



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project ID	IE31WAT101328
Project Type:	Training
Project Name:	Provision of facilitation and capacity building support for established/new voluntary groups
Promoters Name:	Waterford LEADER Partnership CLG
Address:	John Barry House, Lismore Business Park, Lismore. Co Waterford
Description:	Facilitation and capacity building for two voluntary community organisations in County Waterford – Ardmore 365 and Kilmacthomas Social Enterprise CLG.
Theme:	Theme 2: Rural Infrastructure and Social Inclusion
Sub-theme:	Sub-theme 2b: Accessible Services
Link to LDS	Strategic Action 2.1: Facilitation support and capacity building for new/established voluntary groups
Is the project at Stage 10 on the IT System Y/N	Will be moved to Stage 10 after Pobal Admin Check

Total Project Costs	€23,050.00		
Eligible Project Costs	€23,050.00		
Funding sought by promoter:	€23,050.00		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€23,050.00		
Details of private funding:	Not applicable as training is 100% funded.		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Waterford LEADER Partnership CLG, who implements the LEADER Rural Development Programme 2023-2027 in County Waterford along with other funding programmes, is sought quotations from suitably qualified persons/organisations to undertake a facilitation and capacity building process with two voluntary community organisations in County Waterford – Ardmore 365 and Kilmacthomas Social Enterprise CLG.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommended by the Evaluation Committee @ 100 %
	Facilitation and Capacity Building	€23,050.00	€23,050.00

Total Funding			
		€23,050.00	€23,050.00
Was an assessment completed?: Date:	Yes. 11 th of March 2025.		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes		
	Yes		
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. Four quotes were received and the most economical one was chosen.		
Innovative Element of the project:	The facilitation, capacity building and resilience training intervention in these two areas will benefit them significantly and support the objective of their own local community plans to ensure a better quality of life and an improved future for these communities.		
Added Value – How will the added value of LEADER funding be demonstrated in the delivery of this project?	The funding will improve the capacity of each of the two participating communities, formalising and consolidating their structure and leadership role in their communities through their own community plan.		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project is entirely dependent on the LEADER funding to carry out this intervention.		
Consideration of Displacement:	There is no displacement as this intervention is not competing with other facilities/enterprises or activities.		
Economic justification for project:	The funding will improve the capacity of each of the two participating communities, formalising and consolidating their structure and leadership role in their communities through their own community plan.		
Average Score for Project and Ranking:	85 (1)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	100%; €23,050.00		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 1) The Evaluation Committee considered this an effective use of LEADER funds, as it will benefit both participating communities. Through a structured, facilitated process, the communities will develop their own action plans, taking ownership and leadership of the initiative 2) This project fits perfectly within the Local Development Plan under Theme 2: Rural Infrastructure and Social Inclusion Sub-theme 2b: Accessible Services Strategic Action 2.1: Facilitation support and capacity building for new/established voluntary groups. 3) The project scored 85/100.		

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

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Not applicable.		

Amount Recommended: €23,050.00	% of Eligible Project Funding: 100%
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Signed: 
Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

Date: 25/3/2025 Date: _____

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

Signed: 

Dated: 26.03.2025

WLP Project Officer

Please insert photos below of reference purposes:

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

Not applicable

Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Project Title: Provision of facilitation & capacity building support for established new voluntary groups	Project Reference no: LE31WAT101328	Date: 11/3/2025	Time: 11am
--	--	------------------------	-------------------

Q	Assessment Criteria	Objective	Evaluation Committee comments	Weighting	Score	
					Pass	Fail
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	✓	
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?			13	
4	Innovation	Is the project innovative in its nature?			12	
5	Project Promoter experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver?			14	
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?			22	
7	Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?			12	
8	Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?			12	
9	Deadweight	Would the project proceed without LEADER funding?	YES	NO	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:	85	

APPROVED

Recommendation of the Evaluation Committee:

Signature of Committee Chair: _____

Date: 11/03/2025

