CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR INVESTMENT

Building the Right Teams

This checklist of criteria and guidelines for building the right teams are intended for use by the Challenge SLG, Knowledge Brokers, and research leads/lead collaborating organisations as we move from development of the Investment Prospectus to Stage 2 investment.

Criterion	Detail
Readiness for investment (big picture – focused on Investment Prospectus as a whole)	Intention: characterise overall readiness for the Challenge to invest. A 'high ranking' means good to go and a recommendation should be made to Mana Rangatira to invest. A 'low ranking' means more work is needed. A 'mid-range ranking' means that a recommendation to Mana Rangatira can be made for some investment (key priorities) to commence now, but that the lead provider will need to work with SLG before further investment can be committed. Strong stop/go measures should be put in place even if an investment receives a high ranking.
Criteria for investment (detail) Pathway to significant long-term impact visible through delivering a tangible outcome (Goal/s) by 2024	Intention: finer-grained assessment of strengths and weaknesses i.e. which specific areas need more work Pathway and critical steps to 2024 Goals clearly laid out? Potential for collective impact obvious, including through bringing on new partners? Critical knowledge gaps along the innovation pathway, potential risks, and barriers to delivery clearly identified and plans to target Challenge investment to overcome these clearly articulated? Metrics for success SMART and clear? Who will deliver what by when? Have the team articulated the work that still needs to be done to build a collective to create impact? Is there a clear link to the Challenge or NRT KPIs? Clearly links with investments and programmes currently or previously funded in Ngā Rakau Taketake or the Challenge?
Potential for science/ knowledge excellence (even if more detail needed)	Intention: to ensure investment will deliver excellent science Ground-breaking research that is novel? – use excellence metrics identified in the Strategy International connections and collaborations identified, and steps taken to ensure collaborations are established or supported?
Team construction (capability, diversity and skills)	Intention: to ensure that the right skills are focused on delivering impact Have they adequately mapped the research landscape and clearly identified gaps? Have lead providers and research leads identified all the capability needed to deliver? Potential for co-leadership, succession planning, early-career researchers and/or Māori leaders?
Partnership with Māori, kaupapa Māori, Mātauranga Māori	Intention: to ensure respectful and meaningful partnership with Māori Is the work unlikely to be procured by mainstream institutes, in part because it falls outside their scope of expertise and/or interest? Does the work address issues that hapū and kaitiaki want? Does it involve them? Ideally, is it driven by affected communities? Does the work qualify as Mātauranga or culturally driven investment (score VM5 Kaupapa Māori)? Is the work able to be completed, inclusive of all deliverables, by dates specified by the Challenge?
Stakeholder co-design, decision-making and partnerships	Intention: to ensure a clear pathway to impact Have key stakeholders been identified? Have potential co-investors been identified? Is meaningful co-investment (e.g. cash, capability, knowledge, data, study areas, infrastructure…) committed? Opportunity to build scale and critical mass, and/or be scaleable in future as new opportunities and new connections come to light?
Public participation	Intention: to address the 'community and sector action' part of the Challenge Mission Do they tell a clear 'story', and include storytellers and/or knowledge translators in the team? Is the link to Challenge supporting architecture clear e.g. communications/relationship management?
Stop/go or pivot points?	Intention: to retain flexibility and not become 'locked in' if research looks like it will not create impact by 2024 Have they outlined processes that will be used to cease or re-deploy investment if a pivot is needed, and do they have a clear process for annual review? Will Mana Rangatira be able to clearly see that the team has processes for proactive self-management of pivot or decision points?

Selecting case studies, sites, private providers, or other initiatives

This checklist of criteria and guidelines are intended for use by the Challenge SLG, Knowledge Brokers when selecting potential sites and/or case studies and/or initiatives and/or private providers for development with or alongside other Stage 2 investments.

Criterion	Detail
Cross Challenge	Ticks off multiple needs across multiple SOs (and sometimes NRT): draws differing skills/disciplines from multiple SOs to address a significant issue/wicked problem – to demonstrate systems approach in action
Mātauranga	Kaitiaki can be, and often are, at the centre, guiding with and using their Mātauranga
Continuity	Builds on momentum from other projects, particularly BHNSC Tranche 1 projects or flagship sites
Scaleability	Has potential to draw others into it through in-kind, cash, other investment – including links to other Challenges (e.g. OLW; health Challenges) – and to rapidly build strong networks of committed participants
Can be part of 'synthesis' via CA Think Tank	Challenging problem that others have shied away from or deemed it 'impossible'; and/or provides crucial data for learning something about a system
Balance	Balanced to integrate different sectors, ecosystem types and restoration types (e.g. planting; pest control)
Ensuring diversity when investing in capability	Addresses ongoing needs around capability/capacity development, including giving effect to MBIE's 'diversity in science' policy
Can be woven into a 'story'	If successful, is: (a) likely to deliver significant impact; and/or (b) even if only a minor success still great story; and/or (c) good first step; and/or (d) others may see potential and be inspired and/or (e) trust is built rapidly