



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT109880
Project Type:	Marketing
Project Name:	Rebranding Waterford & Suir Valley Railway
Promoters Name:	Waterford & Suir Valley Railway Company CLG
Address:	Kilmeaden Station, Kileaden, Co. Waterford
Description:	The project was already recommended for funding by the Evaluation Committee on the 27 th May however the promoter advised prior to LAT approval that the chosen supplier Totem had provided two options for the design and manufacture of the story board element and they have decided on the cheaper option 2 totaling €6,515 as opposed to the initial agreed option of €19,255.
Theme:	LO 1 Rural Tourism
Sub-theme:	SA1.2 Culture and Heritage Product Development
Link to LDS	Investment in preserving rural heritage and culture

Total Project Costs	€46,505		
Eligible Project Costs	€46,505		
Funding sought by promoter:	€23,252.50		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€23,252.50		
Details of private funding:	€23,252.50 Funds inhouse		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	The project is now celebrating 20 years in existence, from its humble beginning to preserving and promoting Waterford's rich railway heritage to incorporating the Greenway that passes through the station. The Board wants to invest in a completely new brand and image for the project to make it more attractive to an international audience and in line with the Ancient East's market segmentation		
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 %
	Marketing	€46,505	€23,252.50
		€46,505	€23,252.50

Total Funding			
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	Yes, 13 th May '19		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering used and the most economic advantageous tender process used to select the winning supplier		
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:	A highly professional marketing company will design and build the new brand for the project to bring it in line with current developments with the Greenway and Ireland Ancients East market segmentation. The results of which will strengthen other tourism products and lengthen the time a visitor will stay in the area		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter would not be in a position to carry out this project without Leader funding as confirmed in their application		
Consideration of Displacement:	This project is unique in that there is no other similar project of this kind in the South East and supporting this initiative will add value to the existing tourism offering		
Economic justification for project:	The rebranding of the Waterford & Suir Valley Railway will portray the company in a more professional way so that it can attract national and international visitors to Waterford and the wider South East. It will also provide a unique rest point on the Greenway, adding value to same		
Average Score for Project:	81/100		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €23,252.50 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed that are happy to recommend the requested change. Noting that the original rationale for funding and scoring shall remain in place. Recommendation: A maximum of €23,252.50 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1	6	€23,252.50 Funds inhouse	Not in the last 3 years

Confirmation that agencies / communities have confirmed that there is no double funding or duplication of activity.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Failte Ireland	8/5/19	Emer Whittle
LEO	9/5/19	Brid Kirby

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

- Ms Claire Connors advised that there was a slight issue with one of the tenders that came to light at article 48 check. The quotation provided for two options for the storey boards. Originally the promoter chose Option 1 for €19,255 the more expensive option as opposed to Option 2 for €6,515. They now wish to change to the cheaper option. Going with the more expensive option would require more tenders to be obtained as it exceeds the threshold. This changes the amount of grant aid allocated from €29,622.50 to €23,252.50.
- A Committee Member queried if this will have any adverse effect on the marketing strategy? Ms Connors confirmed that it will not as it is only one element across a whole range of elements planned.

The Evaluation Committee agreed that are happy to recommend the requested change. Noting that the original rationale and scoring shall remain in place.

The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC as presented.

A maximum of €23,252.50 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €23,252.50

50 % of Eligible Project Funding: €46,505

Signed: _____

Signed: _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response

Signed: Claire Connors

Dated: 2nd Oct '19

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: 27th May 2019

Time: 11am to 3pm

Project Title: Rebranding Waterford & Suir Valley Railway

Project Reference Number: 31LDRWAT109880

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>4</u> - Displacement 5/19 <u>3</u> - Job Creation 5/19 <u>3</u>		19	15
Promoters experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver? - Standards of Operation 6/25 <u>5</u> - Track Record 6/25 <u>5</u> - Structure of Business 6/25 <u>5</u> - Necessary skills base 7/25 <u>5</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>5</u> - Financial Plan 6/25 <u>5</u>		25	22

	Deadweight	6/25	5		
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	14
Total				100	81

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: 27/04/2018

Denise Walsh

From: pclerkin@cablesurf.com
Sent: Thursday 3 October 2019 17:23
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Evaluation Committee Meeting on 26th September 2019

Hi Denise

I confirm that I am in agreement with the draft minutes of the above meeting.

Regards,

Paul Clerkin
Chairperson
Evaluation Committee

