

## Gateway Innovation Fund – Points of Clarification 4 July 2007

### **1. Project selection and scale**

- Must it be a single project or can it include a range of integrated measures that together contribute to the overall impact? Do the proposal elements have to be in the same sector e.g. urban regeneration?

*It is likely that proposals under the GIF will consist of a package of complementary and integrated interventions which together can stimulate and accelerate Gateway development. While it is not a requirement that the projects within the bid proposal fall within the same sector, it is important that the synergy and compatibility of the project elements is evidenced in the application and that the added value of funding this package of measures is demonstrated.*

- Can the GIF proposals include elements of the package that are funded under NDP?

*Investment under the GIF is designed to complement committed investments under the NDP and address areas where mechanisms to support Gateway development are either not apparent or where funding levels available would not result in the required pace of development or progress in the Gateway concerned. However, the bid proposal must show how the GIF package is consistent and builds on the planned NDP investment in the gateway.*

*The GIF is not designed as a mechanism to “top-up” funding already secured under the NDP, or indeed as a second attempt to secure funding for a proposal that failed to secure funding under the sectoral investment programmes. However, where a bid proposal under the GIF can be shown to be complementary to and enhance linked projects under the NDP and where the additionality of GIF investment would further strengthen the impact, such proposals might be considered. The onus is on the applicant authority to adequately demonstrate the synergy with other projects.*

- What total level of funding can be expected for each bid?

*The GIF is additional to the significant funds already available under the NDP sectoral investment programmes. Given the nature of the Fund and the need to maximise the impact of the €300m development, we’re looking for the best proposals from the Gateways. As it’s intended that the scheme will have a significant impact on the growth of the Gateway, and that large-scale projects will be advanced, not all Gateways will be successful – depending on the quality of proposals, probably only 4 or 5 Gateways will be successful.*

- What element of co-funding is required? How can this co-funding be provided – monetarised values?

*Gateways will be expected to provide co-funding of at least 20% of the cost of the package to be supported by the GIF. Depending on local circumstances and the potential for local authority investment, other public sector investment and private sector investment, proposals for GIF support should provide for a higher rate of co-funding, where feasible. This local co-funding may be sourced from any of or any combination of the following: private sector investment, development contributions under sections 48 and 49 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 and the monetarised value of assets such as publicly-owned land, whose development will be an integral part of a GIF proposal.*

*The 20% contribution is a minimum threshold. The provision of higher levels of matching funding will be given due consideration in the assessment of bid proposals.*

- Is it accepted that development consent procedures may delay actual starts on GIF projects during 2008?

*When a lead Gateway authority is identifying potential bid proposals, it is important to retain a firm focus on the potential for actual delivery of the project(s). It is acknowledged that some projects may take longer to complete than others and may have a longer lead-in time. However, it is vital that the proposal is deliverable within the timeframe of the current Fund i.e. to 2010, or in the case of projects with a longer lead-in tangible demonstrable progress towards early delivery, and clear milestones and outcomes must be identified in the submission. If there is a serious doubt or risk that the project may not be delivered within the specified timeframe, consideration should perhaps be given to identifying alternative bid proposals.*

## **2. Collaboration and Consultation**

- Is private sector involvement an essential element of any bid proposal?

*Given that one of the core aims of the GIF is to stimulate Gateway development and enable the Gateway to grow to its full potential, the private sector will play a key role in realising that objective. In identifying and agreeing a strategic action plan for the Gateway, it would be essential that the local private sector representatives (e.g. the Chamber of Commerce) or key private sector partners ascribe to the plan and are committed to its delivery.*

*However, it is acknowledged that some proposals under the GIF may not be directly linked to specific private sector interests or may not involve private sector investment. Nevertheless, it would be highly desirable for some degree of commitment or “buy-in”*

*from key private sector interests to demonstrate that the project(s) leveraged through the GIF and local public funding will stimulate private sector development and investment. The potential yield from future development levies arising from the GIF delivery should also be identified.*

- One of the stated aims of the GIF is to promote collaboration between stakeholders within the Gateways – how will such collaboration be measured and evaluated?

*Successful development of a Gateway depends on strong teamwork between the local authorities in each location, between local authorities and the private sector and between local level stakeholders and Government Departments and Agencies. Structures to ensure maximum engagement by all of the above stakeholders are necessary to deliver dynamic, strategically focused and co-ordinated development. Bids under the GIF will be assessed with reference to the wider arrangements that the lead authorities are expected to have in place to secure the type of co-ordination and development described above. Such assessment will take into account the comprehensiveness of the co-ordination arrangements, their robustness in the longer term, their ability to harness existing mechanisms and resources and their ability to deliver real change in the way the development of the Gateways is promoted and co-ordinated.*

- Is there any scope for involvement by the elected members, including members of other Councils within the Gateway?

*There is no specific requirement for the lead Gateway authority to secure the formal approval of the elected members before submitting a bid proposal. Some of the proposals being put forward for consideration may already feature in the Regional Planning Guidelines, the City or County Development Plan or the Gateway Land Use and Transportation Strategy, and therefore have already been approved by the members. Nevertheless, it would be prudent to keep elected representatives fully apprised of developments and issues under GIF consideration, and engaged as may be necessary (as the timeframe permits), given the need for broad collaboration of both public and private sectors and the ongoing coordinated focus on Gateway delivery.*

- What is the role envisaged for the private sector?

*Funding under the GIF is designed to act as a stimulant for more substantial and wider private investment. The development of GIF funding proposals should therefore be mindful of the wider private sector perspective in relation to key investment requirements and property development parameters. Lead authorities should take whatever steps they consider appropriate to consult with the private sector in the development of GIF proposals.*

- What is the role envisaged for the regional authority?

*Regional Authorities have an important co-ordinating role across local authorities in each of the Regional Authority areas. The Regional Authorities can play a valuable role by feeding in to the development of GIF proposals by Lead Authorities and focusing specifically on measures to secure gateway development within a wider regional perspective.*

- What kind of engagement is expected with cross-border bodies for the border Gateways?

*The gateways of Dundalk and Letterkenny/Derry straddle or are adjacent to the border with Northern Ireland. The development of these gateways is closely related to the development of adjacent areas in Northern Ireland and there are existing arrangements for co-operation in many areas. The development of GIF proposals in these gateways must include a cross border dimension that could comprise for example of proposals jointly developed with the relevant local authorities in Northern Ireland, Government Departments or other interests. Such jointly developed proposals could embrace issues such as inter alia, strategic development, connectivity, innovation and economic development and the development of amenity and cultural attractions.*

- Can the constituent local authorities decide which is the lead authority?

*In the main, it is expected that the lead Gateway authority (for the purposes of the GIF process) will be the authority with primary responsibility for the core Gateway area. However, subject to the agreement of the Gateway authorities, an alternative lead local authority can be appointed.*

- What if there is not agreement between (or endorsement by) all of the Gateway local authorities on the bid proposals being put forward by the lead LA?

*The lead authorities have ultimate responsibility for the development of GIF proposals within the stated bid timetable. It is their responsibility to secure the widest possible consensus on the structure and content of proposals. While agreement by all local authorities in each gateway on the GIF bid is highly desirable from the point of view of the operation of the evaluation framework, if such agreement is not possible, the bid should be developed on the basis of majority agreement.*

### **3. Project Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis**

- Is CBA required for a package of projects which cost €30 m+ in aggregate?

*The Dept of Finance Capital Appraisal Guidelines state that a full CBA is required for individual projects with a value of over €30m. However, where there are a number of integrated but nonetheless separate projects that comprise the GIF bid proposal, and the value of each of those bid elements are under €30m, a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) is required for each individual project. Where MCA is undertaken, the marking criteria in Appendix 1 of the GIF Call for Proposals should be used in the appraisal.*

- Is there any assistance for Gateway authorities to put together the bid proposals, especially where there may be consultancy inputs e.g. CBA?

*There is no specific fund available to Gateway authorities to off-set bid preparation costs incurred. However, consideration should be given to pooling the preparatory and technical costs among all parties.*

#### **4. Preparation and submission of proposal**

- Is there a standard application form of format?

*As outlined in the Call for Proposals, the format of GIF proposals should follow the assessment framework and criteria template outlined at Appendix 1. The submission should not exceed 20 pages in length. However, additional supporting documents (e.g. technical reports, financial appraisals etc.) may be attached for reference.*

- Who is the GIF contact point in the Department?

*Patrick O’Sullivan is the point of contact regarding any queries on the Fund, and is also a central resource and initial point of contact within DEHLG for queries relating to other sectors under its remit e.g. housing, wastewater and water services etc. He can be contacted by phone at 01-888 2269 or by email at Patrick.O’Sullivan@environ.ie .*

- Are there GIF contacts within other Departments?

*It is intended to have individual GIF contact points within each of the key Government Departments and State Agencies, so that queries can be dealt with in a efficient manner. It is intended to make a full list of contact names available on the NSS website shortly.*