

1. **Confirmation of Quorum:** Having reviewed the attendance record, Chief Officer D. Tuohy confirmed that a quorum was achieved. Non-public 8; Public 7; 15 members in attendance.
Chair Damien Geoghegan opened the meeting.

2. **Apologies:** As per table above, apologies were noted.

3. **Conflict of Interest:**

- (i) Chief Officer 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.
- (ii) J Somers declared a C.O.I. on Item 6 and J Beresford declared a C.O.I. on Item 7.a.v.
- (iii) Review of Quorum: M Walsh agreed to step down from voting on item 7.a.v Legacy Irish Cider to rebalance the quorum in favour of the non-public sector.

4. **Confirmation of Minutes of LAG Meeting held on February 11th 2021.**

Proposed: S. Cooke	Seconded by: L. O'Sullivan
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

5. **Matters arising:** Following on from the discussion at the February meeting regarding the promotion of social inclusion, J Somers queried if any progress had been made on the issue. Chief Officer D Tuohy suggested that a sub group should be convened to look at the issue in the context of the Transitional Leader Programme. The matter will be discussed again at the April meeting.

6. **For Noting:**

- i) J Somers outlined a request for LCDC support regarding a Barnardos application for a Community Development Pilot project in West Waterford, J Somers then left the meeting citing a conflict of interest should the matter require a vote.
- ii) A second and similar request for support was submitted by Waterford Integration Services regarding an application for translation services.
Chief Officer D. Tuohy informed the committee that nationally, €1m was available in 2021 and this would fund about 8 projects. The award of same rests solely with the Department. J Taaffe commented that as the LCDC/LAG would provide oversight as administrators it would be prudent not to show bias. C.E. M. Walsh proposed that the requests be noted by the committee.

Proposed: M. Walsh	Seconded by: M. Flanagan
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Abstentions: J Somers	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

7. Rural Development Programme.

(a) Project approvals: (on extranet).

i) 31LDRWAT113895 Cheekpoint Pontoon and Gangway

WLP C.E.O. Mr. Jimmy Taaffe outlined the merits of this project noting that a comprehensive E.I.S. was undertaken and whilst there was a planning objection lodged the case against the project was weak. The facility will operate on a non-exclusive basis.

Project ID	31LDRWAT113895
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Cheekpoint Pontoon and Gangway
Promoters Name:	Cheekpoint Boat Owners Association (C.B.O.A)
Address:	C/o Hedera, Faithlegg, Co. Waterford
Description:	The promoter is looking to invest in the installation of a 63m pontoon located in the deep water pool at Cheekpoint harbour with a 21m connecting wheelchair accessible gangway. The pontoon will allow access to vessels in all tides and provide safe river access for all local boat users
Theme:	L01 Rural Tourism
Sub-theme:	SA1.1 Activity Tourism
Link to LDS	Supporting marine based activity tourism

Total Project Costs	€211,618.47
Eligible Project Costs	€211,618.47
Funding sought by promoter:	A maximum of €158,713.85 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:	A maximum of €158,713.85 or 75% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser

Details of private funding:	€52,904.62 - €35,655 awarded by Cheekpoint Community Liaison Committee and balance from Port of Waterford
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No
Synopsis of project:	Investment in key marine infrastructure that will facilitate full access to the River Suir for all marine boat and water craft users
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	10 th Nov 2020
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 and therefore considered the costs reasonable.
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	eTendering was used to seek suppliers for the equipment and 2 quotes were received for the pontoon and gangway and only 1 quote for the piling works. Despite many expressions of interest, the response was low due to the specialized nature of the equipment sought
Innovative Element of the project:	The connection of the village to the estuary at all tide times which previously wasn't possible due to the nature of the quay
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project would not proceed without funding as the equipment is very expensive
Consideration of Displacement:	There is no issue of displacement as the new infrastructure will complement the existing facilities in Dunmore East and Waterford City
Economic justification for project:	The huge benefit to be gained from boat owners in Cheekpoint having all day access to the estuary and the appeal to leisure boat users and charter boats to use the village as a stop off. This will impact hugely on the local eateries providing much needed footfall
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 73/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €158,713.85 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project scored 73/100 2. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for tourism projects <p>A maximum of €158,713.85 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p>

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

0	0	€52,904.62	0
---	---	------------	---

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Failte Ireland	16 th Nov 2020	Ivona Carr

Detail of Discussion: 24 2 21 Project recommended for approval - The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- Ms Claire Connors advised that the project was deferred previously over queries about match funding. They have been successful in obtaining the match funding and all finance for the project is now in place.
- Ms Connors advised that the Port of Waterford agreed to fully support the project for bridging funding and are providing €30,000.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that this is a good use of Rural Development funds and will provide an excellent tourism facility in Cheekpoint.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project with the following condition:-
 - Funding is conditional on the foreshore license being granted.

A maximum of €158,713.85 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

27 1 21 Project Deferred- The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- Ms Claire Connors advised that the project was deferred as it had several outstanding issues. Since then, they have been granted their planning permission but are still awaiting confirmation of match finance and the foreshore license.
- The foreshore license application is currently being prepared for the next stage where it will be technically vetted and reviewed. It will be July before a decision is known.
- Ms. Connors advised that the finance will be sorted this month. The Community group is applying for funds to the Community Gain Funding to cover their match funding. There was a delay on this due to Covid which temporarily halted the process. They have now put in a new system whereby they can vote on the winning project by vote. The promoters have been informed that they are the only applications for the fund. The decision should be known early February.
- The Evaluation Committee queried the note in the application on page 6 question 18 where it stated that the foreshore license was in process with the Dept of Housing, as it should be the Dept of Marine. Ms Connors confirmed it should be the Dept of Marine.
- The collection of fees in cash by a rota of the Committee was discussed. It was noted that they would like to see some sort of system in place.
- The Evaluation noted that while they appreciated that the foreshore license will take some time agreed that they would prefer to wait until the outcome of the promoter's application to the

Community Gain Fund was know before approval. Once approved it can be conditional on the foreshore license being granted.

- The Evaluation Committee agreed to defer for the following reasons:-

☐ Awaiting confirmation of match funding

☐ Funding is conditional on the foreshore license being granted.

A maximum of €158,713.85 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

75% of Eligible Project Funding: €211,618.47

Proposed: S. Cooke

Seconded by: G. Hurley

Abstentions: None

Quorum achieved: Yes

APPROVED

ii) **31LDRWAT114829 Conservation of our living River Clodiagh**

J Taaffe informed the committee that whilst this was a small project it was important for bio-diversity as it will attempt to preserve and regenerate the indigenous pearl mussel population. R Walsh commented that environmental agencies are supportive of this type of project.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114829
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Conservation of our living River Clodiagh
Promoters Name:	Friends of the Clodiagh
Address:	Portlaw, Co. Waterford
Description:	The main aim of the project is to restore the population of the iconic freshwater pearl mussel in the river Clodiagh. The freshwater pearl mussel, once abundant, is extinct from most European and Irish rivers. The population still living in the Clodiagh river is one of very few in the country, however the juvenile mussels are not surviving and the population is going extinct
Theme:	LO7 Rural Environment
Sub-theme:	SA7.1 Bio diversity
Link to LDS	Raising awareness and supporting the river habitat in the River Clodiagh

Total Project Costs	€16,388		
Eligible Project Costs	€16,388		
Funding sought by promoter:	A maximum of €12,253.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €12,253.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
Details of private funding:	€816.90 Promoters Own funds €3,267.60 LAWPRO		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Capital investment in remedial works along the River Clodiagh at specific points to protect the endangered juvenile pearl mussel		
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%
	Solar water pump x 4	8,540	6,405
	Pasture pumps x 5	1,475	1,106.25
	Water troughs x 5	1,011	758.25
	Water pipe 1000m	320	240
	Electric fence wire 1000m	90	67.50
	Electric fence controller & battery x 5	625	468.75
	Electric fence solar power x 5	975	731.25
	Electric fence posts 200	340	255
	Digger plus driver 1 week	1,362	1,021.50
	Manpower 2 weeks	1,600	1,200
	Total Funding	€16,338	€12,253.50
	Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	Yes, 9 th February 2021	

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 most economic advantageous tender process used to select the chosen suppliers
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	Where less than 3 quotes were obtained, a comparison quote was provided for most elements apart from very specialized items such as labor cost
Innovative Element of the project:	The protection of the highly endangered pearl mussel population which is reducing at alarming rates in most European and Irish rivers but has been found in the River Clodiagh which is very special
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter would attempt to proceed with 25% of the planned work if unsuccessful in their bid for LEADER funding using the funds available.
Consideration of Displacement:	There is no competing activity to this project in the region as the problem is only particularly relevant to the pearl mussel preservation in the River Clodiagh
Economic justification for project:	The project is more about the improvement of bio diversity and safe guarding of an endangered species which will in time be the focus of educational and environmental studies that will interest people to come and visit the sites
Average Score for Project:	- The project scored 86/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €12,253.50 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The project scored 86/100 4. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for Rural Enterprise projects. 5. Funding this project will stop the freshwater pearl mussel going extinct locally. <p>A maximum of €12,253.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p>

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
0	0	€816.90 Promoters Own funds €3,267.60 LAWPRO	No previous funding received as the group has only recently been established

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
LAWPRO committing part matching funds	12 Feb 2021	S. Thompson

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

- Ms Claire Connors briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters Friends of the Clodiagh group are made up of longstanding members of the Tidy Towns and Heritage groups from three villages, Rathgormack, Clonea Power and Portlaw. Also fully engaged on the project are representatives from the Local Authority, National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Local Authorities Water Programme.
- The promoters will carry out practical improvements measures in the river catchment including fencing of riverbanks, alternative drinking points and riverbank erosion protection works. This will benefit all water-dependent life along the river. It will establish nursery sites for the ongoing development of juvenile mussels needed to restore the mussel population in the river.
- The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project as presented.

A maximum of €12,253.50 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons:

- The project scored 86/100
- The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for Rural Enterprise projects.
- Funding this project will stop the freshwater pearl mussel going extinct locally.

Amount Recommended: €12,253.50	75% of Eligible Project Funding:€16,338
---------------------------------------	--

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: J. Beresford
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

iii) **31LDRWAT114826 Ice Cream Production**

J Taaffe outlined the merits of this project and confirmed that all health & safety and standard food production protocols were in place.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114826
Project Type:	Capital Investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Project Name:	Ice Cream Production
Promoters Name:	Kenneth Reddy Ltd
Address:	52 O'Connell Street, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford
Description:	The project involves the purchase of an industrial scale Ice Cream Production Unit. The proprietor previously worked for Butlers Ice Cream and has set up a new business to take over from Butlers. He

	is keeping the Butlers trade name with the agreement of Butlers. In order for the business to develop, he needs to invest in a new unit.
Theme:	L.O. 2, Economic Development
Sub-theme:	Strategic Action 2.1
Link to LDS	L.O. 2, Economic Development

Total Project Costs	€40,915.00		
Eligible Project Costs	€40,915.00		
Funding sought by promoter:	€20,457.50 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €20,457.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser as presented.		
Details of private funding:	Cash/Money in account 20,458 50%		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Funding of an ice cream production facility including two machines and a freezer		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50 %
	Frigomat Batch Freezer	22,375	11,187.50
	Carpigiani Pastomaster	15,930	7,965.00
	Infrico Ice Cream Freezer	2,610	1,305.00
		40,919	20,457.00
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 15/02/21		
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 2 LEADER Specific 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:	N/A
Innovative Element of the project:	The promoters have the skills and knowledge to implement this project.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters are dependent on grant aid to invest fully in this project.
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as the promoters are taking over a business that was known for its quality ice cream. Other local suppliers are delivering at a different level i.e. Baldwin Ice Cream
Economic justification for project:	The project fits the Local Development Strategy plan for Enterprise Development.
Average Score for Project:	82/ 100 (1)
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €20,457.00 or 50% 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Evaluation Committee agreed the promoter and his wife were very competent and had the skills necessary to implement the project successful. 7. A Committee Member noted that they will get a much better efficiencies and product from the new equipment. 8. The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project as presented

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
2 Part time	2 and 3 part time	Yes	No

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Email from the Local Enterprise Office	16/02/2021	B Kirby

<p>Detail of Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Jimmy Taaffe briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that Butlers Ice Cream has been in operation for many years. The promoter a Mr. Kenneth Reddy has worked for Butlers for nearly 20 years and is taking over the business. Due to their supplier ceasing supply they now wish to produce its own high quality ice cream. Not only will they be

producing ice cream for their own shop they also sell it other local outlets.

- Butlers Ice cream is a well-known and popular brand around Dungarvan and very popular. The promoter will be keeping the brand name.
- Mr. Jimmy Taaffe advised that the promoter has sufficient match funding as he has €20k in his credit union account and €15k in his trading account.
- Where the pet supplies station is set up in the front of the shop will be converted to the production area.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed the promoter and his wife were very competent and had the skills necessary to implement the project successful.
- A Committee Member noted that they will get a much better efficiencies and product from the new equipment.

The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project as presented.

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €20,457.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser as presented

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €20,457.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser as presented	50% of Eligible Project Funding:
---	---

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: C. Quinlan
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

- iv) **31LDRWAT113885 Installation of maturation storage, bottling and blending equipment in existing unit.**

J Taaffe described the project and informed the committee that 3 to 4 jobs were being supported in this instance, as a rule of thumb if a €40k grant investment creates one position it should be considered as a good return on investment. R Walsh advised that LEO and Enterprise Ireland have supported this business already therefore 'de minimus' funding thresholds must not be exceeded.

Project ID	31LDRWAT113885
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Installation of maturation storage, bottling and blending equipment in existing unit
Promoters Name:	O'Connell Whiskey Merchants Ltd
Address:	Mountain View, Stradbally, Co. Waterford

Description:	The project is phase I of a two phase development. This application focuses on a storage, maturation, blending and bottling facility for O'Connell Whiskey Merchant. This will enable the promoter to carry out the primary function from cask intake to disgorging, blending and vatting in stainless steel tanks and finally bottling and packaging for domestic and export market. Phase two will involve the restoration of an old protected unit at the Kilmacthomas Workhouse and the development of a tourism experience.
Theme:	LO2 Economic and Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA2.1 Capital investment in new and existing technology
Link to LDS	Supporting new equipment investment in a small rural enterprise

Total Project Costs	€161,985		
Eligible Project Costs	€161,985		
Funding sought by promoter:	A maximum of €80,992.50 or 50% 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:	A maximum of €80,992.50 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser subject to the following conditions:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As the bank account from the investor is in the name of Thomas and his wife both should sign the letter of commitment ➤ The letter of commitment should be strengthened. 		
Details of private funding:	€80,992.50 Equity investor		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Investment in new blending, maturation and bottling facilities as phase 1 of an existing whiskey company looking to locate in the Kilmacthomas Workhouses seeking to enter the premium whiskey market		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	Blending equipment	€33,940	€16,970
	RO Water Set	€4,900	€2,450

	Bottling Line	€46,725	€23,362.50
	Lifting & Handling Equipment	€17,950	€8,975
	Cask Racking & Mobile Shelving	€49,870	€24,935
	Stainless Steel	€8,600	€4,300
Total Funding	Total cost of project	€161,985	€80,992.50
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	Yes, 18th Jan 2021		
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 where the required number of quotations were sought, in some cases less than 3 quotations were received but mostly comparison prices were available		
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 Department have accepted the procurement process undertaken following a project query submission based on the specialization of the items sought		
Innovative Element of the project:	This will enable the promoter to carry out the primary function from cask intake to disgorging, blending and vatting in stainless steel tanks and finally bottling and packaging for domestic and export market		
Consideration of Deadweight:	<p>According to the promoter's response as per Q10 of the application form, the project would only proceed on a reduced basis. The lack of a grant will delay the project being in a position to hire staff while efforts to source other private funding continue.</p> <p>As per my assessment, the project is hugely dependent on grant aid to develop further.</p>		
Consideration of Displacement:	<p>There are no nearby standalone maturation, bottling and packaging facilities that handle whiskey and other alcohols. There are four nearby distilleries: Blackwater, Waterford, the Irish Distillers maturation site at Dungourney, and the Distillery at Middleton. Waterford does not have a bottling line. Blackwater does not contract-bottle. Irish Distillers is owned by multinational drinks conglomerate Pernod Ricard. Middleton does not have a bottling plant on-site nor do they offer third-party services</p>		
Economic justification for project:	<p>Following a risk assessment, the promoter cannot outsource the entire operation on a long term basis. As a small batch producer, they do not get priority currently and have bulk stocks sitting in 5 different locations which proves difficult to manage. They have also experienced a price increase of 65% since December last year on costs associated with bottling alone</p>		
Average Score for Project:	This project scored 70/100		

% level of aid & ceiling:		A maximum of €80,992.50 or 50% of eligible costs 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>9. The project scored 70/100</p> <p>10. The project fits the Local Development Strategy for enterprise projects</p> <p>11. Funding will help restore and bring back into use old historic buildings</p> <p>A maximum of €80,992.50 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser subject to the following conditions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As the bank account from the investor is in the name of Thomas and his wife both should sign the letter of commitment ➤ The letter of commitment should be strengthened. 	
Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
7.5 over 24 months	2	€80,992.50 Investment	None from LEADER €12,750 from LEO & Bord Bia since 2019

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford LEO	15 th Jan 2021	Email sent – no response

Detail of Discussion 24 2 21 Project recommended for approval: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -

- The Evaluation Committee discussed the background of the promoter Daithi O'Connell and his mentoring experience with Enterprise Ireland.
- Ms Claire Connors said that the breakdown of funding was circulated for review as requested.
- A Committee Member noted that they thought the 1.5m would be for capital expenditure but noted that 70% of it is for buying in stock. Ms Connors clarified that it is not only new spirit required but also matured and this is quite expensive. He will need aged, matured stock to create his more expensive matured blends.
- Ms Connors advised that the partner Mr. Thomas Draths is American and met the promoter when they both worked together in Hong Kong. He has moved to Dublin with his wife and is willing to invest in the project. He has provided a bank statement totaling €470k and said in his letter of commitment that he is happy to provide and funds needed.

- A concern was raised that the promoter was not providing any funding towards the project? Ms Connors explained that the promoter has already spent €80k to get the project to this stage. Mr. Draths will provide funding as required.
- Ms Connors advised that the promoter wished to set up a bottling and blending facility as the initial phase of this project. Phase 2 will involve the tourism aspect but this will be in a few years time.
- The Committee queried if the funding needed should be transferred over into the promoters account before approval. Ms Connors replied that the rules state that the investor must provide a bank statements showing that he has sufficient funding available and must provide a letter of commitment.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that the letter of commitment was a big vague and should be strengthened. Also, as the bank account is in the name of Mr. and Mrs. Draths then both should sign the letter of commitment.
- In general, the Committee was supportive of the project as they consider it a tremendous benefit to Kilmacthomas and a great use of the buildings.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend this project for approval at a maximum of **€80,992.50** or **50%** of eligible costs whichever is the lesser subject to the following conditions:-

- As the bank account from the investor is in the name of Thomas and his wife both should sign the letter of commitment
- The letter of commitment should be strengthened.

Detail of Discussion 27 1 21 Project deferred The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project:

- Ms Claire Connors advised that funding is being sought for Phase 1 of this project which involves the purchase of blending tanks and bottling equipment to streamline their operations by enabling them to do it in-house. The promoters currently outsource all aspects of their business which is not tenable long term. As small batch producers they do not get priority. Having their own maturing, blending, bottling, and packaging facility will greatly reduce costs and be more efficient. The 2nd phase will involve the fit out of the old workhouse units in Kilmacthomas where they will also develop a visitor's experience. An unsigned lease was circulated to the Evaluation Committee for the premises prior to the meeting.

- Basically, they buy in everything and subcontract it out to be matured, blended, and bottled. Currently they have no plans to distil. They have some blends that can be ready for market quite quickly but want to develop other premium blends that will be far more expensive but take longer to see a return from.

- The promoters have already established their markets and from next month will also be supplying the States and South Africa.

- Ms Connors clarified that the premises does not require change of use for phase 1 but will for phase 2.

- All Evaluation Members agreed that it would be great to see the premises being renovated and used.

- The promoters are Daithi O’Connell and Thomas Draths. Daithi O’Connell is the founder and has worked in the Food & Beverage sector for over 20 years and was referred to us for funding by Enterprise Ireland. Thomas Draths is a US Marketing Developer who is providing funding of up to €470,000 as required.
- A Committee Member queried who William O’Connell was. Ms Connors replied that it was William D O’Connell and that the D was for the promoter Daithi.
- Evaluation Members queried if the €470,000 was a loan or an investment?
- They also where the private investment would be sourced.
- The Evaluation Committee questioned if the promoters had a certainty of raw materials? Ms Connors confirmed that they had several small suppliers that they can draw from.
- The promoters appear to have the skills and experience necessary and have other skilled people ready to come on board once the project is up and running.
- In general, the Committee were supportive of the project but had a few queries it would like clarification on.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to defer this project until the following information is received:-

- ☐ A detailed breakdown of where all the funding is coming from
- ☐ Details on interest and dividends
- ☐ Is there working capital
- ☐ Detail what the €1m Debt finance was being sourced.
- ☐ Detail expertise that will be on site once up and running
- ☐ Check the spelling on logo

Amount Recommended: €80,992.50	50% of Eligible Project Funding: €161,985
---------------------------------------	--

Proposed: S. Cooke	Seconded by: G. Hurley
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

v) **31LDRWAT114830 Legacy Irish Cider Bottling Unit**

J Taaffe outlined the merits of the project to the committee.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114830
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Legacy Irish Cider Bottling Unit
Promoters Name:	Liam McDonnell T/A Legacy Irish Cider
Address:	85 Springfield, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford
Description:	<p>The promoter wishes to invest in a small in-house bottling unit that will allow them to bottle 2,000 x 500ml bottles at a time. The unit will come in 4/5 separate parts that will be purchased separately and assembled in-house. This unit will be of considerable benefit for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial new products on the market before going into big scale costly production • Introduce innovative special edition products to engage their consumer base • It is a low-cost bottling unit that can increase the margin per bottle
Theme:	LO2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA2.1 Capital investment
Link to LDS	Supporting the investment in capital development in an existing rural business

Total Project Costs	€25,680		
Eligible Project Costs	€25,680		
Funding sought by promoter:	A maximum of €12,840.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €12,840.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
Details of private funding:	€12,840 promoter own funds		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Investment in a small bottling unit in house to enable the promoter to produce smaller batches of new product for tastings, launches etc		
	Detail	Total Cost	Grant Aid recommend by

		(Expenditure)	the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	Bottling Line	€25,680	€12,840
	Total Funding		€12,840
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	Yes, 9 th February 2021		
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 to seek suppliers and the most economic advantageous tender 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:	Installing an in house bottling unit enabling the promoter to keep control of his business and produce smaller batches of product when required		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The project would proceed on a much reduced and slower growth basis without this access to much needed funds		
Consideration of Displacement:	The nearest craft cideries are Mallow and Carrigaline in Cork so do not pose any direct competition		
Economic justification for project:	This investment will help the business to grow and remain competitive while creating an additional full time job in time		
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 75/100 (4)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €12,840.00 or 50% 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"> 12. The project scored 75/100 13. Funding will create a part time role 14. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for supporting enterprise development <p>A maximum of €12,840.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser</p>		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1	2	€12,840 own funds	€21, 520 awarded by LEADER in Feb 2020 for marketing support €20, 327 from Bord Bia, LEO & WC&CC

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford LEO	11 Feb 2021	Brid Kirby

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

- Ms Claire Connors briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters wished to purchase a small in-house bottling unit. Currently he has to wait until he requires x amount of bottles as he has to outsource the bottling. Having his own unit would enable him to run small test runs for new products.
- The promoter was funded previously for marketing and branding of the product.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that for product safety line you would need to have in-house bottling and be completely self-sufficient.
- It was noted that the promoter adapted to Covid quite well and has changed his market from on-trade to off-trade.
- The promoter has taken on one part time worker and if this project is successful it could become full time.
- The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project as presented.

A maximum of €12,840.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons: -

- The project scored 75/100
- The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for enterprise development.

Amount Recommended: €12,840	50% of Eligible Project Funding: €25,680
------------------------------------	---

Proposed: D Geoghegan	Seconded by: G. Hurley
Abstentions: J Beresford and M Walsh	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

vi) **31LDRWAT114856 Villierstown Joinery Sanding Line**

J Taaffe outlined the merits of the project and informed the committee that one additional FTE will be created with this investment and several other FTEs would be consolidated.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114856
Project Type:	Capital Investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Project Name:	Villierstown Joinery Sanding Line
Promoters Name:	Villierstown Joinery Ltd
Address:	Villierstown, Co. Waterford
Description:	The Company is a local joinery and woodworking business. In order to maintain competitiveness and employment, the production facilities need to be streamlined and product quality more consistent. To do this the applicants are proposing to purchase and install an automated wide belt sanding line for finishing products.
Theme:	LO2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA2.1 Capital Investment in attracting existing and new enterprises
Link to LDS	LO2 Enterprise Development

Total Project Costs	€21,000.00
Eligible Project Costs	€21,000.00
Funding sought by promoter:	The cost of this project is €21,000.00 and the promoter has requested funding of €10,500.00 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €10,500.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
Details of private funding:	Cash/Money in account 10,500 50%
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No
Synopsis of project:	The purchase and installation of an automated wide belt sanding line for finishing products.
Detail exactly what WLP will be	Detail Total Cost Grant Aid recommend by

funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)		(Expenditure)	the Evaluation Committee @ 50 %
Total Funding	Wide Belt Sander	21,000	10,500
		21,000	10,500
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 15/02/2021		
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 2 Leader Specific 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:	N/A		
Innovative Element of the project:	The installation of this machine will complement their existing CNC machinery and current working methods along with opening up new avenues of work. It will streamline production and make the promoters more competitive.		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters will not go ahead with this project without funding due to uncertainties in the industry due to Covid.		
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as the promoters are looking to complement and streamline work they are already doing.		
Economic justification for project:	The project fits the Local Development Strategy plan for Enterprise Development.		
Average Score for Project:	79/ 100 (2)		
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €10.500.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser		
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons: The project scored 79/100 - The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for enterprise development. <p>Funding supports employment in a rural area.</p>		

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
2	6	Yes	2018

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford Local Enterprise Office	16/02/2021	B. Kirby

Detail of Discussion:

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

- Mr Jimmy Taaffe briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters received previous rural development funding which helped them sustain both the business and employment numbers.
- This investment is preparing the promoters for the future and along with previous investment is helping the business on an incremental basis in becoming an automated process.
- Mr Jimmy Taaffe confirmed that the promoter had the necessary insurance in place with the required indemnities.
- The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project as presented.

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €10,500.00 or 50% of eligible expenditure	50% of Eligible Project Funding:
---	---

Proposed: G. Foley	Seconded by: J. Beresford
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

vii) **31LDRWAT114978 Renovations to Dungarvan Club**

J Taaffe outlined the project to the committee. C Quinlan and J Somers queried inclusivity and child protection protocols. J Taaffe confirmed that child safety matters were addressed and that club membership is open to the public and is open to both women and men.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114978
Project Type:	S.A. 1.1 Activity Tourism: Non-Core Activity Sports i.e. Iron Man, International Equestrian Events.
Project Name:	Renovations to Dungarvan Club
Promoters Name:	Dungarvan Club
Address:	Garynagrenagh, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford, X35 T186:
Description:	Renovate the newly purchased premises at 35 O'Connell Street, Dungarvan. This will entail the full refit and the construction of an extension at the rear of the building to hold 2 Championship Snooker Tables, and 1 Championship Pool Table on the ground floor. Upstairs will be a room for Board Games and Card Playing.
Theme:	L.O. 1 Tourism as a key driver of Economic Development;
Sub-theme:	S.A. 1.1 Activity Tourism: Non-Core Activity Sports i.e. Iron Man, International Equestrian Events.
Link to LDS	L.O. 1 Tourism as a key driver of Economic Development;

Total Project Costs	€141,960.94
Eligible Project Costs	€138,982.56
Funding sought by promoter:	€106,470.70 or 75%, whichever is the lesser amount.
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €104,236.41 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project scored 78/100 - The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for supporting tourism development - However funding is conditional on the membership being inclusive and open to all comers as the facility is funded by public monies.
Details of private funding:	€35,200.99
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No

Synopsis of project:	Renovate the newly purchased premises at 35 O'Connell Street, Dungarvan. This will entail the full refit and the construction of an extension at the rear of the building to hold 2 Championship Snooker Tables, and 1 Championship Pool Table on the ground floor. Upstairs will be a room for Board Games and Card Playing.		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report) Total Funding	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 75 %
	Construction	107,484.70	80,613.53
	2 X Snooker Tables	16,000.00	12,000.00
	1 X Pool Table	1,850.00	1,387.50
	2 X Table Lights	760.00	570.00
	2 x Table Irons	660.00	495.00
	Strachen Cloth	3,750.00	2,812.50
	Table Heating	900.00	675.00
	4 X Extended Rests	214.09	160.57
		214.09	160.57
		20.93	15.70
		101.77	76.33
	1 G Balls	1,411.50	1,058.63
	Billiard Balls	305.66	229.25
	Brush	126.40	94.80
	Napping Block	122.29	91.18
	3 X Monitors	1,291.50	968.63
	1 X Large Monitor	836.40	627.30
	2 X Scoring Tablets	369.00	276.75
	2 X Electronic Boards	319.80	239.85
	Table Fitting	0.00	0.00
	Dart Board	223.03	167.27
	2 X Mini Tables	2,021.40	1,516.05
	€138,982.56	€104,236.41	
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	08/03/2021		
Are detailed costings provided for the project? Were the costs for the project considered reasonable and how was this measured?	Yes. They were chosen on the basis of the lowest price for the construction element and most economically advantageous tender basis for the equipment.		
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the	The applicant used E Tenders for the Construction element and direct tenders for the equipment. They obtained the appropriate		

EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	number of quotations.
Innovative Element of the project:	It the only one of its kind in the area
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee did not consider deadweight an issue in this project as it will not proceed without funding.
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as this is the only facility in a 20-mile radius. The other facility in Cappoquin is in a parochial hall.
Economic justification for project:	Funding will provide an amenity to the members and visiting tournaments
Average Score for Project:	78/ 100 (1)
% level of aid & ceiling:	€104,236.41 or 75% of the eligible costs, whichever is the lesser amount.
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	<p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- A maximum of €104,236.41 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project scored 78/100 - The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for supporting tourism development - However funding is conditional on the membership being inclusive and open to all comers as the facility is funded by public monies.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
0	0	€35,200.99	None

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford LEO	08/03/2021	B Kirby
Failte Ireland		I. Carr

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

- Mr. Jimmy Taaffe briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters were formally known as the Gentleman Club in Abbeyside and they have a very strong membership. The Club is open to all genders to join. They have sold the premises in Abbeyside and purchased 35 O'Connell Street, Dungarvan. They are renovating the building and purchasing competition match tables which are not available anywhere in Ireland. They plan to bring in outside tournaments. The new premises will allow them to expand their memberships allowing full inclusion and will be wheelchair friendly.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters put together a very good application and have a very good membership.
- A discussion ensued on how the facility will be staffed by volunteers or by schemes rather than creating employment.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed that it will be a good addition to the amenities already on offer in Dungarvan.
- Mr. Jimmy Taaffe clarified that the promoters have been made aware that the membership must be open for all-comers as it is publicly funded.
- The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project with the following condition:
 - The membership must be inclusive and open to all-comers as the facility is funded by public monies.

A maximum of €104,236.41 or 75% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser for the following reasons: -

- The project scored 78/100
- The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for tourism development.

Amount Recommended: €104,236.41 or 75% of eligible costs, whichever is the lesser amount.	75% of Eligible Project Funding: €104,236.41
--	---

Proposed: D Geoghegan	Seconded by: G. Foley
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

viii) **31LDRWAT115031 New Deburring Machine, 6 No. Pulse welding stations and an electric forklift.**

J Taaffe outlined the project to the committee.

Project ID	31LDRWAT115031
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	New Deburring Machine, 6 No. Pulse welding stations and an

	electric forklift
Promoters Name:	SMF Engineering Ltd
Address:	The Square, Portlawn, Co. Waterford
Description:	The aim of the project is to enable SMF Engineering to purchase a new deburring machine, 6 no. pulse welding stations and an electric forklift. These will allow SMF Engineering to acquire new customers both in Ireland and abroad in the Green Energy Sector, while sustaining existing and creating new jobs in the business. The forklift in particular will also lower the carbon footprint of the company as a whole, reducing the reliance on diesel fuel.
Theme:	LO2 Economic and Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA2.1 Capital investment in existing technology
Link to LDS	Supporting small rural enterprise invest in much needed new technology to help it remain competitive and create additional employment

Total Project Costs	€191,500		
Eligible Project Costs	€191,500		
Funding sought by promoter:	€95,750		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€95,750		
Details of private funding:	€95,750		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Investment in a deburring machine, 6 new pulse welding stations and an electric forklift to enable the company enter the green energy sector		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	600mm wide Deburring and edge rounding machine	€94,600.00	€47,300

	3 Tonne Electric Forklift C/W lithium Ion Battery	€55,500.00	€27,750
	6 Number 400/500 Amp Pulse welding Machines	€41,400.00	€20,700
Total Funding		€191,500	€95,750
Was an assessment completed? Date: __10 th March 2021_____	Yes		
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 to select suppliers and an advertisement placed in a local newspaper and the MEAT process used to select the chosen suppliers		
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	In all cases, three comparison quotations were gathered and evidence of effort to seek the requested 5 quotations for all items was provided using the MEAT process to select the chosen suppliers		
Innovative Element of the project:	The project requires a deburring machine to remove rough edges and new welding machines which prevent weld splatter common with the older machines which is a requirement for the finish on products entering the green energy market		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter has confirmed that project would only proceed on a reduced basis. Due to the high capital investment required relative to the existing resources within SMF Engineering. The promoter would benefit greatly from grant support due to the large capital investment required in this technology		
Consideration of Displacement:	No local manufacturing business has this type of machinery. The closest businesses with similar machines are located in Waterford city and further afield. These companies are well established and have their own market contracts separate to those SMF Engineering have identified.		
Economic justification for project:	To ensure SMF continues into the future as an employment source in the local area the promoters need to move with the market, green energy has a lot of opportunities for business over the next 10+ years. This machinery would fully solve the issues revealed in their market research and allow them to engage with new customers in this sector. It would potentially create 6 jobs in a		

	rural area, thus stimulating the local economy financially.
Average Score for Project:	This project scored 83/100 (1)
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €95,750.00 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	<p>The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project at a maximum of €95,750.00 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project scored 83/100 - The project fits the Local Development Strategy for enterprise projects - Funding will create up to 6 new jobs and sustain existing employment levels in a rural area

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
6	13	€35,750 Own funds €60,000 Loan	€200,000 LEADER grant Nov '18 for a laser machine

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford Local Enterprise Office	11 th March 2021	Brid Kirby

<p>The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Claire Connors apologised for the delay in circulating the information to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters had to put the project out to tender and it was only received for review last Tuesday. On reviewing we requested the accounts from the linked accounts which were sent to you separately. - The promoters have been in business since 1994 and are considerably experienced and knowledgeable. The company specialises in providing precision sheet metal and structural steel fabrication services to all sectors. - They were funded in 2018 for a laser cutting machine and the only change to the business since then has been the purchase to a similar company in Meath. - On reviewing current market trends, the promoters identified the Green Energy Sector as an area where potential work could be obtained. The new equipment will enable the promoters to provide their customers with competitive and quality improvements and will also have a very low carbon footprint.

- The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoter is right to continually try to improve and break into new sectors.
- Funding this project is a good use of Rural Development funds as it helps create and sustain employment in a rural area.

The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend this project for approval as presented.

A maximum of **€95,750.00** or **50%** of eligible costs whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €95,750

50% of Eligible Project Funding: €191,500

Proposed: J. Beresford	Seconded by: D Geoghegan
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

ix) **31LDRWAT114971 New Optical Measuring Machine**

J Taaffe outlined the project to the committee.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114971
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	New Optical Measuring Machine
Promoters Name:	Total Precision Ltd
Address:	Unit 7, Riverstown Business Park, Tramore, Co. Waterford
Description:	The promoters are sourcing a new Optical Measuring Machine with the most up-to-date software equipment. This machine will greatly enhance their production facility and attract new customers
Theme:	Project fits under Theme 2 Economic and Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	Sub theme 2.1 supporting existing enterprises with investment in new technology
Link to LDS	Supporting micro rural enterprises with much needed technology to enable further growth and remain competitive

Total Project Costs	€55,750.20
Eligible Project Costs	€55,750.20

Funding sought by promoter:	€27,875.10		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	€27,875.10		
Details of private funding:	€27,875.10 in house funds		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Purchase of a new optical measuring machine to enable the promoter remain competitive and increase efficiency		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	Supply of a New Optical Measuring Machine	€55,750.20	€27,875.10
	Total Funding	€55,750.20	€27,875.10
Was an assessment completed?: Date: <u>4th March 2021</u>	Yes		
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 an advertisement placed in a local newspaper 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. Evidence is provided of the effort to seek the required 5 quotations and four comparison quotations provided		
Innovative Element of the project:	The machine will have the newest/ most up-to-date Technology which is critical in the promoters' production quality. Metrology is a VERY important area of production. This new machine will basically scan the part & produce a report showing the various dimensions avoiding any human error. Acquiring this new machine will greatly enhance the company's reputation for quality		
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoter has confirmed that they would progress but on a reduced basis. They need to improve their production quality & keep pace with their competitors, so metrology is an area that will have to be invested in time. The promoter would significantly benefit from grant support to invest in this much needed		

	technology as in house funds are relied upon in the current changing work environment
Consideration of Displacement:	The nearest Machine shops are in Waterford city (Allied Turned Parts & Colbert Eng.) but the promoter will not be competing with these companies as they do not do work in Aerospace or the Medical device sectors which are markets the promoter is looking to consolidate with a new Optical Measuring Machine.
Economic justification for project:	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:-
Average Score for Project:	The project scored 81/100
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €27,875.10 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project as presented for the following reasons:- 15. The project scored 81/100 16. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for enterprise projects. 17. Funding this project secures the business and sustains employment

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
1	9	€27,875.10 own funds	€65,000 LEADER grant Dec '19 CNC Machine

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford Local Enterprise Office	8 th March 2021	Brid Kirby

Detail of Discussion: The following were the main points raised in the discussion of the project: -
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Connors advised the Evaluation Committee that the promoters were funded previously and successfully implemented the project. They have been in business for over ten years and their main customers are in the Pharma, Oil & Gas and the Automotive industry. Looking to the future they wish to upgrade by getting the most up to date technologies which will ensure the best quality product thereby attracting new customers. - A Committee Member noted that this upgrading will bring the business up to the next level and

is well worth doing.

- The Committee said that the company has a healthy balance sheet and have been nicely developing the business. The turnover and profit dropped slightly for 2020 but that is to be expected.
- The Committee agreed that it is sensible approach to improve the business

A maximum of €27,875.10 or 50% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Amount Recommended: €27,875.10	50% of Eligible Project Funding: €55,750.20
---------------------------------------	--

Proposed: L. O'Sullivan	Seconded by: S. Cooke
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

x) **31LDRWAT114834 Freezin Friesian Capital Expansion**

J Taaffe outlined the project to the committee.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114834
Project Type:	Capital
Project Name:	Freezin Friesian Capital Expansion
Promoters Name:	Freezin Friesian
Address:	Ballyhussa, Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
Description:	Freezin Friesian is an ice cream company specialising in the production of artisan farmhouse ice cream products to the retail market in Ireland. The company was established in 2018 as Irelands first artisan rolled ice cream. The 'ice cream roll' format of theatre and innovation allowed the company to enter the market and grow brand recognition throughout the South East. In October 2020, the business supplied its first retail store with a new product range. The acceleration into the retail market was due to Covid 19 driven step change in the company's private market from supplying rolled ice cream in local markets to supplying retailed stored with tubbed product.
Theme:	L02 Rural Enterprise
Sub-theme:	SA 2.1 Capital investment in existing and start up technology
Link to LDS	Support of a micro rural enterprise with the investment in much needed equipment to grow the business and enter new retail

	markets
--	---------

Total Project Costs	€98,218.16		
Eligible Project Costs	€98,218.16		
Funding sought by promoter:	€49,109.08		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €49,109.08 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser		
Details of private funding:	€49,109.08 private funds		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Investment in much needed equipment to help grow the business and enter new retail markets as current operation is dependent on outdated equipment		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 50%
	Pasteuriser	€33,210	€16,605
	Batch freezer	€32,237.98	€16,118.99
	Aging tank	€3,874.50	€1,937.25
	Blast freezer unifrost	€3,991.35	€1,995.68
	Oven Banks	€662.97	€331.48
	Separator	€8,083.56	€4,041.78
	3 Phase electricity	€16,157.80	€8,078.90
Total Funding		€98,218.16	€49,109.08
Was an assessment completed?: Date: ____10th March 2021_____	Yes		
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 to source suppliers and evidence of seeking the required number of quotations was provided and the MEAT process used to select the chosen suppliers.		
Where the procurement process resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the	Evidence of gathering the required number of quotes was provided and in most cases where possible, comparison prices were provided though the MEAT process was used to score winning suppliers		

reasonableness of costs:	
Innovative Element of the project:	This is the first product of its kind available in the luxury Irish Farmhouse Ice Cream Market which uses its own quality milk and is produced in house
Consideration of Deadweight:	The promoters would only be in a position to proceed on a much reduced basis struggling on with the limited and aging equipment already in place. The lack of investment in this much needed new technology will enable the promoters to meet the rising demand of the retail sector and target more outlets
Consideration of Displacement:	The product is somewhat different to the existing farm ice cream such as Baldwins Ice Cream, Knockanore, Cramer's Grove, Kilkenny and Gino's Waterford.
Economic justification for project:	The promoters now need to invest in much needed equipment both to replace aging equipment and add to existing equipment to facilitate the expansion of the business. The purchasing of equipment will lead to a greater output of product and ultimately leading to considerable growth.
Average Score for Project:	This project scored 74/100 (3)
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €49,109.08 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 18. The project scored 74/100 19. The project fits the Local Development Strategy for enterprise projects 20. However it is a condition of funding that the brother Tom provides the same written confirmation on use of funds as John.

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
2pt	0	€49,109.08 private funds	€10,000 in 2018 Enterprise Ireland vouchers

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Waterford Local Enterprise Office	11 th Feb 2021	Brid Kirby

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

- Ms Claire Connors advised the Evaluation Committee that the company was first established in 2018 as Irelands first artisan rolled ice cream but that they have been trailing and testing the product and its production with years at festivals and events. They have gone from producing ice cream from a frozen marble slap to custom made freezing plates from China. The acceleration into the retail market from local markets is due to Covid 19.
- The promoters operate from a unit on the family farm and it's very much a family project. Ivan Keirsej will be the main person involved on a day-to-day basis with brothers John & Tom also providing their expertise in assistance. Brother-in-law Neil is providing marketing and sales expertise.
- The promoters now have a tubbed product ready for retail outlets. It can be bought in Cass and Co and in And Chips in Dungarvan but they need to up capacity to get into more retail outlets.
- The Committee queried if funding this project had any implications for the Butlers ice cream project funded recently? Ms Connors clarified that they are two very different products altogether. This is a rolled ice cream that can be filled with seasonal fruit.
- The Evaluation Committee discussed similarities with Knockanore Cheese and Baldwin Ice Cream who are also dairy farmers using surplus milk in other on farm enterprises.
- The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend this project for as presented:-

A maximum of **€49,109.08** or **50%** of eligible costs whichever is the lesser with the following condition:-

The brother Tom must provide the same written confirmation on use of funds as John.

Amount Recommended: €49,109.08	50% of Eligible Project Funding: €98,218.16
---------------------------------------	--

Proposed: L. O'Sullivan	Seconded by: S. Cooke
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

xi) **31LDRWAT114853 Machinery Upgrade**

J Taafe outlined the merits of this project and informed the LAG that the evaluation committee recommended reducing the recommended rate of funding from 50% to 40%.

Project ID	31LDRWAT114853
Project Type:	Capital Investment in existing and start up technology, graduate orientated rural businesses
Project Name:	Machinery Upgrade 1
Promoters Name:	Hickey Fabrication Services Ltd.
Address:	Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
Description:	The project is part of a series of affordable upgrades by this progressive company so that it can get into new markets and be competitive through the use of new technology using CAD Design linked to digitally enabled equipment. The Company is moving into the Green Tech area and is starting the manufacture on contract

	of digesters. They are also considering designs around the manufacture of trailing shoes for slurry spreaders.
Theme:	LO2 Enterprise Development
Sub-theme:	SA2.1 Capital Investment in attracting existing and new enterprises
Link to LDS	LO2 Enterprise Development

Total Project Costs	€25,000.00		
Eligible Project Costs	€25,000.00		
Funding sought by promoter:	The cost of this project is €25,000.00 and the promoter has requested funding of €12,500.00 or 50% of eligible costs whichever is the lesser.		
State one of the following: - First Review / Previously Deferred or Not Recommend	First Review		
Funding recommended by Evaluation Committee:	A maximum of €10,000.00 or 40% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser as presented.		
Details of private funding:	Cash / Money in account 12,500 50%		
Voluntary Labour: YES / NO (If yes provide detail)	No		
Synopsis of project:	Purchase of new equipment		
Detail exactly what WLP will be funding (List items from Project Assessment Report)	Detail	Total Cost (Expenditure)	Grant Aid recommend by the Evaluation Committee @ 40 %
	Auto Bandsaw	18,000	7,200
	Sirius Bandsaw	7,000	2,800
Total Funding		25,000	10,000
Was an assessment completed?: Date: _____	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the project assessment was completed on the 15/02/2021		
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 2 Leader Specific Guidelines.		
Where the procurement process	N/A		

resulted in less than 3 quotes, the EC must show the additional steps taken to ensure the reasonableness of costs:	
Innovative Element of the project:	The promoters continually try to progress using new technologies to adapt their business to changing markets.
Consideration of Deadweight:	The Evaluation Committee agreed that the promoters should be encouraged to progress but to address deadweight reduced grant aid to 40%. It is important for Companies such as this on to invest promptly in new technologies
Consideration of Displacement:	Displacement is not an issue as the promoters have developed their own niches and areas of expertise.
Economic justification for project:	The project fits the Local Development Strategy plan for Enterprise Development.
Average Score for Project:	77/ 100 (3)
% level of aid & ceiling:	A maximum of €10,000.00 or 40% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser
E. C. Executive Summary/Rationale for Funding	The Evaluation Committee agreed to recommend funding this project for the following reasons:- 21. The project scored 77/100 22. Funding supports existing employment and may create one additional job if new contracts are secured 23. The project fits the Local Development Plan (LDS) for supporting enterprise development

Jobs Created	Jobs Sustained	Match Funding	Previous Grant Aid Received
4	22	Yes	2019

Confirmation on the applicant's position re De-Minimus and double from the relevant agencies.	Date of Confirmation	Signed By
Email from the L.E.O.	17/02/2021	B. Kirby

- **Detail of Discussion:** Mr Jimmy Taaffe briefly outlined this project to the Evaluation Committee advising that the promoters were funded previously and successfully implemented the project. They are very progressive, continually adapting and using new technologies. Since previous

funding, their employment numbers have increased.

- With this new equipment they will no longer have to outsource work to other companies and will expand into the production of digesters and trailing shoes for slurry spreaders.
- What the promoters are doing currently is very price sensitive and with this new equipment he hopes to produce products he can sell and enable them to move away from subcontracting work.
- The Evaluation Committee questioned why they lost the Honeywell contract. Mr Jimmy Taaffe confirmed that large organisations regularly re tender for contracts.
- The Evaluation Committee noted that even with the loss of Honeywell the accounts and projections look quite healthy and questioned deadweight? Mr Jimmy Taaffe said that this is more a matter of encouragement. The promoter is an employer in a rural area and is trying to prepare for the future. See it as progression not deadweight.
- The Evaluation agreed to recommend funding this project at 40% rather than 50% to address deadweight issues. They felt that while the bank statements are healthy it is a volatile business, and this can change quite quickly.

Amount Recommended: A maximum of €10,000.00 or 40% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

40% of Eligible Project Funding: €10,000.00 or 40% of eligible expenditure, whichever is the lesser

Proposed: J. Beresford	Seconded by: D. Geoghegan
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

7.b. Extensions

Four extension requests were considered in unison. Covid-19 restrictions have caused delays in each instance and each promoter is seeking a 6 month extension to complete their project.

- i) 31LDRWAT111753 Biodiversity Audit Cheekpoint.
- ii) 31LDRWAT111752 Clashmore Community Biodiversity Action Plan.
- iii) 31LDRWAT111737 Villierstown Tree Planting.
- iv) 31LDRWAT111375 West Waterford Festival of Food.

Proposed: G. Hurley	Seconded by: G. Foley
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

7.c and 7.d

Waterford Leader Annual Progress Report 2020, Implementation Plan 2021 and Transitional Leader Programme.

Chief Officer D. Tuohy thanked WLP for progress to date and noted that maximum allocation of available budget had been achieved. WLP CEO Mr. J Taaffe thanked the Council staff for cooperation and support. Mr. Taaffe further commented that no projects had been compromised due to administration oversights or other potential system failures. A press release from Minister Humphries regarding the extra allocation of €50 million to the transitional programme was most welcome. Waterford can expect approx €2.1m i.e. €0.75m in admin costs and the remainder towards project funding. A thematic shift towards green tech and bio diversity is expected in line with the current public policy agenda. D Tuohy explained that transitional budget proposed in the first instance was insufficient to sustain the both the programme and the LDCs. S Cooke proposed, subject to funding, hiring agricultural science graduates or similar on short-term contracts to assist with animating green tech projects.

Proposed: S. Cooke	Seconded by: M O'Brien
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

7.e. Evaluation Committee: New Appointments

WLP CEO J Taaffe informed the committee that there is a need to appoint two new members to the evaluation committee to ensure a quorum and to provide for succession planning. As has been the precedent, the members of the evaluation committee are neither members of the Board of WLP Clg or the Board of the LCDC in order to ensure a separation of powers. The Chairman of the Evaluation Committee was invited to suggest a number of nominees (The Chairman of the Evaluation Committee knows the level of commitment involved, (which is substantial) and the standards to be adhered to). The proposals were as follows:

State Sector	Private Sector
1. Mary Walsh, WWETB(Year to go)	1. John David Power Retired Business
2. John Moloney Retired Teagasc	2. Anita Geoghegan, Retired Lancaster Labs

L O'Sullivan queried if geographical bias was an issue, Mr. Taaffe responded that appointing knowledgeable candidates was the main priority but informed the committee that the candidates were representative of regional interests more so than any specific hinterland. J. Beresford queried the source of the nominations, Mr. Taaffe replied that nominations for the Evaluation Committee came from the Evaluation Committee and WLP; he also informed the committee that impartiality and sufficient knowledge were the key criteria in sourcing nominations. D Geoghegan commented that the candidates were suitable for the role. It was proposed that all 4 names be approved and that Mary Walsh and John David Power be approached initially to sit on the evaluation committee.

Proposed: L. O'Sullivan	Seconded by: G. Foley
Abstentions: None	
Quorum achieved: Yes	APPROVED

8. Correspondence:

Two items of correspondence, which have previously been dealt with, were noted.

- Press Release regarding Supplementary Leader Funding.
- Letter for Waterford Integration Services requesting funding for translation services.

9. A.O.B.

WLP CEO Mr. J Taaffe thanked the membership of the LCDC for the development of a good working relationship following the establishment of the LCDC/LAG and placement of LEADER with the committee remit.

10. Date and venue of next meeting: 11.00am Thursday 8th April 2021, via videoconference.

Meeting Closed

Signed L. O'Sullivan 15/4/21
CHAIRPERSON DATE