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# 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 in the Manaaki Fund guidelines under Annex 2 Due Diligence Assessment 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 years) do not need to repeat due diligence. However, these applicants must complete Annex 6 Due Diligence Declaration. If there has been any substantive change, 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) |  |  |
| List of governing members summarising experience, qualifications\* |  |
| List of key management personnel summarising experience, qualifications\* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy (or equivalent[[1]](#footnote-2)) which outlines: how COIs are identified; how often they are updated and what procedures are to be followed when a COI is identified |  |  |
| Copy of current COI register |  |
| 3 | Relationship with New Zealand constituency | Annual Report or equivalent[[2]](#footnote-3) (or link to website) which describes engagement with the New Zealand public[[3]](#footnote-4) and demonstrates donor acknowledgement |  |  |
| Statement of willingness to communicate MFAT support\* |  |  |
| Two examples of relationship with New Zealand constituency i.e. social media, membership, supporter newsletters |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| 4 | NGO has appropriate financial systems and controls | Financial Policies and/or procedures manual provides details on how the NGO actions receipting grants, partner funds transfer, acquittals, cash management, monthly reconciliation process, budget management, payment controls, separation of roles, foreign exchange/interest rate gains, internal audits/controls |  |  |
| Financial Delegation policy |  |
| Name of accounting system and a chart of accounts (list of General Ledger accounts) |  |
| Signed copy of audit/reviewed[[4]](#footnote-5) Financial Statements and copy of audit/reviewer’s management letter[[5]](#footnote-6) (3 years). |  |
| 5 | NGO is in a sound Financial Position | Audited/reviewed Financial Statements (3 years) – *assessor will use those provided in Standard 4* |  |  |
| Statement of fundraisingover past three years\*. (The NGO must have the capacity to raise funds from the New Zealand public[[6]](#footnote-7)) |  |
| Reserves Policy |  |
| Any Bank covenants |  |
| 6 | NGO has systems to prevent funding terrorism | Counter-Terrorism Policy and procedures which contain at a minimum, but not limited to:   1. references to the Anti-Money Laundering and Countering Financing of Terrorism Act 2009, and Terrorism Suppression Act 2002 2. requires reviews of all organisations and individuals regularly against global lists of ‘terrorist organisations’ 3. the prevention procedures in place in the staff recruitment process 4. details the steps on how any issues identified are reported to management 5. a ‘counter-terrorism’ clause is written into all partner agreements 6. direct partners or potential partners checked against the NZ terrorism watch lists annually 7. identifies where these checks are stored |  |  |
| Evidence of terrorism screening check[[7]](#footnote-8) of downstream implementing partners/subcontractors if the terrorism risk is rated minor or above\*. |  |
| 7 | NGO has systems in place to prevent, manage and report fraud, bribery, and corruption | Fraud Control Policy/and procedures which contain at a minimum, but not limited to:   1. an explicit definition of actions that are deemed to be fraudulent/corruption 2. allocation of responsibilities for the overall management of fraud 3. a statement that all appropriate measures to deter fraud will be taken 4. the formal procedures which employees should follow if fraud is suspected 5. notification that all instances of suspected fraud will be investigated and reported to the appropriate authorities 6. the steps to be taken in the event fraud is discovered and who is responsible for taking these actions 7. confidential safe reporting internally and externally |  |  |
| An explanation\* and recent evidence of how the NGO promotes awareness of a) fraud risk and b) how staff can report fraud? |  |
| 8 | NGO has effective project management systems | Documented guidelines and/or procedures for project management which cover design, appraisal, progress and risk reporting and monitoring, evaluation, research and learning (MERL) |  |  |
| Two pieces of evidence to demonstrate two different project management phases |  |
| An explanation of how the organisation tracks various projects\* (i.e., through a project management system, excel or another IT application), and evidence of this. |  |
| 9 | NGO can demonstrate a track record of effectively managing international development funds | Table of international funds/ or projects implemented in the past three years including activity purpose, location, duration and funding amount\* |  |  |
| Any other evidence (evaluations/ referee reports/other donor performance reports etc.) |  |
| 10 | NGO can demonstrate an organisational commitment to good practice development | Confirmation of CID membership, or, if not a member, a Statement\* or Policy which demonstrates that the organisation understands that good development practice does not involve supporting activities such as welfare, partisan politics, and evangelism / proselytism |  |  |
| Gender Policy[[8]](#footnote-9) (or equivalent) outlining the NGO’s commitment to gender/ gender equality. This should include organisational commitment (e.g gender balance on governance and recruitment processes) and development practice (development strategy) and how gender is considered throughout the project cycle.  Policy on Inclusive Development/Disability Inclusion[[9]](#footnote-10) (or equivalent) outlining the NGO’s commitment to inclusive development/meeting the needs of people with disabilities and how this is considered throughout the project cycle. |  |
| **Safeguarding** | | | | |
| 11 | NGO can demonstrate the application of effective Health and Safety systems | Health and Safety Policy/Manual that has been reviewed in the last 12 months which includes:   * how the NGO ensures the physical, mental, and emotional well-being of workers and prevents work-related injuries and diseases including systems for monitoring competency and task related training [[10]](#footnote-11) * how the NGO will consult, coordinate and cooperate with other partners where they share overlapping duties * how external feedback, concerns or complaints will be handled * how/when H&S training is undertaken * ensuring workers have the opportunity to engage in H&S matters * how incidents and hazards are reported (including serious incidents). (NB copies of templates to be included) * signature from CEO/management representative to demonstrate commitment from leadership |  |  |
| Example of a H&S Plan for anticipated\* or previous activity (which demonstrates how policies and systems are reflected in a specific plan including training of staff/contractors for H&S/travel safety) |  |
| Example of a risk register or any other document that outlines how risks are identified, assessed and managed through appropriate control measures |  |
| One example to demonstrate H&S is monitored and improvements made i.e. copy of a health and safety inspection/audit report, review, safety/in-house meeting minutes, reporting dashboard |  |
| Statement declaring whether NGO has/has not received any notices, fines, prosecutions or enforceable undertakings by a regulator with regards to local and/or international H&S matters\*. If it has, provide details of what occurred, the outcome, lessons learnt, and any changes made as a result. |  |
| 12 | NGO has adequate systems and processes for managing organisational risk | Risk Management Policy and procedures, or equivalent[[11]](#footnote-12) that demonstrates how organisational and project risks are identified, assessed/rated, monitored, reported, reviewed (and how often), treated, and if necessary escalated |  |  |
| A copy of the current organisational risk register, and (if not included in the organisational risk register) one example of a project risk register |  |
| Insurance policies i.e. travel, business continuity, public liability |  |
| 13 | NGO has effective mechanisms for complaints and whistle-blowing | Whistle-blower/Complaints Policies and procedures – internal and external\*\*\* including for fraud, child protection, health and safety and PSEAH  (\*\*\* link on the website) |  |  |
| 14 | NGO has adequate systems for the prevention, detection, and response to sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment (PSEAH) and Child Protection | PSEAH and Child Protection policy, guidance and/or equivalent[[12]](#footnote-13) that covers prevention, awareness, reporting and responding including as a minimum:   * staff and supplier code of conduct * reference checking and recruitment screening * employment contracts contain provisions to manage an employee who is under investigation and dismiss if the complaint is upheld * staff and supplier education on the policy, prevention, risk factors and responding to harm (NB: Education work can be outsourced to suitably qualified in-country partner/s) * clear and accessible systems and processes are in place for reporting (see standard 13) and investigation of; code of conduct infringements and policy non-compliance, including sanctions for breaches * ensuring risks are identified and actively managed in risk assessments |  |  |
| Two examples of the practical application of the policy or equivalent such as awareness raising activities, reporting forms, training material. |  |
| 15 | NGO has systems for child safeguarding and protection of children when the activity involves ‘working with children’[[13]](#footnote-14)  *Note: This is an additional standard for NGOs defined as ‘working with children’ as per above* | Child Protection Policy (or equivalent[[14]](#footnote-15)) that is fit-for purpose based on the child safeguarding risk (identified in Standard 12) and includes[[15]](#footnote-16):   * child participants know how to report concerns and/or harm. * evidence of child safe recruitment e.g. staff integrity checks (and/or criminal record checks), child protection specific questions at interview where relevant (see[[16]](#footnote-17)) * guidance on child participation[[17]](#footnote-18) (including consent, safe recruitment of facilitators, supervision and physical safety). * guidance on taking images and using them such as for fundraising which ensures safeguarding, consent and privacy of children is applied for all project communication |  |  |
| Two examples of the practical application of the policy or equivalent. |  |
| 16 | Genuine NZNGO partnership/ relationship with local CSO[[18]](#footnote-19) legitimately representing local constituents | Signed Partnership MOU\* or Joint Statement from NGO and CSO\*, or (draft) Project Agreement\* |  |  |
| A signed letter of support from the NZ NGO’s in-country partner that confirms the partner legitimately represents the needs/demands of a local constituency and outlines the length/depth of the relationship with the NZNGO\*. |  |
| 17 | NGO routinely undertakes satisfactory due diligence[[19]](#footnote-20) / organisational capacity assessment of partners and has systems/processes to provide strengthening | Signed Partnership MOU\* or Joint Statement from NGO and CSO\* or (draft) Project Agreement\* which includes expectations/requirements for: results and financial reporting; financial controls (i.e. to enable auditing, prevent fraud); counter-terrorism; budget planning and variance management; Child Protection and PSEAH[[20]](#footnote-21) (see standards 14/15); Health and Safety; unspent funding at end of stage or project; termination; good practice development; due diligence of any downstream partners/outsourcing |  |  |
| A policy (or equivalent[[21]](#footnote-22)) covering the organisation’s approach to performing and checking due diligence of partners/downstream partners including a copy of a due diligence assessment template checklist (even if this template is from a third party) |  |
| A policy (or equivalent[[22]](#footnote-23)) covering the NGO’s approach to assessing, strengthen-ing and monitoring capacity of in-country partners/downstream partners including how it responds to strengthening needs identified during due diligence and how changes required are monitored |  |
| A recent (within the last 12 months) example of a capacity assessment or a partner capacity strengthening plan and records of training/mentoring responding to the assessed gap. |  |
|  |  |

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

**APPLICANT NAME:**

*Please tick the relevant box to confirm and declare that:*

* Our organisation has not experienced any substantive changes that may impact the previous Manaaki due diligence assessment including having had no changes to the governing board and key members of the management team since the due diligence assessment.
* Our organisation has experienced changes as per above since our due diligence assessment.

Please outline what these are in the space below (or on a separate page if needed) to enable assessors to determine if parts of the due diligence require reassessment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 International Development Cooperation (IDC) 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) | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 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. 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. 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. 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](https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid-Prog-docs/Partnerships/Manaaki/Activity-MERL-Framework-Guidance.docx). |
| * 1. 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. 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. Alignment: Provide a brief narrative highlighting alignment (and/or complementarity) of the proposed activity and its relevance to New Zealand IDC Programme and national development priorities and the achievement of the SDGs at a country level (and/or other relevant sectoral/ technical policy and guidelines). |
| 1. **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) |
| * 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. |
| * 1. 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). |
| * 1. 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). |
| * 1. 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, age, ability and other relevant characteristics. |
| * 1. Confirm the local CSO’s/partner’s relationship with the direct beneficiaries. Where the local partner is not a CSO, NZNGOs are encouraged to to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions. Confirm how (and from whom) the idea for this activity was initiated. |
| * 1. 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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) |
| * 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). |
| * 1. Confirm who will be responsible for financial management and reporting – including description of capability and track record where relevant. |
| * 1. Confirm who will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the progress and ensuring the quality of activities and outputs. |
| * 1. Confirm who will be responsible for assessing, evaluating and reporting progress towards and or achievement of outcomes. |
| * 1. Confirm key risks you have identified for this proposed activity (include any treatments or mitigation strategies envisaged to manage these risks). |
| * 1. Describe the process for completing a full design proposal, workplan and budget including timeframe. |
| * 1. 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. |
| 1. **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 IDC programme. (2 A4 pages maximum) |
| * 1. Confirm how requested funds and implementation costs were calculated, including a demonstration of cost consciousness. |
| * 1. Confirm that your NGO co-investment mets the criteria on section 1.3 on pages 4-5 . 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. |
| * 1. 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). |
| * 1. 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 IDC 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?  Is it clear how this problem was identified?  Is there adequate evidence of contextual analysis?  Have gender (and social inclusion) dimensions been analysed and included in the problem analysis? Is the rationale for engagement adequately articulated?  Is there evidence of consideration of other agents involved in the sector/their role? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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?  Are there sufficient strategies to ensure inclusion and equity of benefits to women and other marginalized and/or vulnerable populations?  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 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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. | Is there a demonstrated capacity to distinguish between outputs and outcomes?  Are end of project outcomes clearly presented indicating the intended change?  Is there evidence of gender and social inclusion outcomes?  Does it seem probable that supported activities will convert to the outcomes i.e. is the suggested program logic reasonable?  Is the narrative clear and compelling? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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. | Are vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups identified as beneficiaries and is there a strategy for reaching them?  Have women, youth, people with disabilities and other disadvantaged people and groups been considered and will they participate in the planning and design process? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 1.5 Indicate strategies for ensuring sustainability of outcomes | Is the concept of sustainability adequately understood and considered?  Are strategies for sustainability clearly articulated?  For extensions to existing projects, is it explained how the new project builds on previous activities and addresses issues of sustainability? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 1.6 Alignment: Provide a brief narrative highlighting alignment (and/or complementarity) of the proposed activity and its relevance to New Zealand IDC Programme and national development priorities and the achievement of the SDGs at a country level (and/or other relevant sectoral/ technical policy and Guidelines) | Are New Zealand IDC Programme and national development priorities presented?  Is it clear how this activity aligns with (or is complementary to) New Zealand IDC 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? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
|  | **Overall Rating** | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |

| 1. **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?  Is there evidence of expertise and building capacity to support gender and social inclusion throughout the programme cycle? | *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?  Have the people, groups and/or communities (units) who will benefit from this project been clearly presented?  Have the people, groups and/or communities been identified as direct (primary) beneficiaries or indirect (secondary) beneficiaries?  From the concept, do we understand enough about how vulnerable and/or marginalised people and groups have been identified? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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 to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions. Confirm how (and from whom) the idea for this activity was initiated. | Has the nature and length of the relationship between the local CSO/partner and the beneficiaries been clearly presented?  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 – will this will be tested further at the proposal development stage? Where the local partner is not a CSO, NZNGOs are encouraged to to consider broadening partnerships to CSOs and/or incorporating community based interventions.  To what extent does the proposed concept reflect local priorities, needs and capacities? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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. | Is it clear how this activity will contribute to a strengthened local civil society?  Is it described how the NZNGO will support the local CSO/partner to have increased skills in order to amplify their voice and better represent local needs in the longer term?  Is there an explicit advocacy approach to achieve increased voice/better responsiveness to local needs and demands in the longer term?  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?  Are there safeguarding measures in place to protect women, youth, children, SOGIESC and other marginalized people from negative (and possibly violent) backlash, in response to their increased voice? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
|  | **Overall Rating** | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 1. **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* |
| 3.5 Confirm key risks you have identified for this proposed activity (include any treatments or mitigation strategies envisaged to manage these risks). | 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)? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 3.6 Describe the process for completing a full design proposal, workplan and budget including timeframe. | 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? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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 | Has any additional support other than submitting partners been identified?  Is it clear how the need for support will be identified and engaged? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
|  | **Overall Rating** | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Financial Investment: *Efficiency (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)* |
| 4.1 Confirm how requested funds and implementation costs were calculated, including a demonstration of cost consciousness. | Has a complete budget amount been presented?  Has a process for estimating costs been presented/justified?  Have all objectives including gender and social inclusion outcomes been adequately resourced and funded?  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)? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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. | 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. | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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). | 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? | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
| 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? | Has the NZNGO confirmed that:   * The activity is in addition to existing initiatives and work programmes of the applicant organisation or partners * There is evidence of added impact, including social inclusion and development outcomes,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 * Manaaki funding will make a critical difference. | *1 = Does not meet requirements 2 = Inadequate  3 = Sufficient 4 = Good 5 = Very strong* |
|  | **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;
* I confirm that the eligibility criteria for this application has been met
* 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 ORGANISATION**

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

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

1. \* Can be produced for the purposes of the due diligence process/this application

   i.e., manual, documented procedures or guidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Public publication or accountability reporting [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. This can include the public in New Zealand, New Zealand citizens based offshore and New Zealand based private sector [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Financial statements must be audited by a qualified auditor if the total operating expenditure for the previous two years was over $1m. Between $1m-$500k financial statements must be either audited or reviewed by a qualified auditor. Less than $500k financial statements are not required by law to have an audit or review unless required by the NGO’s rules (e.g. trust deed, constitution or charter) or as a condition of receiving a grant. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The letter or report provided by your auditor to management and governance at the end of the audit which sets out the key areas of focus during the audit, recommendations for improvements, any audit adjustments, and required communications [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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 NZ based private sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Can be a checklist outlining date and result of check. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Can be policy, manual, documented procedures or guidelines in development/recently redrafted but must show sufficient commitment/understanding to give MFAT confidence its practical application can be demonstrated during Manaaki design. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. As per previous footnote [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. MFAT will assess individual safety plans once activity areas are agreed. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. i.e., manual, documented procedures or guidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. 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-free and safe workplace cultures are needed to ensure organisations can protect beneficiaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Any paid or unpaid work that involves regular or overnight contact with children, or at least once a week, or at least 4 days per month. Contact includes physical, oral (in person or by phone) or by any electronic medium (writing or visual).   *(New Zealand’s Children’s Act 2014)* [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. i.e., manual, documented procedures or guidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. In the absence of an organisational policy, when Implementing Partners are small or informal, the following steps should be incorporated into the Activity design as project steps. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. [https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Working-with-children/Childrens-act-requirements/Safer-Organisations-safer-children.pdf](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Working-with-children/Childrens-act-requirements/Safer-Organisations-safer-children.pdf__;!!DSXNDE5CDw!KoSENZrg-ln75nTn6vOCwCJZ52ZDv0x43J_qCgMG42cba-fYTcjunLyNHkIrq0H5mg$) [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Relevant guidelines are here: https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/library/practice-standards-childrens-participation-user-friendly-summary [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. 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](mailto:PartneringForImpact@mfat.govt.nz) [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. In rare circumstances where MFAT has agreed that the in-country partner can be a government department/agency and this is the sole in-country partner, due diligence requirements will be determined via consultation with the appropriate MFAT bilateral/Post teams on a case-by-case basis. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. If small implementing partners do not have child protection and/or PSEAH policies, they could a) agree as part of the MOU/joint statement/project agreement to a code of conduct for child protection and PSEAH and to follow reporting and response procedures b) sign up to the main in-country partner’s Child Protection and PSEAH policies. Activity specific risks, mitigations and processes and procedures will be required in Manaaki activity design. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Can be policy, manual, documented procedures or guidelines in development/recently redrafted but must show sufficient commitment/understanding to give MFAT confidence its practical application can be demonstrated during Manaaki design appraisal. In-country partner due diligence can involve accessing fit-for-purpose due diligence performed by appropriate third parties (if agreed with MFAT). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Can be policy, manual, documented procedures or guidelines in development/recently redrafted but must show sufficient commitment/understanding to give MFAT confidence its practical application can be demonstrated during Manaaki design appraisal. Can involve accessing fit-for-purpose capability/capacity assessments performed by appropriate third parties (if agreed with MFAT) and/or outsourcing training to relevant expertise in-country. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)