



Minutes of the Waterford LAG Meeting
Thursday 9th January 2020, Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Dungarvan at 11.00 a.m.

Present: **Non Public Sector:** **Public Sector**

1. Gabriel Foley	PPN / Environment	1. Cllr. J. Pratt Chair	Mayor, Elected Rep
2. Jimmy Taaffe	CEO – WLP CLG	2. Cllr. Lola O’Sullivan Vice Chair	Elected Representative
3. Richie Grant	CEO – Waterford Area Partnership	3. Michael Walsh	CE, WC&CC
4. Richard Awosika	PPN / Community & Voluntary	4. Kevin Lewis	CEO WWETB
5. Catherine Quinlan	I.C.M.S.A.	5. Liam Daly	Reg. Mgr. Dept Social Protection
6. Jenny Beresford	CEO Dungarvan & West Waterford Chamber	6. Julie Somers	CYSP Coordinator
7. Senan Cooke	PPN / Community & Voluntary	7. Derval Howley	Head of Wellbeing HSE
8. Gerald Hurley	CEO Waterford City Chamber		
Apologies:			
1. Maggie Flanagan	PPN / Community & Voluntary	1. Cllr. Adam Wyse	Elected representative
2. Heather Kiely	PPN/Social Inclusion	2. Richie Walsh	Head of LEO

Staff Present: D. Tuohy Chief Officer, K Moynihan SO, Ivan Grimes, Director of Serv, E. Hickey SO, E Smyth A.SO,

1.Total current Membership	19
2.Total attendees	15
3. Quorum % required (50% of 1 above)	Achieved – 79%
4. non-public/public ratio attendees % ratio non-public/public attendees	8 non-public : 7 public 53% non-public: 47% public

- 1. Confirmation of Quorum:** Having reviewed the attendance record, Chief Officer D. Tuohy confirmed that a quorum was achieved. Non-public 8: Public 7; 15 members in attendance.
The Chair Mayor John Pratt opened the meeting.

2. Apologies

As per table above, apologies were noted.

3. Conflict of Interest

- (i) Chief Officer, D. Tuohy confirmed that the 2020 COI declaration and register of interest forms for those attending the meeting were completed.
- (ii) D. Tuohy outlined the provisions of Section 5.4 of the LEADER Operating Rules (v2.0) and reminded members of their obligations therein. He reminded members to consider whether a conflict of interest could arise on receipt of the notice of meeting and agenda items. He requested members to contact him in advance of the meetings following reviewing the Agenda and associated documentation should a COI arise.
- (iii) In relation to items on the meeting agenda, relevant documentation had been circulated. Jenny Beresford (non-public sector) declared a conflict of interest for Item 8(iv) 31LDRWAT111374 Legacy Irish Cider. Michael Walsh (Public Sector) volunteered to step down from decision making in order to facilitate the representational balance for the quorum.

Agreed

4. Confirmation of Minutes of LCDC Meeting held on December 12th 2019.

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: J. Somers
Abstentions: N/A	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

5. Matters arising: No matters arising - Noted

6. Circulars:

No: 15 – 2019 Extension of the current open call for the LEADER food initiative
Don Tuohy synthesised the main provisions therein.
No questions arose.
Noted.

7. Expressions of interest: - N/A

8. Rural Development Programme.

Projects for consideration (Evaluation committee decision sheets, and score records as circulated on the extranet): Mr. J. Taaffe C.E.O. WLP summarised the main points and background of all projects detailed below for the members.

8(a) (i) Appeal update: Redevelopment and improvement works to Ballysaggart Community Hall 31LDRWAT110668

Decision of Evaluation Committee 6 January 2020

Project ID	31LDRWAT110668
Project Type:	Social Inclusion, Local Objective 5
Project Name:	Extension and Renovation Works including Wastewater Treatment System to Ballysaggart Community Centre
Promoters Name:	Ballysaggart Community Centre Ltd
Address:	Feagarid, Ballysaggart, Lismore, Co. Waterford, P51 VK80
Description:	This project involves an extension to and renovation of an old school house into a meeting centre and venue for social activities.
Theme:	LO5 Basic Service
Sub-theme:	SA 5.1 Community service delivery hubs
Link to LDS	LO 5, S.A. 5.1

Total Project Costs	€290,804.03		
Eligible Project Costs	€290,804.03		
Funding sought by promoter:	The cost of this project is €290,804.03 and the promoter has requested funding of €200,000.00 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	Not Recommended. Now on Appeal		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€0		
Details of private funding:	Cash/Money in account 40,000 12.8% Loan/Bridging Finance 214,000 (50,804.03) 73.6%		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	This project involves an extension to and renovation of an old school house into a meeting centre and venue for social activities.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ %
	Construction	€290,804.02	€0
Total Funding			

		€290,804.02	€0
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 11 th Sept 2019		
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 project assessment was completed on the 11 th Sept 2019		
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 Procurement Process was properly conducted, and the process was totally in order.		
Innovative Element of the project:	It was agreed that the idea is innovative, but the Evaluation Committee agreed there is duplication with the other hall.		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Project will not proceed without Grant Aid		
Consideration of Displacement:	The Evaluation Committee considered displacement an issue.		
Economic justification for project:	The Evaluation Committee did not consider this project good value for investment.		
Average Score for Project:	After achieving an overall score of 56 out of 100, the Evaluation Committee agreed that they are not recommending this project for approval to the Board of Waterford LCDC. As it did not receive the minimum score of 65% required it was not ranked.		
% level of aid & ceiling:	0%		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project based on their previous review. The original rationale and scoring will remain in place. 1. A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
None	None	Cash/Money in account 40,000 12.8% Loan/Bridging Finance 214,000 (50,804.03) 73.6%	Yes, 2010 Training

Confirmation that agencies / communities are not double funding or duplicating on this project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford LEO	02/10/2019	B Kirby

Detail of Discussion:	The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: - - Mr Jimmy Taaffe advised that the promoters Ballysaggart Community Development Co CLG sent correspondence dated 16th Nov 2019 to the LCDC seeking a review of the decision not to fund the project. He noted that his original recommendation to the Evaluation Committee not to fund the project stands as there are two issues 1) The population of just over 300 will struggle to fund two halls and 2) The second building is located just over a mile outside the village. It is up to the Evaluation Committee following review of the correspondence to decide on their recommendation to the LCDC. - A discussion ensued on the problems being experienced by the Sports Hall which is in serious financial trouble due to an error with the roof and is currently at a standstill. - Mr Jimmy Taaffe advised that during the appeal on the Sports Hall the Department Inspector also visited the proposed community hall, as it was mentioned in the documentation, to see where it was located. - The ideal solution for the community is one hall in the centre of the village for use by all. It could have been built onto the side of the Sports Hall. The example of Ballymacarby was given as a successful example of the combined Sports and Community Hall. Funding was received from Lotto for the sports section and from LEADER for the community section. - The consensus of the Evaluation Committee is that they agree with their original recommendation as they do not consider the project viable. They do not believe a community of that size can support two halls and they have serious doubts about the project funding and the removal of supervision from a project of that scale. - The Evaluation Committee expressed the opinion that a lot of the content of the letter did not relate to them. They refuted the suggestion that they were confused between both projects noting that each proposal was reviewed separately as a business proposal with supporting documentation and that they made their recommendation not to fund based on that. All recommendations are based on logic and facts and not emotion and have to be stood over for years afterwards. - From the correspondence circulated there was no new additional information for them to consider therefore the original recommendation not to fund the project remains. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project and that the original rationale and scoring remain. - A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.
Was an assessment completed?	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 11th Sept 2019

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 promoters followed Category 1 national procurement guidelines.		
Innovative Element of project:	It was agreed that the idea is innovative, but the Evaluation Committee agreed there is duplication with the other hall.		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that deadweight is not an issue as without funding this project will not proceed.		
Consideration of Displacement:	The Evaluation Committee considered displacement an issue.		
Economic justification for the project:	The Evaluation Committee did not consider this project good value for investment.		
Average Score for Project:	After achieving an overall score of 56 out of 100, the Evaluation Committee agreed that they are not recommending this project for approval to the Board of Waterford LCDC. As it did not receive the minimum score of 65% required it was not ranked.		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
Proposed by:	Gerry Cummins		
Seconded by:	Ray McAndrew		
Agreed by:	Paul Clerkin		
Recommendation to the LAG:	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project based on their previous review. The original rationale and scoring will remain in place. A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.		
<table> <tr> <td>Amount Recommended:€0</td><td>0 % of Eligible Project Funding:</td></tr> </table>		Amount Recommended:€0	0 % of Eligible Project Funding:
Amount Recommended:€0	0 % of Eligible Project Funding:		

D. Tuohy advised that it was important for the members to take into consideration the reasons for the appeal as outlined by the Appellant and included on the extranet for LAG consideration. He synopsised the appeal as follows:

- *The appellants were of the opinion that the IEC/LCDC had a bias towards funding a sports hall with a community element*
- *They disputed IEC/LCDC concern re adequate funding*
- *Disputed IEC/LCDC concern re removal of supervision element*
- *Disputed IEC/LCDC's view that issue of location a mile from village would be an issue*
- *Disputed IEC/LCDC's concern re lack of parking*
- *Disputed IEC/LCDC's concern re Value for Money of project*

J. Taaffe confirmed that subsequent to the December LAG meeting, the Independent Evaluation Committee reviewed the appeal at a meeting held on Monday 6th January. The recommendation not to fund the project remained unchanged. The LAG agreed with the IEC opinion that the project did not provide good value for investment. They do not believe that a community with a population of just over 300 can support two halls; they also have reservations about the financial viability of the project and the sustainability of the project.

The LAG members agreed not to fund the project. D. Tuohy confirmed the group have the right of appeal to the Department.

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: D. Howley
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: YES	FUNDING NOT APPROVED

**Item 8(ii) 31LDRWAT110720 Fiddown Union of Parishes – Restoration of Clonegam Church
Decision of Evaluation Committee**

Project ID	31LDRWAT110720
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Restoration of Clonegam Church, Portlaw
Promoters Name:	Fiddown Union of Parishes
Address:	Clonegam, Portlaw, Co. Waterford
Description:	Preservation of Clonegam Church will ensure that the valuable relics contained within, will be protected from the elements and shared with visitors as part of Portlaw's heritage experience
Theme:	LO1 Rural Tourism
Sub-theme:	SA1.2 Culture & Heritage Product Development
Link to LDS	

Total Project Costs	€47,670
Eligible Project Costs	€47,670
Funding sought by promoter:	€35,752.50
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	Previously Deferred
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€35,752.50
Details of private funding:	€11,917.50
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No
Synopsis of project:	To carry out essential weather proofing to the protected Clonegam

	Church in Portlaw in order to bring cultural visitors to view the relics contained within and add to the tourism offering in Portlaw		
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%
Total Funding	Restoration work	€47,670	€35,752.50
		€47,670	€35,752.50
Was an assessment completed?: Date: <u>27/08/19</u>	Yes		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering was used and the contractor chosen on the lowest value tender		
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. Five contractors submitted prices as per National procurement Guidelines		
Innovative Element of the project:	The building contains some priceless relics that will hugely appeal to the culturally curious particularly one monument which dates from 1873 dedicated to Florence Grosvenor Rowley, wife of the fifth marquis of Waterford. The marchioness died in 1873 during childbirth and her grief-stricken husband commissioned the monument, designed by an eminent Austrian artist. The monument is in Kilkenny marble and sits cleverly in a wall niche, lit by a skylight in the roof above		
Consideration of Deadweight:	Promoter would not be in a position to carry out this essential works without access to grant support		
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as the support of the church will add to the visitor experience in Portlaw		
Economic justification for project:	The project will attract visitor groups by appointment and will add value to the existing visitor experience of Portlaw as a heritage village. The village has a small number of grocery shops, butchers and a café that will benefit greatly from the additional footfall.		
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 75/100 (1)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% 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:-		

	2. The project scored 75/100 3. The project fits the Co Waterford Local Development Strategy for Cultural Tourism. A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser
--	---

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
0	0	€11,917.50 in house	€0

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of the proposed project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Local Enterprise Office	5/9/19	Brid Kirby
Faillte Ireland	12/9/19	Sarah Fitzpatrick

The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project on the 6.12.19: -

- Ms Claire Connors advised that the promoter's response was circulated by email to the Evaluation Committee.
- The Evaluation Committee noted that they still had doubts about the project as it has no lease in place and the committee membership is limited.
- Ms Claire Connors advised that the lease is in motion and will be in place shortly and that the promoters have widened the membership and included the Portlaw Heritage Group as requested. The new Committee will be called The Friends of Clonagam.
- The Committee said that they were not happy with the Committee as it's mostly representatives of the Church body. It was noted that it does not look like a community group and that it should have a broader representation.
- Ms Connors advised that originally the promoters were asked to have representatives of the Portlaw Heritage Group on the Committee which they have now done. Both Mr Gerard Crotty and Mr Alan Walsh are members of the Portlaw Heritage. Mr Alan Walsh is a member of the elected committee and Mr Gerard Walsh will be a committee member.
- Ms Connor said that other groups are not there and that it is proving awfully difficult in Portlaw to get people involved in community projects. It is planned to hold capacity building training in the New Year.
- The Evaluation Committee stated that the memberships should be more weighted to the Portlaw Heritage Group rather than the Church representatives but agreed that the Committee as stated will be the main drivers of the project and responsible for getting it done.
- When responding to the Promoters, we must be clear about our requirements as they have already done as asked by adding members from the Portlaw Heritage group said Ms. Connors
- The Evaluation Committee expressed the opinion that it is a worthwhile project, and one they would like to support, but referenced other projects where they insisted on a community group being the promoters. The Red Hall in Lismore being a very successful example and it is being

widely used.

- A general discussion ensued on committees and if they are considered a formal entity. It was confirmed that they are not but that the rules allow the funding of a formalised committee group.
- Given the lack of community groups in Portlaw the Committee queried if what they were looking for was attainable in this instance? Mr Jimmy Taaffe said that there is other groups such as the Tidy Towns and that other members could be obtained.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding the project with the following conditions: -
 - The Lease must be in place prior to payment.
 - A fairer balance of membership must be obtained by adding a minimum of two members from the Portlaw Heritage Group or from a local Community group.

A maximum of €35,752.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser for the following reasons: -

- **The project scored 75/100**
- **The project fits the Co Waterford Local Development Strategy for Cultural Tourism.**

Previous Evaluation on the 11.10.19

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

- Ms Claire Connors advised that the promoters have reverted by email noting that they can see the Evaluation Committees point about being vested in the community. They are proposing that for phase two of the project a separate committee called Friends of Clonagam Committee will be set up consisting of two members from the church, two members from Curraghmore and two members from the Heritage Group.
- For phase one this application it is only about making the premises weather tight and secure the heritage contained within. The new arrangement will be put in place for phase two which will be about providing the services, lighting, heating, etc and opening as a tourist facility.
- It was confirmed that the building belongs to the Church of Ireland and not Curraghmore.
- The Evaluation Committee noted that their concern was how to ensure that the community benefited from funding. Citing the Red Hall in Lismore as an example of where the premises were vested in the community and how successful this has been. It is currently being used for lots of different activities.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed the project has huge potential and is well worth preserving.
- A discussion ensued and it was agreed that a precedent has been set whereby all similar type projects had to be invested in the community and that they don't see how they could make an exception for this one. To date only projects invested in the community has been funded to ensure that they are open to all comers.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to defer this project to see if the promoters will accelerate the formation of the Friends of Clonagam Committee saying that funding can only go to non-denominational organisation that includes people from the Portlaw Heritage Group and the Local Community.

Amount Recommended: €35,752.50	75% of Eligible Project Funding: €47,670
---------------------------------------	---

The LAG members noted the report and accepted the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to fund the project.

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: S. Cooke
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

Item 8 (iii) 31LDRWAT111426 Glasha Hydro Project – EIAR Report

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT111426
Project Type:	Analysis and Development
Project Name:	Glasla Hydro Project – EIAR Report
Promoters Name:	Hydrotricity Limited
Address:	Glen, Kilsheelan, Clonmel, Co. Tipperary
Description:	While the promoters received grant approval under the RD Programme 2014-2020 for the capital costs associated with the implementation of a small hydro project on the River Glasla, a number of judicial reviews were undertaken querying the grid connection and lack of planning for same. As a result, the promoters have been advised to apply for planning permission again to include a grid connection and due to a new EU Directive require the completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) which is what is now been applied for in this application under analysis and development
Theme:	LO9 Rural Environment
Sub-theme:	SA9.1 Development of renewable energy
Link to LDS	Promotion of small hydro schemes in County Waterford

Total Project Costs	€24,000
Eligible Project Costs	€24,000
Funding sought by promoter:	€18,000
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€18,000
Details of private funding:	€6,000 in house funds
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No
Synopsis of project:	Funding of an EIAR report as a recent requirement for a new

	revised planning application for the capital works under analysis and development		
	EIAR Report	€24,000	€18,000
		€24,000	€18,000
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	4 th October 2019		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering was used to invite the consultants and a scoring matrix and weighting used to select the chosen 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. Three quotations received		
Innovative Element of the project:	The funding will produce a detailed EIAR report which will certainly help towards a successful planning application that cannot be further queried		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter's own funds are tied up in the capital costs associated with the bigger works projects and therefore need the funding to carry out this study		
Consideration of Displacement:	While there are a number of hydro projects in the Munster area, each project stands on its own merit and serves the local area		
Economic justification for project:	The EIAR report is a requirement under a new EU directive for a new planning application for a hydro project or similar		
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 83 /100 (1)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €18,000.00 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 4. The project scored 83 /100 5. This project fits in with the Co Waterford LDS for Rural Environment type projects. A maximum of €18,000.00 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
0	0	€6,000	€0

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of	Date of	Signed By
---	----------------	------------------

the proposed project.	Confirmation	
LEO (for previous capital project)	13 April '17	Brid Kirby
Failte Ireland	6 April '17	Sarah Fitzpatrick

The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project on the 6.12.19: -

- Ms Claire Connors noted that the Evaluation Committee are all familiar with the promoter as they were previously allocated funding over two years ago for a Hydro project. They have been having a difficult time of it; with judicial reviews as their nearest neighbours have been objecting to the project.
- While granted planning permission originally the laws have change since approval and a separate application must be made for connection to the grid. As part of this application an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) is required. The promoters are requesting funding under analysis and development for this report.
- They have a further judicial review in the New Year and hopefully this report will get them across the line.
- A Committee Member said that there is a high-risk element to this project. Ms Connors replied that it will help the promoters in their judicial review as they must abide by the new EU directives. They hadn't applied previously for a separate grid connection planning application.
- The Committee discussed the possible objections the neighbours might have but it was advised that only the objection to the technicality is known.
- The Committee agreed that it is not a huge amount of money to be supportive of the promoters.
- The Committee said that by funding this project does not mean a guarantee of funding for the Hydro project as that will be a separate application possibly under a new programme.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project with the following conditions: -

- Funding the technical assistance part of this project does not guarantee that additional funds will be granted for the overall project. That will be a new application and subject to evaluation and funding being available.

Recommendation: A maximum of €18,000.00 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser. For the following reasons:-

- The project scored 83 /100
- This project fits in with the Co Waterford LDS for Rural Environment type projects.

Amount Recommended: €18,000	75% of Eligible Project Funding: €24,000
------------------------------------	---

The LAG members noted the report and accepted the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to fund the project.

Proposed: D. Howley	Seconded by: G. Hurley
Abstentions: None	

Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved
----------------------	----------

Item (iv) Legacy Irish Cider – Marketing Activity

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT111374
Project Type:	Marketing
Project Name:	Legacy Irish Cider Marketing Activity 2020
Promoters Name:	Legacy Irish Cider
Address:	85 Springfield, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford. X35XE37
Description:	The project is pursuing a strong marketing campaign targeting current and prospective consumers and trade customers incorporating new brand and promotional material that will help sustain the business in the long term using innovative marketing methods and tools.
Theme:	LO2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	Leader Food Initiative
Link to LDS	Supporting the role of rural artisan food and beverage producers

Total Project Costs	€43,040		
Eligible Project Costs	€43,040		
Funding sought by promoter:	€21,520		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€21,520		
Details of private funding:	€21,520 loan		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Marketing support to further develop this beverage business by growing the number of trade customers and consumers		
Detail exactly what WLP will be	Detail	Total Cost	Grant Aid recommend by

funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)		(Expenditure)	the Evaluation Committee @ 50 %
	Marketing campaign	€43,040	€21,520
Total Funding		€43,040	€21,520
Was an assessment completed?: Date: 8/11/19 _____	Yes		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering was used and a scoring matrix used to select the chosen tenderer		
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 sought 5 quotations but could only get 4 quotes which is sufficient as the effort was made to obtain the required number		
Innovative Element of the project:	The promoter is growing his business through contract work having taken on two customers for the outsourcing of their production given the consumer market is quite localized. He is also looking at new product development and this new branding will portray a consistent and fresh look to the consumer		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter is dependent on this funding to develop further and without will remain at the same level		
Consideration of Displacement:	There are no other local craft cideries apart from those listed in the application form under Q11. The nearest being in Cork.		
Economic justification for project:	This marketing campaign will help to grow his business by increasing trade customers and general consumers and potentially increase employment opportunities		
Average Score for Project:	82/100 (2)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	€21,520.00 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:- 6. The project scored 82/100 7. Funding this project will assist the promoter to further develop his business and help make it more sustainable. A maximum of €21,520.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
.5	3	€21,520 loan	€34,223

Confirmation that agencies / communities are supportive of the proposed project.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Local Enterprise Office	11/11/19	Brid Kirby

Detail of Discussion on the 6.12.19: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- Ms Claire Connors advised that the promoter was funded previously but could not draw down the marketing element as he wanted to change what was originally proposed. The marketplace is much more competitive than originally thought and they are finding that the market for craft beers is getting quite saturated. They have changed their strategy accordingly and will now be concentrating on more local markets.
- They have subcontracted out the marketing element and will target current and prospective consumers and trade customers through a digital marketing strategy, trade marketing, product extension cohesive branding and consumer display marketing.
- The promoter successfully delivered all other aspects of the previous project which was mainly capital investment.
- The Evaluation Committee noted that it is a very well-presented marketing plan.
- It was noted that the accounts provided were in draft format. Ms Claire Connors circulated a copy of the approved 2018 accounts for review.
- A discussion ensued on the level of debts and Ms Connors advised that the promoter has agreed a 10-year loan with the AIB to consolidate all short-term loans.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoter has secured some very good contracts.
- It was agreed that the promoter is adapting to change and has the capability and track record to successfully implement the project.

The Evaluation Committee recommended a maximum of €21,520.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure whichever is the lesser.

Amount Recommended: €21,520	50% of Eligible Project Funding: €43,040
------------------------------------	---

The LAG members noted the report and accepted the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to fund the project.

Proposed: D. Howley	Seconded by: S. Cooke
Abstentions: J. Beresford non-public, M. Walsh Public	Revised: Non- Public 7 : Public 6
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

8 (v) 31LDRWAT 111375 West Waterford Festival of Food 11

J. Taaffe confirmed that the procurement process had not concluded, therefore consideration of the project is required to be deferred to the February meeting. A member referred to timelines and queried if a delay would impact on the project financially. In response, J. Taaffe confirmed that the organisers

were aware of the procurement requirement and were addressing same. If the project is approved, the onus is on the LAG to ensure a letter of offer is issued within timelines and subject also to a valid and complete application being submitted in a timely manner. Timelines would be noted in communication with the promoters and in dealing with the application.

DEFERRED

Item 8 (vi) 31LDRWAT111377 Hickey Fabrication Services Ltd – DS New Machinery

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT111377
Project Type:	Enterprise Development
Project Name:	New Machinery
Promoters Name:	Hickey Fabrication Services Ltd
Address:	Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
Description:	The applicant is a light engineering works employing 24 people. They are investing in a CNC Plasma Cutter to ensure that they maintain competitiveness in their markets, and reduce turnaround time, waste and increase product quality, thus sustaining jobs.
Theme:	Local Objective 2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	Strategic Action 2.1 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	€48,750.00
Eligible Project Costs	€48,750.00
Funding sought by promoter:	The cost of the project is €48,750.00 and the promoter has requested funding of €24,875.00 or 50 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€24,875.00 or 50 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
Details of private funding:	Cash on account - €24,875.00
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	None
Synopsis of project:	Purchase of a CNC Plasma Cutter. This machine will link to the Company's computer aided design system to facilitate pin point accuracy in terms of measurement to ensure a quality finish on all

	products.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report) Total Funding	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	CNC Plasma Cutter	€49,750.00	€24,875.00
		€49,750	€24,875.00
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 20 th November 2019.		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Category 2 LEADER Specific Procurement guidelines were followed so costs were deemed reasonable. The applicants obtained the correct number of quotations under the LEADER Guidelines, and they chose the Most Economically Advantageous Tender(M.E.A.T.)		
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	N/A Full quotations obtained.		
Innovative Element of the project:	Funding this project will enable the promoters to cut heavier material and complete work in-house that they had to outsource previously. As a result, this will allow the promoters the opportunity to seek new customers and in turn also increase employment.		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project would not proceed on the same scale without funding.		
Consideration of Displacement:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that displacement is not an issue the promoters have their own niche areas and customers.		
Economic justification for project:	Funding will help sustain current employment and if the promoters are successful in obtaining new contracts will create two new jobs.		
Average Score for Project:	81/100 (1)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	€24,875.00 or 50 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	- The project scored 81/100 - This was considered a good use of Rural Development Funding as creating and sustaining employment is one of the main criteria of the programme. - The promoters were considered to have the skills and expertise to successfully implement the project and sustain the business into the future.		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
---------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

2	24	Yes	2019 - €47,500

Confirmation by the agencies / communities that there is no duplication of funding or receipt of funding from them.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
	21/11/2019	B. Kirby

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

- Mr Jimmy Taaffe briefly outlined the promoter's, Hickey Fabrication Services Ltd, background to the Evaluation Committee noting that they have been in operation since 2001. They are a leading Engineering and Fabrication company that provide design, manufacturing and installation of an extensive range of stainless-steel products.
- They propose to purchase a new Plasma cutter for their workshop in Kilmacthomas. Obtaining this new machine will increase productivity and decrease lead time on projects. Over the years they have built up a wide range of varied and increasingly complex products for both residential and commercial customers, incorporating steel, glass and wood as integral materials into their projects.
- Mr Jimmy Taaffe advised that promoter is a very good operator and has the matching finance available.
- The Evaluation Committee agree that the promoters have the skills and expertise and are committed to growing the business.
- A Committee Member agreed to recommend funding as it will create an additional two jobs in a rural area.

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

A maximum of €24,875.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €24,875.00	% of Eligible Project Funding: 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.
--	---

The LAG members noted the report and accepted the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to fund the project. They welcomed the increase in jobs generated.

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: J. Taaffe
Abstentions:	
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

Financials

Item (iiv) Projects: 1st September– 31st December 2019 income and expenditure

D. Tuohy commented that the control documents circulated followed on from the reconciliation noted at the September meeting:-

- Financial Management system (Agresso) report summary indicating payment of €2,620,086 to promoters under the programme as at 31st December 2019
- Extract from the Pobal CRM system indicating details of the project payments from 1.09.2019 – 31.12.2019 and the reconciliation with the above figure to end December.

(iiiv) Administration: income and expenditure report to 31.12.2019

Members reviewed the:

- Financial Management system summary reports indicating the receipts from the Department as at 31.12.2019, which included monthly return claims received to October 2019 (€1,132,784.94) and the payments made as at 31st December 2019 (€1,288,174.59).

Chief Officer D. Tuohy confirmed to the members that the documents presented outline in a transparent manner how the LAG element of LEADER funding is managed and accounted for. No further questions arose. **NOTED**

10 **Reports from sub-committees:** N/A

11 **Correspondence** Correspondence was dealt with as part of Agenda items 8(i) above.

12 **A.O.B.**

(i) For approval: Project extension request:

The Warehouse -2B Climbing Limited 31LDRWAT109889

J. Taaffe informed the members that this project is going ahead. The premises intended for use was leased by others, resulting in a consequent delay. However, they have now secured a premises and the project will be placed for consideration at the February meeting. A one month extension was requested.

Proposed: Cllr. L. O’Sullivan	Seconded by: J. Somers
Abstentions: None	Revised: Non- Public 8 : Public 7
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

(ii) Kevin Lewis CE Waterford and Wexford Education and Training Board, advised the members he was standing down from the committee due to conflicting management meetings planned for year ahead coinciding with the LCDC/LAG meetings.

He recommended his colleague Michael O'Brien, Innovation and Development Manager (WWETB) as his replacement.

Proposed: Cllr Lola O'Sullivan	Seconded by: R. Grant
Abstentions: None	Revised: Non- Public 8 : Public 7
Quorum achieved: Yes	Approved

13 **Date and venue of next meeting:** Thursday 13th February 2020 at 11.00a.m. Council Chamber, City Hall, Waterford

Meeting Closed

Signed _____

CHAIRPERSON

DATE