



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31LDRWAT116848
Project Type:	SA 2.1) Capital Investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Project Name:	EURI - Tracked Skid Steer with Grader and GPS
Promoters Name:	McDonald Plant and Civil
Address:	Reandampaun, Ballymacarbry, Via Clonmel, Co. Waterford
Description:	The equipment comprises of a GPS guided skid steer with grader attachment. This equipment will accurately grade passages to minimise soiled water run off into local water courses. It can also be used for a similar purpose on construction sites and industrial locations. If the project goes ahead, it will assist in the creation of 1.5 jobs.
Theme:	LO 2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA 2.1) Capital Investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Link to LDS	LO 2 Enterprise Development

Total Project Costs	€118,711		
Eligible Project Costs	€118,711		
Funding sought by promoter:	The cost of this project is €118,711 and the promoter has requested funding of €89,033.25 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	Previously Deferred		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€0		
Details of private funding:	€29,677.75 Loan		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	The purchase of specialised equipment comprising of GPS guided tracked skid steer with grader attachment.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ %
	Tracked Skid Steer with GPS	€118,711	€0
		€118,711	€0
Total Funding			

Was an assessment completed?: Date:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 23th November 2021
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
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	OGP and the Dept. were contacted and they confirmed that procurement was in order
Innovative Element of the project:	This project is highly innovative as it is offering a new service to reduce soiled water run-off from farm roadways.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that this project would not proceed without funding
Consideration of Displacement:	The Evaluation Committee considered displacement an issue and therefore are not recommending for approval.
Economic justification for project:	The project fits the Local Development Strategy plan for enterprise support
Average Score for Project:	62/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €0 or 0% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to not recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 1. Funding will cause displacement 2. The project scored 62% and not the required 65% minimum required to pass.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1.5		Yes	None

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minibus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford Local Enterprise Office	24/11/2021	B. Kirby

Meeting on the 20 12 21:- The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: - - Mr Jimmy Taaffe advised that this is a new start up business, and the promoter is working with Mr Brendan O'Dwyer an Accountant in Dungarvan to formalise the business. DPE are clients of Dwyer's and probably put both in touch. - The query in relation to displacement is a valid concern and Mr Taaffe confirmed that he had only considered the environmental aspect of the project. Without doubt if funded other applications will follow and this could be an issue. - A Committee Member queried if WLP has a policy on funding this type of project? Mr Taaffe said that WLP did

not fund mainstream agriculture or plant contracting equipment but took this application as an environmental project as the promoter identified a niche market.

- Mr Jimmy Taaffe confirmed that the gradient works could be carried out by mainstream contractors but that this machine will do it more efficiently and cheaper as the levels can be ascertained while in the cab and do not require physical measuring and manpower.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that this machine is the way forward but noted it will compete against JBC and Hymac diggers.
- They referred to it as disrupted technology comparing it to the internet versus post.
- It was noted that someone is bound to go ahead given the new legislation requirements. A lengthy discussion ensued with consideration being given to funding at a reduced level as the project was considered progressive and fits the environmental criteria of the programme. Jimmy advised that the Project Assessment requested 75% but anything below 50% would not be feasible for the promoter to make repayments.
- A Committee Member noted that the application was weak in terms of confirmed contracts with reference being made to SISK and Comeragh Construction and none from farmers or Teagasc. Mr Jimmy Taaffe replied that the promoter was probably staying away for referencing farmers due to the displacement issue.
- Mr Jimmy Taaffe said that he could not say how many applications may be received if this one is funded. No doubt funding this machine will give the promoter a massive leap ahead of competition as he will be able to do the job more efficiently and cheaper than other contractors.

The Evaluation Committee did not consider the project eligible due to displacement and agreed to recommend not funding.

Meeting on the 8 12 21 :- The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- Ms Claire Connors advised that Mr Jimmy Taaffe sent his apologies but due to a bereavement in the family he was unavailable to attend the meeting today.
- Ms Connors briefly updated the Evaluation Committee on the background of the promoter advising that he has set up a contracting business in Ballymacarbry in 2018 after returning from Australia. He sees a gap in the market and wishes to purchase specialised equipment that will complement and work with his existing business.
- New legislation by the Dept of Agriculture effective from Jan 2021 means that farmers now must prevent the direct run-off soiled water from farm roadways. This equipment will be a one stop piece of equipment to create the slope on the roadway without having to bring in huge amount of stone /fill and the gps will enable the correct slope/gradient be created accurately.
- The original Project Assessment report was sent out at 50% but the promoter can apply for 75% and will do so subject to the Evaluation Committee agreeing to this. This will reduce his match funding which you will see is being provided by Dungarvan Precision Engineering.
- A Committee Member noted that it is quite a weak proposition and while he shows a client base there are no confirmed contracts and doesn't show a repayment capacity for the loan. Turnover is only 56k in 2021.
- Ms Connors said that in its favour the promoter came to us through the accountant Brendan O'Dwyer who seems to have taken the promoter under his wing.
- The Committee queried if they would have a deluge of applications from other contractors following funding. Typically, the programme did not fund plant and equipment for contractors, and it was queried if this was a project for other funding sources.

- It was pointed out that the project fits the environmental criteria of the new programme as it is addressing a problem of runoff water for farmers. It is cheaper and more efficient and will use less resources.
- A discussion took place on displacement and if by funding this project other local contractors will be displaced.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to defer this project subject to clarification on the following:-

- Issue of displacement
- What is the connection between DPE and the promoter?
- Potential contracts

Deferred

Amount Recommended:€0

0% of Eligible Project Funding:

Signed: _____

Signed: _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response

Signed: J Taaffe

Dated: 21/12/2021

WLP Project Officer

Please insert photos below of reference purposes:

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

Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Date: 20/12/2021

Time: 11am

Project Title: ZUCI - TRAFICED SLEO STEER WITH GRADER & GPS

Project Reference Number: 3140RWAT116848

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>8</u> - Displacement 5/19 <u>0</u> - Job Creation 5/19 <u>1</u>		19	9
Promoters experience/	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver? - Standards of Operation 6/25 <u>3</u> - Track Record 6/25 <u>3</u> - Structure of Business 6/25 <u>3</u> - Necessary skills base 7/25 <u>6</u>		25	15
Financial Viability	Are the project costs justifiable (reasonableness of costs) and / is funding available to co-fund the project? - Overall Costs 7/25 <u>4</u> - Co Funding 6/25 <u>4</u>		25	15

	- Financial Plan	6/25	4		
	- Deadweight	6/25	3		
Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			13	8
Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			18	15
Total				100	62

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: NOT RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Signature: 

Signature of Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 20/12/2021

Denise Walsh

From: pclerkin@cablesurf.com
Sent: Tuesday 21 December 2021 11:11
To: Denise Walsh
Subject: Evaluation Committee meeting on 20th December 2021

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Denise,

I have reviewed the draft minutes of the above minutes and I am in agreement with them.

Paul Clerkin.
Chairperson
Evaluation Committee.

