

DSI Grant Procedures

This document outlines the DSI Grant processes for Collaborative Research Grants and RHD Student Grants.

Annex A provides reviewer guidelines and schedule. Annex B contains a full set of criteria for assessing applications. Annex C is a reviewer template to be sent to reviewers. Annex D contains generic instructions to Institutions for selecting reviewers.

Collaborative Research Grants

Note 1: Application, review and monitoring done through DSI's online portal.

1. Call for applications
 - a. Target DST Group, Universities, industry networks and current/past researchers
 - b. Advertise on website and through news email
2. Call for co-director nomination from participant universities for purposes of grant review, with one nominee accepted¹
3. Grant applications received
4. Collate and review received grant applications
 - a. Assess against DSI criteria (1 week)
 - b. Allocate DSI approved applications to Participant Institutions with assessment guidelines² (2 weeks)
 - c. Participant institution distributes internally for technical review
 - d. Participant institution will choose relevant reviewer(s) from within their institution
 - e. Reviewers complete Review Form and return
5. Rank reviewed applications (1 week)
 - a. DSI Exec plus co-director review feedback against assessment criteria
 - b. Final funding offer
 - c. Acceptance
6. Contracts
7. Progress and reporting

Research Higher Degree Student Grants

Note 1: Application, review and monitoring done through DSI's online portal.

1. Proposed projects forwarded to DSI for assessment of relevance against criteria
2. DSI approves projects for RHD student top up
3. Project supervisor selects and negotiates student in accordance with university requirements
4. Agreement between DSI and university established to provide student stipend
5. Monitor progress of enrollment/PhD
6. University ensures reporting guidelines met

¹ Rotational position that endures only for the review period. Not required.

² Participants will not be asked to review applications listing investigators from their institutions

Annex A: Guidelines

Reviewers should assess the application against the supplied criteria. An assessment sheet is included and reviewers are only asked to assess against the specific criteria identified for their institutional type (DSI, DST Group or University). Reviewers can use any information contained in the application and the supplied supporting documentation, and any other information of relevance to make the assessment.

Where a reviewer believes he/she has a conflict of interest, no review is required but an explanation of the conflict of interest is requested. An alternate reviewer will be sourced by the DSI.

Reviews are to be returned within two weeks of receipt by the reviewer to the Defence Science Institute via email.

It is the responsibility of the Participating University to ensure that grants for review are allocated to appropriate reviewers in a timely manner.

Where possible, reviewers should provide explanatory text to support their assessment. This can include reference to key evidence to support their claim, such as scientific publications, strategic guidance documentation, patent information and so on.

Annex B: Criteria

The following presents a general statement of criteria for assessment. Not all reviewers will need to assess against all criteria. For clarification on criteria, please contact the Defence Science Institute.

Defence Relevance³

Assessed by DSI Executive and DST Group reviewer.

- **None [0]:** No obvious relationship to Defence S&T priorities
- **Low [1]:** Tangential relationship to Defence S&T priorities (work would be able to be applied with significant modification to a Defence problem of quite a different nature)
- **Medium [2]:** Research that is closely related to a similar Defence problem or that is developing a technology of direct relevance to a Defence application
- **High [3]:** Working directly on a Defence problem in partnership with Defence

DSI Relevance⁴

Assessed by DSI Executive

- **None [0]:** Does not match DSI themes
- **Low [1]:** Matches broad DSI themes, but does not align with subthemes
- **High [3]:** Aligns with one or more themes and subthemes, and/or matches an identified DSI Initiative

Collaboration/Leverage

Assessed by direct comparison of proposals by the DSI Executive. Takes into account immediate and potential future leverage opportunities.

- **None [0]:** DSI and the requesting institution are the only contributors and DSI is the only cash contributor
- **Low [1]:** Non-cash contributions from at least one other collaborator
- **Medium [2]:** Cash and non-cash contributions from at least one other contributor
- **High [3]:** Cash and non-cash contributions from at least one other contributor and an industry partner making cash or cash equivalent contributions

Technical/Scientific Merits

Assessed by university reviewers as selected by Participant Institutions.

- **Outstanding [3]:** Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. Well budgeted for the proposed statement of work. Sound track record of investigators.
- **Excellent [2]:** High quality research and a strongly competitive proposal. Investigators have provided evidence of previous ability to deliver.
- **Good [1]:** An interesting proposal. Developing expertise amongst investigators. Some concerns about either the resource estimate or the ability of the researchers to deliver based on their understanding of the state of the art or their track record. The proposal may lack a compelling element.
- **Uncompetitive [0]:** The Proposal is uncompetitive and has significant weaknesses or flaws, such as a poorly developed or costed plan, no demonstrated ability that the investigators can deliver on the proposed research, or a lack of novelty or value.

³ Determined by DSI Executive and DST Group Reference Group

⁴ Determined by DSI Executive

Annex C: Assessment Sheet

Reviewer Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Reviewer's Institution: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Grant Application Being Reviewed (enter application code found on front of grant application; one assessment sheet per grant reviewed): [Click here to enter text.](#)

For DST Group Reviewers (DST Group reviewers should assess both criteria 1 and 4)

Criterion 1 - *Defence Relevance*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Criterion 4 – *Technical Merits*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

For University Reviewers (University reviewers should only assess criterion 4)

Criterion 4 – *Technical Merits*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

For DSI Reviewers

Criterion 1 - *Defence Relevance*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Criterion 2 – *DSI Technology Theme Relevance*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Criterion 3 – *Collaboration/Leverage*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Criterion 4 – *Technical Merits*: Choose an item.

Explanatory Text: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Reviewers Signature: _____

Date: _____

Annex D: Instruction to Institutions for Selecting Reviewers

Institutions should identify reviewers using the following principles:

- A reviewer should not be asked to review an application they are a party to
- A reviewer should have the technical background and credentials to be able to make a judgement on the technical merits of the proposal
- A reviewer should be available to commit to the review process in a timely manner
- No reviewer should be asked to review more than 3 applications
- Where an institution cannot find a suitable reviewer, the DSI should be notified to source an alternative
- For DST Group reviewers, the reviewer should have the authority within DST Group to provide an informed opinion on Defence Relevance.