



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT616606
Project Type:	SA2.1 Capital Investment in existing & start up technology
Project Name:	Equipment Upgrade
Promoters Name:	Frank Seery Water Services Ltd
Address:	Cappagh, Cappoquin, Co. Waterford
Description:	The Business carries out contract water service works. Part of this involves removing and replacing water pumps at extremely low depths in the ground. This Trax Puller will remove the need for dangerous lifting by operatives of very heavy pumps set deep down in the earth
Theme:	L.O.2
Sub-theme:	Enterprise Development - SA2.1 Capital investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Link to LDS	L.O. 2, S.A. 2.1

Total Project Costs	The cost of this project is €14,797.24 and the promoter has requested funding of €7,398.62 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
Eligible Project Costs	€14,797.24		
Funding sought by promoter:	€7,398.62 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€7,398.62 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
Details of private funding:	€7,398.62 Cash/Money in account		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Purchase of PumpTrax Well Pump Puller, Packer Unit & Drive Tech for well drilling and water service company.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50 %
	Trax Puller & Parts	€5,398.37	
	Packer Unit	€3,000	
	Washington Rotating	€6,398.91	
		€14,797.28	€7,398.64 @50%
Total Funding			
Was an assessment completed?: Date: <u>09/05/2018</u>	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was		

	completed on the 9th May 2018 and following a review noted the following :- The project fits the Co Waterford Local Community Development Plan Local Objective 2 SA 2.1 for capital investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses The Evaluation Committee agreed that funding this project is a good use of Rural Development funds as funding will sustain existing jobs.
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the costs are reasonable as the Project Assessment report noted that Cat 2 Leader Specific Procurement Guidelines were followed.
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	The Promoter are supplied information that the equipment is extremely specialized.
Innovative Element of the project:	Funding this project will improve health and safety and improve efficiency.
Consideration of Deadweight:	Deadweight was not considered an issue by the Evaluation Committee
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement was not considered an issue by the Evaluation Committee
Economic justification for project:	Funding will help sustain employment and has the potential to create 1 new job in a rural area in West Waterford.
Average Score for Project:	73/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €7,398.62 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 1. The Evaluation Committee agreed that funding this project is a good use of Rural Development funds as funding will sustain existing jobs. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project as presented. - A maximum of €7,398.62 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1	6	Yes	No

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of the proposed project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed on behalf By
L.E.O.	24/08/2018	B. Kirby
Failte Ireland	24/08/2018	H. Creedon

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

- Mr Jimmy Taaffe advised that this project was evaluated and recommended for approval at the previous meeting. The amount recommend was below the minimum threshold of €5,000. The promoter wished to add the purchase of a Drive Tech to his application.

-

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

A maximum of €7,398.62 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Previous Meeting Discussion 14th May 2018

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

- The Evaluation Committee noted the length of time the promoter was in business and his experience. A discussion ensued on funding and if it was required as the business is in operation for over 50 years. On review of the 2016 accounts it was agreed that deadweight is not an issue and that funding is appropriate. The turnover is less than was expected and the creditors are extremely high.
- The Evaluation Committee considered the project viable and that the promoter has the skills and experience to successfully implement the project.
- Displacement was discussed and the other operators noted but it was agreed that there is enough work to support all.
- The Committee considered it a small investment to support existing employment of four and potentially creating one new job in a rural area.

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

- A maximum of €4,199.18 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €7,398.62	% of Eligible Project Funding: or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.
---	--

Signed: _____

Signed: _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response
---	---------------------------

Signed: _____

Dated: _____

WLP Project Officer

Please insert photos below of reference purposes:

(for example a photo of the building to be renovated/machinery being purchased, etc)

Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Date: 14th May 2018

Time: 11am to 2pm

Project Title: **Equipment Upgrade**

Project Reference Number: **31LDRWAT616606**

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>6</u> - Displacement 5/19 <u>3</u> - Job Creation 5/19 <u>2</u>		19	11
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>5</u> - Co Funding 6/25 <u>5</u> - Financial Plan 6/25 <u>4</u>		25	18

	-	Deadweight	6/25	4		
Sustainability		Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			13	12
Requirement		Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			18	12
Total					100	73

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: _____

4

Signature: 

Signature of Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 13.08.2018

Denise Walsh

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday 23 August 2018 11:34
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Re: August Minutes

Denise,

I am in agreement with draft minutes.

Regards

Paul Clerkin.

On 2018-08-22 15:49, Denise Walsh wrote:

Hi Paul,

Attached please find the amended minutes for you to review.

Thanks & Regards,

Denise Walsh

Administrator / Riarthóir

Waterford Leader Partnership CLG

Lismore Business Park,

Mayfield,

Lismore,

Co. Waterford.

Charities Regulatory Authority No.20070748

