



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT105218
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Fishermans Hall Development
Promoters Name:	Fishermans Hall Development Committee & Trustees
Address:	Fornaught, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford
Description:	The project is seeking funding for the refurbishment of the Fishermans Hall in Dunmore East. It will include the construction of a meeting room and associated kitchen, a store room, a unisex toilet and disable toilet along with connecting doors to the existing structure. The work will include upgrading the existing toilets, hall and creche at the north end of the building. Included shall be electrical and mechanical services to the extension and a new fire alarm installation for the complete building.
Theme:	Social Inclusion
Sub-theme:	Basic services targeted at hard to reach communities
Link to LDS	Objective 5, Strategic Action 5.1 - one of the villages included in the LDS lacking community facilities

Total Project Costs	€202,911.88		
Eligible Project Costs	€202,911.88		
Funding sought by promoter:	€152,183.91		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€152,183.91		
Details of private funding:	€50,727.97 Cash/Money in account		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Capital investment in basic upgrades to the Fishermans Hall in Dunmore East, the only community facility in the village		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 75%
	Refurbishment	€202,911.88	€152,183.91
Total Funding		€202,911.88	€152,183.91
Was an assessment completed?: Date: <u>4th May 2018</u>	Yes		
Are detailed costings provided for the	Yes, etendering used and QS report used to select tenderer		

project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	Not applicable
Innovative Element of the project:	It was agreed that the project is innovative in that it wishes to enhance the users experience by improving the facility for all users.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that deadweight is not an issue as without funding this project will not proceed.
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as funding is going towards supporting an existing community centre that services the needs of all the community. There is no alternative community facility in the village as the Fisherman's Hall was intended as the sole community facility when it was built and gifted to the fishermen and later the trustees
Economic justification for project:	The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for underpinning social inclusion initiatives in rural areas through investment in physical and human capital.
Average Score for Project:	82/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	75% Of €202,911.88, maximum grant of €152,183.91
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- - The project fits the Co Waterford Local Community Development Plan Local Objective 5 Strategic Action 5.1 for investment support into community service delivery hubs. - The promoters have the experience and capability to deliver the project successfully. - The Evaluation Committee agreed that funding this project is a good use of Rural Development funds as funding will support social inclusion by sustaining the hall and allow for the adapting needs of the growing community. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend this project as presented. A maximum of €152,183.91 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
NA	NA	€50,727.97	€9,576.56

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of the proposed project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
FLAG	15/05/18	John Hickey

Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project:-

- Claire Connors briefly outlined the project and the background of the Committee Members to the Evaluation Committee. The promoters applied at the very end of the previous LEADER programme but were not successful as the budget was exhausted. They also applied through an earlier Call but did not get through due to procurement rules. This time they have obtained the 5 tenders required.
- The Evaluation Committee discussed displacement noting that the other application for Carbally is less than 6km away. Ms Connors advised that Dunmore East was one of the locations identified as one of the villages needing a community hall. The other application is for the development of youth facilities.
- The Call sought both community & youth projects and only one application was received under each budget therefore there is no competition as they are both separate budgets.
- The Evaluation Committee were supportive of this project noting its ideal location and agreed that the promoters have the skills set and experience to deliver the project successfully.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project as presented.

A maximum of €152,183.91 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Amount Recommended: €152,183.91

75% of Eligible Project Funding: €202,911.88

Signed: _____

Signed: _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response

Signed: _____ Claire Connors _____

Dated: _____ 21 May '18 _____

WLP Project Officer

Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Date: 14th May 2018

Time: 11am to 2pm

Project Title: Fishermans Hall Development

Project Reference Number: 31LDRWAT106839

Assessment Criteria	Objective	Issues raised by Evaluation Committee	Weighting	Score
Compatibility with Local Development Strategy	Do the project proposals meet the criteria set out in the LAG business plan for the relevant measure?		Yes / No ☒	
Innovation	Is the product innovative in its nature and does it displace existing enterprises? - Product / Service 9/19 <u>9</u> - Displacement 5/19 <u>5</u> - Job Creation 5/19 <u>2</u>		19	16
Promoters experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver? - Standards of Operation 6/25 <u>6</u> - Track Record 6/25 <u>6</u> - Structure of Business 6/25 <u>4</u> - Necessary skills base 7/25 <u>4</u>		25	20
Financial Viability	Are the project costs justifiable (reasonableness of costs) and / is funding available to co-fund the project? - Overall Costs 7/25 <u>7</u> - Co Funding 6/25 <u>6</u> - Financial Plan 6/25 <u>4</u>		25	21

	- Deadweight	6/25	4.		
Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			13	10
Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			18	15
Total				100	82

N.B. Project must receive a minimum score of 65% prior to being recommended for approval.

- Has the potential level of deadweight been assessed for this project? YES / NO
- i.e. would the project proceed without LEADER funding? YES / NO

Recommendations of the Evaluation Committee: Approved

Signature: [Signature]

Signature of Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 14th May 2018,

Denise Walsh

From: pclerkin@cablesurf.com
Sent: Tuesday 5 June 2018 11:02
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Draft minutes May 14 2018

Dear Denise,

I confirm that I am in agreement with the Draft minutes attached for the Evaluation Committee Meeting held on 14th May 2018.

Paul Clerkin

