

Smart Ideas Call for Proposals and Scoring Guide

2025 Investment Round – Endeavour Fund





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.

August 2024

ISBN: 978-1-991316-03-5

©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

- Smart Ideas Call for Proposals 2025 4**
- The funding available 4
- Who can apply..... 4
- Application and assessment information..... 5
- Completing your registration and submitting proposals 5
- Key dates 5
- Endeavour Fund Roadshows: 2025 Investment Round 6
- Key documents..... 6
- The assessment criteria..... 7
- Excellence..... 7
- Impact..... 7
- Conflicts of interest 8
- Funding decisions 9
- Contracting, payment, reporting, and monitoring..... 9
- Payments..... 9
- Reporting and monitoring 9
- Contact 9
- Assessment and scoring guidance - Smart Ideas 2025 investment round – Endeavour Fund 10**
- Assessment guidance 10
- Guidance on Terms 10
- Excellence: Science Criterion (50% weighting)..... 12
- Excellence: Team Criterion (15% weighting)..... 13
- Impact: Benefit to New Zealand (25% weighting)..... 15
- Impact: Implementation Pathways (10% weighting) 16
- Vision Mātauranga assessment..... 18
- Appendix one – Scoring Grids 20**

Smart Ideas Call for Proposals 2025

We are inviting proposals for the Endeavour - Smart Ideas funding mechanism. The Fund's objective is to catalyse and rapidly tests promising, innovative research ideas with high potential for benefit to New Zealand, to refresh and enable diversity in the science portfolio.

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.

The funding available

The indicative total annual funding available is \$17m (excluding GST). Each individual contract value is between \$0.4m and \$1m (excluding GST) for a term of two or three years.

For the 2025 investment round, the Science Board will aim to fund at least 47 Smart Ideas proposals.

Who can apply

For proposals to be eligible under the Endeavour Smart Ideas mechanism, they must:

- be made by a New Zealand-based Research Organisation or a New Zealand-based legal entity representing a New Zealand-based Research Organisation
- be designed so that the majority of the public benefits in new knowledge accrue outside of the Research Organisation or legal entity which represents the Research Organisation
- not be made by a department of the public service as listed in Schedule 2 of the Public Service Act 2020
- be made under an investment mechanism specified in the Schedules of the 2025 Gazette Notice
- be for research, science or technology, or related activities, the majority of which are to be undertaken in New Zealand, unless the Science Board considers that there are compelling reasons to consider the proposals, despite the amount of research, science or technology or related activities being proposed to be undertaken overseas
- 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
- meet any applicable timing, formatting, system or other similar administrative requirements imposed by MBIE in supplying administrative services to the Science Board under section 10(7) of the RS&T Act 2010
- advise that the proposed funding recipient will, and the Science Board is of the view that it can, adhere to the terms and conditions of funding set out in an investment contract determined by the Science Board
- not be for activities already funded elsewhere.

In addition to the above criteria, to be eligible:

- research proposals can include some out-of-scope research outcomes (health, defence and expanding knowledge) and remain eligible, as long as the sum of these outcomes is 49% or less of the proposal's outcomes.

All organisations are subject to a cap or maximum number of applications they can register and submit

The cap or maximum applies to all organisations. You can see how this cap applies to your organisation on the [Endeavour web page](#).

Application and assessment information

The application and assessment process includes:

1. Registration - all applicants must register before they can submit a proposal.
2. Applicants submit a proposal.
3. Independent Assessors review and score the proposal against the Excellence and Impact assessment criteria.
4. The Science Board decides if the proposal is eligible.
5. Based on the Assessor reviews and scores, the Science Board makes its investment decisions and may use the portfolio approach described in the [Endeavour Fund 2025 Gazette Notice](#)

Completing your registration and submitting proposals

Applicants are required to complete their registration and submit proposals in Pītau, our Investment Management System - a secure online portal. To help you prepare your registration and proposals we have provided two templates:

- Smart Ideas Registration template
- Smart Ideas Proposal template

Links to these templates are in the Key documents section of the Call for Proposals web page.

Key dates

Date	Activity
Registration period	30 September 2024 until 12 noon, 30 October 2024
Proposal submission period	30 September 2024 until 12 noon, 11 December 2024
Assessment period	7 – 26 February 2025
Science Board makes funding decisions	21 May 2025
Applicants notified of funding decisions	Mid- to late June 2025
Funding decisions announced	Mid- to late June 2025
Applicant feedback	By late July 2025
Contracting period	30 June 2025 to 29 September 2025
Contracts begin	1 October 2025

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](#).

Endeavour Fund Roadshows: 2025 Investment Round

Join us for the virtual Endeavour Fund Roadshows for the 2025 Investment Round on 2, 3, and 7 October 2024. This is an opportunity for the research community to engage with the Endeavour Team.

At the roadshows, we will provide everything you need to know about the 2025 Investment Round for both the Smart Ideas and Research Programmes funding mechanisms.

The Roadshow webinars are scheduled for two hours. The first hour is a webinar presentation given by MBIE, followed by an hour for Q&A. Register using one of the registration links below to secure your place.

Roadshow 1	Wednesday 2 October 2024: 9.30am – 11.30am	Register for Roadshow 1
Roadshow 2	Thursday 3 October 2024: 9am – 11am	Register for Roadshow 2
Roadshow 3	Monday 7 October 2024: 12.30pm – 2.30pm	Register for Roadshow 3

The webinar presentation will be published on this page before the end of October 2024.

Contact Endeavour.roadshow@mbie.govt.nz

Key documents

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

- [The National Statement of Science Investment 2015-2025](#) details the Government's ten-year vision for New Zealand's science system.
- [Endeavour Fund Investment Plan 2025-2027](#)
- The [Vision Mātauranga policy](#) outlines the Government's policy framework that aims to unlock the innovation potential of Māori knowledge, resources, and people to assist New Zealanders to create a better future.
- [Endeavour Fund 2025 Investment Round Gazette Notice](#)
- [Smart Ideas Call for Proposals 2025 investment round web pages](#) for:
 - Assessment and Scoring Guidance Smart Ideas 2025 investment round – Endeavour Fund
 - Smart Ideas Registration template
 - Smart Ideas Proposal template
 - Science Investment Contract template
 - Smart Ideas Annual Reporting template
 - Smart Ideas Final Reporting template

The assessment criteria

Assessors will assess proposals on each of the criteria (below) and score them from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality).

Excellence

EXCELLENCE: SCIENCE CRITERION (50% WEIGHTING)

Research should be well-designed, involve risk and/or novelty, and leverage additional value from wider research. Assessment must have particular regard to whether the proposed research, science or technology or related activities:

- progress and disseminate new knowledge
- have a well-designed research plan and a credible approach to risk management
- are ambitious in terms of scientific risk, technical risk, novelty and/or innovative approaches
- are well-positioned in the domestic and international research context
- if applicable to the proposal, recognises the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge and resources, including Mātauranga Māori.

EXCELLENCE: TEAM CRITERION (15% WEIGHTING)

The proposed team should have the mix of complementary skills, knowledge, and resources to deliver the proposed research, science or technology or related activities, and to manage risk. Assessment must have particular regard as to whether:

- the mix of skills is appropriate for the research
- the team has the skills, knowledge and resources which give confidence in their ability to deliver the research
- if applicable, the team has the appropriate Māori expertise for the project.

Impact

IMPACT: BENEFIT TO NEW ZEALAND (25% WEIGHTING)

Research should have direct and indirect benefits or effect on individuals, communities or society as a whole, including broad benefits to New Zealand's economy, environment or society. Assessment must have particular regard to:

- the scale and extent of potential benefits from the proposed research, science or technology, or related activities
- the extent of alignment with one or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need for New Zealand
- where relevant, the extent to which the project has identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.

IMPACT: IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY(S) (10% WEIGHTING)

Research should have an indicative implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefit to New Zealand that is not limited to a single firm or end-user, and an understanding of the barriers to impact. Assessment must have particular regard to:

- the degree to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the enablers and barriers in potential implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefits to New Zealand

- identification of the indicative end or next-users, beneficiaries, and stakeholders
- for those projects with mātauranga Māori, assess whether there is sufficient input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) of the project, that are adequately resourced, to ensure effective implementation.

VISION MĀTAURANGA ASSESSMENT

Where applicable, proposals must consider the relevancy of the Vision Mātauranga Policy. We expect that the Vision Mātauranga Policy will not be relevant to all proposals. Proposals that give effect to the Policy should demonstrate the relevance and use of a fit-for-purpose approach.

Related to Vision Mātauranga, Assessors will be asked - in their opinion, is the Vision Mātauranga policy relevant to this proposal? (Yes / No)

If the assessor answers 'Yes' they will then be asked:

- In their opinion, how well will the project give effect to the Vision Mātauranga Policy (i.e., realise the potential of Māori people, knowledge and resources), and reflect genuine, fit-for-purpose approaches?
- To consider the specific activities, outputs, and outcomes described, and whether they will create impact for Māori.

Assessors will select from the following to best describe their opinion:

Exceptional / Very Well / Well / Not Well / Absent.

[See the assessment and scoring guidance section](#) in the appendix below for detailed information and the scoring grids.

Conflicts of interest

We will publish the membership of the College of Assessors on our [College of Assessors webpage](#). If you identify that an Assessor has an actual, potential, or perceived direct or indirect conflict of interest, declare this in the Conflicts of Interest section of your application. If you discover a potential conflict of interest after proposal submission, you must notify us immediately by emailing endeavour@mbie.govt.nz with details of the conflict. 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, or
 - 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, e.g., an acquaintance
 - is assessing a proposal under discussion that may compete with their business interests.

Funding decisions

The Science Board decides on eligibility and makes the investment decisions in accordance with the Endeavour Fund 2025 Investment Round Gazette Notice, considering:

- independent Assessor reviews and scores
- may consider portfolio balancing, investment signals and targets in the Endeavour Fund Investment Plan 2025-2027.

The Science Board may decide to invest less than the total funding indicated in the Gazette Notice.

Contracting, payment, reporting, and monitoring

Contracting (variation process)

If the Science Board decides to invest in your proposal, MBIE will enter into a Science Investment Contract and an associated Work Programme Agreement with your organisation (subject to any pre-contract conditions being met). A sample contract is available in our Key Documents section.

The Science Board may:

- set pre-contract conditions that must be met before MBIE and the applicant organisation can enter into a Science Investment Contract or any Work Programme Agreement
- set special contract conditions, and/or
- vary the amount of funding allocated from that requested.

Payments

For successful applicants, the total funding over the term of the contract will be split into equal monthly payments and paid in advance.

Reporting and monitoring

Successful applicants will be required to report once a year in Pītau – our online portal. Reporting guidance and reporting templates are published annually.

ANNUAL REPORT

We will require an annual report. Reporting information required includes, deliverables and tasks identified in the work programme, details of any emerging risks, and what is being done to address them. See the Annual Reporting Template in the Key Documents section.

FINAL REPORT

Required at the end of the project and will include commentary on the overall project outcomes, including key achievements, the steps taken and, where applicable, the changes made to your approach. See the Final Reporting Template in the Key Documents section.

Contact

Email endeavour@mbie.govt.nz

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

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

Assessment and scoring guidance - Smart Ideas 2025 investment round – Endeavour Fund

Smart Ideas Proposals will be assessed using the guidance, criteria, and scoring tables below.

This information is also produced in scoring grids, see appendix.

Assessment guidance

The Smart Ideas investment mechanism is intended to catalyse and rapidly test promising, innovative research ideas with high potential for benefit to New Zealand, to enable refresh and diversity in the science portfolio. The expectation and assessment of impact of the proposal needs to be consistent with the Smart Ideas mechanisms, in particular Benefits and Pathway(s) are indicative and do not need to be supported by evidence.

Assessors for Endeavour Fund Smart Ideas read and assess proposals assigned to them for Excellence and Impact, based on a 7-point scoring system (see scoring tables below). Each Assessor provides scores and commentary underpinning their rationale for the Science Board, and feedback for MBIE to provide to the applicant on the main strength and weakness of the proposal.

Guidance on Terms

Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making the research results available for potential end- or next-users so that impact and benefits can be achieved.• May vary according to the situation and should not be confined to publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals.
Novelty	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A new method or idea.• All or some elements of a proposal may be novel.• Novelty can range from making incremental to ground-breaking advances.
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bringing in new methods or ideas.• Degrees of innovation range from minor innovations of existing processes/techniques to the implementation of completely new processes/techniques that significantly challenge the status quo.• Can include the application of existing processes or techniques in new or unexpected areas.
Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Risk is defined as the effect of uncertainty on objectives.• Scientific and technical risk is the basis of an ambitious proposal. This includes assumptions based on current knowledge or scientific principles.• A project that involves Risk may seek to apply scientific techniques in an unproven or speculative way.• The level of risk taken should be justified by the magnitude of the impact benefits sought. The level of risk should be matched by appropriate risk management.

Risk Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk management is the coordinated activities used to direct and control a project or its' objectives when regarding risks. Risk should be managed through risk mitigation strategies and/or contingency plans. • Residual risk should be considered against the potential additional scientific value.
Well-positioned	<p>The research takes account of existing knowledge and research, either by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoiding redundancy or overlap, or • using existing knowledge/research as a platform for achieving more significant advances in knowledge than would otherwise be the case • describing links with key related science activities (often funded separately) which are complementary or synergistic • has international links that provide leverage and additional value.
A credible research plan	<p>Contains all of the expected elements, in a way which can be managed and effectively implemented. Expected elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the research methods/methodology, design and proposed outputs • a risk management and mitigation plan • provision for access to and use of the facilities and equipment for carrying out the research.
Benefit (as it relates to Impact)	<p>Impact being the strong positive effect or influence of a research outcome. Example impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic gains • improved social well-being • better use of resources or more efficient processes • support for new or existing sectors • new jobs and or businesses <p>Benefit to NZ should be in context of the <i>scale</i> and <i>extent</i> of the impact (see below).</p>
Scale	<p>Relative size, in context, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an economic development project may express scale in financial worth or as a share of a market • social and environmental projects may use statistics on population size, the number of people or organisations affected, or level of emissions reduced. <p>In assessing scale, consider the value over and above business as usual.</p>
Extent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area or degree of coverage of the benefits, irrespective of scale. • Consider whether benefits are narrow (for example, individual organisations), widespread (for example, across multiple sectors), or enabling (for example, increasing uptake of investments already made). Benefit should not solely be to a single firm or end-user.
Implementation pathway(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan that outlines broadly the steps a team will take in the goal to disseminate and realise impact from research outputs. • An indicative implementation pathway for Smart Ideas may provide the type of end-users that could benefit (but may not necessarily identify by name) and provide an indication of critical elements that support or hinder implementation (such as regulatory approvals vs. a potential manufacturing partner).

Excellence: Science Criterion (50% weighting)

Research should be well-designed, involve risk and/or novelty, and leverage additional value from wider research. Assessment must have particular regard to whether the proposed research, science or technology or related activities:

- progress and disseminate new knowledge
- have a well-designed research plan and a credible approach to risk management
- are ambitious in terms of scientific risk, technical risk, novelty and/or innovative approaches
- are well-positioned in the domestic and international research context
- if applicable to the proposal, recognises the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.

The scores in the table below range from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality).

Score	Keywords	Example
1	(Low quality) None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible	There is no risk and or novelty. Risk is not managed. The research plan and methodology are not credible. No additional value is leveraged from wider research. No new knowledge will be progressed or disseminated. When you would otherwise expect it, there is no recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
2	Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely	There is minimal risk and or novelty. Risk management is doubtful. The research plan and methodology are poor. Little additional value is leveraged from wider research. Minimal new knowledge will be progressed or disseminated. When you would otherwise expect it, there is insufficient recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
3	Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible	There is some risk and/or novelty. Risk management lacks detail. The research plan and methodology lack detail. Some additional value is leveraged from wider research. Limited new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated. When you would otherwise expect it, there is only partial recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
4	Acceptable Sufficient Suitable	There is acceptable risk and/or novelty. Risk management is adequate. The research plan and methodology are sufficient.

	Adequate Reasonable Quite likely	Sufficient additional value is leveraged from wider research. Adequate new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated. If applicable, there is suitable recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
5	Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large Probable	There is significant risk and/or novelty. Risk management is good. The research plan and methodology are clear. Substantial additional value is leveraged from wider research. Significant new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated. If applicable, there is good recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
6	Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain	There is high risk and/or novelty. Risk management is very good. The research plan and methodology are comprehensive. Comprehensive additional value is leveraged from wider research. Extensive new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated. If applicable, there is very good recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.
7	(High quality) Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Definite	The proposal has outstanding novelty and includes risk. There is exceptional risk management. The research plan and methodology are impressive. Exemplary additional value is leveraged from wider research. Outstanding new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated. If applicable, the project has outstanding recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.

Excellence: Team Criterion (15% weighting)

The proposed team should have the mix of complementary skills, knowledge, and resources to deliver the proposed research, science or technology or related activities, and to manage risk. Assessment must have particular regard as to whether:

- the mix of skills is appropriate for the research
- the team has the skills, knowledge and resources which give confidence in their ability to deliver the research
- if applicable, the team has the appropriate Māori expertise for the project.

The scores in the table below range from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality).

Score	Keywords	Example
1	(Low quality) None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible	The team has none of the skills, knowledge, or resources needed. The team gives no confidence in their ability to deliver the research or manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, appropriate Māori expertise in the team is missing.
2	Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely	The team has an inadequate mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives little confidence in their ability to deliver the research or manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, the team is lacking appropriate Māori expertise.
3	Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible	The team has a partial mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives some confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, there is limited appropriate Māori expertise in the team.
4	Acceptable Sufficient Suitable Adequate Reasonable Quite likely	The team has a suitable mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives adequate confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is reasonable or appropriate Māori expertise in the team.
5	Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large Probable	The team has a good mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives good confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is significant appropriate Māori expertise in the team.
6	Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain	The team has a comprehensive mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives high confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is comprehensive appropriate Māori expertise in the team.

7	(High quality) Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Definite	The team has an impressive mix of the necessary skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives outstanding confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is exemplary appropriate Māori expertise in the team.
---	--	---

Impact: Benefit to New Zealand (25% weighting)

Research should have direct and indirect benefits or effect on individuals, communities, or society as a whole, including broad benefits to New Zealand's economy, environment or society. Assessment must have particular regard to:

- the scale and extent of potential benefits from the proposed research, science or technology, or related activities
- the extent of alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need for New Zealand
- where relevant, the extent to which the project has identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.

The scores in the table below range from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality).

Score	Keywords	Example
1	(Low quality) None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is negligible. The outcomes have no alignment with any areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has not identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.
2	Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is minimal. The outcomes have doubtful alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has poorly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.
3	Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is limited. The outcomes have some alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has partially identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.

4	Acceptable Sufficient Suitable Adequate Reasonable Quite likely	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is adequate. The outcomes have reasonable alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has adequately identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.
5	Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large Probable	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is significant. The outcomes have good alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has clearly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.
6	Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is extensive. The outcomes have very good alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has comprehensively identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.
7	(High quality) Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Definite	The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is impressive. The outcomes have outstanding alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need. Where relevant, the project has outstandingly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.

Impact: Implementation Pathways (10% weighting)

Research should have an indicative implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefit to New Zealand that is not limited to a single firm or end-user, and an understanding of the barriers to impact. Assessment must have particular regard to:

- the degree to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the enablers and barriers in potential implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefits to New Zealand
- identification of the indicative end or next-users, beneficiaries, and stakeholders
- for those projects with mātauranga Māori, assess whether there is sufficient input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) of the project, that they are adequately resourced, to ensure effective implementation.

The scores in the table below range from 1 (low quality) to 7 (high quality).

Score	Keywords	Example
1	(Low quality) None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible	The indicative implementation pathway(s) is not credible because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways is missing description of indicative relationships is missing it will not deliver public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has no input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.</p>
2	Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely	The indicative implementation pathway(s) has minimal credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways is poor description of indicative relationships is poor it will be unlikely to deliver public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has little input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.</p>
3	Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible	The indicative implementation pathway(s) has limited credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it lacks detail understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is limited it will possibly deliver public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has some input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.</p>
4	Acceptable Sufficient Suitable Adequate Reasonable Quite likely	The indicative implementation pathway(s) has acceptable credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates adequate understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is sufficient it will quite likely deliver public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has adequate input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.</p>
5	Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large	The indicative implementation pathway(s) has good credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates substantial understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is substantial it will probably deliver public benefit to New Zealand.

	Probable	For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has significant input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.
6	Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain Likely	<p>The indicative implementation pathway(s) has very good credibility because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it demonstrates very good understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways • description of indicative relationships is comprehensive • it will likely deliver public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has very good input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.</p>
7	(High quality) Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Highly likely	<p>The indicative implementation pathway(s) has outstanding credibility because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it demonstrates exemplary understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways • description of indicative relationship gives total confidence • it is highly likely public benefit to New Zealand. <p>For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal includes outstanding engagement with Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.</p>

Vision Mātauranga assessment

Through the Vision Mātauranga Policy, we encourage appropriate and distinctive research arising from the interface between Māori knowledge and science to deliver effective and innovative products, services, and outcomes for New Zealand. Vision Mātauranga is designed to inspire researchers to find innovative responses to opportunities and solutions to issues and needs facing our country. This includes encouraging and building the capability, capacity and networks of Māori and the research community to collaborate in carrying out this work.

Giving effect to the Vision Mātauranga policy

Where applicable, proposals must consider the relevancy of the Vision Mātauranga Policy. We expect that the Vision Mātauranga Policy will not be relevant to all proposals. Proposals that give effect to the Policy should demonstrate the relevance and use of a fit-for-purpose approach.

Related to Vision Mātauranga, we are asking assessors the following:

- In your opinion, is the Vision Mātauranga policy relevant to this proposal? (Yes / No)

If the assessor ticks 'Yes' then we ask the assessor to answer the follow up question.

- In your opinion, how well will the project give effect to the Vision Mātauranga Policy (i.e., realise the potential of Māori people, knowledge and resources), and reflect genuine, fit-for-purpose approaches?

Consider the specific activities, output and outcomes described, and whether they will create impact for Māori. Assessors will select from the following to best describe their opinion:

Exceptional / Very Well / Well / Not Well / Absent.

If the Vision Mātauranga policy is relevant to this proposal, then the proposal can give effect to the Vision Mātauranga policy by considering the various ways in which Māori communities, knowledge and resources may be enabled, mobilised, and empowered in research, science and innovation. The manner and extent to which proposals give effect to Vision Mātauranga may differ depending on the research.

- Very strong applications, giving effect to Vision Mātauranga, may be Māori-led or co-led.
- Strong applications may have Māori researchers or traditional knowledge holders as part of the team; or may work meaningfully with Māori communities, interest groups, businesses, or key individuals.
- Strong applications enabling Māori knowledge may use kaupapa Māori approaches or draw deeply on mātauranga Māori.
- Others may incorporate Māori principles or perspectives into the research.

Enabling Māori people will be an important part of giving effect to Vision Mātauranga, as the appropriate understanding, development, and protection of Māori knowledge and resources will have Māori input. Research positioned to give effect to the Vision Mātauranga policy will create distinctive and meaningful impact for Māori and for New Zealand in any or all of the following ways:

- Enhancing productivity and performance of Māori and non-Māori enterprise through new products, processes, and services.
- Achieving environmental sustainability by utilising distinctive Māori relationships with the environment.
- Improving health and social well-being for Māori (the Endeavour Fund does not fund research with primarily health outcomes but will support this as a secondary outcome, as long as the sum of these outcomes is 49% or less of the proposal's outcomes).
- Generating new knowledge at the interface between indigenous knowledge (including mātauranga Māori) and research, science and innovation.
- Generating new indigenous knowledge (including mātauranga Māori) and research, science, and innovation.

Appendix – Scoring Grids

Excellence Assessment Scoring Grids

Science Criterion (50%) Research should be well-designed, involve risk and/or novelty, and leverage additional value from wider research.	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality) <i>None</i> <i>Not fit for purpose</i> <i>Negligible</i> <i>Missing</i> <i>Not credible</i>	2 <i>Minimal</i> <i>Poor</i> <i>Inadequate</i> <i>Insufficient</i> <i>Doubtful</i> <i>Lacking</i> <i>Unlikely</i>	3 <i>Limited</i> <i>Uncertain</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Partial</i> <i>Incomplete</i> <i>Lacks detail</i> <i>Possible</i>	4 <i>Acceptable</i> <i>Sufficient</i> <i>Suitable</i> <i>Adequate</i> <i>Reasonable</i> <i>Quite likely</i>	5 <i>Significant</i> <i>Good</i> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Well</i> <i>Clear</i> <i>Large</i> <i>Probable</i>	6 <i>Strong</i> <i>High</i> <i>Comprehensive</i> <i>Very good</i> <i>Very well</i> <i>Extensive</i> <i>Certain</i>	7 (High Quality) <i>Excellent</i> <i>Exemplary</i> <i>Impressive</i> <i>Outstanding</i> <i>Total</i> <i>Definite</i>
<p>Assessment must have particular regard to whether the proposed research, science or technology or related activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • progress and disseminate new knowledge • have a well-designed research plan and a credible approach to risk management • are ambitious in terms of scientific risk, technical risk, novelty and/or innovative approaches • are well-positioned in the domestic and international research context • if applicable to the proposal, recognises the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori 	<p>For example:</p> <p>No new knowledge will be progressed or disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are not credible.</p> <p>There is no risk and or novelty.</p> <p>Risk is not managed.</p> <p>No additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>When you would otherwise expect it, there is no recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Minimal new knowledge will be progressed or disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are poor.</p> <p>There is minimal risk and or novelty.</p> <p>Risk management is doubtful.</p> <p>Little additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>When you would otherwise expect it, there is insufficient recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Limited new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology lack detail.</p> <p>There is some risk and/or novelty.</p> <p>Risk management lacks detail.</p> <p>Some additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>When you would otherwise expect it, there is only partial recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Adequate new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are sufficient.</p> <p>There is acceptable risk and/or novelty.</p> <p>Risk management is adequate.</p> <p>Sufficient additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>If applicable, there is suitable recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Significant new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are clear.</p> <p>There is significant risk and/or novelty.</p> <p>Risk management is good.</p> <p>Substantial additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>If applicable, there is good recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Extensive new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are comprehensive.</p> <p>There is high risk and/or novelty.</p> <p>Risk management is very good.</p> <p>Comprehensive additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>Extensive new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>If applicable, there is very good recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>Outstanding new knowledge will be progressed and disseminated.</p> <p>The research plan and methodology are impressive.</p> <p>The proposal has outstanding novelty and includes risk.</p> <p>There is exceptional risk management.</p> <p>Exemplary additional value is leveraged from wider research.</p> <p>If applicable, the project has outstanding recognition of the distinctive research, science and innovation contributions of Māori people, knowledge, and resources, including mātauranga Māori.</p>

Team Criterion (15%)	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
<p>The proposed team should have the mix of complementary skills, knowledge, and resources to deliver the proposed research, science or technology or related activities, and to manage risk.</p>	<p>1 (Low quality) None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible</p>	<p>2 Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely</p>	<p>3 Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible</p>	<p>4 Acceptable Sufficient Suitable Adequate Reasonable Quite likely</p>	<p>5 Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large Probable</p>	<p>6 Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain</p>	<p>7 (High Quality) Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Definite</p>
<p>Assessment must have particular regard as to whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the mix of skills is appropriate for the research the team has the skills, knowledge and resources which give confidence in their ability to deliver the research if applicable, the team has the appropriate Māori expertise for the project. 	<p>For example: The team has none of the skills, knowledge, or resources needed. The team gives no confidence in their ability to deliver the research or manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, appropriate Māori expertise in the team is missing.</p>	<p>For example: The team has an inadequate mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives little confidence in their ability to deliver the research or manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, the team is lacking appropriate Māori expertise.</p>	<p>For example: The team has a partial mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives some confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. When you would otherwise expect it, there is limited appropriate Māori expertise in the team.</p>	<p>For example: The team has a suitable mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives adequate confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is reasonable or appropriate Māori expertise in the team.</p>	<p>For example: The team has a good mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives good confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is significant appropriate Māori expertise in the team.</p>	<p>For example: The team has a comprehensive mix of the skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives high confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is comprehensive appropriate Māori expertise in the team.</p>	<p>For example: The team has an impressive mix of the necessary skills, knowledge and resources needed. The team gives outstanding confidence in their ability to deliver the research and manage risks. If applicable, there is exemplary appropriate Māori expertise in the team.</p>

Impact Assessment Scoring Grids

Benefit To New Zealand Criterion (25%) Research should have direct and indirect benefits or effect on individuals, communities, or society as a whole, including broad benefits to New Zealand's economy, environment or society.	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality) <i>None Not fit for purpose Negligible Missing Not credible</i>	2 <i>Minimal Poor Inadequate Insufficient Doubtful Lacking Unlikely</i>	3 <i>Limited Uncertain Some Partial Incomplete Lacks detail Possible</i>	4 <i>Acceptable Sufficient Suitable Adequate Reasonable Quite likely</i>	5 <i>Significant Good Substantial Well Clear Large Probable</i>	6 <i>Strong High Comprehensive Very good Very well Extensive Certain</i>	7 (High quality) <i>Excellent Exemplary Impressive Outstanding Total Definite</i>
<p>Assessment must have particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale and extent of potential benefits from the proposed research, science or technology, or related activities the extent of alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need for New Zealand where relevant, the extent to which the project has identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori. 	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is negligible.</p> <p>The outcomes have no alignment with any areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has not identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is minimal.</p> <p>The outcomes have doubtful alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has poorly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is limited.</p> <p>The outcomes have some alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has partially identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is adequate.</p> <p>The outcomes have reasonable alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has adequately identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is significant.</p> <p>The outcomes have good alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has clearly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is extensive.</p> <p>The outcomes have very good alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has comprehensively identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <p>The scale and extent of the potential (direct or indirect) benefits of the proposed work is impressive.</p> <p>The outcomes have outstanding alignment with 1 or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need.</p> <p>Where relevant, the project has outstandingly identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.</p>

Implementation Pathway(s) Criterion (10%) Research should have an indicative implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefit to New Zealand that is not limited to a single firm or end-user, and an understanding of the barriers to impact.	SCORE & KEYWORDS						
	1 (Low quality) <i>None</i> <i>Not fit for purpose</i> <i>Negligible</i> <i>Missing</i> <i>Not credible</i>	2 <i>Minimal</i> <i>Poor</i> <i>Inadequate</i> <i>Insufficient</i> <i>Doubtful</i> <i>Lacking</i> <i>Unlikely</i>	3 <i>Limited</i> <i>Uncertain</i> <i>Some</i> <i>Partial</i> <i>Incomplete</i> <i>Lacks detail</i> <i>Possible</i>	4 <i>Acceptable</i> <i>Sufficient</i> <i>Suitable</i> <i>Adequate</i> <i>Reasonable</i> <i>Quite likely</i>	5 <i>Significant</i> <i>Good</i> <i>Substantial</i> <i>Well</i> <i>Clear</i> <i>Large</i> <i>Probable</i>	6 <i>Strong</i> <i>High</i> <i>Comprehensive</i> <i>Very good</i> <i>Very well</i> <i>Extensive</i> <i>Likely</i>	7 (High quality) <i>Excellent</i> <i>Exemplary</i> <i>Impressive</i> <i>Outstanding</i> <i>Total</i> <i>Highly likely</i>
Assessment must have particular regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the degree to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the enablers and barriers in potential implementation pathway(s) to deliver public benefits to New Zealand identification of the indicative end or next-users, beneficiaries, and stakeholders; and for those projects with mātauranga Māori, assess whether there is sufficient input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) of the project, that they are adequately resourced, to ensure effective implementation. 	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) is not credible because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways is missing description of indicative relationships is missing it will not deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has no input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has minimal credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways is poor description of indicative relationships is poor it will be unlikely to deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has little input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has limited credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it lacks detail understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is limited it will possibly deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has some input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation, given the focus of the research plan.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has acceptable credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates adequate understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is sufficient it will quite likely deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has adequate input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has good credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates substantial understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is substantial it will probably deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has significant input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has very good credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates very good understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationships is comprehensive it will likely deliver public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal has very good input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.	For example: The indicative implementation pathway(s) has outstanding credibility because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it demonstrates exemplary understanding of the enablers and barriers for potential implementation pathways description of indicative relationship gives total confidence it is highly likely public benefit to New Zealand. For proposals with mātauranga Māori, the proposal includes outstanding engagement with Māori at the appropriate stage(s) or levels to ensure effective implementation where required.