

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

MANATŪ AORERE

Manaaki

“Uplifting mana, through listening, supporting and empowering”

Guidelines and Application

ROUND THREE – FEBRUARY 2021



Contents

1	Introduction	2
	Overview	3
1.1	How Manaaki will operate	3
1.2	Eligible NZNGOs.....	3
1.3	MFAT and NZNGOs co-investment.....	3
1.4	Geographic and sector focus	5
1.5	Eligibility	7
2	Operating principles	9
3	Funding process	10
3.1	Stage 1: Request for applications	11
3.1.1	Due diligence assessment	11
3.1.2	Concept Note	12
3.2	Stage 2: Concept appraisal	13
3.3	Stage 3: Detailed design and contracting	14
3.4	Stage 4: Implementation	15
	How to complete the application	16
	Annex 1 Applying to the Fund.....	16
	Annex 2 Due Diligence Assessment	17
	Annex 3 Due Diligence Self-Assessment.....	26
	Annex 4 Concept Note Template	31
	Annex 5 Concept Note Assessment Framework.....	35
	Annex 6 Declaration	44

1 Introduction

Manaaki: “uplifting mana, through listening, supporting and empowering”

All applicants should read these Guidelines before they submit an application for Manaaki.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) established Manaaki to support New Zealand registered non-government organisations (NZNGOs) working with local civil society organisations (CSOs) (and other partners, on a case-by-case basis¹) to deliver on the Pacific reset and other New Zealand aid programme priorities. Through a contestable and transparent selection process MFAT will fund activities in priority developing countries that reach the vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups so that no one is left behind². Activities must deliver impact that aligns with, or complements, the New Zealand aid programme priorities. Approved Manaaki activities will have a two to three year implementation timeframe.

Following the initial two year Manaaki pilot, an additional round of Manaaki has been announced (round three – 2021). NZ\$6 million has been made available for co-investment arrangements. MFAT’s co-investment will range in size from NZ\$100,000 to NZ\$1.25 million across the life of an activity. The application criteria for round three has been adjusted based on learnings from the Manaaki pilot.

Manaaki will be guided by [New Zealand’s International Cooperation for Effective Sustainable Development \(ICESD\)](#) and will contribute to the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals, Pacific reset and other New Zealand aid programme priorities. MFAT will pursue impact through development outcomes that are: effective, inclusive, resilient and sustained. Eligible focus areas under the Pacific reset include: economic resilience, climate change, non-climate change environmental issues (such as environmental degradation, invasive species, habitat loss and pollution), human development (especially health and education), inclusive development (e.g. women’s political and economic empowerment, child and youth), human rights (e.g. a human rights based approach to development, disability rights, SOGIESC rights, indigenous rights), governance and democracy and other bilateral and regional aid programme priorities.

Manaaki will fund activities delivered through established relationships between NZNGOs and local CSOs³ to address local problems, respond to local priorities as articulated by communities and their legitimate representatives and that deliver on national priorities.

Only NZNGOs that meet the eligibility criteria, including having a track record of effectively managing international development funding for at least three years, will be able to access co-investment funding.

These guidelines provide details for applicants on eligibility and the application process.

Manaaki round three opened Thursday 25 February 2021 with concept note applications due 11am Monday 31 May 2021.

¹ MFAT will consider funding a NZNGO working with an in-country partner other than a civil society organisation (such as local or national government) where it aligns with the principles and intent of the fund and includes strong development outcomes. If you would like to apply for funding to work with a non-CSO partner, please get in touch to discuss this prior to submitting an application by emailing PartneringForImpact@mfat.govt.nz

² Defined as people and groups experiencing, or at risk of, discrimination and exclusion by historic, existing and/or emerging economic, social, geographic and political inequalities, and humanitarian situations of crisis, conflict and fragility, which render them disadvantaged and at risk of being left behind by the usual development processes and benefits.

³ As above explained in footnote 1.

Overview

1.1 How Manaaki will operate

Manaaki will be an efficient co-investment mechanism to deliver development impact in the Pacific (at least 60% of funding) and other priority countries (up to 40%) for the New Zealand aid programme.

Manaaki will contribute to the following long-term outcomes of MFAT's engagement with New Zealand NGOs through:

- Increased impact in line with the Pacific reset and other New Zealand aid programme priorities and the Sustainable Development Goals;
- Supporting positive relationships between MFAT and NGOs;
- Enhanced capacity of local partners and communities to address local development needs;
- Increased engagement of the New Zealand public in the New Zealand aid programme;
- Enhanced MFAT policy and programming with clear reference to local, regional and national priorities.

Manaaki will be managed to:

- Focus on listening to local voices and respond to local priorities as articulated by communities and their representatives;
- Strengthen relationships between NZNGO and local CSOs⁴;
- Support positive relationships between MFAT and NZNGOs;
- Minimise transaction costs for all parties.

Manaaki will prioritise activities and approaches which reach marginalised and/or vulnerable people and groups⁵.

Selected by MFAT, each year Manaaki will fund a portfolio of activities up to NZ\$6 million. MFAT will use a portfolio approach to report annually on the portfolio's contribution to development impact in the Pacific and beyond. Information will be used to provide evidence of development results and promote broader understanding and greater participation by New Zealanders in the development of the Pacific and elsewhere.

1.2 Eligible NZNGOs

Manaaki will work through NGOs registered in New Zealand as not-for-profits that can meet the due diligence requirements, have demonstrated working relationships with local CSOs⁶ in the Pacific and/or beyond, and who can demonstrate a track record of effectively managing international development funding for at least three years. NZNGOs with Negotiated Partnerships are not eligible to apply.

1.3 MFAT and NZNGOs co-investment

Additionality is a pre-requisite for co-investment. This means that applicants must explain how achievement of the proposed outcomes are a result of the availability of MFAT's co-investment. NGOs must confirm that:

⁴ See footnote 1 on page 2.

⁵ See footnote 2 on page 2.

⁶ See footnote 1 on page 2.

- The activity is in addition to existing initiatives and work programmes of the applicant organisation or partners – this may include a continuation or extension of existing funding activity that would not otherwise be funded;
- The activity is beyond ‘business as usual’ reasonably expected to be undertaken by the applicant organisation or partners;
- Funding for the activity is not available, nor being received, from other sources.

Applicants must also be able to make a co-investment contribution as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Co-investment requirements

Region	NGO co-investment	MFAT co-investment
Pacific	20%	80%
South East Asia Least Developed Countries (LDCs)	25%	75%
Rest of World	33%	67%

Note that co-investment can be paid upfront or pro-rated across all years. MFAT does not require a fixed proportion of co-investment payments each year, but the spread needs to be agreed with MFAT and the co-investment cannot be applied in the final year only.

NZNGO co-investment: New Zealand Sources

Sixty per cent of a NZNGO’s co-investment will come from New Zealand sources. This can include funds raised from: the public in New Zealand; New Zealand citizens based offshore; New Zealand based philanthropic organisations; income from New Zealand based services and New Zealand based private sector. Investment from New Zealand sources will facilitate the New Zealand public’s participation in the development of our region.

NZNGO co-investment: Other Sources

Up to 40% of the co-investment may come from other funding sources, where additionality can be demonstrated.

Co-investment from local CSOs⁷ or project beneficiaries/target communities is allowed as this may demonstrate commitment to the project and increase sustainability of outcomes. However, the NZNGO should provide a strong rationale as to how the support is derived; why it adds to the work; and how the NZNGO ensured there is no pressure on the in-country partners to contribute.

In circumstances where co-investment (in cash or in-kind) expected to come from a third party can no longer be sourced, NZNGOs are expected to find alternative means to make up the shortfall

Note that co-investment cannot come from another donor-funded project.

NZNGO co-investment: In-kind

In-kind contributions cannot represent more than 30% of the total co-investment required. The acceptance of in-kind co-investment is at the discretion of MFAT. In-kind contributions must contribute to the delivery of activity outputs and may include:

- Use of facilities and equipment;
- Raw materials;

⁷ See footnote 1 on page 2.

- Skills/labour (staff time will be valued at pro-rata direct salary costs inclusive of leave entitlements, ACC, as long as these reflect reasonable market rates);
- Volunteer inputs (usually costed at the minimum wage except in exceptional cases at MFAT's discretion, where the volunteer is providing professional services which would otherwise need to be sourced from the market);
- Overhead costs specific to the project (e.g. communications, IT equipment, office and facilities).

In-kind support can be provided by the NZ NGO and/or in-country partners

Gifts-in-kind received from the New Zealand community must be sent overseas to be Recognised Development Expenditure (RDE). The NGO should be able to provide particulars of goods or services sent overseas and clear justification for inclusion in RDE for this Activity.

In-kind contributions that do not contribute directly to the agreed outputs or outcomes may not be included.

1.4 Geographic and sector focus

The following regions, countries and sectors have been prioritised and this will be taken into consideration when finalising the annual grant portfolio. Applicants are encouraged to discuss applications directly with MFAT, in New Zealand or at Posts, prior to submission in order to ensure strong alignment with regional and local development priorities for New Zealand.

Table 2: Geographic focus

Geographic Region	Manaaki Funding allocation
Pacific	At least 60%
South East Asia LDCs	No more than 30%
Rest of the world	No more than 10%

Figure 1: Manaaki: Geographic and Sector Focus

Sector	Pacific	South East Asia	Other focus Countries
Economic Resilience	●	●	●
Climate Change	●	●	●
Non-climate change environmental issues	●	●	●
Inclusive Development (e.g. youth, women's political and economic empowerment)	●	●	●
Human Development (especially health and education)	●	● (Timor Leste only)	
Human Rights (e.g. disability)	●	●	
Governance	●		
Democracy	●		

Pacific	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Wallis and Futuna
South East Asia (Least Developed Countries)	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Timor-Leste
Other Focus Countries	Indonesia, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam

1.5 Eligibility

Eligibility: Co-investment is available to eligible NZNGOs where the following criteria have been met:

1. The applicant must be a New Zealand Charities Registered non-government organisation (NZNGO) <https://www.register.charities.govt.nz/CharitiesRegister/Search>.
2. The applicant and its partner must demonstrate how their activity will deliver sustainable development impact aligned with, or complementary to, the New Zealand aid programme priorities
3. One concept note per partner per round (not including joint applications).
4. The applicant must pass a due diligence assessment which includes demonstrating a track record of effectively managing international development funding for at least three years.
5. The applicant must demonstrate a relationship with a local civil society organisation or partner⁸.
6. The applicant and its partners must demonstrate how they will work together and reflect the interests and demands of local communities – especially marginalised and/or vulnerable populations⁹ – as well as alignment to national development priorities.
7. The applicant and its partners must be able to make a co-investment contribution that meets the ratios outlined in Table 1.
8. At least 60% of the NGO financial contribution must come from the New Zealand public or New Zealand sources.¹⁰
9. Additionality, as described in Section 1.3.
10. The applicant and its partner/s must demonstrate how they will effectively engage with New Zealanders.

Ineligible activities: Manaaki **will not** fund the following:

1. NGOs who have a Negotiated Partnership Arrangement or other partnerships with MFAT
2. Activities in which the New Zealand organisation adds little or no value, i.e. is acting only as a conduit to transfer funds
3. Promotion of, or engagement in, religious or political activities
4. Stand-alone feasibility studies and/or pure research (activities with small research components that comprise up to 20% of the total budget and clearly contribute to activity implementation will be considered)
5. Fees or costs associated with an international branch or overseas partner of the applicant where the partner cannot demonstrate added value to the activity
6. Retrospective activities
7. Activities that build in profit margins beyond reasonable market rates
8. Activities that appear to require indefinite funding support to achieve sustainable outcomes

⁸ See footnote 1 on page 2.

⁹ See footnote 2 on page 2.

¹⁰ This can include funds from the New Zealand public, New Zealand citizens based offshore, New Zealand-based philanthropic organisations, income from New Zealand-based services and New Zealand-based private sector.

9. Advocacy activities within New Zealand
10. Activities that predominantly are the supply of goods and services for which MFAT considers a more appropriate route is via a competitive procurement process
11. Activities which contravene New Zealand's international legal commitments, trade obligations, trade agreements or policy positions in international negotiations
12. Equity grants or loans
13. Micro-finance as part of the Activity delivery, except where the Activity is not-for-profit and where any repaid micro-finance funds and interest form a revolving fund
14. One-off advisory missions
15. Activities relating to manufacturing, distributing or selling arms, tobacco, alcohol, gambling products or services; and/or that negatively impact human rights, gender equity or the environment; and/or directly or indirectly support terrorists
16. Activities in which the MFAT contribution would not fall within the [OECD Development Assistance Committee definition of Official Development Assistance](#)
17. Research, conferences, seminars, training events and/or exchanges to New Zealand or partner country
18. Costs associated with participants attending events
19. Substantial freight of goods supplied to the overseas country
20. Major capital expenditure (purchase of buildings or land)
21. Activities considered to be welfare activities, for example on an individual or family rather than a community basis and or implemented long term without a clear exit strategy for example activities that involve unskilled volunteers supporting orphanages or providing food or medicinal supplies to residential care institutions
22. Activities that are determined to be contrary to the interests of New Zealand
23. Providing funding to, inadvertently or otherwise, designated terrorist entities as listed on the [New Zealand Police website](#).

2 Operating principles

The operating principles of Manaaki will be applied to decide which applicants will be supported, who the fund will target and how activities will be designed, delivered and implemented.

The operating principles ensure the management of Manaaki contributes to the fund's short, intermediate and long-term outcomes.

Manaaki operating principles:

- Focus on reaching vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups¹¹
- Emphasis on quality relationships with local civil society organisations and their constituents¹²
- Essential to confirm local contextual analysis, understanding and genuine representation
- Explicit about responding to community needs and locally identified priorities
- NZNGOs are working to their strengths
- NZNGOs have strong relationship with a New Zealand constituency
- Focus on sustainability of outcomes
- Protects and promotes human rights (including gender and inclusion) and environmental sustainability
- Enable collaboration to achieve enhanced development impact, where appropriate
- Efficient process and engagement with MFAT
- Transparent decision making
- Confirmed additionality - activity is not an existing initiative or work programme scheduled to happen anyway
- NZNGOs will meet eligibility requirements
- NZNGO co-investment required to ensure mutuality and common objectives
- Funding from NZNGOs must be 60% sourced from New Zealand¹³
- At least 60% of MFAT co-investment is focused on the Pacific Region
- Align with or complement partner country and New Zealand aid programme priorities

¹¹ See footnote 2 on page 2.

¹² See footnote 1 on page 2.

¹³ This can include funds from the New Zealand public, New Zealand citizens based offshore, New Zealand-based philanthropic organisations, income from New Zealand-based services and New Zealand-based private sector.

3 Funding process

The process is designed to maximise efficiency and achieve the Manaaki objectives. The development and assessment of concept notes, due diligence and designs will confirm the:

- 1 Eligibility of the activity and the NZNGO and partners.
- 2 Activity objectives and outcomes, how they impact on the local communities and how they align with partner country and New Zealand aid programme development priorities.
- 3 Relationship between the NZNGO and local CSO¹⁴ and map out key roles and responsibilities.
- 4 Feasibility of proposed implementation including how the NGO is best placed to deliver and other stakeholder relationships.
- 5 Proposed monitoring and evaluation and reporting approach and how they will be delivered.
- 6 Ratios of co-investment contribution to be provided by the NZNGO and local CSO including contribution from New Zealand sources.
- 7 Timeframe and support available to develop a detailed design, workplan and budget.

Table 3 provides an overview of the funding process and this is elaborated in the sections below and their supporting annexes.

Table 3: Overview of Manaaki 2021 funding process

<p>Stage 1: Request for NZNGO applications February – May</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NZNGO eligibility self-assessments • NZNGO concept note that aligns with New Zealand aid programme priorities
<p>Stage 2: Appraisal June – August August - October</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFAT engages external assessment of Concept Notes • MFAT reviews Concept Note assessments • MFAT approves Manaaki Portfolio • Applicants informed of the outcome of their application • MFAT engages external due diligence assessments (for new partners)
<p>Stage 3: Detailed design and contracting September – May</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFAT approves contribution towards expenses for design • MFAT facilitates input from the Partnerships Team, bilateral, post and technical expertise as necessary • MFAT appraises design and/or engages external assessment. Appraisal involves Partnerships Team, bilateral, post and technical experts as necessary. • NZNGO contracted

¹⁴ See footnote 1 on page 2.

Stage 4: Implementation, monitoring and reporting April – ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NZNGO co-investment made available• Annual activity reporting• Annual Manaaki Portfolio reporting
---	---

3.1 Stage 1: Request for applications

3.1.1 Due diligence assessment

The due diligence assessment will be undertaken to ensure that MFAT supports high performing, legally compliant and registered NZNGOs who can demonstrate international development best practice and work closely with local CSOs¹⁵ that reflect the needs and demands of local communities. Refer to Annex 1 for the due diligence framework and criteria.

Note:

- a) Organisations that have passed Manaaki due diligence from a previous round do not need to repeat due diligence. However, they do need to declare any substantive changes that may impact their previous due diligence assessment.
- b) MFAT is undertaking a review of its Partnering for Impact due diligence which is expected to be complete in by late April 2021. Applicants to Manaaki round three will not be subject to any additional due diligence requirements than those outlined in these guidelines, however the review findings may result in some clarifications/changes to improve the due diligence pathway where appropriate.

Due diligence assessment is conducted in two stages:

1. NZNGOs will complete a self-assessment against the eligibility criteria and due diligence standards in Annex 1 and confirm that they are able to provide all mandatory documentation.¹⁶ If the NZNGO assesses that it satisfies due diligence standards after completing the form in Annex 1, then it can submit a concept note in Annex 3.
2. If the concept note is approved, then the NZNGO will be invited to submit all mandatory documentation for due diligence. This submission will be reviewed by an external provider to recommend to MFAT whether the NZNGO meets the due diligence standards.

Note: If NZNGOs are **not** able to satisfy all due diligence criteria and provide all mandatory documentation in line with the requirements outlined in this document then they should **not** submit a concept note. The purpose of the self-assessment is to maximize the efficiency of the process and ensure that NZNGOs, local CSOs, communities and MFAT do not invest in developing and assessing concept notes for organisations that will not be eligible for funding.

For organisations not yet able to meet the due diligence requirements, the self-assessment process can be used to identify areas to strengthen capability and then re-assess whether an organisation could be eligible for future Manaaki funding.

¹⁵ See footnote 1 on page 2.

¹⁶ NB; the due diligence assessment seeks to confirm that NZNGOs are currently meeting due diligence standards and are already actively applying the policies and processes described in the mandatory documentation. Policies developed for the purpose of meeting the due diligence standards will not generally be accepted and NGOs will need to demonstrate ongoing review of policies. However, exceptions may be considered on a case by case basis,

How do the MFAT due diligence frameworks work alongside the Council for International Development Code of Conduct?

MFAT views its due diligence frameworks and Council for International Development (CID) Code of Conduct as complementary.

The CID Code of Conduct is a voluntary, sector self-regulated code of good practice, which MFAT sees as crucial for raising awareness and encouraging best practice and accountability within the New Zealand international development sector. MFAT's due diligence is a rigorous evidence-based process, which seeks to provide the Government and New Zealand taxpayers with the reassurance that organisations receiving funding have been objectively and independently verified as meeting key criteria.

The MFAT due diligence framework for the Negotiated Partnerships states that: “there is an expectation that NZNGOs engaging in MFATs Negotiated Partnerships will be members of CID and are signatories to, or working to become signatories to, the CID Code of Conduct.”

Being a signatory to the CID Code of Conduct provides an additional source of verification for various domains within the Manaaki Due Diligence process, but it is not a mandatory requirement. This is to ensure that Manaaki is widely accessible to a diverse range of NZNGOs. If any NGO receiving Manaaki funding was not a CID member or Code of Conduct signatory, MFAT would encourage them to consider joining and becoming a signatory.

3.1.2 Concept Note

The concept note template provides an overview of the proposed activity and evidence of the relationship between the NZNGO and local NGO. This will form the basis for a preliminary business case for MFAT to co-invest in an activity.

The concept note confirms:

- 1 The country of the proposed activity
 - 2 The sector of the proposed activity
 - 3 The problem definition and opportunity
 - 4 Who will benefit
 - 5 The total budget required for the proposed activity
 - 6 The co-investment being provided by the NZNGO
 - 7 The co-investment requested from MFAT
 - 8 The strength of the relationship with the New Zealand public
 - 9 Expected long term outcomes and how they align with MFAT development priorities
 - 10 Local voice and representation
 - 11 Delivery feasibility and risk, and
 - 12 Value for money
-

MFAT will review the concept notes and apply an assessment rating as described in 4.2.

3.2 Stage 2: Concept appraisal

The application will be assessed to determine it meets the eligibility criteria outlined in section 1.5. If it does, assessment of the concept note will be undertaken based on the four assessment areas (with an additional section on responding in the COVID-19 context also taken into account):

1. **The relevance and effectiveness of the strategic investment** – Applicant needs to demonstrate that the Concept is based on sound knowledge of the context and inclusive of approaches which will reach vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups.
2. **The local investment** – Proposed activities must be based on genuine partnership with local CSO partners¹⁷ who can demonstrate connectedness and representativeness of community needs and voices. Manaaki applicants must also demonstrate how their activities will strengthen local civil society.
3. **The management feasibility** – MFAT needs to be confident that the intended delivery of activities will be effectively project managed with clear roles and responsibility for respective parties based on demonstrated capability.
4. **The financial investment** – MFAT needs to be confident the financial investment will allow efficient delivery of all activities and offer value for money.

Applicants responses to assessment questions in each area will be assessed according to the framework provided in Annex 4. Each of these four assessment areas has been weighted at 25%. Applications exceeding page/word limits will face point deductions. The selection of successful concepts notes will be based on a two-stage process:

- **Review of individual concept notes (primary process):** Concept notes will be reviewed by an external assessor, the MFAT Partnerships Unit and MFAT posts, bilateral and thematic teams as appropriate. Individual assessment questions will be scored from 1-5 and scores will be averaged for each assessment area. Manaaki will prioritise the highest scoring concept notes in line with the fund's objective to support strong projects to achieve impact.
- **Review of the portfolio (secondary process):** Once the highest scoring concept notes are identified, MFAT will review the portfolio to ensure that 60% of funding will be focused on the Pacific. If the highest scoring concept notes (those receiving scores of 4 and 5 in all assessment areas) represent more than NZ\$6 million, then MFAT will consider the complementarity of concepts in the portfolio and the extent to which MFAT's geographic and sectoral priorities are represented. If the highest scoring concept notes represent less than NZ\$6 million, then MFAT will consider concept notes which have scored 3 in any of the assessment areas.

MFAT will provide feedback to successful and unsuccessful applicants through a phone call to discuss the assessment and written feedback on performance in each assessment area.

As noted above, if an NZNGO's concept note is selected, then they will be required to provide all mandatory documentation (and supplementary evidence as required) to demonstrate compliance with MFAT's due diligence standards (unless the applicant has already passed Manaaki due diligence). An independent provider will undertake the due diligence assessment of the NZNGO.

¹⁷ See footnote 1 on page 2.

3.3 Stage 3: Detailed design and contracting

For successful concept notes MFAT will provide a contribution to expenses to develop a full design. MFAT will confirm in writing that it will provide this support. Contribution to design costs will be 8% of the MFAT co-investment amount, up to a maximum of \$40,000, paid half on approval of the concept note and half on acceptance of the design.

Submitted designs will be appraised and applicants will be advised of the outcome of the appraisal.

A design document template will be provided to applicants with successful concept notes. This includes:

-
- The Goal
 - Problem and/or opportunity
 - Optioneering
 - Expected results and long-term, medium-term and short-term outcomes
 - Who will benefit (how will vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups be reached?)
 - Actual outputs to be delivered
 - Clear roles and responsibilities of the NZNGO and local CSO partner¹⁸
 - Stakeholder mapping
 - A comprehensive activity work plan
 - Detailed Risk Matrix and Management Plan
 - A complete budget
 - Verification as to how co-investment and in-kind contributions will be made available/sourced
 - A monitoring and evaluation framework that confirms how information will be captured at the input, activity, output and outcome levels¹⁹
 - A New Zealand constituency engagement plan
 - A table of deliverables (e.g. progress reports, acquittals and constituency engagement products)
-

When designs are approved, MFAT will negotiate Grant Funding Arrangements (GFA) with the NZNGO.

Together MFAT and the NZNGO will agree:

- a tranche payment schedule
- a reporting and acquittal schedule linked to the payment schedule, and
- a monitoring schedule.

MFAT may independently monitor activities in coordination with NZNGO and local partners.

¹⁸ See footnote 1 on page 2.

¹⁹ It will be critical to demonstrate how beneficiaries and local partners will be enabled and encouraged to provide direct reports and feedback.

3.4 Stage 4: Implementation

The design document will guide project implementation and all monitoring, reporting and performance assessment will be based on the programme theory and results framework therein. Further guidance on how Manaaki will align with and report against MFAT's development, partnerships and public diplomacy outcomes can be found in the overarching monitoring, evaluation, research and learning (MERL) Framework for the Partnering for Impact Programme.

If you have any questions about the Manaaki Guidelines, please contact:

PartneringforImpact@mfat.govt.nz.

How to complete the application

Annex 1 Applying to the Fund

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) uses the information you provide to determine the application eligibility and which concept notes should proceed to design. It is important that you provide all information requested. Please write as concisely as possible.

Reviewing the guidelines and writing your application:

- **Please read the Manaaki Guidelines for Applicants and the Manaaki Application Form in full** before starting to fill them out. Take particular care when reading through the due diligence self-assessment and concept note template sections.
- **Please complete the due diligence self-assessment first** to determine whether your organisation is eligible to apply to the fund.
- **Only applications using the Manaaki Application Form concept note template format will be accepted.** The completed concept note must comply with the indicated A4 page limits. Applications exceeding page/word limits will face point deductions. Please enter information using the headings in the guidance provided in the template.

Sending your application:

- **Please submit documents as word documents**, *do not* convert them to PDFs (with the exception of the signed declaration if this is a scanned pdf).
- **Required information includes:**
 - a. Due diligence self-assessment form (see Annex 3)
 - b. Concept note application form (Annex 4)
 - c. Signed declaration (see Annex 6)

No additional documentation will be considered.

- **Please email all three completed documents by 11am Tuesday 31 May 2021 to Partnering for Impact: PartneringforImpact@mfat.govt.nz**

If you have any questions or would like to discuss your application, please get in touch by emailing PartneringforImpact@mfat.govt.nz.

Annex 2 Due Diligence Assessment

The due diligence assessment will be undertaken to ensure that MFAT supports high performing, legally compliant and registered NZNGOs who can demonstrate international development best practice and work closely with local CSOs²⁰ that reflect the needs and demands of local communities.

Note:

- a) Organisations that have passed Manaaki due diligence from a previous round do not need to repeat due diligence. However, they do need to declare any substantive changes that may impact their previous due diligence assessment by completing the due diligence declaration on page 30.
- b) MFAT is undertaking a review of its Partnering for Impact due diligence which is expected to be complete by late April 2021. Applicants to Manaaki round three will not be subject to any additional due diligence requirements than those outlined in these guidelines, however the review findings may result in some clarifications/changes to improve the due diligence pathway where appropriate.

Due diligence assessment is conducted in two stages:

1. NZNGOs will complete a self-assessment (see form on page 19) against the following due diligence standards and confirm that they are able to provide all mandatory documentation. If the NZNGOs believes it satisfies due diligence standards after completing the self-assessment form, then it should submit a concept note in Annex 3.
2. If the concept note is approved, then the NZNGO will be invited to submit all mandatory documentation and explanatory narrative. This submission will be reviewed by an external provider to make recommendations on whether the due diligence standards have been met and/or whether strengthening could be undertaken during design and/or implementation that would enable standards where appropriate. MFAT reserves the right to ask for additional information where necessary to ensure it can verify a standard is met.

Note: If NZNGOs are **not** able to satisfy all due diligence criteria and provide all mandatory documentation in line with the requirements outlined in this document, then they should **not** submit a concept note and/or seek further guidance from MFAT. The purpose of the self-assessment is to maximise the efficiency of the process and ensure that NZNGOs, local CSOs²¹, communities and MFAT do not invest in developing and assessing concept notes for organisations that will not be eligible for funding.

The due diligence assessment seeks to confirm that NZNGOs are **currently** meeting due diligence standards and are **already** actively applying the policies and processes described in the mandatory documentation. Policies developed for the purpose of meeting the due diligence standards will generally not be accepted and NGOs will need to demonstrate ongoing review of policies. Exceptions may be considered on a case by case basis. However, mandatory documents marked with an asterisk* can be produced for the purposes of the due diligence process (i.e. an NGO can request a letter of support from their in-country partner for the purposes of applying to Manaaki).

²⁰ See footnote 1 on page 2.

²¹ See footnote 1 on page 2.

For organisations not yet able to meet the requirements, the self-assessment process can be used to identify areas to strengthen and then re-assess if an organisation could be eligible for future Manaaki funding.

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
1	NGO is a legally established not for profit with a head office or primary place of business in New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered in New Zealand as a Charitable Trust or Incorporated Society Registered as a not for profit on the Charities Register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration number 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessor to check Charities Register https://register.charities.govt.nz and http://www.societies.govt.nz/cms Registration under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 or Incorporated Societies Act 1908
2	NGO has adequate structures and systems for governance, management and accountability to stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suitably qualified and functioning Board which operates as per the NGO's governing instruments Policy and procedures to identify, report and (if appropriate) manage conflicts of interest A suitably qualified and functioning management team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governing Instrument (Constitution or Trust Deed) Conflict of Interest Policy or equivalent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGO website List of Governing members and key management summarising experience, qualifications Any other publicly available due diligence or capability assessment undertaken on the NGO
3	NGO has adequate systems and processes for managing organisational risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Risk Management Policy and or Framework which details management of both organisational risk and project risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk Management Policy /Framework or equivalent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CID Signatory Status (Obligation 1e)

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
Associates				
4	Genuine NZNGO partnership/relationship with local CSO ²² legitimately representing local constituents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A fully defined relationship with a local CSO A relationship with a local CSO that is able to confirm legitimate representation of local constituent needs and demands Able to define roles and responsibilities of both organisations in the concept note and any Proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter from partner* Partnership MoU or signed partnership/project agreement or equivalent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview with MFAT Joint signed statement from NZNGO and Local CSO Previous performance records from NZNGOs associating with this or other local partners in this country
5	NGO routinely undertakes satisfactory due diligence/ organisational capacity assessment of partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An appropriate system for routinely undertaking due diligence assessments of its partners – covering financial and administrative capability, legal status, good practice and safeguarding, and governance Responsive to capacity strengthening needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner Agreements – include minimum standards for financial control (Inc. fraud, audit and counter terrorism) Partner capacity strengthening plan and or records of training/mentoring – including finance and key cross cutting issues/good practice approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner capacity assessments
6	Relationship with New Zealand constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to clearly identify New Zealand constituency/supporter base Evidence of communication outreach strategies to constituency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Report or equivalent document which describes engagement with the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social media/website Memberships, supporter newsletters Volunteer engagement

²² See footnote 1 on page 2.

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of capacity to communicate MFAT support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Zealand public²³ and demonstrates donor acknowledgment Statement of willingness to communicate MFAT support* Examples of communication pieces/publications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of previous acknowledgment of funding support and or New Zealand public support
Finance				
7	NGO has appropriate financial systems and controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented policies and transparent procedures to account for funding Accounting systems that can effectively, efficiently and transparently manage and monitor the use of public funds Annual audited financial statements Financial systems for controlling general ledger and project ledger 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Policies and/or procedures manual including detail on receipting grants, partner funds transfer, acquittals, cash management, monthly reconciliation process, budget management, financial delegation, payment controls, separation of roles, foreign exchange/interest rate gains, internal audits Signed copy of audit reports and copy of audit management letter (3 years) 	

²³ This can include funds from raised from the public in New Zealand, New Zealand citizens based offshore, New Zealand based philanthropic organisations, income from New Zealand based services and New Zealand based private sector.

Mandatory documents marked with an asterisk can be produced for the purposes of the due diligence process (i.e. an NGO can request a letter of support from their in-country partner for the purposes of applying to Manaaki.

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
8	NGO is in a sound Financial Position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity to raise funds from the New Zealand public²⁴ Assets are of greater value than liabilities, and sufficient liquidity and working capital and reserves to meet existing and planned commitments Operating within any bank covenants Has insurance policies in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audited Financial Statements (3 years) Statement of fundraising over past three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGO Website Insurance policies
9	NGO has systems to prevent funding terrorism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems and processes for countering financing of terrorism which are consistent with New Zealand counter terrorism legislation – i.e. <i>The Anti-Money Laundering and Countering Financing of Terrorism Act 2009</i>²⁵, and <i>Terrorism Suppression Act 2002</i>²⁶ Considered strategy and procedure of minimising the risk of providing financing to terrorism related activities and includes a verifiable process for ensuring that partners (and any downstream sub-grantees or pertinent contractors) are regularly checked against published lists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counter Terrorism Policy and procedures or equivalent and documented evidence of checks of downstream partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CID Signatory Status (Obligation B2.3)
10	NGO has systems in place to prevent, manage and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and control mechanisms that enable the prevention and detection of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fraud Control Policy/ reporting plan 	

²⁴ This can include funds from raised from the public in New Zealand, New Zealand citizens based offshore, New Zealand based philanthropic organisations, income from New Zealand based services and New Zealand based private sector.

²⁵ <http://legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2009/0035/latest/DLM2140720.html?src>.

²⁶ *New Zealand Police list on their [website](#).*

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
	report fraud, bribery and corruption	fraud, bribery and corruption including processes for investigating suspected fraud, reporting to donors and consequences • Confidential safe reporting of wrongdoing		
Sector Good Practice				
11	NGO can demonstrate an organisational commitment to good practice development	• Able to demonstrate an understanding of ‘ineligible’ activities (e.g. proselytism, partisan political activities) • Ensured attention to gender in development • Able to demonstrate sound record of inclusive development approaches	• Policy or statement on development approach which demonstrates that the organisation understands that good development practice does not involve supporting activities such as welfare, partisan politics and evangelism/proselytism • Examples of good practice (e.g. gender analyses for design – see Gender Analysis) • Examples of good practice – inclusive development	• CID Signatory Status (Obligation B1.5 Non-Development Activity)
12	NGO has effective project management systems	• Documented guidelines and or systemic procedures for project management (design, appraisal, reporting) through the project cycle	• Project cycle or management guidelines, or an example of templates used for project design, appraisal, progress reports/monitoring trip reports	• NGO website • Other project management tools, resources or examples
13	NGO can demonstrate a track record of effectively managing international development funds	• A history of implementing and completing international development projects or programmes effectively	• Table of funds/projects in the past three years	• MFAT Performance reports as relevant/available

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Past completion reports and any performance reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any other evidence (evaluations/ referee reports/other donor performance reports etc.) 	
Safeguarding				
14	NGO has adequate systems for the prevention, detection, and response to sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment (PSEAH) and Child Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated organisational commitment to PSEAH Demonstrated organisational commitment to the safeguarding of children A Code of Conduct which explicitly references child safeguarding and other unacceptable behaviour issues (such as SEAH) and is supported by contracts which authorise dismissal, suspension or transfer to other duties for any employee who breaches the Code of Conduct. Confidential mechanisms for complaints and/or whistle-blowing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and procedures²⁷ that cover organisational commitment; prevention; detection; response; and measurement/improvement for PSEAH matters (including Child Protection – may have a separate Child Safeguarding Policy or procedures) Recruitment processes which include integrity checks (including VCA 2014²⁸ requirements) NGO Code of Conduct (signed examples) Partner Agreements – include clauses re minimum standards for safeguarding Evidence of downstream partner due diligence and training Whistle-blower/Complaints Policies – internal and external 	

²⁷ These matters do not need to all be covered in the same policies or procedures (i.e. could be spread across various policies including code of conduct, HR policies) however must be adequately covered and recognition is needed that the obligation to protect beneficiaries extends beyond illegal activity e.g. harassment and Safe workplace cultures are needed to ensure organisations can protect beneficiaries.

²⁸ On 1 July 2015 safety checking regulations for the children’s workforce came into force. The regulations require all paid people who work with children for government-funded New Zealand-based organisations to be safety checked, and to have these safety checks updated every three years. This also applies to unpaid people working with children as part of an educational or vocational training course. See <https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/working-with-children/vulnerable-children-act-requirements/safety-checking/>.

Domain	Standard	Indicators: NGO is or has	Mandatory evidence	Possible Additional Sources of Verification
15	NGO can demonstrate application of effective Health and Safety protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated awareness of MFAT Health & Safety requirements • Sufficient health and safety capability to complete a specific safety plan for anticipated scope of activities that identify relevant hazards and means of eliminating or minimising risks of serious harm to workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Policy and Guidelines which include how the NGO ensures the physical, mental and emotional well-being of workers and prevents work related injuries and diseases²⁹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Plan for anticipated activities/location³⁰ (NGOs must be able to demonstrate how their overall policies/safety system is reflected in the specific safety plan and how it reflects standard practice now)

²⁹ MFAT will assess individual safety plans once activity areas are agreed.

²³ See <https://www.cid.org.nz/assets/Health-and-Safety/Health-and-Safety-CID-Guidelines-2017.pdf>.

Annex 3 Due Diligence Self-Assessment

NZNGO due diligence self-assessment form

Please use this form to ensure you are able to meet the requirements outlined under Due Diligence in Annex 1 prior to making a decision whether to create a concept and apply to Manaaki. If you do not meet the requirements please do not submit an application. NGO applicants that have completed Manaaki due diligence from a previous round (in the last 5 year) do not need to repeat due diligence. However, these applicants must complete the due diligence declaration on page 30. If there has been any substantive changes, this must be declared and discussed with MFAT.

If your organisation has not completed Manaaki due diligence in the previous 5 years, please complete this due diligence self assessment:

Domain	Standard	Mandatory evidence	Y/N	Comments (50 words max.)
1	NGO is a legally established not for profit with a head office or primary place of business in New Zealand	Registration number		
2	NGO has adequate structures and systems for governance, management and accountability to stakeholders	Governing Instrument (Constitution or Trust Deed)		
		Conflict of Interest Policy or equivalent		
3	NGO has adequate systems and processes for managing organisational risk	Risk Management Policy/Framework or equivalent		
Associates				
4		Letter from partner*		

Domain	Standard	Mandatory evidence	Y/N	Comments (50 words max.)
	Genuine NZNGO partnership/ relationship with local CSO ³¹ legitimately representing local constituents	Partnership MoU or signed partnership/project agreement or equivalent		
5	NGO routinely undertakes satisfactory due diligence/ organisational capacity assessment of Partners	Partner Agreements – include minimum standards for financial control (inc. fraud, audit and counter terrorism)		
		Partner capacity strengthening plan and or records of training/mentoring – including finance and key cross cutting issues/good practice approaches		
6	Relationship with New Zealand constituency	Annual Report or equivalent document which describes engagement with the New Zealand public ³² and demonstrates donor acknowledgment		
		Statement of willingness to communicate MFAT support*		
		Examples of communication pieces/publications		
Finance				
7	NGO has appropriate financial systems and controls	Financial Policies and or procedures manual including detail on receipting grants, partner funds transfer, acquittals, cash management, monthly reconciliation		

³¹ See footnote 1 on page 2.

³² This can include funds from raised from the public in New Zealand, New Zealand citizens based offshore, New Zealand based philanthropic organisations, income from New Zealand based services and New Zealand based private sector.

Mandatory documents marked with an asterisk can be produced for the purposes of the due diligence process (i.e. an NGO can request a letter of support from their in-country partner for the purposes of applying to Manaaki.

Domain	Standard	Mandatory evidence	Y/N	Comments (50 words max.)
		process, budget management, financial delegation, payment controls, separation of roles, foreign exchange/interest rate gains, internal audits		
		Signed copy of audit reports and copy of audit management letter (3 years)		
8	NGO is in a sound financial position	Audited Financial Statements (3 years)		
9	NGO has systems to prevent funding terrorism	Counter Terrorism Policy and procedures or equivalent and documented evidence of checks of downstream partners		
10	NGO has systems in place to prevent, manage and report fraud, bribery and corruption	Fraud Control Policy/reporting plan		
Sector Good Practice				
11	NGO can demonstrate an organisational commitment to good practice development	Policy or statement on approach to development which demonstrates an understanding that development does not include support to welfare, partisan politics, and evangelism/proselytism		
		Examples of good practice (e.g. gender analyses for design – see Gender Analysis)		
		Examples of good practice – inclusive development		
12	NGO has effective project management systems	Project cycle or management guidelines, or an example of templates used for project design, appraisal, progress reports/monitoring trip reports		

Domain	Standard	Mandatory evidence	Y/N	Comments (50 words max.)
13	NGO can demonstrate a track record of effectively managing international development funds	Table of funds/projects in the past three years		
		Any other evidence (evaluations/referee reports/other donor performance reports etc.)		
Safeguarding				
14	NGO has adequate systems for the prevention, detection, and response to sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment (PSEAH) and Child Protection	Policies and procedures ³³ that cover organisational commitment; prevention; detection; response; and measurement/improvement or PSEAH matters (including Child Protection – may have a separate Child Safeguarding Policy or procedures)		
		Recruitment processes which include integrity checks (including VCA 2014 ³⁴ requirements)		
		NGO Code of Conduct (signed examples)		
		Partner Agreements – include clauses re minimum standards for safeguarding		
		Evidence of downstream partner due diligence and training		

³³ These matters do not need to all be covered in the same policies or procedures (i.e. could be spread across various policies including code of conduct, HR policies) however they must be adequately covered and recognition is needed that the obligation to protect beneficiaries extends beyond illegal activity e.g. harassment and Safe workplace cultures are needed to ensure organisations can protect beneficiaries.

³⁴ On 1 July 2015 safety checking regulations for the children’s workforce came into force. The regulations require all paid people who work with children for government-funded New Zealand-based organisations to be safety checked, and to have these safety checks updated every three years. This also applies to unpaid people working with children as part of an educational or vocational training course. See <https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/working-with-children/vulnerable-children-act-requirements/safety-checking/>.

Domain	Standard	Mandatory evidence	Y/N	Comments (50 words max.)
		Whistle-blower/Complaints Policies – internal and external		
15	NGO can demonstrate application of effective Health and Safety protocols	Health and Safety Policy and Guidelines which include how the NGO ensures the physical, mental and emotional well-being of workers and prevents work related injuries and diseases		

If your organisation has completed Manaaki due diligence in the previous 5 years, please complete this due diligence declaration:

APPLICANT:

I confirm and declare that:

- Our organisation has not experienced any substantive changes that may impact the previous Manaaki due diligence assessment

Name of authorised signatory:	Signature:
Position:	Date:
Organisation:	

This declaration must be signed by a person with the legal authority to commit your organisation to a transaction.

Annex 4 Concept Note Template

Activity name

Name of NZNGO

Name of in-country civil
society
organisation(s)/local
partner(s)

Country

Region/sub-region

Duration

Implementation timeframes must be two to three years

Start date
(month, year)

End date
(month, year)

New Zealand Aid
Programme
priority/priorities

Funding

MFAT co-investment
requested
(NZD, excluding GST)

Co-investment from
NZNGO (cash contribution,
NZD, excluding GST)

In-kind contribution
(if any, value in NZD,
excluding GST)

Total Activity budget
(NZD, excluding GST)

High Level
Statement/Activity Goal

What will this activity achieve/what does your vision of success (future state) look like? (250 characters maximum)

Given uncertainty around the ongoing impact of COVID-19, include brief responses to the following two questions (*Please note that this additional information will be considered by MFAT in determining the portfolio to be funded i.e. while these questions do not contribute to the overall rating for the concept note, activities will need to be appropriate in the COVID-19 context at the time of appraisal*)

- A. Please describe how the design and implementation of your proposed activity could be completed under COVID-19 conditions and restrictions.
-
- B. Please describe how the proposed activity remains relevant and/or could add value in the COVID-19 environment (for example, will the activity help strengthen vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups in some way, or respond to a current or anticipated need?).
-

1. Relevance & Effectiveness

Strategic investment: long-term results and impact expected (weighting 25%)

This section should succinctly explain what this investment activity will deliver and achieve including demonstrating an evidence-based approach/analysis (i.e. this should go beyond providing evidence from your past experience to referencing links to international best practice).
(3 A4 pages maximum)

-
- 1.1 Describe the current local context and the problem/issue/need and/or opportunity this investment is addressing; the rationale for involvement; and the processes through which this development issue/need was identified
-
- 1.2 Describe strategies and approaches to address the issue identified at 1.1 – inclusive of a brief description of the partners' collective experience in this sectoral/technical area of development activity and considerations of any alternative approaches considered to date. Note that assessing various options to address the development problem, need opportunity (optioneering) is a key part of the design process (refer to page 4 of the design template).
-
- 1.3 Describe the expected activity outcomes, providing a brief narrative on how strategies and approaches (anticipated activities) are expected to contribute to the achievement of outcomes. Note that guidance on outputs/outcomes and results/logical frameworks is available [here](#).
-
- 1.4 Elaborate on the processes taken or to be undertaken to ensure the activity will reach vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups (this would include but not be limited to a consideration of gender and disability inclusion). If the local partner is a non-CSOs, demonstrate how this partner will reach vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups. Please note that reaching vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups is a key Manaaki objective and MFAT expects all activities to demonstrate how these people and groups will be targeted.
-
- 1.5 Indicate strategies for ensuring sustainability of outcomes. For extensions to existing projects, explain how the new project builds on previous activities and addresses issues of sustainability
-
- 1.6 Alignment: Provide a brief narrative highlighting alignment (and/or complementarity) of the proposed activity and its relevance to New Zealand Aid Programme and national development priorities and the achievement of the SDGs at a country level (and/or other relevant sectoral/ technical policy and guidelines)
-

2. Local Engagement:

Benefits planned with the local community (weighting 25%)

This section should succinctly confirm a genuine relationship between the local direct beneficiaries, the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO (2.5 A4 pages maximum)

-
- 2.1 Describe the nature and length of relationship between the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO and provide detail on previous activity collaboration/successful outcomes

 - 2.2 Elaborate on local partner priorities and capabilities – describing the process used for assessment and/or previous investment in capacity strengthening (e.g. mutual capacity strengthening and/or partner strengthening)

 - 2.3 Provide a full description of other relevant stakeholders – other NGOs or service providers as well as local networks/community structures in the proposed location with some indication of how these groups/individuals might engage with the project (and/or be enablers/barriers to implementation/achievement of outcomes)

 - 2.4 Confirm the name, location and likely number of beneficiaries who will be impacted by the activity. Provide an initial estimate of direct and indirect beneficiary numbers, and break-down by gender and other relevant characteristics

 - 2.5 Confirm the local CSO's/partner's relationship with the direct beneficiaries. Where the local partner is not a CSO, NZNGOs are encouraged to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions. Confirm how (and from whom) the idea for this activity was initiated.

 - 2.6 Describe how this initiative will strengthen local civil society and contribute to an increased voice/better responsiveness to local needs and demand in the longer term

3. Management Feasibility

Delivery of activities and outputs (weighting 25%)

This section should succinctly confirm the feasibility of delivering the intended activities and outputs within the timeframe and resources (2.5 A4 pages maximum)

-
- 3.1 Present the expected roles and responsibilities of the direct beneficiaries, the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO and how these have been decided and will be managed (elaborate further where this activity involves more than one collaborating NZNGO or CSO/partner)

 - 3.2 Confirm who will be responsible for financial management and reporting – including description of capability and track record where relevant
-

3.3 Confirm who will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the progress and ensuring the quality of activities and outputs

3.4 Confirm who will be responsible for assessing, evaluating and reporting progress towards and or achievement of outcomes

3.5 Confirm key risks you have identified for this proposed activity (include any treatments or mitigation strategies envisaged to manage these risks)

3.6 Describe the process for completing a full design proposal, workplan and budget including timeframe

3.7 Describe how you will identify and engage any key support/collaborations you may require to successfully implement the activity (including from MFAT)? Identify the key support areas in your response

4. Financial Investment *Efficiency (weighting 25%)*

This section should succinctly confirm the full investment will deliver expected long-term results efficiently and provide value for money to the New Zealand aid programme (2 A4 pages maximum)

4.1 Confirm how requested funds and implementation costs were calculated, including a demonstration of cost consciousness

4.2 Confirm that your NGO co-investment meets the criteria on section 1.3 on pages 3-5 . Provide information on how any NGO co-investment will be sourced by the NZNGO (and local partner where relevant), and the amounts. Include your expected timeframes for NGO co-investment payments. If local partners are making funding and/or in-kind contributions, please demonstrate the rationale, value add of this and confirm that local CSO/partners have not been pressured to provide co-investment.

4.3 Describe the nature and scope of relationship between the NZNGO and the New Zealand public, confirming: how the NZNGO will engage with any New Zealand constituency during the activity, for example to create awareness and promote this activity and harness New Zealand support (financial or non-financial)

4.4 What other initiatives are working towards your desired development outcomes, and how will your proposed activity generate outcomes that are additional to what would happen anyway

Annex 5 Concept Note Assessment Framework

1. Relevance & Effectiveness

Strategic investment: long-term results and impact expected (weighting 25%)

Concept Note Assessment Question	Concept Note Assessment guiding questions to make an informed and objective assessment. Compelling positive answers will increase the rating.	Assessment rating (select one)
1.1 Describe the current local context and the problem/issue/need and/or opportunity this investment is addressing, including partner country and New Zealand aid programme priorities; and the rationale for involvement; and the processes through which this development issue/need was identified	Is the problem clearly articulated and understandable?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
	Is it clear how this problem was identified?	
	Is there adequate evidence of contextual analysis?	
	Are there adequate considerations of gender or identification of need for gender analysis?	
	Is the rationale for engagement adequately articulated?	
1.2 Describe strategies and approaches to address the issue identified at 1.1 – inclusive of a brief description of the partners’ collective experience in this sectoral/ technical area of development activity and considerations of any alternative approaches considered to date. Note that assessing various options to address the development problem, need opportunity (optioneering) is a key part of the design process (refer to page 4 of the design template).	Is the strategy and approach to address the problem clearly articulated, understandable and evidence-based?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
	Does the intended approach appear appropriate and feasible based on knowledge of the context and the issue being addressed?	
	Is the collective experience of the respective parties to undertake this activity adequately substantiated?	
1.3 Describe the expected activity outcomes providing a brief narrative on how strategies and approaches (anticipated activities) are	Is there a demonstrated capacity to distinguish between outputs and outcomes?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate
	Are end of project outcomes clearly presented indicating the intended change?	

<p>expected to contribute to the achievement of outcomes.</p>	<p>Does it seem probably that supported activities will convert to the outcomes i.e. the suggested program logic reasonable? Is the narrative clear and compelling?</p>	<p>3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
<p>1.4 Elaborate on the processes taken or to be undertaken to ensure activity will reach vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups (this would include but not be limited to a consideration of gender and disability inclusion). If the local partner is a non-CSOs, demonstrate how this partner will reach marginalised and/or vulnerable people and groups. Please note that reaching the vulnerable and/or marginalised is a key Manaaki objective and all activities are expected to demonstrate how the vulnerable and/or marginalised will be targeted.</p>	<p>Are vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups identified as beneficiaries? Is the involvement of disabled people and disadvantaged people and groups including women and girls considered and/or processes planned to identify and or engage with them?</p>	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
<p>1.5 Indicate strategies for ensuring sustainability of outcomes</p>	<p>Is the concept of sustainability adequately understood and considered? Are strategies for sustainability clearly articulated? For extensions to existing projects, it it explained how the new project builds on previous activities and addresses issues of sustainability?</p>	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
<p>1.6 Alignment: Provide a brief narrative highlighting alignment (and/or complementarity) of the proposed activity and its relevance to New Zealand Aid Programme and national development priorities and the achievement of the SDGs at a country level (and/or other relevant sectoral/ technical policy and Guidelines)</p>	<p>Are New Zealand Aid Programme and national development priorities presented? Is it clear how this activity aligns with (or is complementary to) New Zealand Aid Programme and national development priorities? Is it clear and believable how project outcomes will contribute to the presented New Zealand development priorities? Is there an awareness of the country level SDGs and how this activity might contribute to their achievement? Does the Concept Note reference or align with other regional/sectoral or other policy/guideline or otherwise?</p>	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>

Overall Rating *1 = Does not meet requirements*
2 = Inadequate
3 = Sufficient
4 = Good
5 = Very strong

2. Local investment:
Benefits planned with the local community (weighting 25%)

Concept Note Assessment Question	Assessment guiding questions to make an informed and objective assessment. Compelling positive answers will increase the rating.	Assessment rating select one)
2.1 Describe the nature and length of relationship between the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO, and provide detail of previous activity collaboration/successful outcomes.	Is it clearly presented how long the NZNGO has been in a relationship with the local CSO/partner – and what the nature/evolution of that relationship has been? To what extent is there evidence of a demonstrated and effective working relationship between the NZNGO and local CSO/partner?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
2.2 Elaborate on local partner priorities and capabilities – describing the process used for assessment and previous investment in capacity strengthening (e.g. mutual capacity assessment and/or partner strengthening).	Is there evidence that the NZNGO and the local partner are working to their strengths and that the NZNGO is bringing value add to the partner organisation? Is there evidence of articulation of local priorities? Is there evidence of capacity assessment by either the local partner (self-assessment) and or the NZNGO having undertaken capacity assessment of the in-country partner (s) to identify strengths and weaknesses in the partner/partnership? Is there evidence of investment in local capacity/capability building and or organisational strengthening?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
2.3 Provide a full description of other relevant stakeholders – other NGOs or service providers as well as local networks/community structures in the proposed location with some indication of how these groups/individuals might engage with the project (and or be enablers/barriers to implementation/achievement of outcomes).	Is a clear and informed understanding of the local community and its structures demonstrated? Have local stakeholder networks been identified/analysis undertaken – or indicated as necessary in the next stage? Has it been presented how stakeholder/networks might support/enable and or present obstacles to the implementation of the project/achievement of outcomes?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
2.4 Confirm the name, location and likely number of beneficiaries who will be impacted by the activity.	Is the location/population that will be reached vulnerable and/or marginalised?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate

	<p>Have the people, groups and/or communities (units) who will benefit from this project been clearly presented?</p> <p>Have the people, groups and/or communities been identified as direct (primary) beneficiaries or indirect (secondary) beneficiaries?</p> <p>From the concept, do we understand enough about how vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups have been identified?</p>	<p>3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
<p>2.5 Confirm the local CSO's/partner's relationship with the direct beneficiaries. Where the local partner is not a CSO, NZNGOs are encouraged to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions. Confirm how (and from whom) the idea for this activity was initiated.</p>	<p>Has the nature and length of the relationship between the local CSO/partner and the beneficiaries been clearly presented?</p> <p>Based on what is presented, do you think it reasonable to assume that the local CSO/partner is able to be a legitimate representative of the local community – this will be tested further at the proposal development stage? Where the local partner is not a CSO, NZNGOs are encouraged to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions.</p> <p>To what extent does the proposed concept reflect local priorities, needs and capacities?</p>	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
<p>2.6 Describe how this initiative will strengthen local civil society and contribute to an increased voice/better responsiveness to local needs and demand in the longer term.</p>	<p>Is it clear how this activity will contribute to a strengthened local civil society?</p> <p>Is it described how the NZNGO will support the local CSO/partner to have an increased voice and better represent local needs in the longer term?</p> <p>Is there an explicit advocacy approach to achieve increased voice/better responsiveness to local needs and demands in the longer term?</p> <p>Is it presented how the local people, groups and/or communities presented will be able to strengthen their advocacy and demands or improve local conditions or services in the longer term?</p>	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>
	Overall Rating	<p>1 = <i>Does not meet requirements</i> 2 = <i>Inadequate</i> 3 = <i>Sufficient</i> 4 = <i>Good</i> 5 = <i>Very strong</i></p>

3. Management feasibility:
Delivery of activities and outputs (weighting 25%)

Concept Note Assessment Question	Assessment guiding questions to make an informed and objective assessment. Compelling positive answers will increase the rating.	Assessment rating (select one)
3.1 Present the expected roles and responsibilities of the direct beneficiaries, the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO and how these have been decided and will be managed (elaborate further where this activity involves more than one collaborating NZNGO or CSO/partner).	Are the roles and responsibilities of the direct beneficiaries, the local CSO/partner and the NZNGO clearly presented? Is it clear how these role and responsibilities were discussed and confirmed?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
3.2 Confirm who will be responsible for financial management and reporting – including evidence of capability and track record where relevant.	Is the anticipated flow of funds clearly described? Where partners are in receipt of funds, is there track record of managing and acquitting funds to a similar amount proposed in this concept? What is the largest value project or programme previously managed by the intended partner organisation?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
3.3 Confirm who will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the progress and quality of key activities and outputs.	Is it clear which entity will be responsible for activity implementation and monitoring the progress and quality of delivery? Based on what is presented, do you think it reasonable to assume that this entity can perform the implementation and monitoring tasks required?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong
3.4 Confirm who will be responsible for assessing, evaluating and reporting progress towards and or achievement of outcomes.	Is it clear which entity will be responsible for evaluating and reporting against the delivery of outcomes? Based on what is presented, do you think it reasonable to assume that this entity can perform evaluation and reporting tasks required?	1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong

<p>3.5 Confirm key risks you have identified for this proposed activity (include any treatments or mitigation strategies envisaged to manage these risks).</p>	<p>Does the Concept Note demonstrate an understanding of risk identification/analysis/mitigation? Have key risks been identified and potential strategies proposed to mitigate them (and or a process to ensure this is undertaken at the design stage)?</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>3.6 Describe the process for completing a full design proposal, workplan and budget including timeframe.</p>	<p>Has it been clearly presented how the full proposal will be developed? Is the process/timeframe described feasible and reasonable to develop a design? Has it been confirmed that the proposal will be developed within the proposed Stage 3 timeframe?</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>3.7 Describe how you will identify and engage any key support/collaborations you may require to successfully implement the activity (including from MFAT)? Identify the key support areas in your response</p>	<p>Has any additional support other than submitting partners been identified? Is it clear how the need for support will be identified and engaged?</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
		<p>Overall Rating 1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>4. Financial Investment: Efficiency (weighting 25%)</p>		
<p>Concept Note Assessment Question</p>	<p>Assessment guiding questions to make an informed and objective assessment. Compelling positive answers will increase the rating.</p>	<p>Assessment rating (select one)</p>

<p>4.1 Confirm how requested funds and implementation costs were calculated, including a demonstration of cost consciousness.</p>	<p>Has a complete budget amount been presented? Has a process for estimating costs been presented/justified? Have all partners been involved in budget decision-making (i.e. full transparency)? Are there any concerns or apparent gaps in the costing? Are there considerations of cost consciousness/value for money (VFM)?</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>4.2 Confirm how any NGO funding contributions (including in-kind) will be sourced by the NZNGO (and local CSO/partner where relevant), and the amounts. Include timeframes of NGO co-investment payments.</p>	<p>Have all co-funding contributions from the NZNGO and local CSO been presented? Has the NZNGO confirmed how and when the co-funding will be provided? Has any contribution in kind component been presented (including monetary value)? If local partners are making funding and/or in-kind contributions; has the rationale, value-add, and assurances that local CSO/partners have not been pressured to provide co-investment been clearly demonstrated.</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>4.3 Describe the nature and scope of relationship between the NZNGO and the NZ public, confirming how the NZNGO will engage with any New Zealand constituency during the activity, for example to create awareness and promote this activity and harness New Zealand support (financial or non-financial).</p>	<p>Does the NZNGO have a clearly identified NZ constituency? Has the NZNGO clearly described its relationship and contact with the New Zealand public? Has the NZNGO clearly described how it will engage with the New Zealand public during implementation?</p>	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>
<p>4.4 What other initiatives are working towards your desired development outcomes and how will your proposed activity generate outcomes that are additional to what would happen anyway?</p>	<p>Has the NZNGO confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activity is in addition to existing initiatives and work programmes of the applicant organisation or partners. • There is evidence of the added impact as a result of the MFAT co-investment. • The activity is beyond ‘business as usual’ reasonably expected to be undertaken by the applicant organisation or partners. • Funding for the activity is not available, nor being received, from other sources 	<p>1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate 3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong</p>

-
- Manaaki funding will make a critical difference.
-

Overall Rating 1 = *Does not meet requirements*
2 = *Inadequate*
3 = *Sufficient*
4 = *Good*
5 = *Very strong*

Annex 6 Declaration

APPLICANT: NEW ZEALAND NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION

I confirm and declare that:

- I have read the Manaaki Guidelines that outline the procedures, terms, conditions and criteria and I understand and agree to these;
- None of the organisations that are part of the application are in receivership, or liquidation;
- The application is not being made by an undischarged bankrupt or someone prohibited from managing a business;
- Should MFAT agree that this concept proceed to design, this organisation commits to being responsible for the provision of the required co-investment funding over the life of the activity;
- I acknowledge that MFAT may promote any successes that result from this application (while respecting commercial confidentiality);
- I consent to MFAT undertaking due diligence on this application and the organisations associated with it;
- The information contained in the attached application is true and correct and there have been no misleading statements, omission of any relevant facts nor any misrepresentation made;
- At the date of this Declaration, I am not aware of anything that may prevent my organisation from completing the Activity. I have notified MFAT of any information that may affect MFAT's decision to fund the Activity;

I am authorised to make this application on behalf of the parties identified above.

Name of authorised signatory:

Signature:

Position:

Date:

Organisation:

This declaration must be signed by a person with the legal authority to commit your organisation to a transaction.

IN-COUNTRY PARTNER/LOCAL CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION³⁵

I am authorised to make this application on behalf of the parties identified above.

Name of authorised signatory:

Signature:

Position:

Date:

Organisation:

³⁵ See footnote 1 on page 2.