

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

Category	Likely impact of the research on improved health security in Southeast Asia and the Pacific (35%)	Clear strategy to build research capacity in health security-related health systems and/or policy research (25%)	Rigour of proposal (20%)	Proven track record <i>relevant to objectives of the call</i> (20%)
<b>7 Outstanding by international standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a well-defined health systems and/or policy focus related to health security.</li> <li>• Clearly strongly articulates how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region.</li> <li>• Strongly demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users.</li> <li>• Clearly highlights processes that engage with users in the design of the study and throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge.</li> <li>• Persuasively articulates how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>• Presents well-defined plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and comprehensive plans and methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</li> <li>• Research will be highly effective in promoting working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li> <li>• Promotes highly effective mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research objectives are well defined, coherent and realistic.</li> <li>• Proposal design is near flawless and will achieve objectives within stated timeframe and budget.</li> <li>• Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are well articulated.</li> <li>• Timeframes for demonstrating results are well defined.</li> <li>• Proposal persuasively addresses risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li> <li>• Research adequately addresses gender issues and exhibits gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) have a proven record of previous Health Systems and/or Policy Research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</li> <li>• Evidence provided of previous highly effective engagement and communication processes with end users.</li> <li>• Lead researchers have a strong regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have proven influence in their field.</li> </ul>
<b>6 Excellent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a strong health systems and/or policy focus related to health security</li> <li>• Soundly articulates how the research will contribute to the evidence base for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and strong plans and methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research objectives are clearly defined and very coherent.</li> <li>• Proposal design is excellent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) have a strong record of previous health systems</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

	<p>health security in the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soundly demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users.</li> <li>• Strongly highlights processes that engage with users throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge.</li> <li>• Effectively articulates how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>• Presents strong plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li> </ul>	<p>mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research will be very effective in promoting working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li> <li>• Promotes very effective mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li> </ul>	<p>and highly likely to achieve objectives within stated timeframe and budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are well articulated.</li> <li>• Timeframes for demonstrating results are clearly articulated.</li> <li>• Proposal effectively addresses risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li> <li>• Research adequately addresses gender issues and exhibits gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li> </ul>	<p>and/or policy Research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided of previous reasonably effective engagement and communication processes with end users.</li> <li>• Lead researchers have a well-established regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have proven influence in their field.</li> </ul>
<b>5 Very good</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a sound health systems and/or policy focus related to health security</li> <li>• Clearly articulates how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region</li> <li>• Clearly demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users</li> <li>• Soundly highlights processes that engage with users throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and sound plans and methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</li> <li>• Research will be effective in promoting working</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research objectives are clearly defined and coherent.</li> <li>• Proposal design is raises a few minor concerns but is likely to achieve objectives within stated timeframe and budget.</li> <li>• Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are soundly articulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) have a sound record of previous health systems and/or policy research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</li> <li>• Evidence provided of previous effective engagement and communication processes</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly articulates how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>Presents sound plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li> </ul>	<p>collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotes effective mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeframes for demonstrating results are soundly articulated.</li> <li>Proposal appropriately addresses risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li> <li>Research adequately appropriately addresses gender issues and exhibits gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li> </ul>	<p>with end users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lead researchers have a sound regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have proven influence in their field.</li> </ul>
<b>4 Good</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a satisfactory health systems and/or policy focus related to health security.</li> <li>Satisfactorily articulates how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region.</li> <li>Satisfactorily demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users.</li> <li>Satisfactorily highlights processes that engage with users in the design of the study and throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge. Satisfactorily articulates how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>Presents satisfactory plans for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory plans and methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</li> <li>Research promotes working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li> <li>Promotes mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are clearly defined and coherent.</li> <li>Proposal design and likelihood of achieving objectives within stated timeframe and budget raises some concerns.</li> <li>Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are satisfactorily articulated.</li> <li>Timeframes for demonstrating results are satisfactorily articulated.</li> <li>Proposal satisfactorily addresses risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li> <li>Research satisfactorily addresses gender issues and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) have a satisfactory record of previous health systems and/or policy research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</li> <li>Evidence provided of previous engagement and communication processes with end users.</li> <li>Lead researchers have a satisfactory regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have influence in their field.</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

	dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.	work based on common interests and agendas.	exhibits gender and socially inclusive research processes.	
<b>3 Marginal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has some health systems and/or policy focus related to health security</li> <li>Does not satisfactorily articulate how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region.</li> <li>Unsatisfactorily demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users.</li> <li>Identifies some processes that engage with users in the design of the study and throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge. Does not satisfactorily articulate how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>Presents some plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans and methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia are not satisfactorily defined.</li> <li>Research poorly promotes working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li> <li>Promotes some mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are not satisfactorily defined or coherent.</li> <li>Proposal design and likelihood of achieving objectives within stated timeframe and budget raises several concerns.</li> <li>Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are poorly articulated.</li> <li>Timeframes for demonstrating results are poorly articulated.</li> <li>Proposal does not satisfactorily address risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li> <li>Research does not satisfactorily address gender issues and is unlikely to satisfactorily exhibit gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) have an unsatisfactory record of previous health systems and/or policy research being effectively transferred into policy. and/or practice in the region</li> <li>Some evidence provided of previous engagement and communication processes with end users.</li> <li>Lead researchers have a unsatisfactory regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have some influence in their field.</li> </ul>
<b>2 Unsatisfactory</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a poor health systems and/or policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poorly defined plans and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research institutions and</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

	<p>focus related to health security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly articulates how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region</li> <li>• Poorly demonstrates the need and demand for that evidence from end users</li> <li>• Identifies little or no processes that engage with users in the design of the study and throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge</li> <li>• Poorly articulates how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li> <li>• Presents poor plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li> </ul>	<p>methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research poorly promotes working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li> <li>• Unlikely to promote mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li> </ul>	<p>poorly defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal design and likelihood of achieving objectives within stated timeframe and budget raises several major concerns.</li> <li>• Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are poorly articulated.</li> <li>• Timeframes for demonstrating results are poorly articulated.</li> <li>• Proposal risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability are poorly addressed.</li> <li>• Research poorly addresses gender issues and is unlikely to exhibit gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li> </ul>	<p>the proposed team leader(s) have a poor record of previous health systems and/or policy research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little evidence provided of previous engagement and communication processes with end users.</li> <li>• Lead researchers have a poor regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have little influence in their field.</li> </ul>
<b>1 Poor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has no health systems and/or policy focus related to health security</li> <li>• Does not articulate how the research will contribute to the evidence base for health security in the region</li> <li>• Does not demonstrate the need and demand for that evidence from end users</li> <li>• Does not demonstrate processes that engage with users in the design of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plans or methodology to build health security research capacity (including capability, mentoring and career development) for male and female researchers in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and junior researchers in Australia.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research objectives are not defined or coherent.</li> <li>• Proposal design and likelihood of achieving objectives within stated timeframe is unlikely.</li> <li>• Plans for monitoring and evaluation of the research grant are not articulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research institutions and the proposed team leader(s) does not have a proven record of previous health systems and/or policy research being effectively transferred into policy and/or practice in the region.</li> </ul>

## Annex 2. CATEGORY DESCRIPTORS FOR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – STRONGER SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH SECURITY

	<p>study and throughout the life of the project or that involve users as part of research teams in co-production of knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not demonstrate how the research is likely to impact and influence any relevant health security policies and practices, including clarity on who will benefit from the research, how they will benefit and what will be done to ensure that they can benefit.</li><li>• Does not provide plans for dissemination and advocacy for policy uptake and/or systems change. This will include details of how the research findings will be presented in an accessible format to key end users, including DFAT, and articulates ways in which this uptake might be monitored.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Research would not promote working collaborations and intellectual exchange between Australia and research institutions in the region.</li><li>• Would not promote mutually beneficial engagement by developing equitable, effective research partnerships with shared work based on common interests and agendas.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Timeframes for demonstrating results are not articulated.</li><li>• Proposal does not address risks and their management, including any issues of sustainability.</li><li>• Research does not address gender issues and would not exhibit gender and socially inclusive research processes.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No evidence provided of previous engagement and communication processes with end users.</li><li>• Lead researchers do not have a regional reputation for health systems and/or policy research, and/or health security related research and have not proven influence in their field.</li></ul>
--	--	--	---	---