

Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals and Scoring Guidance 2026

He Ara Whakahihiko Capability Fund





**MINISTRY OF BUSINESS,
INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT**
HĪKINA WHAKATUTUKI

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) Hīkina Whakatutuki – Lifting to make successful

MBIE develops and delivers policy, services, advice and regulation to support economic growth and the prosperity and wellbeing of New Zealanders.

MORE INFORMATION

Information, examples and answers to your questions about the topics covered here can be found on our website: www.mbie.govt.nz.

DISCLAIMER

This document is a guide only. It should not be used as a substitute for legislation or legal advice. The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment is not responsible for the results of any actions taken on the basis of information in this document, or for any errors or omissions.

June 2025

ISBN: 978-1-991143-03-7

©Crown Copyright

The material contained in this report is subject to Crown copyright protection unless otherwise indicated. The Crown copyright protected material may be reproduced free of charge in any format or media without requiring specific permission. This is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and not being used in a derogatory manner or in a misleading context. Where the material is being published or issued to others, the source and copyright status should be acknowledged. The permission to reproduce Crown copyright protected material does not extend to any material in this report that is identified as being the copyright of a third party. Authorisation to reproduce such material should be obtained from the copyright holders.

Contents

Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals 2026 investment round - He Ara Whakahihiko Capability Fund	4
About this opportunity	4
The funding available	4
Who can apply	5
The application, assessment, and decision-making process	6
Applicant feedback	6
Ballot process	6
Key dates	7
Information webinar.....	7
Key documents and content.....	8
Application process	8
Additional support.....	8
The assessment criteria	9
Conflicts of Interest	10
Assessment Panel members.....	10
Funding decisions	10
The contracting process	11
Payment.....	11
Reporting and monitoring	11
Contact us.....	11
Appendix A: Scoring grids.....	12

Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals 2026 investment round – He Ara Whakahihiko Capability Fund

We are inviting proposals for the He Ara Whakahihiko Capability Fund Rangapū Rangahau funding mechanism. Rangapū Rangahau invests in work programmes that strengthen capability and networks by building new connections between Māori organisations and the science, innovation and technology system (SI&T).

This Call for Proposals contains the same information published on our webpages. The web pages will always contain the correct and most up to date information. Any changes will get communicated by stakeholder alerts and published on the web pages. No updates will be available in PDF.

About this opportunity

Rangapū Rangahau funds research partnerships between research organisations and Māori organisations to undertake SI&T relevant research focussing primarily on promoting economic growth and/or environmental outcomes.

- Work programmes should provide a catalyst to establish new connections between Māori facing organisations and research organisations and opportunities to work collaboratively on SI&T relevant research. They should not support or extend existing research projects currently being funded, and/or involve full-time students.
- Proposals must be co-developed between the research organisation and the Māori facing organisation.

This Call for Proposals provides you with information on how to apply to the Fund, how your application will be assessed, what happens if your application is successful, and how to contact us for assistance with the application process.

The funding available

The indicative total funding available for Rangapū Rangahau is up to \$6.5 million (excluding GST). Each individual contract value is \$350,000 (excluding GST) for a term of 2 years.

Project costs must be solely and directly related to the project work programme. Funding can be used to cover costs towards the work programme development, delivery, and operating costs (including travel). Capital expenditure is not funded. Co-funding is not required for this Fund.

Who can apply

Proposals must meet all eligibility criteria to proceed for further assessment and proposals that do not meet the criteria will be declined. To be eligible for funding, proposals must:

1. Be made by a New Zealand based single legal entity that is a Māori facing organisation or a Research organisation.

A Māori facing organisation is defined as any organisation which has demonstrable evidence of building science and innovation capabilities within the Māori economy. The relationship with the research organisation must actively support the growth of Māori research capability and enable the research organisation to work effectively with Māori communities, knowledge systems or priorities.

A Research organisation is defined as an organisation that has the internal capability* to carry out science, innovation and technology.

*Internal capability being sought refers to scientific research qualification/s or equivalent demonstrated experience in the science sector.

2. Not be made by a Government department (as defined in Schedule 2 of the Public Service Act 2020).
3. Include both a Research organisation** and a Māori facing organisation, with one taking the lead as Applicant organisation and the other as Partner organisation. No more than one partner can be a public research organisation (including a university).

**A Research Organisation may be a Māori Research Organisation; however a Partner Māori Facing Organisation is still required to be eligible to apply.

A relationship must not be solely between the Applicant organisation and an organisation that is either a parent entity, subsidiary, or co-subsidiary of the Applicant organisation; or between departments within a single organisation (for example, a tertiary institution).

4. Be for activities that clearly align with the funding purpose and requirements of the scheme as outlined in the He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund Investment Plan.
5. Not be for activities that already receive government funding.
6. Not include any full-time tertiary students or school students.

Proposals with work programme activities that are eligible for funding from the Ministry of Education are a poor fit for the He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund.

7. Be for scientific research activities where the majority of the work programme is to be undertaken in New Zealand, unless MBIE considers there are compelling reasons to consider the proposal.

If the majority of the work programme will not be carried out in New Zealand, then explain in your proposal the reasons for this and why they are compelling. If a work programme is to have significant linkages with indigenous knowledge practitioners in other countries, demonstrate how this will be of benefit to New Zealand.

8. Not benefit a Russian state institution (including but not limited to support for Russian military or security activity) or an organisation outside government that may be perceived as contributing to the war effort.
9. Be submitted in Pītau - MBIE's Investment Management System and meet any applicable timing, formatting, content, or other administrative requirements.
10. Address one or more of the Vision Mātauranga Policy themes: Taiao, Indigenous Innovation and/or Mātauranga.

Note that some mātauranga Māori will not align with the Vision Mātauranga Policy Mātauranga theme for the purposes of this fund***.

***The following ANZSRC Field of Research (FoR) codes are not aligned, and are instead expected to be funded through other agencies:

- 4507 Te ahurea, reo me te hītori o te Māori (Māori culture, language and history)
- 4508 Mātauranga Māori (Māori education)
- 4511 Ngā tāngata, te porihanga me ngā hāpori o te Māori (Māori peoples, society and community)

The Vision Mātauranga Policy Hauora/Health theme is not supported by this fund as this theme is addressed through funding administered by the Health Research Council. Research proposals can include some hauora/health and remain eligible, as long as the majority**** of the proposal's outcomes address one or more of the three eligible themes.

****At least 50% of eligible FoR codes must address one or more of the eligible themes.

11. Be co-developed between the research organisation and the Māori facing organisation(s). If you submit an application, you must upload a co-development letter. This letter needs to state that the work programme has been co-developed by both/all parties and must be signed by both the Applicant organisation and the Partner organisation(s). The letter must demonstrate how the Māori facing organisation(s) meet the definition of 'Māori facing organisation' under eligibility criteria 1.

The application, assessment, and decision-making process

These steps outline the process from application to assessment and decision making:

1. Applicants submit a funding proposal.
2. MBIE reviews applications to ensure they meet the eligibility criteria.
3. Up to 10 MBIE officials with subject matter expertise relevant to this investment will complete an internal assessment of each proposal across each of the four assessment criteria detailed in Rangapū Rangahau Assessment and Scoring Guidance 2026 and the Vision Mātauranga policy. Assessments will be recorded internally.
4. Proposals that score a “3” or higher across each of the four assessment criteria (the funding threshold) will proceed to the next stage. Proposals that score a “2” or under will be considered below the threshold for funding and will be recommended as not fundable to the Deputy Secretary, Labour, Science and Enterprise, who is the decision-maker.
5. If 70 or fewer proposals are submitted, all eligible/fundable proposals will proceed to assessment.
6. If 71 or more eligible/fundable proposals are submitted, a selection ballot will occur to reduce the number of eligible proposals proceeding to assessment to 70.
7. Ineligible applicants are notified.
8. Applicants that scored a “2” or less against the assessment criteria and did not proceed are notified.
9. If applicable, applicants that scored a “3” or higher against the assessment criteria but were not selected to proceed to assessment via ballot are notified.
10. Assessors will accept/decline assigned proposals and declare any conflicts of interest.
11. Proposals are assessed by three independent Assessment Panel members against the assessment criteria and recorded in Pītau.
12. The Assessment Panel meet and discuss the proposals and reach a consensus on scores, feedback comments, and recommendations which will inform the Panel Chair's report.
13. The Panel Chair provides a report that includes funding recommendations to the Deputy Secretary, Labour, Science and Enterprise, who is the decision-maker.
14. Successful applicants are notified.

Applicant feedback

Following eligibility checks, all applicants will be notified whether they were eligible or not. If applicants are not eligible, we will let you know the reasons why.

After the full assessment process has been completed, all applicants that proceed to assessment will receive written notification and feedback about their applications. Feedback will be based on information gathered from Assessment Panel members about the main strengths and weaknesses of their proposals.

Ballot process

Why we are using a selection ballot system

If we receive 71 or more eligible proposals that meet the funding threshold, we will use a ballot system to reduce assessment burden on MBIE's Assessment Panel. All eligible proposals that meet the funding threshold will go into the ballot.

The ballot process helps us manage operational costs and is a transparent selection method which treats all proposals that meet the funding threshold fairly and doesn't discriminate against applicants in any way. The ballot system is not a new system and is widely used internationally

The 70 proposed selected by the ballot will proceed to the Panel Assessment.

How the ballot system works

MBIE will use a [Microsoft Excel function](#) to randomly select the 70 eligible proposals which will proceed to Panel Assessment. MBIE will use an excel spreadsheet that uses a Random Array (RANDARRAY) function. This function assigns a random number between 1 and n (where n is the number of eligible applications) to each application.

The programme will then select the first 70 applications generated by the RANDARRAY function to proceed to Panel Assessment. The programme will be run on 20 October 2025 by the General Manager Science Investment and Performance.

Key dates

Activity	Date
Information webinar (register here)	25 June 2025
Proposal submission period	20 August 2025 until 12 noon, 1 October 2025
Assessment Panel members published	By 30 August 2025
MBIE checks all proposals against the eligibility criteria and funding threshold	Late October 2025
If applicable MBIE will use the ballot system if we receive 71 or more eligible proposals meeting the funding threshold	20 October 2025
Proposals assigned to Assessors	Late October 2025
Assessment Panel Briefing	Late October 2025
Ineligible and unsuccessful applicants notified	Early December 2025
Assessment of proposals by the Assessment Panel	November – December 2025
Assessment Panel meeting	18-19 February 2026
Investment funding decisions announced	March 2026
Feedback to Applicants	March 2026
Contracting period	April - May 2026
Contracts commence	1 June 2026

Dates are subject to change. If they change, we'll let you know by email or by stakeholder alert. You can also subscribe to our [Alert e-newsletter](#).

Information webinar

A webinar and Q&A session will be held for applicants on Wednesday 25 June 2025. We will provide everything you need to know about the 2026 Investment Round for both the Rangapū Rangahau and Ara Whaihua funding mechanisms.

The first hour is a webinar presentation followed by an hour for Q&A.

Register for [He Ara Whakahihiko Capability Fund \(HAWCF\) information webinar](#) — Zoom

Key documents and content

When developing your application, we encourage you to consult the following key reference documents:

The [He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund Investment Plan](#) for the fund investment objectives and outcomes

The [He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund web page](#)

The [Vision Mātauranga policy](#)

See the [Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals](#) web pages for:

- Rangapū Rangahau Proposal Template 2026: He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund
- Assessment and Scoring Guidance Rangapū Rangahau 2026: He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund
- Rangapū Rangahau Combined Progress and Final Reporting Template 2026: He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund
- Rangapū Rangahau Contract Template 2026: He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund

Application process

Applicants are required to complete their Rangapū Rangahau proposals in [Pītau](#) our Investment Management System a secure online portal. To help you prepare your proposal we've provided a proposal template.

1. Proposals are entered and submitted in Pītau. To access Pītau you will first need a [RealMe](#) account.
2. If you do not have a Pītau login, contact your Research Office to get one, or if you don't have a Research Office you can request access. Before developing your proposal, you are encouraged to consider the eligibility criteria, the assessment criteria, and the terms and conditions relating to this Call for Proposals.
3. The proposal template provides guidance on how to prepare your proposal and the information you are required to provide. We recommend you use the proposal template provided to draft the required information in a word processor of your choice and then when ready to submit, copy and paste the necessary segments into the appropriate Pītau fields and upload your supporting documentation where directed.
4. MBIE staff will be able to assist you with accessing Pītau and providing guidance about how to go about entering content.
5. The information in your proposal is used for assessment and forms the basis of the contract for successful projects.
6. Proposals submitted in te reo Māori are welcomed. The assessment of proposals may take place in English. Applicants may choose to provide a translation of their proposal or rely on MBIE to commission a translation without further recourse to the Applicant. The choice of language will not influence assessment outcomes. Translations must be upload into Pītau, and any translations must be consistent with the original te reo Māori version.

Additional support

Moko Kauri Consultants are available to support all applicants throughout the application process. For more information or to get in touch with Moko Kauri Consultants email info@mokokauri.co.nz

The assessment criteria

MBIE officials will assess proposals on each of the criteria (below) and score them from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality). See Appendix A on page 12 for the scoring grids.

Excellence

The Fund seeks excellence by developing, retaining, and attracting talented people and organisations through undertaking high quality scientific research, and innovation solutions relevant to science, innovation and technology.

Development of People, Partnerships, and Skills (25%)

Key Question: To what extent are longer-term capabilities and networks likely to emerge to generate excellent science which support economic and/or environmental outcomes?

When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:

- Will the project build research capability networks and partnerships for generating excellent science?
- Will the project go beyond 'business as usual' for the organisations involved? For example, establish a new long-term research collaboration.
- To what extent will the project substantially develop capability and skill of the participants?

Ability to Deliver (25%)

Key Question: What is the likelihood that the outputs of the proposed project will be achieved?

When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:

- How does the calibre, experience, and skills of the team relate to the subject area(s) proposed for the work programme?
- Does the team have the appropriate mandate to conduct this work?
- Are all involved parties and the work programme appropriately resourced and supported, including management and facilities?
- Have challenges to delivery been identified and mitigated?

Impact

The Fund seeks impact through programmes of work that explore the ways in which scientific research and its development and commercial application can benefit whānau, communities, the Māori economy and New Zealand.

Science, Innovation and Technology Outcomes (25%)

Key Question: Will the project deliver SI&T relevant research leading to economic and/or environmental outcomes and what are the expected impacts of the research?

When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:

- Does the SI&T relevant research have the potential to lead to tangible economic and/or environmental outcomes and impacts?
- Will the project uplift Māori science capability and capacity to benefit the Māori facing organisation(s)?
- Do the expected science outcomes align with the aspirations of the Māori facing organisation(s)?
- Will the science outcomes be disseminated to wider Māori and/or other stakeholders?

Science, Innovation & Technology Benefits and Vision Mātauranga (25%)

Key Question: Will the increased science capability and capacity benefit the science, innovation and technology (SI&T) sector, and to what extent does the project support the Vision Mātauranga policy?

When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:

- Will the project develop excellent science and partnerships which enables Māori organisations to deliver benefit to New Zealand?
- Will the project uplift Māori science capability and capacity to benefit the SI&T sector?
- Will the project identify and support future opportunities for Māori to participate in the SI&T sector?
- How well does the project address the Vision Mātauranga theme(s) selected?

Conflicts of Interest

If you are submitting a proposal, check the list of Assessment Panel members for any potential conflicts of interest. If you identify an actual, potential, or perceived direct or indirect conflict of interest, you must notify us before the application closing date by emailing HAWCF@mbie.govt.nz with the details for further discussion.

Conflicts of interest may occur on two different levels:

1. A direct conflict of interest, where an Assessor is:
 - directly involved with a proposal (as a participant, manager, mentor, or partner) or has a close personal relationship with the applicant, for example, family members
 - a collaborator or in some other way involved with an applicant's proposal.
2. An indirect conflict of interest, where an Assessor:
 - is employed by an organisation involved in a proposal but is not part of the applicant's proposal
 - has a personal and/or professional relationship with one of the applicants, for example, an acquaintance
 - is assessing a proposal under discussion that may compete with their business interests.

A close personal relationship is generally considered in relatively narrow terms, for example, that of a direct relationship (spouse/partner, sibling, dependent). Iwi or hapū affiliation would not normally be considered a direct conflict of interest.

Assessment Panel members

A list of Assessment Panel members will be published on our [Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals](#) web pages by 30 August 2025.

Funding decisions

MBIE's Deputy Secretary, Labour, Science and Enterprise will make the final investment decision based on recommendations from MBIE's report, and may:

- set pre-contractual conditions which must be met before the investment is contracted
- set special conditions in addition to the general terms and conditions set out in the Fund's Funding Contract
- vary the contract title (in consultation with the applicant)
- vary the Public Statement (in consultation with the applicant)
- vary the proposed term of the project
- vary the funding allocated from that proposed
- require the proposed project plan be negotiated to MBIE's satisfaction to reflect the changed funding
- consider prior performance in MBIE funded science contracts. Where an applicant is recommended to be funded but has an outstanding reporting requirement, or unmet contractual obligations, at the time of contracting, we may withhold the funding contract until such a time as previous contracting obligations are fulfilled. Please note that the new contract start date could be delayed where earlier contractual obligations are unfulfilled.

We will advise the proposal's Application Administrator of the funding decisions in March 2026. The successful applicants will be published on our He Ara Whakahihiho Capability Fund webpages and announced via a press release, or announced by the Ministers for Science, Innovation and Technology and Māori Development.

The contracting process

Successful applicants will enter into a Funding Contract with us (subject to any pre-contractual conditions being met).

This agreement must be signed and returned to us within one month.

The terms and conditions of the Rangapū Rangahau Contract Template 2026: He Ara Whakāhiko Capability Fund will apply to the provision of funding agreed between us and the contracting organisation. By submitting a proposal, you are agreeing to the terms and conditions of the Rangapū Rangahau Contract Template 2026: He Ara Whakāhiko Capability Fund. This template is available on our [Rangapū Rangahau Call for Proposals](#) web page in the *Key documents and content* section.

Payment

The contract holder must manage the funding to ensure delivery of the contracted work programme and adhere to any reporting requirements. Subject to specific contract conditions, MBIE funding will be provided as follows:

- 50% at the start of the work programme
- 50% at the mid-point (after submission of a progress report to our satisfaction).

Reporting and monitoring

Successful applicants will be required to submit a progress report and a final report in Pītau and will be evaluated by us. These reports should be prepared jointly and include information provided from both the contract holder and Partner organisation(s). This includes a signed co-development letter/letters from the Partner organisation(s) to confirm that the report has been prepared in conjunction with that organisation(s) and that the information contained in the letter is accurate. The letter(s) provided must match the Partner organisations listed in the contract.

Progress report

The progress report should include information on the status and progress towards delivering on the work programme as contracted. This is due one month after the mid-point of the work programme (30 June 2027) and covers the period 1 June 2026 to 30 May 2027.

Final report

The final report should also include information on:

- the status and progress towards delivering on the Deliverables and Tasks as contracted
- key achievements
- emerging risks and what is being done to address them
- public statement
- an assessment of whether the work programme has or will lead to further science, innovation and technology opportunities, the project's success in building science capability and capacity, and the effectiveness of the overall work programme.

Final reports are due one month after the end date of the work programme (30 June 2028) and covers the period 1 June 2026 to 30 May 2028.

Contact us

Application queries: HAWCF@mbie.govt.nz

Pītau queries: imssupport@mbie.govt.nz

Phone: 0800 693 778 (Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 4:30pm)

You can also subscribe to our [Alert e-newsletter](#).

Appendix A: Scoring grids

Excellence scoring grid

Development of People, Partnerships, and Skills (25%)	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (High quality)
<p>Key Question: To what extent are longer-term capabilities and networks likely to emerge to generate excellent science which support economic and/or environmental outcomes?</p> <p>When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project build research capability networks and partnerships for generating excellent science? Will the project go beyond 'business as usual' for the organisations involved? For example, establish a new long-term research collaboration. To what extent will the project substantially develop capability and skill of the participants? 	<p><i>None Insufficient Not relevant No information Missing</i></p> <p>No relevant information has been provided in the proposal.</p> <p>For example, the proposal does not outline any plans to develop capabilities and partnerships, or these are not beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Vague Unclear Unlikely Dubious Little relevance</i></p> <p>The information provided in the proposal is unclear or not supported.</p> <p>For example, plans to develop capabilities and partnerships are vague or unlikely, and/or these are unlikely to be beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Limited Minimum - acceptable level Uncertainty Lacks detail</i></p> <p>Some useful information is provided, however significant gaps and lack of detail remain.</p> <p>For example, plans to develop capabilities and partnerships have been outlined but there is some uncertainty about their effectiveness, and/or these are minimally beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Acceptable Sufficient Adequate Suitable</i></p> <p>Solid information is provided, however there is room for further information and evidence to improve the proposal.</p> <p>For example, plans to develop capabilities and partnerships are adequate and/or these are acceptably beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Significant Clear Multiple High level Robust</i></p> <p>Clear, succinct information is provided, delivering a solid proposal with relevant evidence.</p> <p>For example, plans to develop capabilities and partnerships are well outlined and robust, and/or these are clearly beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Certain Enduring Effective Comprehensive Strong Experience</i></p> <p>Significant information is provided and is backed up by relevant and effective evidence.</p> <p>For example, it is certain that capabilities and partnerships will be developed, and the plans are comprehensive, and/or these are well beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>	<p><i>Excellent Exemplary Detailed Impressive</i></p> <p>The proposal is exemplary, excellent, comprehensive, and well explained and detailed in all respects.</p> <p>For example, excellent capabilities and partnerships will be developed and will provide a step-change, and/or there is a complete shift above and beyond 'business-as-usual'.</p>
Ability to Deliver (25%)	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (High quality)
<p>Key Question: What is the likelihood that the outputs of the proposed project will be achieved?</p> <p>When assessing this question, Assessors will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the calibre, experience, and skills of the team relate to the subject area(s) proposed for the work programme? Does the team have the appropriate mandate to conduct this work? Are all involved parties and the work programme appropriately resourced and supported, including management and facilities? Have challenges to delivery been identified and mitigated? 	<p><i>None Insufficient Not relevant No information Missing</i></p> <p>No relevant information has been provided.</p> <p>For example, there is no information about the work programme. Significant challenges in the project have not been identified or addressed. Team information is insufficient, and/or team science capability is inadequate.</p>	<p><i>Vague Unclear Unlikely Dubious Little relevance</i></p> <p>The information provided is unclear or not supported.</p> <p>For example, work programme details are missing or unclear. There are challenges in the project that have not been identified or addressed. Team information is vague, and/or team science capability is substandard.</p>	<p><i>Limited Minimum - acceptable level Uncertainty Lacks detail</i></p> <p>Some useful information is provided, however significant gaps and lack of detail remain.</p> <p>For example, work programme details are provided. There's some uncertainty around challenges and mitigations. Team information is minimal, and/or team science capability is limited.</p>	<p><i>Acceptable Sufficient Adequate Suitable</i></p> <p>Solid information is provided, however there's room for further information and evidence.</p> <p>For example, work programme details are sufficient but further explanation could be provided. Identification of challenges and mitigations are adequate. Team information is sufficient, and/or team science capability is acceptable.</p>	<p><i>Significant Clear Multiple High level Robust</i></p> <p>Clear, succinct information is provided, with relevant evidence.</p> <p>For example, the work programme is well developed. Key challenges and mitigations are clearly identified. Team information is good, and/or team science capability is evident.</p>	<p><i>Certain Enduring Effective Comprehensive Strong Experience</i></p> <p>Significant information is provided and backed up by relevant and effective evidence.</p> <p>For example, the project plan is comprehensive and addresses challenges well. Team information is very good, and/or team science capability is strong.</p>	<p><i>Excellent Exemplary Detailed Impressive</i></p> <p>The proposal is exemplary and detailed in all respects.</p> <p>For example, the work programme is impressive and will clearly achieve its intended outcomes. Identification of challenges and mitigation is excellent. Team information is excellent, and/or team science capability is exemplary.</p>

Impact scoring grid

Science, Innovation and Technology Outcomes (25%) Key Question: Will the project deliver science, innovation and technology (SI&T) relevant research leading to economic and/or environmental outcomes and what are the expected impacts of the research?	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality) <i>None Insufficient Not relevant No information Missing</i>	2 <i>Vague Unclear Unlikely Dubious Little relevance</i>	3 <i>Limited Minimum - acceptable level Uncertainty Lacks detail</i>	4 <i>Acceptable Sufficient Adequate Suitable</i>	5 <i>Significant Clear Multiple High level Robust</i>	6 <i>Certain Enduring Effective Comprehensive Strong Experience</i>	7 (High quality) <i>Excellent Exemplary Detailed Impressive</i>
When assessing this question, Assessors will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the SI&T relevant research have the potential to lead to tangible economic and/or environmental outcomes and impacts? Will the project uplift Māori science capability and capacity to benefit the Māori facing organisation(s)? Do the expected science outcomes align with the aspirations of the Māori facing organisation(s)? Will the science outcomes be disseminated to wider Māori and/or other stakeholders? 	No relevant information has been provided. For example, insufficient information is provided, or no science outcomes and expected impact/s will be achieved. There is no evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	The information provided is unclear or not supported. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are unclear or unlikely, and/or there is little evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	Some useful information is provided, however significant gaps and lack of detail remain. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are uncertain or limited, and/or there is minimal evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	Solid information is provided, however there is room for further information and evidence to improve the proposal. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are acceptable, and/or there is adequate evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	Clear, succinct information is provided, delivering a solid proposal with relevant evidence. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are good, and/or there is clear evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	Comprehensive information is provided. The proposal may deliver enduring impacts and is backed up by relevant and effective evidence. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are very good and will be enduring, and/or there is strong evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.	Excellent information is provided, delivering an exemplary proposal. A high level of confidence/ certainty exists that this proposal will successfully deliver on its outcomes. For example, science outcomes and expected impact/s are substantial and will result in a step-change, and/or there is exemplary evidence of capability and capacity uplift at an individual or organisational level.
Science, Innovation & Technology Benefits and Vision Mātauranga (25%) Key Question: Will the increased science capability and capacity benefit the science, innovation and technology (SI&T) sector, and to what extent does the project support the Vision Mātauranga policy?	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality) <i>None Insufficient Not relevant No information Missing</i>	2 <i>Vague Unclear Unlikely Dubious Little relevance</i>	3 <i>Limited Minimum - acceptable level Uncertainty Lacks detail</i>	4 <i>Acceptable Sufficient Adequate Suitable</i>	5 <i>Significant Clear Multiple High level Robust</i>	6 <i>Certain Enduring Effective Comprehensive Strong Experience</i>	7 (High quality) <i>Excellent Exemplary Detailed Impressive</i>
When assessing this question, Assessors will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project develop excellent science and partnerships which enables Māori organisations to deliver benefit to New Zealand? Will the project uplift Māori science capability and capacity to benefit the SI&T sector? Will the project identify and support future opportunities for Māori to participate in the SI&T sector? How well does the project address the Vision Mātauranga theme(s) selected? 	No relevant information has been provided in the proposal. For example, there is insufficient information to assess the feasibility, or the project does not deliver increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes. The science is absent.	The information provided in the proposal is unclear or not supported. For example, the work programme is unlikely to deliver increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes, or science described is of substandard quality.	Some useful information is provided, however significant gaps and lack of detail remain. For example, the work programme will deliver limited increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes, and/or the science described is of minimum quality.	Solid information is provided, however there is room for further information and evidence to improve the proposal. For example, the work programme will deliver adequate increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes, and/or the science described is of acceptable quality.	Clear, succinct information is provided, delivering a solid proposal with relevant evidence. For example, the work programme will deliver clear increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes, and/or the science described is of good quality.	Comprehensive information is provided. The proposal may deliver enduring impacts and is backed up by relevant and effective evidence. For example, the work programme is certain to deliver increased science capability/capacity and Vision Mātauranga outcomes, and/or the science described is of very good quality.	Excellent information is provided, delivering an exemplary proposal. A high level of confidence/certainty exists that this proposal will successfully deliver on its outcomes. For example, the work programme will deliver significant increased science capability/capacity and excellent Vision Mātauranga outcomes that are substantial and represent a step-change, and/or the science described is of excellent quality.

