



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	31WAT100002
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	SE Farm Buildings
Promoters Name:	South East Farm Buildings Ltd
Address:	Ballynoe, Lismore, Co. Waterford. P51C2W6
Description:	The promoter is looking to purchase a CNC plasma table to increase production and manufacturing efficiency which will also reduce carbon omissions
Theme:	Theme 1 Economic Development & Job Creation
Sub-theme:	Sub theme 1a Green Economy
Link to LDS	Supporting new technology and improve efficiency to reduce carbon output

Total Project Costs	€48,750		
Eligible Project Costs	€48,750		
Funding sought by promoter:	€36,562.50		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€0		
Details of private funding:	€12,187.50		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Investment in new equipment to improve efficiencies		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 0 %
	Plasma CNC machine	€48,750	€0
	Total	€48,750	€0
Total Funding			
Was an assessment completed?: Date:	Yes, 19 th of March '24		

Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, direct tendering was use and functionality and price was the selecting criteria
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
Innovative Element of the project:	The promoter is looking to invest in a CNC plasma machine to increase production and manufacturing efficiency and reduce carbon output
Added Value – How will the added value of LEADER funding be demonstrated in the delivery of this project?	Reduction in carbon emission in the investment in new and greener technology that will greatly improve the manufacturing process as the elimination of travel to and from sub-contractors/providers
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project would go ahead without LEADER funding
Consideration of Displacement:	Three competitors have been identified – Mulcahy Steel, Nelgara Steel and O'Dwyer Steel but the promoter provides a full package, from excavation of the site, to ground and concrete works, to the steel shed erection unlike the other companies who just provide the erection service
Economic justification for project:	Increase in employment – one full time and one part time position
Average Score for Project:	Not scored due to deadweight
% level of aid & ceiling:	No aid will be granted due to deadweight
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed not to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 1. It would proceed without funding.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1.5	7	€12,187.50	Never received grant aid in the past

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimis and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Local Enterprise Office	21st of March '24	Brid Kirby

Detail of Discussion:

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

-Ms Connors advised that the very glaring component here is deadweight. The promoter has worked in the UK and Australia and learned his trade there. He incorporated the business in 2015. He builds farms sheds for the dairy sector. He is trying to futureproof his business. Farm vat rules are going to change this year, impacting the amount of money that farmers will have to spend. He did some work for Meadowfresh Cold Storage business and will be looking more towards markets like this.

-The Committee asked if he would be in competition with Norris Bros and Kenneally Steel,

-Ms. Connors advised that he would, but they all have their own customer base.

-The Committee suggested funding the project at a reduced rate, given the cash reserves in the business.

-Ms Connors read a letter from the company accountant advising the reasons why he was seeking funding.

-Ms Drennan advised that the Leader rules state, in reference to Deadweight, 'LAGs must not grant-aid projects that are capable of proceeding without LEADER funding'.

-The Committee commented that the promoter has very healthy financial projections and a healthy bank balance.

-This programme has a reduced level of funding, and it may be better to keep it available for more needy projects.

-They agreed that the project would score very highly but fails on deadweight.

Amount Recommended: €0

0% of Eligible Project Funding: €0

Signed:

_____ **Signed:** _____

Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Committee Member

Date: _____

Date: _____

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response
N/A	

--	--

Signed: Chait Amad

Dated: 27th of March '24

Project Officer

Please insert photos below of reference purposes: _____



Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Project Title: SOUTH EAST FARM BUILDING	Project Reference no: 1231WAT100002	Date: 29.03.2024	Time:
---	---	----------------------------	--------------

Q	Assessment Criteria	Objective	Evaluation Committee comments	Weighting	Score	
1	Has project development officer report indicated that any documentation / information requested has not been provided by the project promoter(s)	Ensure that the project promoter has provided all the required information / documentation requested by project development officer to progress this project.		N/A	Pass	Fail
2	Displacement	Does the project comply with displacement requirements?		N/A	Pass	Fail
3	Compatibility with Local Development Strategy (LDS)	Do the project proposals meet the criteria set out in the LAG's LDS for the relevant measure?				
4	Innovation	Is the project innovative in its nature?				
5	Project Promoter experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver?				
6	Financial Viability	Do the proposed actions and associated costs appear reasonable and represent value for money, and is adequate funding available to co-fund the project?				
7	Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?				
8	Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?				
9	Deadweight	Would the project proceed without LEADER funding?	YES ☒ NO ☒	N/A	N/A	
N.B. Prior to being recommended for approval, projects must: - pass question 1 and 2 - answer no to question 9 - receive a minimum score of 65%.				Total:		
Recommendation of the Evaluation Committee:				Refused - Deadweight,		

Signature of Committee Chair:  Date: 27/03/24

Angeline Drennan

From: John Harnedy <johnjharnedy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday 3 April 2024 13:49
To: Angeline Drennan
Subject: Re: Draft Evaluation Minutes 27.03.2024
Attachments: image001.gif

Hi Angeline

I've reviewed the attached minutes and all seems in order.

I will talk to you later regarding dates for deferred Projects.

Thanks, John

On Wed 3 Apr 2024, 09:44 Angeline Drennan, <Angeline.Drennan@wlp.ie> wrote:

Hi John,

Attached are the draft minutes for last week's meeting.

Could you please have a read through them and confirm if you are happy that they are correct or advise if you believe there are any errors or omissions?

I will give you a call this afternoon to confirm.

Thanks & regards,

Angeline

Angeline Drennan CPA

Rialaitheoir Airgeadais/Financial Controller

Cúntóir Príomhfheidhmeanneach/Assistant CEO

Comhpháirtíocht Leader Phort Láirge / Waterford Leader Partnership CLG

