

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 who did not attend January 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.

Agreed

4. Confirmation of Minutes of LAG Meeting held on February 13th 2020.

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Proposed: J. Beresford | Seconded by: J. Somers |
| Abstentions: N/A | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | APPROVED |

5. Matters arising: No matters arising - Noted

6. Circulars: None - Noted

7. Expressions of interest: None - Noted

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.

Item 8 (i) 31LDRWAT109889 2B Climbing Limited - Update

D. Tuohy, Chief Officer received an email from 2B Climbing Limited informing him that they were unable to keep their original lease from 12 months ago in place and that they have been unable to secure a new viable lease in the meantime. Their application has been withdrawn.

Item 8 (ii) 31LDRWAT111375 West Waterford Festival of Food

Following Departmental approval (as per email dated 27th February 2020) following the LAG approval, the transport element was deemed ineligible as per section 14.5 of the LEADER Operating Rules which

state that 'Leader does not fund the transport and accommodation costs of participants to attend the centre/location where a project activity is taking place'. As a result, the project costings have been reduced accordingly. Re-approval sought.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Proposed: S. Cooke | Seconded by: M. Flanagan |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (iii) 31LDRWAT111737 Villierstown Tree Planting Project

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Project ID | 31LDRWAT111737 |
| Project Type: | Capital |
| Project Name: | Villierstown Tree Planting Project |
| Promoters Name: | Villierstown Tidy Towns Council |
| Address: | Villierstown, Cappoquin, Co. Waterford. |
| Description: | The group wish to purchase and plant mature trees which will in time form an avenue to the top of the village and be a haven for bird and wildlife |
| Theme: | LO7 Rural Environment |
| Sub-theme: | SA 7.2 Improving Bio Diversity |
| Link to LDS | Promotion of greater environmental awareness through exemplar projects |

| | |
|--|--|
| Total Project Costs | €3,660.38. |
| Eligible Project Costs | €3,660.38 |
| Funding sought by promoter: | €2,745.28 |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €2,745.28 |
| Details of private funding: | €915.10 in house funds |
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | No |
| Synopsis of project: | Planting of 15 <i>Carpinus betulus</i> Fastigiata clear stem trees opposite the existing trees to form a tree lined avenue to the top of the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|
| | village | | |
| 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 % |
| | Tree planting | €3,660.38 | €2,745.28 |
| | Total | €3,660.38 | €2,745.28 |
| Total Funding | | | |
| Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____ | Yes on the 14 th Jan 2020 | | |
| 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 MEAT process 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 | | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | Planting mature trees opposite the existing line of trees will create a wonderful avenue effect and encourage more birdlife etc | | |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | The promoter would not be in a position to proceed without access to funding | | |
| Consideration of Displacement: | Displacement is not applicable when encouraging biodiversity actions | | |
| Economic justification for project: | Project has an environmental value solely encouraging biodiversity and wildlife | | |
| Average Score for Project: | 80/100 (Ranked 3) | | |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | 75% of €3,660.38 amounting to €2,745.28 | | |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. 2. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 80% <p>A maximum of €2,745.28 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p> | | |

| Jobs Created | Jobs Sustained | Match Funding | Previous Grant Aid Received |
|--------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 0 | 0 | €915.10 in house funds | €0 |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|
| Ella Ryan, Environmental Officer, WC&CC | 6 th Feb | Ella Ryan |
|---|---------------------|-----------|

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

- Ms Claire advised the Evaluation Committee that this project plans to plant trees at the top of the village matching existing trees already planted on the other side
- It was advised that WC&CC have been notified of the planting and have no objection to it.
- The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 80%

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

A maximum of €2,745.28 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €2,745.28

75% of Eligible Project Funding: €3,660.38

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Proposed: J. Beresford | Seconded by: G. Foley |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (iv) 31LDRWAT111752 Clashmore Community Bio Diversity Action Plan

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Project ID | 31LDRWAT111752 |
| Project Type: | Capital |
| Project Name: | Clashmore Community Bio Diversity Action Plan |
| Promoters Name: | Clashmore Tidy Towns Group |
| Address: | Clashmore, Co. Waterford |
| Description: | The main objective of the project is to maximise the bio diversity factor of the pre-existing habitats within the environs of Clashmore village including the River Greagagh and related pond habitats, increasing the bio diversity of green areas by adding wild flower meadows while reducing the level of grass cutting which was traditionally associated with the village. Increase the biodiversity within our hedgerows and other areas through initiatives such as 'managed for wildlife' areas to promote habitats for bees, hedgehogs, birds etc. |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Theme: | LO7 Rural Environment |
| Sub-theme: | SA 7.2 Improving Biodiversity |
| Link to LDS | Promotion of greater environmental awareness through exemplar projects |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Total Project Costs | €3,583.96 | | |
| Eligible Project Costs | €3,583.96 | | |
| Funding sought by promoter: | €2,687.97 | | |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review | | |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €2,687.97 | | |
| Details of private funding: | €895.99 In house funds | | |
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | No | | |
| Synopsis of project: | Funding sought for actions that will lead to improved biodiversity through the creation of wildflower meadows rather than grass cutting, natural hedgerows, wildlife corridors and a timber shed for composting etc. | | |
| 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% |
| | 14ft x 10ft Timber shed | €1,825 | €1,368.75 |
| | Wildflower mix | €299.50 | €224.62 |
| | 25m round top fencing | €1,109.46 | €832.09 |
| | 10m Post & Rail Timber Fencing | €350 | €262.50 |
| | Total | €3,583.96 | €2,687.97 |
| Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____ | Yes, on the 14 th Jan 2020 | | |
| 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 MEAT process used to select the chosen supplier | | |
| Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional | Not applicable due to the low value items of expenditure and required number of quotations received | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs: | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | The community's effort to increase biodiversity actions by setting wildflower seeds in all green areas to create wildflower meadows that not only alleviate grass cutting but also attract bees. Creating wild hedgerows to encourage bee friendly flowers etc. Fencing off pond areas for wildlife etc |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | Project would not proceed without access to public funding as funds are limited |
| Consideration of Displacement: | Displacement is not applicable in a project like this that's encouraging biodiversity |
| Economic justification for project: | The value is in improving the rural environment whereby the community will benefit from more bio-diversity actions to support flora and fauna |
| Average Score for Project: | 81/100 (Ranked 2) |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | A maximum of €2,687.97 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Evaluation Committee agreed that this is a good use of Rural Development funds as it supports community volunteering as well as being good for the environment. 4. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 81 <p>A maximum of €2,687.97 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p> |

| Jobs Created | Jobs Sustained | Match Funding | Previous Grant Aid Received |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| 0 | 0 | €895.99 | €0 |

| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| Ella Ryan, Environmental Awareness Officer, WC&CC | 6 th Feb 2020 | Ella Ryan |

| |
|---|
| <p>Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Claire Connors advised the Evaluation Committee that WLP ran a biodiversity training session for Tidy Towns Committees. Following training there was a biodiversity call in October and the four applications are a direct result of that call. There were two others, but one was more of a construction project and the other was under the threshold allowed. The threshold for these projects is the LEADER rules of €1250 and not the minimum €5,000 required by WLP. - For Clashmore the plan is to plant a wild meadow on the common area along the existing River |
|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Walk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. - The Evaluation Committee agreed that this is a good use of Rural Development funds as it supports community volunteering as well as being good for the environment. - The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 81% <p>The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC as presented.</p> <p>A maximum of €2,687.97 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p> | |
| Amount Recommended: €2,687.97 | 75% of Eligible Project Funding: €3,583.96 |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Proposed: J. Beresford | Seconded by: H. Kiely |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (v) 31LDRWAT111738 Ardmore National School Bio Diversity Project

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Project ID | 31LDRWAT111738 |
| Project Type: | Capital |
| Project Name: | Ardmore National School Bio diversity Project |
| Promoters Name: | Ardmore Tidy Towns Association |
| Address: | Ardmore National School, College Rd, Ardmore, Co. Waterford |
| Description: | The group wish to landscape 1 acre of waste ground at the National School in Ardmore in a bio diversity friendly manner. To erect a grow tunnel for the students adjacent to their new science room which has a fully equipped kitchen. This will enable sustainable education through grow your own and cook it programmes. |
| Theme: | LO7 Rural Environment |
| Sub-theme: | SA 7.2 Improving Bio Diversity |
| Link to LDS | Promotion of greater environmental awareness through exemplar projects |

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Total Project Costs | €11,123 | | |
| Eligible Project Costs | €11,123 | | |
| Funding sought by promoter: | €8,342.25 | | |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review | | |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €8,342.25 | | |
| Details of private funding: | €2,780.75 | | |
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | No | | |
| Synopsis of project: | Funding to landscape 1 acre of waste ground beside Ardmore National School for vegetables, bee friendly plants and wild meadow and a grow tunnel to be incorporated into a school initiative | | |
| 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 % |
| | Landscaping | €11,123 | €8,342.25 |
| | Total | €11,123 | €8,342.25 |
| Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____ | Yes, 14 th Jan 2020 | | |
| 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 MEAT process 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 due to the low value items of expenditure and required number of quotations received | | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | Incorporating the growing of vegetables in a grow tunnel to be used by the National School in Ardmore linked into the cooking facilities incorporated into their new Science Room located close by | | |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | Project would not proceed without access to public funding as funds are limited | | |
| Consideration of Displacement: | Displacement is not applicable in a project like this that's encouraging bio diversity | | |
| Economic justification for project: | The value is in improving the rural environment whereby the community will benefit from more bio-diversity actions to support flora and fauna and increasing awareness through school education | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Average Score for Project: | 79/100 (Ranked 4 th) |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | 75% of €11,123 amounting to grant support of €8,342.25 |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. 6. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 79 % <p>A maximum of €8,342.25 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p> |

| Jobs Created | Jobs Sustained | Match Funding | Previous Grant Aid Received |
|--------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 0 | 0 | €2,780.75 in house funds | €0 |

| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|---|----------------------|-----------|
| Ella Ryan, Environmental Awareness Officer, WC&CC | 6th Feb 2020 | Ella Ryan |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Claire advised the Evaluation Committee that Ardmore have experience of implementing biodiversity projects as they already have a successful compost facility. - This project is looking for the biggest investment as they are seeking €8,342.25 in grant aid. They have one acre around the National School that they wish to develop in a biodiversity manner. The School recently built and opened a new Science room with a fully equipped modern kitchen. They wish to erect a grow tunnel adjacent to it where the children can grow their own fruit and veg and cook it in the kitchen. - The Evaluation Committee noted their concerns regarding the maintenance of the acre and a discussion took place around the differences between a landscaper and a horticulturist. - The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. - The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 79 % <p>The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC with the following condition: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The promoters must ensure they employ the necessary expertise to maintain and develop the project properly. <p>A maximum of €8,342.25 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p> | |
| Amount Recommended:€8,342.25 | 75% of Eligible Project Funding: €11,123 |

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Proposed: J. Somers | Seconded by: Cllr. L. O'Sullivan |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (vi) 31LDRWAT111753 Bio Diversity Audit Cheekpoint, Co. Waterford

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Project ID | 31LDRWAT111753 |
| Project Type: | Analysis and Development and Capital |
| Project Name: | Bio diversity audit Cheekpoint, Co. Waterford |
| Promoters Name: | Cheekpoint and Faithlegg Development Group |
| Address: | 'Sceanra', Coolbunnia, Cheekpoint, Co. Waterford |
| Description: | Cheekpoint and Faithlegg Development Group is seeking funding towards an audit of the village area and the two approach roads to get guidance on enhancing the bio diversity and visual amenity of the area. Please see attached report. This element of the project will provide a clear vision and strategy for its quest for greater bio diversity action. Some capital funding is also sought for planting in public areas around the village which have become decayed to encourage bees and other insects to flourish. |
| Theme: | LO7 Rural Environment |
| Sub-theme: | SA 7.2 Improving Bio Diversity |
| Link to LDS | Promotion of greater environmental awareness through exemplar projects |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Total Project Costs | €2,000 |
| Eligible Project Costs | €2,000 |
| Funding sought by promoter: | €1,500 |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €1,500 |
| Details of private funding: | €500 in house funds |

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | No | | |
| Synopsis of project: | Funding of an audit to identify potential bio diversity actions around the village and plant some commonage areas on the approach roads into Cheekpoint | | |
| 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 % |
| | Audit | 1,660.50 | €1,245.38 |
| | Planting | 339.50 | €254.62 |
| | Total | €2,000 | €1,500 |
| Total Funding | | | |
| Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____ | Yes, 14 th Jan 2020 | | |
| 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 MEAT process 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 due to the low value of the elements concerned when two quotations available | | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | The audit will identify further bio diversity actions that could be undertaken in the village and how to raise awareness within the community. The planting of wild seeds in public areas will encourage bees and generally enhance the areas | | |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | Promoter would proceed on a much-reduced basis with less scope to implement its initiatives | | |
| Consideration of Displacement: | Displacement is not applicable in a project like this that's encouraging bio diversity | | |
| Economic justification for project: | The value is in improving the rural environment whereby the community will benefit from more bio-diversity actions that support flora and fauna | | |
| Average Score for Project: | 82/100 (Ranked 1 st) | | |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | 75% of €2,000 amounting to a grant of €1,500 | | |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. 8. The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 82% <p>A maximum of €1,500.00 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p> | | |

| Jobs Created | Jobs Sustained | Match Funding | Previous Grant Aid Received |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|---|
| 0 | 0 | €500 | Town & Village Renewal funding in 2018 of €80,000 |

| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| Ella Ryan, Environmental Awareness Officer, WC&CC | 3 rd Feb 2020 | Ella Ryan |
| | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: - | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Claire Connors noted that the applicant is a community group as Cheekpoint does not have a Tidy Towns Committee. - The Evaluation Committee noted that Cheekpoint has become quite run down and could do with some initiatives to improve the appearance of it. - Funding might encourage other community initiative's going forward. - The project fits in with the Co Waterford LCDC Plan for Biodiversity projects. - The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding as this project scored 82% | |
| The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project to the Waterford LCDC as presented. | |
| A maximum of €1,500.00 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser | |
| Amount Recommended: €1,500.00 | 75% of Eligible Project Funding: |

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

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Proposed: M. Flanagan | Seconded by: H. Kiely |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (vii) 31LDRWAT111766 Lismore Music Festival (Blackwater Opera Festival)

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Project ID | 31 LDRWAT111766 |
| Project Type: | L.O. 1, Economic Development, Rural Tourism, Strategic Action 1.2, Cultural Tourism |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Project Name: | Lismore Music Festival |
| Promoters Name: | Lismore Music Festival Clg |
| Address: | 8, Main Street, Lismore, Co. Waterford. |
| Description: | <p>The Lismore Music Festival will provide ready access to the great houses along the Blackwater Valley, one of the objectives of the Local Development Strategy. This access will be due to the fact that concerts and recitals will held in the Great Houses and the cathedral. It will also promote education, and access to a form of music that that is very difficult to access for the wider public.</p> <p>Finally, it will provide a knock-on benefit for Restaurants, and Hotels.</p> |
| Theme: | L.O. 1, Economic Development, Rural Tourism |
| Sub-theme: | Strategic Action 1.2, Cultural Tourism |
| Link to LDS | L.O. 1, S.A.1.2 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Total Project Costs | €147,516.10 | | |
| Eligible Project Costs | €147,516.10 | | |
| Funding sought by promoter: | €100,310.948 or 68%, whichever is the lesser cost. | | |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review | | |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €50,000 or 33.8946% | | |
| Details of private funding: | Bank Statements | | |
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | No | | |
| Synopsis of project: | <p>The Lismore Music Festival will provide ready access to the great houses along the Blackwater Valley, one of the objectives of the Local Development Strategy. This access will be due to the fact that concerts and recitals will held in the Great Houses and the cathedral. It will also promote education, and access to a form of music that that is very difficult to access for the wider public.</p> <p>Finally, it will provide a knock-on benefit for Restaurants, and Hotels.</p> | | |
| Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project | Detail | Total Cost (Expenditure) | Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|
| Assessment Report) | | | @ 33.8946 % |
| Total Funding | Sound | €3,000 | €1,016.838 |
| | Piano | €4,305 | €1,459.163 |
| | First Aid | €1,155 | €391.483 |
| | Diesel Generator | €1,209.05 | €409.802 |
| | Lighting | €9,840 | €3,335.228 |
| | Marquees | €19,741.50 | €6,691.302 |
| | Marquees Seating Bank Cover | €14,944 | €5,065.209 |
| | Seating | €7,900 | €2,677.673 |
| | PR | €22,017 | €7,462.574 |
| | Literature | €11,010 | €3,731.795 |
| | Venue 1 | €12,000 | €4,067.352 |
| | Venue 11 | €5,000 | €1,694.73 |
| | Sound Dampening | €9,895 | €3,353.871 |
| | Artist 1 | €6,500 | €2,203.149 |
| | Artist 11 | €5,500 | €1,864.203 |
| | Artist 111 | €5,500 | €1,864.203 |
| | Artist 1V | €8,000 | €2,711.568 |
| | | | |
| | | €147,516.10 | €50,000 |
| Was an assessment completed? Date: _____ | 20/01/2020 | | |
| Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured? | Yes. The National Procurement Guidelines were followed. | | |
| 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 applicant did show that they did take steps to obtain sufficient quotations. | | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | <p>The Lismore Music Festival will provide ready access to the great houses along the Blackwater Valley, one of the objectives of the Local Development Strategy. This access will be due to the fact that concerts and recitals will be held in the Great Houses and the cathedral. It will also promote education, and access to a form of music that that is very difficult to access for the wider public.</p> <p>Finally, it will provide a knock-on benefit for Restaurants, and Hotels.</p> | | |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | The project if not funded will proceed on a much lesser scale | | |
| Consideration of Displacement: | Checks have taken place to ascertain when other such Festivals | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | are taking place. There is no displacement at the time proposed. |
| Economic justification for project: | The project will meet the need outlined in the Local Development Strategy to encourage the further opening-up of the Great Houses on the Blackwater Valley. |
| Average Score for Project: | The project scored 79/100 |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | €50,000 or 33.8946%, whichever is the lesser amount. |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project with the following conditions: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grant aid to be limited to €50,000.00 - The reduction is also to let the promoter know that funding cannot be continued going forward. This will be the final year of funding under the Rural Development Programme. <p>They agreed to recommend funding for the following reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. The project scored 79/100 10. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for Cultural Tourism. 11. The project puts a spotlight on West Waterford as a Tourism destination and adds value to the region. <p>A maximum of €50,000.00 or 33.8946% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p> |

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

| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minibus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| Waterford L.E.O. | 20/01/2020 | Brid Kirby |
| Failte Ireland | 20/01/2020 | Sarah Fitzpatrick |
| | | |

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

- Mr Jimmy Taaffe noted that the Evaluation Committee are familiar with the promoters as they have been funded previously. This will be the last year of funding and the promoters are presenting a special event in Dublin shortly in the hope of obtaining funding for the festival going forward from the Arts Council.
- The Committee noted that their concerns regarding the number of free tickets given for events were not address this year either.
- Mr Jimmy Taaffe said that these types of events are not expected to make money but are considered important cultural events that attract visitors to the region.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that it is an important event for Lismore and does add value.
- Another purposed of this application is the opening and gaining access to the Great Houses which is a factor of the Local Development Strategy (LDS) for Co Waterford.
- It was noted that the Castle are not very generous to the promoters and that while access is granted to the Great Houses only access to the Gardens is available in the Castle.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project deserved supporting as it puts a spotlight on the region.
- It was agreed that it the promoters have the skills and expertise and run a very professional event.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding the project at a maximum grant aid of €50,000.

A maximum of €50,000.00 or 33.8946 % of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €50,000

33.8946% of Eligible Project Funding:

The LAG members considered the above report. During the discussion, members raised the following points and their queries were addressed:

M. Walsh stated that WC&CC significantly funds festivals in Waterford each year but that there should not be double funding to any project/festival and he would suggest not approving funding for this festival and similar festivals after this year. J. Taaffe agreed that LEADER and WC&CC should discuss festival funding to avoid duplication J. Pratt recommended that appropriate criteria be put in place in relation to the funding of festivals. H. Kiely said that festivals should be about community gatherings and inclusion and consideration given to funding other smaller projects.

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed: S. Cooke | Seconded by: J. Beresford |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Cllr. L. O'Sullivan – Mentioned that if festivals that have received funding over the last number of years and depend on same that if they are not going to be considered again for funding next year then they should be notified in advance before they start preparations for next year's events.

It was recommended that the three major festivals receive written notice that no further funding will be allocated to them after 2020 by LAG – Approved.

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed: S. Cooke | Seconded by: J. Beresford |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

Item 8 (vii) 31LDRWAT111848 Camphire International Horse Trials and Country Fair 2020

Decision of Evaluation Committee 10th February 2020

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Project ID | 31LDRWAT111848 |
| Project Type: | Local Objective 1, Economic Development; Strategic Action 1.1, Activity Tourism under Rural Tourism |
| Project Name: | Camphire International Horse Trials and Country Fair 2020 |
| Promoters Name: | Mr. Paul Brady |
| Address: | Camphire International Development Committee, Lisanley, Cloyne, Co. Cork |
| Description: | Further development of the Cross-Country Courses Improved Infrastructure for Visitors – Hard Stands and passages Increased Safety with roping off, of competition areas Temporary on-site stabling Improved Office Facilities- Vets/Judges, etc. |
| Theme: | Local Objective 1, Economic Development |
| Sub-theme: | Strategic Action 1.1, Activity Tourism. |
| Link to LDS | L.O. 1, S.A. 1.1 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Total Project Costs | €96,399.10 |
| Eligible Project Costs | €75,501.60 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Funding sought by promoter: | 75% of €96,399.10 = €72,299.325 | | |
| State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend | First Review | | |
| Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee: | €56,626.20 Or 75% of eligible funding, whatever is the lesser amount. | | |
| Details of private funding: | Own Funds – Bank Statement | | |
| Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail) | None | | |
| Synopsis of project: | To further develop the Camphire venue to enable the continued hosting of international equestrian competition as well as the County Fair. | | |
| 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 % |
| | Stickers | €0 | €0 |
| Total Funding | Live Streaming | €0 | €0 |
| | Stabling | €24,840 | €18,630 |
| | Quarry Materials | €2,678 | €2,008.50 |
| | Plant Hire | €4,366.50 | €3,274.88 |
| | Ground Works | €6,950 | €5,212.50 |
| | Horse Rescue | €1,100 | €825 |
| | First Aid | €3,500 | €2,625 |
| | Site | €10,000 | €7,500 |
| | Scoring | €4,879 | €3,659.25 |
| | Website | €1,691 | €1,268.25 |
| | Broadband | €0 | €0 |
| | Carts | €4,482 | €3,361.50 |
| | Materials | €3,980 | €2,985 |
| | P.A. | €2,200 | €1,650 |
| | Radio | €0 | €0 |
| Electrics | €4,835.10 | €3,626.33 | |
| | €75,501.60 | €56,626.21 | |
| Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____ | 03/12/2019 | | |
| Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured? | Yes. The applicants obtained 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 | Items were excluded from grant aid at evaluation stage. | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| reasonableness of costs: | |
| Innovative Element of the project: | Improved Infrastructure for Visitors – Hard Stands and passages Increased Safety with roping off of competition areas |
| Consideration of Deadweight: | The project would proceed on a reduced basis. |
| Consideration of Displacement: | This initiative is not a direct competitor to other Equestrian Events in the Munster area. They have all adapted to their own niches. |
| Economic justification for project: | The project has improved the visibility of West Waterford to a very wide European Audience, and the development of Camphire is important for the Farming Community in Munster who develop Sport Horses, and the tourism product development in the South. |
| Average Score for Project: | The project scored 81 out of 100. |
| % level of aid & ceiling: | A maximum of €56,626.20 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser |
| E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding | <p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:-</p> <p>12. It is a very well-run prestigious event of great benefit to the South East in terms of visitors to the area.</p> <p>13. The project scored 81 out of 100.</p> <p>14. The project fits the Local Development Strategy Plan (LDS) for Activity Tourism.</p> <p>A maximum of €56,626.20 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser.</p> |

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

| Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies. | Date of Confirmation | Signed By |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Failte Ireland | 17/12/2019 | Sarah Fitzpatrick |
| Waterford L.E.O. | 05/1/2019 | Brid Kirby |
| | | |

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

- Mr. Jimmy Taaffe noted that the Evaluation Committee are familiar with the promoters as they have been funded previously. This event has grown year on year since its inception in 2009. It is a sports tourism activity which also encompasses a County Fair. It takes place over 5 days and will result in a large influx of people to the area who will require accommodation, restaurants, shops and other services. It appeals to a wide audience and will attract National and International visitors. West Waterford is a beautiful destination and this event highlights and promotes that.
- Mr. Taaffe noted that certain elements did not receive the required number of quotations necessary and should not be funded i.e. live streaming, audio, printing and broadband.
- The Evaluation Committee discussed the amount of funding received over the years, approx. 360k since 2011, noting that it has been well supported by the Rural Development fund and that it was time to cut back.
- Mr. Jimmy Taaffe advised that reducing the funding will give the message that LEADER cannot be an ongoing source of funding and that next year they should apply to Horse Sport Ireland and Eventing Ireland.
- The Committee stated that the again this year there is very little information on sponsorship received. Mr. Jimmy Taaffe replied that they don't get a substantial amount in sponsorship.
- A Committee Member queried if the promoters made a profit in 2019? Mr. Jimmy Taaffe advised that they had a balance of €37,000 after the festival due to a loss in 2016 and monies owed back to the promoters.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding the project at €20,000 less than the total overall costs. This reduction will include the elements not procured correctly. The eligible project cost is €75,501.60 @75% = €56,626.20

A maximum of €56,626.20 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €56,626.20 Or 75% of eligible funding, whatever is the lesser amount.

75% of Eligible Project Funding:

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Proposed: J. Beresford | Seconded by: S. Cooke |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

8.b WLP Board observations on projects – Noted.

8.c Approval to WLP RDP Advance Administration funding (01.04.2020 – 30.06.2020) in the sum of €91,616.77); Noting of Administration Returns, Income, Expenditure & Bank Reconciliations for the period October to December 2019

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Proposed: G. Foley | Seconded by: J. Pratt |
| Abstentions: J. Taaffe; R. Walsh | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

8.d Transnational Co-operation projects with North East Antrim– proposal to proceed to next stage. Approved.

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Proposed: M. Flanagan | Seconded by: J. Somers |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

8.e Request to re-allocate funding from Strategic Action 1.4, Glamping and Strategic Action 1.1, Activity Tourism and re-allocate it to Strategic Action 1.2 Culture and Heritage under Circular 08/10/2018. Report noted. Approved.

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Proposed: M. Flanagan | Seconded by: J. Somers |
| Abstentions: None | |
| Quorum achieved: Yes | Approved |

For noting – Re: Glasha Hydro Project – EIAR Report

J. Taaffe confirmed that applicants were turned down for planning permission so this project is unlikely to go ahead due to timelines. An update will be given at the next meeting.

9. **Reports from sub-committees:** Deferred to next meeting.

10. **Correspondence:** None

11. **A.O.B.:** On H. Kiely’s recommendation, it was agreed to have a presentation on the biodiversity project at a future meeting.

12. **Date and venue of next meeting:** Thursday 9th April 2020 at 11.00 a.m. Council Chamber, City Hall, Waterford City.

Meeting Closed

Signed John Pratt 11 June 2020
CHAIRPERSON DATE