may have more members in the future, as […] becomes increasingly more important in the communities; and aging citizens faced with depleting incomes and rising urban housing costs have to move to the rural and remote areas of BC."*
	"We have two annual projects that need more funding in order to continue."
	"We operate solely on program fees; in order to grow and provide more and better services. We will need the funding."
Expand Program(s)/Project(s)	*"To expand our programming and create additional programs and spaces for [children]."*
	"We could use the funding to put on more events and programs for the betterment of the community, plus bring awareness of [our organization]."
	"Our organization runs a number of [activities] for our community and having the ability to apply for grants will allow for this program to expand."
No Prior Knowledge, Will Apply Shortly	*"We are in the process of seeking out new funding partnerships. It seems we might be a good match under "Human and Social Services".*
	"We are always seeking sources of funding for our program. Now that we are aware of the possibility of a new source of funding we will investigate it further and apply."
	"We just found out that we are eligible for the grant and would like to apply for it so our members can benefit from it."
Funds Needed for Capital Projects, etc.	*"We have many projects which involve building maintenance. Our carpeting needs replacing which we believe will help to improve our air quality - some roofing work also needs to be done, upgrades to the bathrooms […] as well as door openers are also on the list to accommodate our [clients]."*
	"We would like to develop more support programs for our membership and volunteers. Also provide modern computers and office equipment rather than depend on donated outdated equipment."
	"Costs to operate and maintain the equipment, rents, and materials are continuing to go up every year and our membership has limited monetary resources."
Will Apply After	*"We have changed our organizational structure to be compliant. We would*

Changes

apply because we need the funding."

"We would like to move towards a fully eligible organization which would then also allow us to apply for grant."

"We are currently trying to get our reserve fund down to 50% of annual operating costs so that we are eligible."

6.13. Why did your organization not attend a regional in-person presentation or online webinar in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants Branch? (Q29)

Eight and a half percent (115) all the 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents indicated 'Yes', they were aware that in 2017 the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) branch hosted a series of regional in-person presentations and online webinars to provide opportunities for not-for-profit organizations across British Columbia to connect with Branch staff (Q26).

Those 115 respondents were then asked Q27: "*Did your organization attend one of the regional in-person presentations and/or online webinars hosted by the Community Gaming Grants branch in 2017?*" of which 81 indicated that they did not attend either opportunity.

Those 81 respondents were then asked Q29 '*Why did your organization not attend a regional in-person presentation or online webinar in 2017 with the Community Gaming Grants branch?*' of which 71 provided feedback.

Close to half of the 71 respondents (33 or 46.5%) indicated that they had either attended a session in the past and/or were not planning to or were not ready to submit an application in 2017.

Approaching one-third of respondents (21 or 29.6%) stated that the timing and location of presentations conflicted with their regular daytime work schedules. Volunteers were mainly available in the evenings. Others did not feel they had the right tools or knowledge to access an online webinar. Some also felt the distance required to travel was too far.

Just over one-quarter (19 or 26.8%) offered a combination of responses from poor communication about the opportunities, to them not seeing the meetings as relevant to them due to their organization or program's ineligibility for the CGG program.

TABLE 73: Q29 COMMENTS: WHY DID YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT ATTEND A REGIONAL IN-PERSON PRESENTATION OR ONLINE WEBINAR IN 2017 WITH THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS BRANCH?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Did Not Attend	Respondents either attended a past session and/or have no intentions of applying in 2017.	**33/71**	**46.5%**
Time/Schedule Conflict	Timing and location of presentations conflicted with respondents' schedule.	**21/71**	**29.6%**

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Other	Not Eligible, and/or had no prior knowledge of the meetings.	**19/71**	**26.8%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**71**	**-**

TABLE 74: Q29 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Did Not Attend	*"Was not planning on applying for funding in 2017."*
	"We were not intended to apply."
	"We are aware of the process and requirements through association with other applicants but were not ready to apply."
Time/Schedule Conflict	*"We are elderly, retired seniors who neither want to travel many miles to attend a presentation about a program that we may or may not need or use, nor are we very computer knowledgeable enough to be comfortable doing on line webinars."*
	"Because it was in [location] and held during the work day. Everyone from our volunteer organization has jobs during the day, so it was not conducive to anyone attending. Also, we found out about it via a post shared on Facebook. It is curious to me that notification was not sent to us via email, because clearly you have that information and it is more direct."
	"The time of the day, we were not able to get a board member that would be dealing with the grants, time to attend the meeting since it was middle of the day middle of the week. Was a hard time to attend."
Other	*"Unless the criteria are broadened there would be no purpose in going."*
	"By the time we heard about them it was too late."
	'As we do not fit the current guidelines for application we deemed it not useful."

6.14. You indicated that you disagree with the following statement: All eligible not-for-profit organizations in B.C. have fair and equitable access to gaming funds to support the delivery of programs that benefit their communities. Why does your organization not agree with this statement? (Q33)

Of all the 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents who were asked if "*all eligible not-for-profit organizations in B.C. have fair and equitable access to gaming funds to support the delivery of programs that benefit their communities*", 153 or 11.3% of them '*Disagreed*' or '*Strongly Disagreed*' with this statement. Those 153 respondents were then asked why they did not agree, and 147 commented (Q33).

Close to half (73 or 49.7%) of the 147 respondents felt the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) guidelines were too restrictive to allow all not-for-profit organizations fair and equitable access to gaming funds.

Respondents found the sector criteria too rigid, making their organizations ineligible; against a backdrop of delivering successful programs that benefited their communities. In addition, it was suggested that the definition of '*impact to the community*' could be broadened to allow organizations that provided services not only in B.C. but worldwide.

Twenty-two or 15.0% of the respondents believed favouritism occurred, making the gaming funds unfair and inequitable. Some respondents believed they were deemed ineligible because they provided services in particular sectors. Others believed specific organizations providing the same services in the same sector received more money than others.

Twenty or 13.6% of respondents believed smaller organizations did not have fair and equitable access to CGG funds. From the cumbersome application process, to the stringent organizational and financial requirements, smaller organizations found it difficult to compete with other larger organizations in accessing gaming funds.

A similar proportion of respondents (19 or 12.9%) pointed to a lack of information as well as insufficient engagement with organizations by CGG staff. Some respondents stated they had little knowledge of the CGG program. They felt a lack of public awareness led organizations to believe the CGG funds were earmarked exclusively for certain organizations, making it unfair to other not-for-profit groups.

Fourteen or 9.5% of respondents found the application process a barrier to fair and equitable access. Respondents found the CGG website convoluted and not user-friendly. Others found the application process too difficult.

TABLE 75: Q33 COMMENTS: YOU INDICATED THAT YOU DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT: ALL ELIGIBLE NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN B.C. HAVE FAIR AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO GAMING FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS THAT BENEFIT THEIR COMMUNITIES. WHY DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION NOT AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
CGG Guidelines	The requirements and limitations in CGG guidelines were a barrier to fair and equitable access.	**73/147**	**49.7%**
Perceived Bias	Respondents believed favouritism led to unfair grant funding.	**22/147**	**15.0%**
Size of Organization	Gaming grant process a barrier to smaller organizations and communities.	**20/147**	**13.6%**
Public Awareness	Limited to no information to encourage organizations to apply.	**19/147**	**12.9%**
Application Process	The application process (financial reports, online process, etc.) a barrier and deterrent for some respondents.	**14/147**	**9.5%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**8/147**	**5.4%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**147**	**-**

TABLE 76: Q33 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

CGG Guidelines	*"Our organization is a not-for-profit organization operating within B.C. We provide a benefit to our communities by […], however we are deemed not to be providing a benefit to our communities and are not eligible to apply for gaming grants."*
	"Because we are not for profit and provide programs at no cost but do not fit in any of the definitions of what organizations are eligible for grants. Although sports teams are eligible, physical activity programs are not - funding these types of programs can reduce medical costs and increase quality of life for the entire community not just a certain subset of ages of the community. If adults exhibit healthy behaviors, children are much more likely to carry on the healthy behaviour."
	"Because we don't meet the criteria of running organized programs, we don't qualify, yet we offer the same, if not more, benefit to our community and surrounding area in terms of access to physical activity and opportunities to volunteer. We also offer employment [opportunities] to students during [busy periods…]."
Perceived Bias	*"We believe our organization is not eligible. Gaming money seems to be sports focused."*
	"Some sports receive large amounts of money and other equally deserving sports do not

	receive an equitable amount. E.g. one club receives a large grant and another club a small grant for no observable reason..."
	"It appears that most funding goes to the Lower Mainland and not to smaller communities in the interior."
Size of Organization	*"Because small organizations like us don't have the capacity to collect, assemble and submit applications as most big organizations with enough resources and manpower. There are lots of small organizations doing amazing work, but the process and demanding nature of the application is a turn off for them."*
	"The program fails to accommodate the circumstances of small non-profits who are struggling to offer services in [more remote areas.]"
	"Again, the process is so challenging. The smaller the organization the fewer volunteers are available to take on the responsibility of applying. The general feeling from people I've spoken to over the years is that unless the application is perfectly written, your application will be denied. I personally have been successful in applying for gaming grant funds with a different organization and absolutely have no interest in pursuing this form of funding again. I'd rather hold a bottle drive or other fundraising event."
Public Awareness	*"We did not know about the gaming funds until last year - the […] year of our organization--and only by word of mouth from a member of a past-recipient group who was attending a grant funding seminar. All non-profit organizations in BC should be informed about this opportunity (and others) right from day 1 of their registration."*
	"I have heard next to nothing about your funding, so although your access may be fair, if needy groups don't know anything about funding opportunities, obviously those "in the know" will be receiving all the grants. If you have a program that is poorly promoted, eligibility is poorly explained (maybe give examples of eligible organizations), then access is not fair."
	"Lack of available public information. The feeling is that these are programs that are only available to those in the know. Most non-profits will probably have no idea they be eligible for support."
Application Process	*"When volunteer-run organizations have to take workshops and often several years of applications to restructure the way they operate in order to fit the gaming grant's funding model, I cannot consider it barrier free, fair and equitable. To date we have chosen not to make our lives so complicated in order to qualify for funding."*
	"The government standard website is a barrier to non-profit grant applicants. Circular links and cryptic language. "
	"We are simple people […] who work very hard to make our community better. We are all volunteers. Everything we do is for the benefit of our community. We are extremely pressed for time. It is very hard to understand the application forms and exactly what you are looking for in an answer."

6.15. What final suggestions for improvements, if any, does your organization have for the Community Gaming Grants program? (Q38)

Of the 1,353 Non-Applicant survey respondents asked '*what final suggestions for improvements, if any, does your organization have for the Community Gaming Grants programs*' 395 gave feedback.

One hundred and fifteen or 29.1% of respondents suggested a need for more awareness of the Community Gaming Grants (CGG) program and increased presence of the CGG staff. Many respondents mentioned this survey was the first time they had heard of the CGG program and wanted to know more with periodic e-mail reminders and updates. Some organizations recommended the CGG branch collaborate more with indigenous communities across the province.

Just over one-fifth or 21.8% of the respondents wanted more inclusive funding sectors and use of funds. Respondents indicated the need to broaden funding sectors such as sports to include recreational organizations. Other organizations wanted to narrow the restrictions on use of funds to allow for capital purchases or travel expenses for competitions.

Fifty-eight or 14.7% of respondents suggested improving the accessibility and level of difficulty of the application process. Some respondents suggested moving the application deadline to match the organization's fiscal year, thereby improving accuracy. Respondents from smaller organizations hoped for shorter and simpler applications due to the low level of funds requested. Other respondents underlined the difficulty in accessing information for certain groups lacking computer and/or internet access.

Thirty-five or 8.9% had no prior knowledge of the CGG programs and could not provide a comment/suggestion.

Thirty or 7.6% provided positive feedback towards the CGG branch. Respondents praised the CGG staff on their knowledge and assistance, and thanked the CGG branch for providing organizations with resources to make a positive change in the province.

Seventeen or 4.3% of the respondents commented on the demographic questions at the end of the survey. The survey concluded with the following questions. Q47 '*Which of the following economic development regions of British Columbia does your organization best fit?*' Q48 '*Is your organization a rural organization or an urban organization?*' Q50A '*Does your organization provide services primarily for First Nations and/or Indigenous peoples of British Columbia (including First Nations, Metis and Inuit)?*' Q50B '*Is your organization located on a reserve?*'

Respondents were confused by these questions and found them unfair. Other respondents found it difficult to answer the demographic related question on the region of service.

Respondents noted that they could not accurately answer these questions due to the limited response options.

Fourteen or 3.5% of respondents suggested an increase in funding maximums for certain sectors such as PAC and DPAC. Others suggested increasing funds to organizations, especially small groups that have demonstrated a serious need for financial assistance.

Some 11 or 2.8% respondents suggested that awarding of the grants should be more fair and equitable, with more transparent allocation of funds. Respondents were unsure what performance measures the CGG used to determine funding amounts, and hoped for an opportunity to review the amounts received by other organizations.

TABLE 77: Q38 COMMENTS: WHAT FINAL SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY, DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE FOR THE COMMUNITY GAMING GRANTS PROGRAM?

THEMES	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS
Increase Public Awareness of the CGG Program	More awareness of this grant in the community, website, advertisements, reminders.	**115/395**	**29.1%**
Expand Funding Sectors	Expansion of funding sectors and use of funds.	**86/395**	**21.8%**
Improve the Application Process	Application deadlines are a barrier for many organizations, the process is too long and complex for small organizations and some organizations face technical barriers completing the application.	**58/395**	**14.7%**
Reduce the CGG Knowledge Gap	Respondents declined to comment due to their lack of knowledge of the CGG program.	**35/395**	**8.9%**
Positive Feedback	Respondents were satisfied with current state of CGG programs and expressed gratitude.	**30/395**	**7.6%**
Demographic Questions	Respondents had an issue with the demographic related questions in the survey.	**17/395**	**4.3%**
Increase Funding	Increase the funding cap, Increase overall funding.	**14/395**	**3.5%**
Improve Funding Allocation	Fair, equitable and transparent allocation of funds.	**11/395**	**2.8%**
No Response	The responses could not be coded.	**49/395**	**12.4%**
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		**395**	**-**

TABLE 78: Q38 COMMENT EXAMPLES BY THEME

Public Awareness of the CGG Program	*"This is the first time, as far as we know, that we've been approached with respect to the grant program. Better communications with and more information about the grant program would be a big benefit."*
	"At the moment I am not sure what to recommend, other than more work to raise public awareness of the Community Gaming Grants program. I was surprised when another board member forwarded the email containing this survey, as I hadn't heard of these grants. Based on what I saw on the website, the grants are hugely beneficial to many communities all over B.C. which is wonderful."
	"Work collaboratively with aboriginal community. Invest in positive outcomes."
Expand Funding Sectors	*"Include non-competitive sports. Include events that may occur [less frequently]. Allow for capital purchase of equipment for regional and seasonal events."*
	"Broaden the sporting eligibility rules to allow non-competitive sports. […]."
	"As an organization supporting the development of sport in […] the province, restrictions on the use of gaming funds to support travel and things of this nature that allow athletes […]to get to competitions (particularly at high and elite levels) works against [us]."
Improve the Application Process	*"Please make the guidelines and application forms easier to understand. We are volunteers and not professional grant writers. The level of detail you require seems to be over the top in my humble opinion."*
	"For small organizations requesting small amounts, could not the application process be simplified?"
	"Information more accessible to seniors and indigenous people as most do not have computers or computer access."
Positive Feedback	*"We have heard great things about the Community Gaming Grants program, keep up the good work."*
	"In the past […] I accessed several BC Community Gaming Grants and found the staff of the Gaming Branch so very helpful and efficient. I hope to be working with them again."
	"It seems to be working well as is."
Reduce the CGG Knowledge Gap	*"I am unfamiliar with this program and am unaware of any contact that my organization has had with you. I will be interested to see how easy or difficult my [upcoming] application […] is to write, and how it is received. I will no doubt have more to say once I have more experience with it. Thanks."*
	"It's hard for us to offer constructive comment...we don't know about the program or its potential benefits in support of the work we undertake."
	"No suggestions at this time. This survey has made me more aware of the Community Gaming Grants program."
Increase Funding	*"Much more funding provided for major projects in some communities rather than gaming dollars going back to government…e.g. – social housing or non-profits sending in their 'major-project-wish list' for their community – requiring millions of dollars and draw from a hat for such.."*
	"We wish that those no profit organizations who do not have enough money to support their activities should be helped with open arms. We have a small community and can hardly do community works for the public with money. I hope to get your financial help."

Demographic Questions	*"Allow agencies to apply for full funding for programs and make the process less difficult to apply for funding."*
	"(Does your organization provide services primarily for First Nations and/or Indigenous peoples of British Columbia)? I believe this is an unfair question on your part, everyone here in our organization is equal no matter race/religion/color, and all people are treated with fairness and respect. I suggest that whoever thinks of these questions should consider that nobody is better or worse than anyone else. Also so some of the questions I answered Don't know/No response…it would be nice to have a comments section to explain why I do not know the answer to a specific question."
	"I don't know. To clarify, with respect to First Nations, we represent a great many Indigenous [people] and their work. […]."
	"Just an observation related to the last few questions, pertaining to demographics. I responded "don't know" to all of them, because we are a provincial organization reaching all BC citizens, regardless of their location or ethnicity."
Improve Funding Allocation	*"Be more transparent in the revenues raised and the funds distributed. This is a government coordinated program that does not have enough accountability to the public. Proceeds should not be used to fund other government programs."*
	"More transparency and more visibility in all aspects of these funding dollars."
	"Be more transparent in the revenues raised and the funds distributed. This is a government coordinated program that does not have enough accountability to the public. Proceeds should not be used to fund other government programs."

BC Stats is the provincial government's leader in statistical and economic research, information and analysis essential for evidence-based decision-making. BC Stats, the central statistics agency of government, is excited to be taking a lead role in the strategic understanding of data sources and analysis across government. The goal is to increase overall business intelligence—information decision makers can use. As part of this goal, BC Stats is also developing an organizational performance measurement program. For more information, please contact Elizabeth Vickery.

Box 9410 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 9V1

Web: www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca
Twitter: @BCStats
Email: BC.Stats@gov.bc.ca