PROJECT GRANTS SCHEME-SPECIFIC FUNDING RULES FOR FUNDING COMMENCING IN 2018

The following sections provide additional information about the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Project Grants scheme including scheme-specific objectives, critical dates, assessment criteria, eligibility rules and funding details, and must be read in conjunction with the following supporting documents:

- the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017
- the Guide to NHMRC Peer Review 2017, incorporating the Project Grants scheme-specific Peer Review Guidelines
- the NHMRC Advice and Instructions to Applicants 2017 incorporating the Project Grants scheme-specific advice and instructions to applicants
- the NHMRC Funding Agreement.

It is recommended that you read the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017 before reading these scheme-specific rules.

1 ABOUT THE SCHEME

1.1 Description

A project grant application must outline a research proposal that describes the investigation of a new research idea/s. The proposal must support a particular set of aims and the budget must be directed to those aims. All project grant applications must be between one and five years. Single investigators or teams of up to ten chief investigators are supported as well as New Investigators (NI) (early career investigators); see section 5 for further details. Research teams are encouraged to include early career researchers as part of the Chief Investigator (CI) team.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the Project Grants scheme are to support the creation of new knowledge by funding the best investigator-initiated research project plan of between one and five years, in any area relevant to human health.

2 KEY CHANGES

Applicants should note the following changes to the Project Grants scheme-specific funding rules for funding commencing in 2018:

- Changes to minimum data requirements (see section 3)
- Changes have been made to the eligibility period (see section 5).
- Changes have been made to NI eligibility (see subsection 5.1.3).
- Changes have been made to criteria for Electromagnetic Energy Research funding (see subsection 6.2.3)
- Changes have been made to 2017 Project Grants Category Descriptors (see Attachment A)
- Changes have been made to 2017 Project Grants Indigenous Category Descriptors (see Attachment C)
3 CRITICAL DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 December 2017</td>
<td>Application information and templates available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 January 2017</td>
<td>Project Grants scheme opens in Research Grants Management System (RGMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 January 2017</td>
<td>New Investigator online forms due to NHMRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 2017</td>
<td>Minimum data due in RGMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2017</td>
<td>Applications close in RGMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June to 16 June 2017</td>
<td>Approximate release dates for Applicants’ Response (rebuttal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June to 26 June 2017 or 6 July to 14 July 2017</td>
<td>Approximate dates for rebuttal submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Completion of Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - December 2017*</td>
<td>Funding Announcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates are indicative and are subject to change

Application outcomes are announced as peer review processes are finalised and ministerial approvals are obtained. Refer to sections 11.4 and 11.6 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017 for further details.

Minimum data must be entered in RGMS by 5:00pm AEDT on the specified due date to allow the NHMRC to commence sourcing suitable assessors. Applications that fail to satisfy this requirement will not be accepted. Applicants are also reminded to complete the recommended fields as outlined below with correct information. Using placeholder text such as “text”, “synopsis” or “xx” etc. is not acceptable as minimum data.

Minimum data for the Project Grants scheme consist of the following:

- General – Application Information: You must complete fields for Administering Institution, Application Title, Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander Research (yes/no) and Synopsis.
- A-RC: Research Classification (all sections).
- B-GRPN: Grant Review Panel Nomination

Research Administration Officers (RAOs) are not required to certify applications for the purpose of minimum data. Applications should only be certified once complete and ready for submission (see section 10.4 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017 and section 6 of the NHMRC Advice and Instructions to Applicants 2017).

Completed applications must be submitted to the NHMRC in RGMS by 5:00pm AEDT on the specified closing date. Late applications will not be accepted.
4 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Applications will be assessed and ranked against the Assessment Criteria listed below:

- Scientific Quality (50%)
- Significance of the Expected Outcomes AND/OR Innovation of the Concept (25%)
- Team Quality and Capability relevant to the application - relative to opportunity, taking into account career disruptions where applicable (25%).

The assessment of the team is not weighted to the CIA but to the team as a whole.

Applications are assessed relative to opportunity, taking into consideration any career disruptions (see sections 6.2 and 6.2.1 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017).

Each Project Grant application is regarded by NHMRC as a new application for funding and is assessed accordingly.

All peer review adheres to NHMRC’s Principles of Peer Review as described in the A Guide to NHMRC Peer Review 2017 and the Project Grants scheme-specific Peer Review Guidelines (see section 4). Therefore, applicants can expect that any matter relevant to the three assessment criteria and budget may be considered in the review of their research application and requested budget. Issues not relevant to the assessment criteria are not considered during the assessment process.

Applicants are expected to address the three assessment criteria in their application and should closely consider the relevant Category Descriptors (see Attachment A). The category descriptors are used by Grant Review Panel (GRP) members to score each application against each criterion. This ensures a consistent framework by which applications are scored between and within panels. Additional guidance on how to address the assessment criteria is provided at Attachment B and in the Project Grants scheme-specific advice and instructions to applicants.

4.1 Additional Criteria for Indigenous Health applications

All applications that are accepted to relate to the improvement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health must also address the Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria (see section 6.3 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017).

These applications will be assigned to panel members with specific expertise in Indigenous health research. In scoring applications against the Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria, the Indigenous assessor will use their discretion, experience and expertise to reflect the relative strength of the application in terms of how well it addresses and meets the criteria and will closely consider the relevant Category Descriptors (Attachment C).

Any applications that have applied to be considered for Indigenous health which do not meet the Indigenous health criteria will be assessed as a standard Project Grant application.
5 ELIGIBILITY

NHMRC staff will not make eligibility rulings prior to an application being submitted. It is up to the applicant, in consultation with their RAO, to judge whether they will be suitable or not and to apply appropriately. An exception applies for applicants who wish to apply as NI applicants. These applicants must seek confirmation of their eligibility to apply in the New Investigator category, which involves an early application and notification process (see section 5.1.4).

Project Grants have eligibility criteria additional to those identified in section 7 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017. Applications will be excluded from consideration if eligibility requirements are not met (see section 10.7 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017).

Except for eligibility criteria requirements specific to NHMRC New Investigator status, which must be met at the time of the New Investigator application submission date, it is the responsibility of all CIs to ensure that they meet all other eligibility criteria at time of submission and for the duration of the peer review period to apply in the Project Grants round. RGMS has functionality available to assist applicants in determining their eligibility. However, this remains indicative only and does not replace the CI’s responsibility to confirm their eligibility.

For example, CIs on current NHMRC Grants should confirm with the CIA that no variation requests have been submitted which may affect the CI’s eligibility to apply.

5.1 Multiple Research Grant Eligibility

5.1.1 Project Grants

The maximum number of project grant applications a CI (CIA-CIJ) may submit in any year is six, less the number of NHMRC Project Grants that are scheduled to continue in the year following the year of the application. For example, if an investigator, at the time of submission holds four NHMRC Project Grants, one of which will finish at the end of the year of the application, the investigator may submit up to three applications.

Where a CI (CIA-CIJ) has submitted applications in excess of the maximum number of grants and/or applications for which she/he is eligible, all applications that include that investigator as a CI will be automatically ineligible and removed from the assessment process (refer to section 10.7 NHMRC Funding Rules). It is the responsibility of all CIs to ensure that they meet these requirements prior to submission of an application.

Note: A different requirement applies to CIs on Program Grants (please refer to subsection 5.1.2 below).

5.1.2 Program Grant applicants and grant holders

NHMRC Program Grant CIs are not permitted to hold, or apply for, more than one Project Grant.

Applicants should note that there can only be one Program Grant holder named as a CI on any Project Grant application. Program Grant CIs cannot be the only (sole) CI named on any existing Project Grant or a Project Grant application: there must be at least one other CI who is not also a CI on an awarded Program Grant or a Program Grant receiving funding in any year in which the Project Grant is funded.
This eligibility criterion applies regardless of a CI’s part-time or full-time status on the Program Grant. For further information on part-time Program Grants and Project Grant eligibility on existing grants please refer to the *Program Grants scheme-specific funding rules for funding commencing in 2019*.

A table summarising the NHMRC Project/Program Grant eligibility rules underpinning the eligibility criterion is at Attachment D.

### 5.1.3 New Investigators

The New Investigator (NI) initiative aims to support researchers who are yet to receive significant research funding through a competitive grants process. NHMRC seeks to fund NI applications at approximately the same rate as standard Project Grant applications.

**All CIs** on a NI application for funding must at the time of the NI application submission date:

- Be less than 10 years from the date of the letter advising them that their doctoral thesis was passed, unless career disruptions exist (see below for further details).
- Not have been a named CI (or equivalent) on a funded NHMRC research support grant and/or an ARC research support grant (e.g. Discovery Projects).
- Not have been a named CI (or equivalent) on a funded research support grant from an agency listed on the Australian Competitive Grants Register or an equivalent national\(^1\) or international competitive funding grant totaling $AUD 250,000 or more. Note the $250,000 limit is not cumulative.

Note: An early application process applies to confirm NI eligibility, refer to subsection 5.1.4 below.

Applicants may still have held a salary-only award (Scholarship or Fellowship) from any funding source including NHMRC (e.g. NHMRC Career Development Fellowship, Early Career Fellowship Award). If applicants have received funding support that includes research and salary support, applicants must provide details of each funding component for the research and salary support (the research support component must not total $AUD 250,000 or more). Applicants must also provide justification why the applicant should be considered a NI. Applicants who fail to provide all necessary details at the time of NI application submission will not be eligible for consideration of NI status and will progress as a standard applicant in the round.

### 5.1.4 New Investigator Eligibility Application Process

Applicants who wish to apply as a NI must seek confirmation of their eligibility to apply in this category by 25 January 2017. The early application and notification process is intended to allow the applicant(s) time to adjust the CI team if they do not meet the eligibility criteria.

All applicants applying as a NI must complete the mandatory NI form in RGMS in the ‘Applications’ section. Applicants should clearly address the NI eligibility criteria as outlined in the form, as no additional explanatory information will be accepted once a submission has been made and the submission date has passed.

\(^1\) Includes State and Territory based awards.
New Investigator Career Disruptions
Career disruptions can be claimed over the 10 year period only for NI eligibility assessment purposes. A career disruption claim for the assessment of Team Quality & Capability will only be considered as outlined in section 4.3 B-GP Grant Proposal of the Project Grants scheme-specific advice & instructions to applicants.

6 FUNDING

6.1 Level and Duration of Funding
Project Grants can be requested for between one and five years. Applicants are required to fully and clearly justify their requested budget on a yearly basis in order to demonstrate value for money.

The GRP will consider how the requested budget and requested duration of the grant supports the proposed outcomes of the application, and may adjust the duration and budget of the grant to ensure the project can be achieved, while ensuring value for money.

For a more detailed explanation regarding the appropriate use of NHMRC funds, Personnel Support Package (PSP) requests and how to prepare the budget in the application, refer to the Project Grants scheme-specific advice and instructions to applicants.

For information on Project Grants awarded in previous funding rounds, refer to the NHMRC website.

NOTE: Investigators applying for grants to be awarded by other funding bodies, for example Cancer Australia, must refer to the relevant guidelines provided by these organisations as specific conditions on the level and duration of funding and the items supported may differ. These guidelines can be found in the relevant links provided in subsection 6.2.3.

6.2 Use of Funds

6.2.1 Funding to support overseas research activities
Applicants may request funding to support specific research activities to be undertaken overseas. In doing so the applicants must clearly demonstrate that the research activity is critical to the successful completion of the project and that the equipment/resources required for the research activity are not available in Australia. In some instances applicants may conduct the majority of their work overseas. However it is important that applicants ensure that the research is well justified and conforms with the scheme eligibility requirements. For example the CIA must ensure they are based in Australia for 80 per cent (%) of the funding period.

Applicants may request funding for salary support for the specific research activities to be undertaken overseas. However, when requesting salary support for overseas activities the personnel in relation to the request may not be named as a CI.

6.2.2 Funding for Clinical Trials
A Clinical Trial and Cohort Studies Grant Review Panel will assess applications where a clinical trial or cohort study is the predominate methodology.
A clinical trial should be considered as the following:

- Study that will recruit humans or groups of humans, particularly unhealthy humans.
- The purpose of the study is to better understand human biology and/or disease.
- Participants will be prospectively assigned to one or more interventions.
- The study will have one or more health related outcomes.
- The study will have a control group and will be a controlled clinical trial.

Clinical trials may be categorised by type e.g. efficacy, effectiveness, explanatory, pragmatic, randomised.

NHMRC will only be able to fund a limited number of clinical trials and may require applicants to find co-funding as a prerequisite for NHMRC support, if the GRP determines that this is warranted.

6.2.3 Funding by other Organisations

The NHMRC Project Grants scheme has established a number of different arrangements with Government agencies, Administering Institutions and not-for-profit organisations to support research in specific areas. These arrangements allow the funding of applications considered fundable by the GRP, in total or in part, that are beyond the limit of NHMRC funding.

Each year, NHMRC conducts the peer review of applications on behalf of these organisations to identify applications suitable for their funding. All applications are peer reviewed in the same manner. If an applicant chooses to apply for funding from NHMRC and another organisation, and the application is ranked as competitive (fundable) following NHMRC peer review, NHMRC has the first option to fund the application. Details, including peer review outcomes, of all remaining relevant applications that are considered fundable by the GRP are then provided to the funding organisation. The decision to fund the additional application/s remains with that organisation. NHMRC does not take part in this stage of the process.

Privacy will be protected in accordance with the Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) as outlined in section 9.5 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017.

Applicants can choose to apply for funding from one or more organisations that offer funding through the NHMRC Project Grants scheme. Applications for NHMRC funding must comply with all NHMRC funding criteria. Applicants seeking funding from other organisations must also comply with any additional specified criteria or requirements from the relevant funding organisation. For information on additional funding opportunities and additional criteria that may apply, refer to Project Grants section on the NHMRC website.

Cancer Australia and Funding Partners and Cancer Councils

In 2017, applicants can choose to apply exclusively to:

- Cancer Councils
- Cancer Australia and Funding Partners
**Electromagnetic Energy (EME) Research**

Applicants who select EME funding in a Project Grant application should be aware that NHMRC, in conjunction with the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA), will determine if an application meets the criteria for EME funding.

Applicants are advised to review the 2010 WHO Research Agenda for Radio Frequency (RF) Fields, in particular, page 7 – Scope. Applicants are required to provide a detailed justification that their application meets the criteria for EME research and is within scope. Specifically, applicants are required to show that their project investigates the effects of RF EME on human health. In this context a description of both the RF exposure (such as frequency range and source of the exposure) and the health effect that is being investigated is required.

Applications that do not meet the WHO’s policy parameters will not be considered for EME funding.

In addition to the WHO agenda, further guidance is provided below:

People are constantly exposed to low levels of RF EME from various sources which are mainly used for telecommunications, such as:

- Radio and television broadcasting
- mobile telephony
- wireless networks such as Wi-Fi
- smart meters and
- other wireless communications.

There are also other sources of varying levels of RF EME exposing people at specific situations such as:

- security and navigation applications such as millimeter wave scanners and radar
- industrial uses such as induction heating and plastic welding
- and various medical applications for imaging and therapy.

It is anticipated that sources of RF EME will increase and there is some concern in relation to potential health effects which is not fully alleviated by existing scientific data.

7 **ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

For information on the peer review process, see the *Guide to NHMRC Peer Review 2017* and *Project Grants scheme-specific Peer Review Guidelines*.

7.1 **External Assessments and Applicant Response**

NHMRC, through its Assigners Academy, will endeavor to seek two reviews from External Assessors for all Project Grant applications. Prior to the GRP meeting, applicants will have an opportunity to respond to the reviews provided by Spokespersons and External Assessors.
Applicant Responses must be uploaded into RGMS by the NHMRC deadline and must meet all size, length and formatting requirements, outlined in the NHMRC notification letter to applicants when assessor comments are available.

8 GRANT ADMINISTRATION

Please refer to the *NHMRC Funding Agreement, section 12.3 of the NHMRC Funding Rules 2017* and on the NHMRC website under Administering Grants.

8.1 Reporting

The requirements for financial and scientific reporting are as described in the *NHMRC Funding Rules 2017, section 12.7*.

Note that where a grant commences funding on a date other than 1 January, the annual financial and scientific reports will still be due on 30 April for the portion of the previous calendar year in which the grant was active.

9 ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - 2017 NHMRC Project Grants Category Descriptors
Attachment B - Guidance for Applications to Address the Project Grants Assessment Criteria
Attachment C - 2017 NHMRC Project Grants Category Descriptors and Assessment Criteria for Health Research Involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples
Attachment D – Project/Program Grant Eligibility Rules
### CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Quality 50% (Feasibility can include contribution of Associate Investigators)</th>
<th>Significance and/or Innovation 25%</th>
<th>Team Quality &amp; Capability relevant to this application 25% (Does NOT include Associate Investigators) - Relative to opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Outstanding by International Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
<td>Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is well-defined, highly coherent and strongly developed.</td>
<td>• will result in a <strong>highly significant advance in knowledge</strong> in this field which addresses an issue of <strong>great importance</strong> to human health.</td>
<td>• has expertise that <strong>specifically targets</strong> the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has a <strong>secure</strong> study design.</td>
<td>• will result in <strong>fundamental outcomes</strong> in the science underpinning human health issues.</td>
<td>• has over the last 5 years, a <strong>combined record of research achievement</strong> that <strong>is outstanding by international standards</strong> commensurate with their field of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is <strong>highly feasible</strong> with all of the required expertise, research tools and techniques established.</td>
<td>• will translate rapidly into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.</td>
<td>o research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally.</td>
<td>• will almost certainly be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings.</td>
<td>o research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will almost certainly result in <strong>highly influential publications</strong>.</td>
<td>o research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is <strong>highly innovative</strong> and introduces advances in concept(s).</td>
<td>• has senior members with <strong>outstanding national and international reputations</strong> in the field of research relevant to the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will use <strong>very advanced</strong> approaches which will optimize outcomes.</td>
<td>• may involve junior members who are very strong contributors to the overall team quality &amp; capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of very strong mentoring by other members of the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Excellent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
<td>Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is clearly defined, coherent and well developed.</td>
<td>• will result in a <strong>significant advance in knowledge</strong> in this field which addresses an issue of <strong>importance</strong> to human health.</td>
<td>• has expertise that is <strong>highly relevant</strong> to the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has a strong study design.</td>
<td>• is likely to result in <strong>fundamental outcomes</strong> to the science underpinning human health issues.</td>
<td>• has over the last 5 years, a <strong>combined record of research achievement</strong> that is <strong>excellent by international standards</strong> commensurate with their field of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is <strong>feasible</strong> with all required tools, techniques and expertise established.</td>
<td>• is likely to translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.</td>
<td>o research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is likely to be competitive with strong, similar research proposals internationally.</td>
<td>• will likely be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings.</td>
<td>o research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will likely result in <strong>influential publications</strong>.</td>
<td>o research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is <strong>highly innovative</strong> in concept.</td>
<td>• has senior members with <strong>excellent national and/or international reputations</strong> in the field of research relevant to the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will use <strong>advanced approaches</strong> to enhance outcomes.</td>
<td>• may involve junior members who are <strong>strong contributors</strong> to the overall team quality &amp; capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of strong mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Very Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
<td>Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is generally clear in its scientific plan and is logical</td>
<td>• will <strong>advance knowledge</strong> in this field which addresses an issue of <strong>importance to human health.</strong></td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raises only very few <strong>minor concerns</strong> regarding the study design.</td>
<td>• very few concerns regarding feasibility may translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.</td>
<td>• has expertise that is <strong>strong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is feasible in all, or almost all areas - required techniques and tools either established or nearly established.</td>
<td>• could be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</td>
<td>• has over the last 5 years, a <strong>combined record of research achievement</strong> that <strong>is solid in concept.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally.</td>
<td>• is likely to result in <strong>some very strong publications.</strong></td>
<td>• has expertise that is <strong>very strong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is <strong>innovative</strong> in concept.</td>
<td>• will in the main use <strong>standard approaches.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will use <strong>established approaches</strong> to good effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
<td>Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is generally solid in its scientific plan, but may not always be clear in its intent and may lack some focus.</td>
<td>• may <strong>incrementally advance knowledge</strong> in the field which addresses an issue of some importance to human health.</td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raises several <strong>minor concerns</strong> regarding the study design.</td>
<td>• is <strong>unlikely to result in fundamental outcomes</strong> in the science underpinning human health issues.</td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>contribute to the overall team quality &amp; capability</strong> or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of some mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raises <strong>doubts</strong> about the feasibility in some areas.</td>
<td>• several minor concerns regarding feasibility is <strong>unlikely to translate</strong> into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally.</td>
<td>• is <strong>unlikely to be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international meetings.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• may result in some <strong>good but not excellent</strong> publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is solid in concept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will in the main use <strong>standard approaches.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Marginal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
<td>Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is somewhat uncertain in its scientific approach and goals.</td>
<td>• addresses an issue of <strong>some importance</strong> to human health.</td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contains some major design flaws.</td>
<td>may result in some publications.</td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raises major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion.</td>
<td>• may have some <strong>innovative and novel aspects</strong>, while others underpin or extend existing knowledge.</td>
<td>• has expertise that will <strong>be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• has evidence of a mentoring framework to support them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• has <strong>some significant concerns</strong> regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• has over the last 5 years, a <strong>combined record of research achievement</strong> that is <strong>above average by international standards</strong> commensurate with their field of research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is unclear in its scientific approach and goals.</td>
<td>• addresses an issue of <em>some concern</em> to human health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• contains several major study design flaws.</td>
<td>• provides a program of research which will not significantly advance current knowledge in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• raises several major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion.</td>
<td>• has relatively little innovation or novelty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>The proposal has a research plan that:</td>
<td>The planned research:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• contains a research plan which <em>does not</em> seem to be feasible.</td>
<td>• does not address an issue of more than marginal concern to human health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is unlikely to be successfully completed.</td>
<td>• will not advance current knowledge in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• only follows behind previously well documented and studied concepts or previously well used approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS TO ADDRESS THE PROJECT GRANTS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

All Project Grants applications are assessed by peers according to three assessment criteria:

- scientific quality (50%)
- significance of the expected outcomes AND/OR innovation of the concept (25%)
- team quality and capability - relative to opportunity, taking into account career disruptions where applicable (25%).

Applicants should consider the guidance below when preparing their application.

Scientific Quality (50%)

This includes the clarity of the hypotheses or research objectives, the strengths and weaknesses of the study design and feasibility.

Applications may be assessed in terms of, but not limited to, the following questions.

- Clarity of the hypothesis or research objectives.
  - Has the method/framework/approach been partially tested?
  - What outcome is sought in the proposed study? What exactly is the outcome measure?
  - Is it well integrated and adequately developed?

- Is there a clear and appropriate research plan?
  - What are the strengths and weaknesses of the study design?
  - Have any major pitfalls or problems been overlooked? Are there more advanced and appropriate alternative approaches that should be used or considered?
  - Is the plan well informed by knowledge of the literature?
  - Is the design appropriate for the aims of the research?
  - That is robust and enables reproducibility of the research?

- Feasibility.
  - Does the research team, including Associate Investigators, have all the required tools and techniques established in their laboratories?
  - Does the research team, including Associate Investigators, have all the expertise required to successfully complete the research plan?
  - Is the team, including Associate Investigators, operating in an appropriately supportive research environment?

Significance of the Expected Outcomes AND/OR Innovation of the Concept (25%)

This includes the potential to increase knowledge about human health, disease diagnoses, or biology of agents that affect human health, or the application of new ideas, procedures,
technologies, programs or health policy settings to important topics that will impact on human health.

Applications need not be rated on both significance and innovation. Truly innovative ideas and research may not reveal their significance until sometime in the future (this is the case for many Nobel Prize winning discoveries). Similarly research of the highest significance such as important randomised clinical trials or public health intervention studies may use 'tried and true' methods only, yet be of immense significance to health.

Applications may be assessed in terms of, but not limited to, the following questions.

Significance

- Would the likely outcome of this study significantly advance knowledge in this field?
- If successful, will the study have a significant impact on the health issue at question?
  - Impact could be measured by advancement in general scientific knowledge, clinical and/or public health applications, policy development or change
  - NB: The significance of the study is not a measure of the prevalence/incidence of the health issue (e.g. cancer versus sudden infant death syndrome)
- What is the likely interest from other researchers, conference organisers, journals, community groups, and policy makers in the outcomes of the research?

Innovation

- Is the proposed research new/novel or creative (has imagination been used)?
- Are the aims transformative?
- Are the techniques cutting edge?
- If successful, could the research result in a paradigm shift?
- Will the research affect current practices or approaches and other researchers within this field of research?
- Is the research proposal a strong candidate for the Marshall and Warren Award?
- Is the proposed study innovative enough that it will be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international meetings?
- Is it likely that the results from the study will yield highly influential publications?
- How well does the proposal describe the new ideas, procedures, technologies, programs or health policy settings?

Team Quality and Capability – relative to opportunity (25%)

The NHMRC Funding Rules provide more detailed descriptions of “relative to opportunity” and “career disruption”. Please refer to NHMRC Funding Rules 2017, sections 6.2 and 6.2.1.

Team Quality and Capability is considered in terms of whether an applicant’s previous research demonstrates that the investigator(s) has the appropriate mix of research skills and experience to achieve the proposed project and/or ability to deliver the proposed project.

Where an application involves a CI team, the combined track record of all CIs is considered and each CI will be assessed relative to opportunity (including career stage). The assessment of the team is not weighted to the CIA but the team as a whole. The inclusion of ECRs is strongly encouraged for all research teams. Assessors will take into consideration the contribution of ECRs and their capability and/or capacity to undertake the proposed research under the guidance (mentoring) of experienced members of the research team, relative to opportunity. Associate Investigators are not considered as part of the team track record.
Team Quality and Capability may encompass the national and international standing of the applicant(s) based upon their research achievements, including but not limited to:

- research outputs relevant to the proposed field of research (most recent significant publications, publications that illustrate innovation and significance to past accomplishments, impact or outcome of previous research achievements, including effects on health care practices or policy, awards or honours in recognition of achievements)
- contribution to discipline or area (invitations to speak at international meetings, editorial appointments, specialist and high level health policy committee appointments)
- other research-related achievements (influence on clinical/health policy or practice or provision of influential advice to health authorities and government, impacts on health via the broad dissemination of research outcomes, e.g. via mainstream media, the community or industry involvement)
- mentoring environment to support junior/emerging researchers.

Team Quality and Capability is considered in relation to opportunity – with regard to factors such as career disruption, administrative and clinical/teaching load, and typical performance (including publications) for the field in question. For Project Grants, Team Quality and Capability will be judged on the most recent five years, except where there is a career disruption (see Project Grant Scheme-Specific Advice and Instructions to Applicants for further details).
### The 2017 NHMRC Project Grants Category Descriptors & Assessment Criteria for Health Research Involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples

The following category descriptors are used as a guide to score an application against each of the assessment criteria: 1) Scientific Quality; 2) Significance of the Potential Outcomes and/or Innovation of the Concept; and 3) Team Quality & Capability, relative to opportunity. While the Category Descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score must be met. The Descriptors are a guide to a “best fit” outcome. The process of consistently referring panel members to these descriptors is vital to ensuring equity, thoroughness and process consistency both within and across all Peer Review Panels.

To assist members of the Indigenous Grant Review Panel (IGRP) when assessing applications the criteria for health and medical research of Indigenous Australians has been integrated into the table below. This is to be used as a guide only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Scientific Quality 50% (Feasibility can include contribution of Associate Investigators)</th>
<th>Significance and/or Innovation 25%</th>
<th>Team Quality &amp; Capability relevant to this application 25% (Does NOT include Associate Investigators) - Relative to opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7 Outstanding by International Standards** | The proposal has a research plan that:  
• is well-defined, coherent and strongly developed.  
• has a near flawless study design.  
• is highly feasible with all of the required expertise, research tools and techniques established.  
• would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally.  
You should use high scores for applicants who:  
• will result in a highly significant advance in knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of great importance to human health.  
• will result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues.  
• will translate rapidly into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.  
• will almost certainly be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings.  
• will almost certainly result in highly influential publications.  
• in highly innovative and introduces advances in concept(s).  
• will use very advanced approaches which will optimize outcomes.  
You should use low scores for applicants who:  
• has expertise that specifically targets the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.  
• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is outstanding by international standards commensurate with their field of research.  
• research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice  
• research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI  
• research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team  
• has senior members with outstanding national and international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application.  
• may involve junior members who are very strong contributors to the overall team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of very strong mentoring by other members of the team.  
| **7 Indigenous Criteria** | Community Engagement: The proposal has a research plan that:  
• has outstanding levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is highly feasible.  
• outstandingly demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community.  
You should use high scores for applicants who:  
• Sustainability and transferability: The outcomes of the study will definitively lead to major and effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project.  
• The outcomes of the study will have a very high impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.  
• Benefit: The outcomes from the proposal will have a strongly significant health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
You should use low scores for applicants who:  
• Building capability: The team has an outstanding track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
• The proposal will build outstanding capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
| **6 Excellent** | The proposal has a research plan that:  
• is clearly defined, coherent and well developed.  
• has a strong study design.  
• is feasible with all required tools, techniques and expertise established.  
• is likely to be competitive with strong, similar research proposals internationally.  
You should use high scores for applicants who:  
• The planned research:  
• will result in a significant advance in knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to human health.  
• is likely to result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues.  
• is likely to translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.  
• will likely be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings.  
• will likely result in influential publications.  
• is highly innovative in concept.  
• will use advanced approaches to enhance outcomes.  
You should use low scores for applicants who:  
• Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:  
• has expertise that is highly relevant to the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.  
• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is excellent by international standards commensurate with their field of research.  
• research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice  
• research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI  
• research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team  
• has senior members with excellent national and/or international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application.  
• may involve junior members who are strong contributors to the overall team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of strong mentoring.  
| **6 Indigenous Criteria** | Community Engagement: The proposal has a research plan that:  
• has excellent levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is feasible.  
• demonstrates excellent communication and potential outcomes are a priority for the community.  
You should use high scores for applicants who:  
• Sustainability and transferability: The outcomes of the study will lead to considerable and effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project.  
• The outcomes of the study will have a high impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.  
• Benefit: The outcomes from the proposal will have a significant health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
You should use low scores for applicants who:  
• Building capability: The team has an excellent track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
• The proposal will build excellent capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.  
| **5 Very Good** | The proposal has a research plan that:  
• is generally clear in its scientific plan and is logical.  
• raises only very few minor concerns with respect to the study design.  
• feasible in all, or almost all areas - required techniques and tools either established or nearly established.  
• may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally.  
You should use high scores for applicants who:  
• The planned research:  
• will advance knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to human health.  
• may result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues.  
• few concerns regarding feasibility may translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy.  
• could be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.  
• is likely to result in some very strong publications.  
• is innovative in concept.  
• will use well established approaches to good effect.  
You should use low scores for applicants who:  
• Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:  
• raises only minor concerns regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise relevant to the proposed research.  
• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is well above by international standards commensurate with their field of research.  
• research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice  
• research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI  
• research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team  
• members have very good and growing national and/or international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application.  
• may involve junior members who are valuable contributors to the team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of some mentoring.
### 5 Indigenous Criteria

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal has a research plan that:
  - has very good levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is likely to be feasible.
  - clearly demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study will lead to effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project.
- The outcomes of the study will have an impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal will have some health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a very good track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal will build very good capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

### 4 Good

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal has a research plan that:
  - is generally solid in its scientific plan, but may not always be clear in its intent and may lack some focus.
  - raises some major design flaws.
  - is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study may lead to effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project.
- The outcomes of the study may have an impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal may have some health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a good track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal may build good capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

### 3 Marginal

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal has a research plan that:
  - is somewhat unclear in its scientific approach and goals.
  - contains some major design flaws.
  - is not likely to be has doubts about the feasibility in some areas.
  - is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study may lead to limited or short-term health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes of the study may have a moderate impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal may have a minimal health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a marginal track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal may build minimal capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

### 3 Indigenous criteria

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal:
  - has limited community engagement.
  - has several concerns that the proposal is feasible and achievable.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study may lead to limited or short-term health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes of the study may have a moderate impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are likely to have a minimal health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a marginal track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal may build minimal capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

### 2 Unsatisfactory

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal:
  - is unclear in its scientific approach and goals.
  - contains several major study design flaws.
  - contains several major concerns regarding the study design.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study are unlikely to lead to any health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes of the study are unlikely to have any impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are likely to have little or no health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a deficient track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

### 1 Poor

#### Community Engagement
- The proposal:
  - has little or no community engagement.
  - is unlikely to be feasible and achievable.

#### Sustainability and transferability
- The outcomes of the study are unlikely to lead to any health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes of the study are unlikely to have any impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are likely to have little or no health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has an unsatisfactory track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:
- members have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a poor record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:
- members have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a poor record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:
- members have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have had significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a poor record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:
- members have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average at best.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.
- members have not made significant contributions to the field of research.

#### Benefit
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The outcomes from the proposal are unlikely to have any health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

#### Building capability
- The team has a poor record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous criteria</th>
<th>Community Engagement</th>
<th>Sustainability and transferability</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Building capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• has no community engagement.</td>
<td>• The outcomes of the study will not lead to any health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.</td>
<td>• The outcomes from the proposal will have no health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.</td>
<td>• The team has a poor track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• will not be feasible.</td>
<td>• The outcomes of the study will not have any impact on health services delivery or other community priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposal will not build any capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It is not essential that applicants demonstrate both Community Engagement and Benefit to score highly against this criterion.
# PROJECT/PROGRAM GRANT ELIGIBILITY RULES

The following table summarises the NHMRC Project/Program Grant eligibility rules underpinning the eligibility criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Grant status</th>
<th>Eligibility to apply for a Program</th>
<th>Eligibility to hold Project Grant/s</th>
<th>Eligibility to apply for Project Grant/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not hold a Program Grant and has not accepted a Program Grant offer of funding</td>
<td>Can apply for a new Program</td>
<td>Can hold up to six Project Grants in the year of a Program Grant application. Cannot hold more than one Project Grant after the commencement of Program Grant funding.</td>
<td>Can apply for up to six Project Grants, less the number of Project Grants that are scheduled to continue in the year following the year of the Project Grant application/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted Program Grant offer of funding, but yet to commence the Program</td>
<td>Cannot apply for a new Program</td>
<td>Can hold up to six Project Grants prior to the commencement of Program Grant funding. Cannot hold more than one Project Grant after the commencement of Program Grant funding.</td>
<td>Can apply for one Project Grant if they do not hold a Project Grant, or if they only hold Project Grant/s that are not scheduled to continue in the following year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program CI in Year 1, 2 or 3 of the Program</td>
<td>Cannot apply for a new Program</td>
<td>Can hold one Project Grant</td>
<td>Can apply for one Project Grant if they do not hold a Project Grant, or if they only hold a Project Grant that is not scheduled to continue in the following year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program CI in Year 4 of the Program</td>
<td>Can apply for a new Program</td>
<td>Can hold one Project Grant</td>
<td>Can apply for one Project Grant if they do not hold a Project Grant, or if they only hold a Project Grant that is not scheduled to continue in the following year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program CI in Year 5 of the Program</td>
<td>Can apply for a new Program</td>
<td>Can hold one Project Grant</td>
<td>Can apply for up to six Project Grants, less the number of Project Grants that are scheduled to continue in the year following the year of the Project Grant application/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>