



Comhpháirtíocht Leader Waterford Leader
Phort Láirge Partnership

Decision of Evaluation Committee

Project Code:	IE31WAT103066
Project Type:	Investment and other supports
Project Promoters Name:	Bioregional Weaving Alliance Ireland CLG
Project Name:	Our Nature Corridor
Address:	Dunhill Eco Park, Dunhill, Co. Waterford
Description:	The project is a robust digital infrastructure with a supporting digital and in person service for land stewards of different types (farmers, gardeners, urban and rural, estates and community spaces) to engage actively through pledging their own land and green spaces to nature. The approach has proven successful in other countries and is now being piloted in west Waterford. The project proposes two main elements, lot 1 digital infrastructure and lot 2 land advisor/ecologist and project manager to engage the stakeholders
Total Project Costs	€155,502.75
Theme:	Theme 3, Sustainable development of the rural environment and climate change mitigation and adaptation
Sub-theme:	3a sustainable development of the rural environment, local objective 09 support for exemplar projects in biodiversity
Eligible Project Costs	€155,502.75
Funding sought by promoter:	€116,627.06
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First review
Outline the Evaluation Committee's consideration on each of the following:-	
Deadweight:	The project would not go ahead without funding. The promoter is confident that they have completed ample preparatory work on the project that now requires this investment to progress and is aware that the council are doing habitat mapping but at a scale and focus at odds with this proposal. From a project officers perspective, the project requires funding due to the cost of the proposed investment if it is deemed necessary
Displacement:	While there are other initiatives that are somewhat similar to the project, they are different in ambition, scope, scale and cross sectoral integration these include, the National Biodiversity Centre – Maps for Biodiversity, All-Ireland Pollination Plan and Waterford City and County Council ecological corridor work
Innovative:	The Evaluation Committee expressed the opinion that the idea is brilliant, but the project is still far from being ready for funding. The outcomes were unclear and, therefore, they were unable to assess the level of innovation.
Reasonableness of Costs:	The project was tendered and the most economic advantageous tender process used to select the chosen suppliers

In-house projects: are there other providers that can deliver the project more cost effectively?	N/A
Recommendation of the Evaluation Committee:	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend not funding this project for the following reasons:- 1. There are no defined, measurable outcomes for the project. 2. The project scored 58/100. A maximum of €0 €or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
Rationale for grant aid, having regard to the LDS:	The project fits under local objective 09 exemplar projects in biodiversity
Added Value – How will the added value of LEADER funding be demonstrated in the delivery of this project?	The Evaluation Committee were unclear about what the defined, measurable outcomes would be following funding, so they did not discuss added value.
Economic Justification for Project:	The Evaluation Committee were unclear about what the outputs would be following funding, so they did think it was appropriate to recommend funding at this stage.
Average Score for Project and Ranking:	58/100 (1)
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €0 €or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Is the project at Stage 10 on the IT System Y/N	Yes		
Details of private funding:	€38,875.69 own funds		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommended by the Evaluation Committee @ 0 %
	Lo1 Digital Infrastructure – branding, mapping, website & database	€67,250	€0
	Land advisor & project management	€88,253	€0
	Total Funding	€155,502.75	€0
Was an assessment completed?: Date:	Yes, 17 th October 2025		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes, etending was used and the most economic advantageous tender process used to select the chosen suppliers		
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC	N/A		

must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
0	2ft, 2pt	€38,875.69 own funds	€0

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimis and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Email correspondence from Waterford City & County Council	29 th October '25	Bernie Guest

Amount Recommended:€0	0% of Eligible Project Funding: €155,502.75
-----------------------	---

Signed: 
Chairperson of Evaluation Committee
Date: 19/11 2025

Issues / Queries raised by Evaluation Committee	Project Officers Response

Signed: 
WLP Project Officer

Dated: 12/11/2025

Please insert photos below of reference purposes: N/A – nothing to show yet in catchment area

Overall Evaluation Committee Scoring Record

Project Title: <u>Our Nature Corridor</u>	Project Reference no: <u>IE31WAT103066</u>	Date: <u>10 NOV 2025</u>	Time: <u>11am</u>
---	--	--------------------------	-------------------

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?		15	9
4	Innovation	Is the project innovative in its nature?		15	9
5	Project Promoter experience	Does the promoter have the training/skills, track record or experience to deliver?		15	10
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?		25	14
7	Sustainability	Is the project viable and will the service continue to be delivered?		15	8
8	Requirement	Does the proposal target a specific need or address a specific gap in the market?		15	8
9	Deadweight	Would the project proceed without LEADER funding?	YES	N/A	N/A
			NO		
	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%.			100 / Total:	58
Recommendation of the Evaluation Committee: Not Recommended					

Signature of Committee Chair: _____



Date: 10/11/2025

