

Document 8

Please note information relating to other attendees within the same document has not been included below as it is out of scope.

Excerpt of Attendee report 28 April for Evaluation Panel

First Name	Last Name	Organisation
Brough	Johnson	Narrative Muse
Teresa	Bass	Narrative Muse
Dil	Khosa	Narrative Muse

Excerpt of spreadsheet capturing projects from Wellington, Online, and Christchurch events

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description
[REDACTED]	Narrative Muse	Purpose: To transform the entertainment landscape to be intersectionally gender diverse. Potential: To help Aotearoa audiences find books, movies and TV that reflects their taste and identify. To help content producers understand how to serve these underrepresented audiences.

Excerpt of Wellington event attendance list

First Name	Surname	Email	Phone	Organisation	Attended event?
Brough	Johnson	S9(2)(a)	S9(2)(a)	Narrative Muse	Yes
Dil	Khosa	S9(2)(a)	S9(2)(a)	Narrative Muse	Yes

Excerpt of Wellington event participant list for Creative HQ as at 28 April

#	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Team?	Ethnicity	Dietary requirements	Accessibility requirements
35	Brough	Johnson	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		
49	Teresa	Bass	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		
50	Dil	Khosa	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		

Excerpt of Wellington event participant list for Creative HQ as at 29 April

#	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Team?	Ethnicity	Dietary requirements	Accessibility requirements
35	Brough	Johnson	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		
49	Teresa	Bass	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		
50	Dil	Khosa	Narrative Muse		S9(2)(a)		

Excerpt of Te Urungi Online (project and Seed) and Porirua (project) Evaluation review

Applicant	Criteria	Weighting	Consensus Score	Percentage achieved	Feedback for applicant	Notes to Manatū Taonga
Narrative Muse	C1: Context and purpose	30%	7	21%	The panel saw an opportunity to develop audiences for diverse content and to influence producers and presenters to publish diverse content. S9(2)(g)(i) [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted]	
	C2: Innovation	30%	7	21%		
	C3: Implementation	30%	8	24%		
	C4: Potential	10%	8	8%		
				Total score		

Excerpt of Funded Innovation projects summary from online portal

Project Name	Project Description	Recommendation Status	Funding Requested	Funding Approved	Event Location	Type of funding requested
Narrative Muse	Purpose: To transform the entertainment landscape to be intersectionally gender diverse. Potential: To help Aotearoa audiences find books, movies and TV that reflects their taste and identify. To help content producers understand how to serve these underrepresented audiences.	Recommended	S9(2)(b)(iii)	500000.00	Wellington	Full

Excerpt of notes from notification calls

Applicant (organisation or individual name)	Organisation name (use for internal purposes only, collected from various sources and therefore it may not be accurate)	Panel Recommendation (Fund/Not fund/Part fund)	Pre call Assigned to call: (if applicable)	Call notes (if applicable)
Narrative Muse	Narrative Muse	Approved	Seb	Call completed. Recipient will have some questions about partial funding offer.

Excerpt of Te Urungi attendance log with funding details

First Name	Surname	Email	Phone	Organisation	Attended event?	
Brough	Johnson	S9(2)(a)	S9(2)(a)	Narrative Muse	Attended Wellington	Full
Dil	Khosa	S9(2)(a)	S9(2)(a)	Narrative Muse	Attended Wellington	

Excerpt of Recipient Tracker

Value	Start	End	
\$500,000.00	23/09/2021	9(2)(b)(ii)	Narrative Muse Limited

Jan-22: meeting
 Apr-22: reporting
 July-22: meeting
 Oct-22: reporting
 Jan-23: meeting
 Mar-23: final reporting

Excerpt of table - Innovation Fund: Project Description for publication on MCH website

Event Location & Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Agreement manager	Project Description (from CFMS or in the case of Porirua & online latest description)	Project Description - for publication COMMS	Amount	Rewritten by Agreement Mgr (YES)	Checked by Comms (YES)	Approval to use by participant (YES)
Project funding: Te Whanganui-a-Tara – Porirua	9(2)(b)(ii)	Narrative Muse	Seb	Digital platform to help Aotearoa audiences find books, movies and TV that reflect intersectionality and gender diversity. To help content producers understand how to serve these underrepresented audiences	To support the development of Narrative Muse, a digital platform to help Aotearoa audiences access books, movies and television content that reflects intersectionality and gender diversity.	\$500,000	Yes 5/10	YES	Yes

Ministry for Culture and Heritage: Contract, Reporting and Relationship Evaluation Support Tool

COVID19 Cultural Sector Regeneration Funds 2021

Recipient Name	Narrative Muse
Fund Application Category	Innovation
Assessor	Sebastian
Date of Assessment	20-Aug-21
Recommended level of assistance	Minimum Assistance
Recommended Contract	Contract A
Recommended Reporting Framework	Report Template B

Colour key:

input required
auto populated
auto

Category	Assessment Criteria	Impact Rating	Mitigation	Overall Risk Score	
Capability & People	Experience in delivering the same or similar type projects	2	2	3	This project is a continuation of NM's existing model, meaning good experience in delivery
	Success in delivering same or similar type project	2	2	2	As above
	Likelihood of key personnel turnover during the execution of the project	1	1	1	Unlikely
	Ability to act autonomously with minimal assistance from MCH to successfully complete the project	2	1	1.5	Operates a commercial model with strong ability to act autonomously
	Organisational structure and maturity	3	3	3	Organisation is less than 5yrs old, and only has limited maturity
Subtotal				10.5	
Money	Grant value	3	1	3	500000
	Total historical funding received from MCH	1	1	1	n/a
	Ability to effectively manage and report on financial performance	1	1	1	experienced
	Experience managing grants	2	1	1.5	Currently managing grants from other investors, including from angel investors
Subtotal				6.5	
Activity & Impact	Duration of grant (contract term)	4	1	5	18 months
	Scale of impact and reach through the sector	1	1	2	National and international
	Number and complexity of stakeholders involved	3	1	2	Different funders for example with different reporting approaches
	Geographical spread of project	1	1	1	International
	Level of public acceptance of the project, particularly if sensitive or provocative in nature	3	2	2.5	Supported
	Vulnerability of the project to disruption from COVID19 during implementation	2	1	2.25	Recipient describes nature of work as 'covid-friendly' given digital nature
Potential repeatability and scalability of project	2	1	1.5	Very scaleable	
Subtotal				16.25	
Relationship	MCH perceives potential for an enduring and valuable relationship with applicant	3	1	3	Some potential
	MCH existing relationship or familiarity with recipient	4	1	2.5	Limited, but some relationship built at Innovation Porirua event
	Applicant willing to engage with MCH in an enduring and valuable relationship	1	1	1.5	Yes, very keen
	Applicant willingness to share images or work for reporting purposes	1	1	1	Absolutely
Subtotal				8	

Category	Assessment Criteria	Impact Scoring Guide					Mitigation Scoring Guide					
		1	2	3	4	5	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Capability & People	Experience in delivering the project or similar type projects	Expert	Significant experience	Some experience	Little experience	No experience	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated. E.g. recently hired someone highly experienced	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Success in delivering same or similar type project	Highly successful, delivered strongly	Successful, delivered to expectations	Mostly successful	Lacks previous success, poor delivery	Poor delivery, no previous success	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Likelihood of key personnel turnover during the execution of the project	Highly unlikely	Unlikely	Possible	Highly possible	Definite	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Ability to act autonomously with minimal assistance from MCH to successfully complete the project	Expert	Significant experience	Some experience	Little experience	No experience	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Organisational structure and maturity	Highly organised, enduring, sophisticated organisation	Organised or sophisticated or enduring organisation	Lacking endurance, sophistication and organisation	Poorly organised, new organisation/person	No clarity of organisational structure	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
Money	Grant value	Less than \$150k	Between \$150 - \$350k	Between \$350 - \$550k	Between \$550 - \$750k	Greater than \$750k	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Total historical funding received from MCH	Less than \$150k	Between \$150 - \$350k	Between \$350 - \$550k	Between \$550 - \$750k	Greater than \$750k	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Ability to effectively manage and report on financial performance	Excellent ability. E.g. high familiarity with accounting software and can easily and accurately generate financial statements	Good ability	Satisfactory ability. E.g. has some ability to generate electronic financial statements for reporting purposes.	Lacking ability	Poor ability e.g. has no financial management (digitally or physically) which will negatively impact their ability to accurately report on grant use and expenses.	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Experience managing grants	Expert	Significant experience	Some experience	Little experience	No experience	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
Activity & Impact	Duration of grant (contract term)	Less than six months	Between six months to nine months	Between nine months to a year	Between one year and 18 months	Longer than 18 months	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Scale of impact and reach through the sector	Greater than 150 people	Between 100-150 people	Between 50-100 people	Between 10-50 people	Less than 10 people	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Number and complexity of stakeholders involved	Low complexity, few stakeholders and common goals	Some complexity, stakeholders may have conflicting goals	Many stakeholders	Many stakeholders with differing goals	Very high complexity, many stakeholders with different interests	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Geographical spread of project	Local with minimal regional coordination	1-2 region spread, little coordination	2-3 region spread	Spread across some regions, complex coordination	Inter-regional, complex coordination	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Level of public acceptance of the activity, particularly if sensitive or provocative in nature	Low or no sensitivity. E.g. the public are highly likely to approve of the project and little or no controversy is likely to surface.	Somewhat sensitive e.g. may be sensitive to NZ public.	Moderately sensitive. E.g.	Highly sensitive	Very high sensitivity e.g. likely to be highly sensitive and cause controversy among the public and has potential to draw media attention.	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Vulnerability of the project to disruption from COVID19 during implementation	Low vulnerability	Moderately low vulnerability	Moderate vulnerability	High vulnerability	Very high vulnerability	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Potential repeatability and scalability of project	Great potential to repeat and increase scale	Good potential to grow scale and repeat project	Possible to repeat project and grow scale	Unlikely to be repeatable or scalable	Not repeatable or scalable	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
Relationship	MCH perceived potential for an enduring and valuable relationship with applicant	Excellent potential	Good potential beyond grant	Some potential beyond grant	Limited potential beyond grant	No potential beyond grant	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	MCH existing relationship or familiarity with recipient	High familiarity with applicant	Mostly familiar with applicant	Somewhat familiar with applicant	Barely any familiarity with applicant	No familiarity with applicant	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Applicant willing to have an enduring relationship with MCH	Highly willing	Mostly willing with some hesitation	Somewhat willing but not too concerned	May be willing in the future	Not willing	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated
	Applicant willingness to share images or work for reporting purposes	Very willing to share progress and imagery	Mostly willing to share progress and imagery	Somewhat willing to share progress and imagery	Unwilling to share progress and imagery	Very unwilling to share progress and imagery	Mitigation score must match the impact score	Highly mitigated	Mostly mitigated	Somewhat mitigated	Poorly mitigated	Not mitigated

Ministry for Culture and Heritage: Contract, Reporting and Relationship Contract Types
COVID19 Cultural Sector Regeneration Funds 2021

Contract A	
Evaluation Criteria Risk Characteristics	
Overall Risk	Carrying minimal risk and any risk carried is well mitigated
People	Highly sophisticated organisation possibly with complex responsibilities and public obligations Likely to have clear organisational structure and roles, low predicted personnel turnover and experience within the sector Well established in the sector with a generally positive reputation
Money	May have extensive government funding experience or other grant experience and therefore is familiar with typical funding processes and stages Likely to have a higher grant allocation and a long contract term
Activity	Likely to have a high impact on the sector and be well known for executing successful projects Likely to have high resilience to natural or unnatural impacts (such as COVID, natural disaster)
Relationship	Likely to want an enduring relationship
Contract and Reporting Implications and Considerations	
Assistance	Requires minimal assistance to successfully execute the project Has the most potential for a high value, long term engagement, therefore engagements with them could be prioritised. MCH POC should be consistent for the client to ensure continuity across the life of the project.
Reporting	Recommend a comprehensive reporting template, which captures the full scale and impact of projects. Reporting regularity may be low due to the comprehensive nature of reports and their ability to act autonomously.
Contracting	Contract should be comprehensive to cover risk with potentially high funds.
Contract B	
Evaluation Criteria Risk Characteristics	
Overall Risk	Carries medium level of risk which is mitigated in some instances
People	Well organised group of individuals or a moderately sophisticated organisation with sector experience. Likely to have a good reputation within the sector.
Money	May not have experience with funding processes and relationships, and therefore request more personalised time with MCH to understand how the process works and how to expedite funding. Likely to have medium level of grant allocation.
Activity	May be well established in the sector and branching into a new project or field. Alternatively, may not be well established in the field but has a clear plan and relevant experience. Impact may be niche or small scale to the sector. May be susceptible to natural or unnatural impacts (such as COVID, natural disaster) particularly if trying to co-ordinate across people or locations.
Relationship	May not be interested in an enduring relationship, but may have the potential to grow and develop greater impact with more maturity
Contract and Reporting Implications and Considerations	
Assistance	Requires medium level assistance with a view to enabling them to be more autonomous and increase engagement only if they show potential for longevity and reach.
Contract	Payments from MCH may be smaller and more frequent and dependant on proof of project progress Schedules need to reflect the risks in carrying out the project.
Reporting	Reporting regularity may more frequent than contract type A to enhance the perceived touch points, formalise assistance (thus mitigating impromptu requests) and ensure project progress against desired outcomes. Report template should be straight-forward to complete, with clear instructions (such as approximate word count expectation per section)
Relationship	May be a high-demand applicant. May need to be wary of spending a great deal of resource on the relationship. May be opportunities to partner them with a more mature organisation also receiving funding.
Contract C	
Evaluation Criteria Risk Characteristics	
Overall Risk	Carries high risk with minimal mitigants in place
People	No or little experience with grants or working with government departments May have risk of key person turnover or discontinuity within organisation. Less likely to have clear roles and structures. May be well established in the sector but have a poor reputation, or be new to the sector.
Money	Unlikely to have prior government funding experience, though may have some expectations of the grant process. Therefore may not ask many questions if they don't know what to ask. Likely to have a smaller grant allocation and short term contract
Activity	Likely to have a smaller or highly localised impact on the sector Resilience of the project to impacts of COVID19 is uncertain.
Contract and Reporting Implications and Considerations	
Assistance	Requires high level of assistance to mitigate risk initially, with a view to enable them to self manage in the medium to long term.
Relationship	May or may not be interested in an enduring relationship, but may have little potential to grow and therefore becomes resource intensive for MCH to maintain relationship
Reporting	Reporting template needs to be simple, easy to complete and not limited to digital platforms Reporting frequency may be low to reflect the smaller scale of the project
Contract	Contract needs to be straight-forward and in plain English. Schedules need to reflect the risks in carrying out the project.