

Guidance for Primary Call Applicants

– Meeting the Research Quality and Research Benefit criteria for your chosen stream

February 2023

This document will assist you in developing responses to questions relating to Research Quality and Research Benefit that align with your chosen Stream.

Also included is the guidance that reviewers will use to assess your submission for a grant of fully funded sea time on RV *Investigator*.

To submit your best application, you should also be familiar with the requirements for each of the [Streams of Access](#) and the [Operations Rolling Plan](#) before starting.

More information available from the MAPS home menu *Help & Documentation* tab:

- Maps Help & Documentation – Primary Applications
- How to - upload supporting documents for your application
- CV Template

Note for Stream #1 applicants:

If your project is related to Stream 1 Policy-driven research, you should also attend the workshops to hear about this Stream directly from end-users. Find out more about the end-user workshops on the MNF website [link](#)

Merit Principle: Research Quality

Fully funded access to RV *Investigator* is expensive and limited, and demand consistently exceeds availability. Consequently, supported research should have a robust disciplinary rationale, clear and appropriate objectives, sound methods, demonstrable feasibility, the prospect of informative results, and be being done by people with appropriate expertise.

The merit principle “Research Quality” will be independently assessed by expert external reviewers and the Research Advisory Committee (RAC). RAC membership is comprised of marine research experts from diverse backgrounds. For further information about the RAC’s role, membership, and Terms of Reference visit [link](#).

Important: Questions relating to *Research Quality* will be assessed by RAC who will **not see** your responses to questions relating to *Research Benefit*. You should not rely on information contained in your *Research Benefit* responses to supplement responses to *Research Quality* questions.

Similarly, documents uploaded to *Research Quality* folders will not be visible to reviewers of *Research Benefit*. Tips on uploading documents can be found on the MAPS home screen *Help & Documentation* tab.

Stream Advice for Applicants	Criteria, Questions and Guidance for Applicants	Assessment and Scoring Guidance 0 Unsupportable; 1 Poor; 2-3 Adequate-Good; 4 Strong; 5 Compelling
RQ 1. Research Rationale		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research</p> <p>Your research should be justified in the context of how it will deliver against your chosen MNF policy-driven priority, with particular reference to how particular objectives will deliver research or data of relevance to the end-user policy domain.</p> <p>The need for research over multiple years should be justified if multiple voyages are being sought including recovery of deployed equipment.</p> <p>Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>Your research should be justified in the context of disciplinary or multi-disciplinary knowledge and theory, with particular reference to current research questions of recognised importance to the relevant discipline(s). You should articulate how your research will contribute significantly to advancing knowledge in the field or test specific hypotheses to advance theory. The need for research over multiple years should be justified if multiple voyages are being sought including recovery of deployed equipment.</p> <p>Research objectives should clearly address the key disciplinary questions or knowledge gaps you have articulated.</p> <p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>Stream 3 will support publicly funded national programs that rely on regular and repeated access to MNF capabilities to support data and sample collection and for which deployment of a national research facility is appropriate. It is expected that Stream 3 research will involve recurrent deployments over multiple years through formal partnership arrangements between the MNF and other publicly funded programs.</p> <p>To become a prospective partner, you should discuss your research requirements with the MNF at an early stage and ahead of submitting an application, to verify both the degree of reliance by the program on MNF capabilities and that the research is appropriate for a partnership arrangement with the MNF. Stream 3 partnership agreements will be reviewed against delivered benefits and merit criteria.</p> <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>Your research should be justified both with reference to its alignment with a clear opportunity for technology innovation to make a difference in some activities and also with reference to the current status of technologies in relevant operational contexts. The need for research over multiple voyages should be justified if multiple voyages are being sought, including recovery of deployed equipment.</p> <p>Research objectives should address clearly the key technological questions that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>You should demonstrate how your research requires the capabilities of the MNF and will deliver data and research of national interest. Stream 5 projects will be considered for MNF support only if</p>	<p>RQ 1A Scientific Rationale</p> <p>Explain the scientific reasons for doing this research.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the scientific reasons for doing this research by clearly outlining the context in which your project will be conducted. • Demonstrate the proposed research is well-grounded in the theory and practice of relevant disciplinary and/or multi-disciplinary fields. • Detail how the proposed work clearly links to the motivation of the stream applied for. 	<p>RQ 1A: Is the research justified well in relation to disciplinary context, knowledge gaps, and Stream objectives?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary relevance of the research obscure and link to Stream strategy not established. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary relevance of the research poorly described and link to Stream strategy weakly or vaguely argued. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary relevance of the research reasonably clearly articulated with moderate justification and link to Stream strategy clear. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary relevance of the research well argued with strong justification of research contribution to discipline(s) and importance to Stream strategy well-argued. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A compelling case has been made that the research will provide key knowledge to advance relevant disciplines and new information essential to the Stream strategy.
	<p>RQ 1B Research Questions</p> <p>State the research objectives and explain their relevance to the Stream strategy.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identify your objective – a statement of your objective/hypotheses as your opening sentence is an excellent start • Explain how the research objective and questions arise from the rationale for the project. • Outline how your project aligns with the chosen stream. 	<p>RQ 1B: Are the research objectives or research questions clearly stated and appropriate for the articulated rationale (need) for the work?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives very obscure or absent. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives vague or poorly linked to need, or both. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives stated with moderate or good specificity and moderate to clear link to need. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives clear and specific, with good link to need. <p>Compelling:</p> <p>Research objectives specific and very clear and convincingly presented as essential to addressing articulated need.</p>

<p>it is demonstrated in advance that the proposed work relies on specific capabilities of the MNF that are not reasonably available otherwise in Australia. You will need to satisfy the MNF that the research could not be done from an alternative platform and that you have the funding to pay for the use of RV Investigator to the extent agreed with the MNF.</p> <p>Applicants should discuss their research requirements with the MNF ahead of submitting an application.</p>		
<p>RQ 2. Research Rigour</p>		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research Stream 2. Discipline-driven research, and Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>You should explain the design (sampling, experimental, analyses) of your research and the methods you will use to gather data sufficiently clearly for a reviewer to be able to repeat the work, in principle.</p> <p>Research methods are expected to be consistent with current best-practice. Clearly indicate if any of the methods you will use are developmental or innovative and describe how you will mitigate potential risks of using such cutting-edge methods.</p> <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>You should clearly explain the design of your technology or innovation and the methods planned to gather data sufficiently clearly for a reviewer to be able to assess the value of supporting your application.</p> <p>Clearly indicate what your methods are, and if developmental or innovative, describe how you will mitigate potential risks of using such cutting-edge methods.</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>You explain how you propose to use MNF capabilities (sampling, experimental, analyses) and the methods planned to gather data sufficiently clearly for a reviewer to be able to assess the value to the nation in granting you sea time.</p> <p>Research methods are expected to be consistent with current best-practice. Clearly indicate if any of the methods you will use are developmental or innovative and describe how you will mitigate potential risks of using such cutting-edge methods.</p>	<p>RQ 2A Research Design</p> <p>Describe the research approach, including sampling, experimental programmes, and proposed analyses, that is robust and sufficient to meet project objectives.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline your approach to designing the sampling or experimental program and planned analyses ensuring you differentiate activities that will be undertaken at sea, pre and/or post voyage. • Demonstrate how the design of the proposed research is consistent with current best practice, robust and appropriate and sufficient to meet the project objectives. 	<p>RQ 2A: Is the design of the research, including design of sampling or experimental programmes and proposed analyses, robust? Is it sufficient to meet project objectives?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling or experimental design(s) during voyage not articulated or fundamentally flawed; proposed analyses not provided or highly inappropriate to meet project objectives. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of sampling or experimental design(s) during voyage poorly explained or potentially flawed; proposed analyses poorly explained or deficient. Unlikely to meet project objectives. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling and experimental design(s) during voyage outlined and apparently sound, but with some gaps; proposed analyses only incompletely explained or of questionable appropriateness for meeting the project objectives. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling or experimental design(s) during voyage clear and inferentially robust; proposed analyses well explained and appropriate. Strong likelihood of meeting objectives. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling or experimental design(s) during voyage state-of-the art and inferentially difficult to fault; proposed analyses thoroughly explained and clearly best-practice. Strong alignment between research approach and articulated objectives.
	<p>RQ 2B Methods</p> <p>Describe the methods, whether well-established or innovative, that are fit-for-purpose and appropriate for the objectives of the work.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide detail around the research methods proposed, demonstrating that, whether well-established or innovative, they are fit-for-purpose and appropriate for the objectives of the work. • Demonstrate that you have considered the most efficient and effective methods to collecting data and/or samples. • Where appropriate, separate activities that will be undertaken at sea, pre or post voyage. • Clearly indicate if any of the methods proposed are developmental or innovative and describe how potential risks of using such cutting-edge methods will be mitigated. 	<p>RQ 2B: Are the methods, whether well-established or innovative, clearly explained, fit-for-purpose, and appropriate for the objectives of the work?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methods not explained or demonstrably ill-suited to delivering data needed to meet project objectives. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methods poorly explained or poorly aligned with data needed to meet project objectives. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methods reasonably clearly explained and likely to be appropriate to project objectives, though perhaps not always current with contemporary best practice in the relevant fields. Likely to deliver data adequate to meet project objectives. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methods well justified, robust, and highly likely to deliver high-quality data to meet project objectives. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methods clearly at contemporary best-practice or innovative and cutting-edge and highly likely to deliver outstanding and novel data to meet project objectives.

RQ 3. Research Feasibility		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research and Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>You should demonstrate that you have both a credible and efficient preliminary voyage plan that justifies the use of the resources involved, and a realistic and appropriate plan for delivering the proposed results post-voyage.</p> <p>You should demonstrate co-design with next- and end-users. In particular for Stream 1 applicants – you should demonstrate that you have engaged with the relevant MNF policy-driven priority end-user to co-design the project for the best possible chance of successful policy-relevant outcomes.</p> <p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>Applicants should demonstrate that they have both a credible and efficient preliminary voyage/partnership plan that justifies the use of the resources involved, and a realistic and appropriate plan for delivering the proposed results post- voyage/partnership.</p> <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>You should demonstrate that you have both a credible and efficient preliminary voyage plan that justifies the use of the resources involved, and a realistic and appropriate plan for delivering the proposed results post-voyage.</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>You should demonstrate that you have both a credible and efficient preliminary voyage plan that justifies the use of the resources involved, and a realistic and appropriate plan for delivering the proposed results post-voyage. It is expected that the bulk of data and samples gathered will be publicly available, consistent with its genesis from a national research facility, after an agreed period of confidentiality, if necessary.</p>	<p>RQ 3A Voyage</p> <p>Provide a plan for voyage work, including pre-voyage activities, that is efficient and feasible with the facilities, funding and sea-time available.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> voyage work should be well aligned with relevant information provided in the <i>Logistics Section</i> of this Application Form, including with respect to the scientific instrument and equipment to be deployed.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include a preliminary voyage plan that has enough detail to justify the efficient use of the resources involved and to demonstrate that the project proposed can be completed on time. ● Demonstrate that you have considered risks and limitations and have factored these into your plan. ● Provide evidence, if relevant, of a plan to obtain funding to support voyage related expenses, including transportation of gear, samples and personnel. 	<p>RQ 3A: Is the voyage work well-planned, efficient, and feasible with the available facilities, funding, and requested sea-time?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Voyage plan unclear or available facilities and funding plan clearly insufficient to ensure completion of voyage, or both. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Voyage plan needs refinement or clarity and appears either inappropriate or excessive. Available facilities and funding plan potentially insufficient to secure completion of project, or both. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Voyage plan reasonable but with some limitations (e.g., insufficient allowance for sampling contingencies, or more time sought than justified); facilities and funding appear adequate to complete the project. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Voyage plan well justified, realistic, and efficient and clear evidence that facilities and funding plan are adequate to complete the project. <p>Compelling:</p> <p>Voyage plan very thorough, well justified, and appropriate for the project taking into account contingencies. Realistic and demonstrated abundance of facilities and funding to complete the project.</p>
	<p>RQ 3B Post-voyage work and research outputs</p> <p>Outline your post-voyage plan of work, including lab-work, data/sample processing and the research outputs that will result from your analyses.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide confirmation of appropriate data and sample management plans (ensuring alignment with the relevant CSIRO policy). ● Articulate the proposed research outputs and explain their appropriateness for the research field. ● Demonstrate support has been secured from institutions external to the proposal but required for completion of post-voyage work and outputs. ● Provide evidence, if relevant, of a plan to obtain funding to support post-voyage work, including production and dissemination of research outputs. 	<p>RQ 3B: Are the promised research outputs likely to be delivered within the proposed schedule, given available resources?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Post-voyage sample/data processing plan is insufficient. Research outputs very unclear, not linked to project objectives, or not deliverable within project timeline. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Post-voyage sample/data processing plan and research outputs unclear or poorly linked to objectives, or both. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Post-voyage sample/data processing plan and proposed outputs clear but somewhat vague about how they will meet project objectives or some uncertainty about delivery within project timeline. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Post-voyage sample/data processing plan and research outputs clearly articulated, linked very well to project objectives, and expected to be deliverable within project timeline. <p>Compelling:</p> <p>Post-voyage sample/data processing plan and research outputs excellently detailed with compelling case they will meet project objectives and be delivered within project timeline.</p>

RQ 4. Research Capability		
<p>All streams</p> <p>You should demonstrate that the research team has the essential capability and experience to complete the proposed work, both during and following the voyage, and includes appropriate leadership on land and at sea to deliver results to the relevant policy domain end-user.</p> <p>Applications that include a mix of early career and experienced researchers will be viewed favourably, especially those with clear plans for mentoring early career researchers in sea-going research leadership.</p> <p>Voyage leadership need not be by established researchers, but you should demonstrate that you will have sufficient support on-board to mentor a first-time leader.</p>	<p>RQ 4A Team capability (Research)</p> <p>Demonstrate that the research team has the essential capability and experience to complete the proposed work, both during and following the voyage.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> details of research track record and publication output will be assessed relative to opportunity.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure answers focus on capability relating to research quality - questions relating to capability in delivering impact will be addressed under RB4 Team Capability (Benefit Delivery) • Describe how the team has the disciplinary and professional capabilities required to successfully deliver the research work proposed. • Attach up to date CV based on the template provided for the voyage leader and PIs and if possible, for team members. • Provide evidence of research capability and research delivery for each team member (relative to opportunity). • Confirm that sufficient time commitment has been made by team members to complete research objectives, both during and post voyage. 	<p>RQ 4A: Does the research team have the essential capability and experience to complete the proposed work, both during and following a voyage?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team is partly secured, with a weak record of research ability and there are significant gaps in their expertise with respect to the research objectives. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has a weak record of research ability and there are major gaps in their expertise with respect to the research objectives. <p>Adequate–Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has good depth of research ability and their national and/or internationally recognised expertise mostly covers the research objectives of the project <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has a very strong record of research ability and their nationally and/or internationally recognised expertise mostly covers the research objectives of the project. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has an outstanding record of research ability and their nationally and internationally recognised expertise can be directly mapped to the research objectives of the project.
	<p>RQ 4B Leadership</p> <p>Demonstrate the research team includes appropriate leadership both on land and at sea.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Evidence of leadership will be assessed relative to opportunity.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of previous voyage leadership experience or clearly articulate how leadership support and mentoring will be provided for less-experienced voyage leaders and PIs. • Provide clear evidence of how the project leader(s) will ensure successful delivery of the proposed outcomes, both during the voyage and the delivery of the research outputs. • Explain how the project leader(s) propose to engage with the broad range of researchers. 	<p>RQ 4B: Does the research team include sufficient research leadership to ensure successful completion of the project, both at sea and post-voyage?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has no people with previous voyage experience and does not explain who will provide overall project leadership. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has few or no people with demonstrated voyage leadership experience (though perhaps with voyage experience) or unclear explanation of overall project leadership to deliver promised outputs, or both. <p>Adequate–Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has at least one person with previous voyage leadership experience (who will be on the voyage) and apparent overall project leadership to deliver promised outputs. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has strong demonstrated voyage leadership experience that will be on the voyage and clear project leadership for delivery of promised outputs. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team has compelling plan for voyage leadership, including mentoring new or future voyage leaders, and clearly articulated project leadership plan that will ensure timely delivery of promised outputs.

Merit Principle: Research Benefit

Fully funded access to RV *Investigator* is expensive and limited, and demand consistently exceeds availability. Consequently, supported research should align with national interests, be likely to deliver upon national needs, have a path to impact and the right team to deliver benefit to justify investment of MNF resources.

The merit principle “Research Benefit” will be independently assessed by the National Benefit Advisory Committee (NBAC). NBAC membership is comprised of user groups including government, industry, and research institutes from diverse backgrounds. For further information about the NBAC’s role, membership, and Terms of Reference visit [link](#).

Important: Questions relating to *Research Benefit* will be assessed by NBAC who will **not see** your responses relating to *Research Quality*. You should not rely on information contained in your *Research Quality* responses to supplement responses to *Research Benefit* questions.

Similarly, documents uploaded to *Research Benefit* folders will not be visible to reviewers of *Research Quality*. Tips on uploading documents can be found on the MAPS home screen *Help & Documentation* tab.

Stream Advice for Applicants	Criteria, Questions and Guidance for Applicants	Assessment and Scoring Guidance 0 Unsupportable; 1 Poor; 2-3 Adequate-Good; 4 Strong; 5 Compelling
RB 1. Benefit Rationale		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research</p> <p>You should clearly establish that the research proposed directly addresses key questions or needs stated for your chosen <u>policy-driven priority</u> for the current allocation round.</p> <p>Ensure that you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate the link between your proposed research and one or more of your nominated end- users needs. • Provide clear, realistic and appropriate objectives that will deliver research of benefit to your nominated end-user. <p>Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>You should clearly identify the Australian interest(s) that stand to benefit from the new knowledge delivered and who will be the recipient(s) of these outputs that will deliver that new knowledge. Explain why the research proposed is relevant to Australia's national policy, industry or public interests, or international standing, such that reviewers can see that the research will fill important information gaps in the relevant area(s).</p> <p>You must also provide clear, realistic and appropriate objectives that will deliver research of benefit to your nominated end-user(s).</p>	<p>RB 1A National interest and user needs</p> <p>Provide the rationale for the project in terms of national interest and user needs.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the national relevance of the proposed research • Demonstrate linkages to an identified need and identify the policy, regulation, innovation or industry where possible. • Demonstrate a sound understanding of the need that the proposed research will address. 	<p>RB 1A: Is a clear rationale for the project provided that establishes that the work addresses research needs of Stream end-users and is in Australia’s national interest?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project not justified with reference to end-user needs or national interests. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National or end-user need for research articulated vaguely. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-user or national needs for research reasonably clear and project objectives credibly justified by reference to those needs. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear articulation of end-user needs for research and its national interest, demonstrating a sound understanding of how the research will address those needs. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In depth understanding of end-users needs and very strong justification that the research is in the national interest.
<p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>You should clearly establish that the research proposed directly addresses key questions or needs of national interest reflected in funding of the national program.</p> <p>Provide a clear link to the objectives of the partnering national program that reflect the national priorities for which it was funded, such that a reviewer can see easily that the research will fill one or more important information gaps of national interest.</p> <p>You must also provide clear, realistic and appropriate objectives that address the funded program objectives - not just for the research outputs, but for your application and uptake by the end-users for whom the identified national priorities are important (e.g., the partnering program, or their funding agencies).</p> <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>You should clearly establish that the research proposed will provide new insights for technology development or innovation or field-test recent technology innovations.</p> <p>Identify the end-users of the technology and the application(s) for which the technology is being developed, whether in research, industry, government, or production sectors and clearly explain why the research is important to fill a technology gap or opportunity or address a technology deficiency in need of resolution.</p> <p>You need to establish that the technology improvement or innovation will be in Australia's national interest, for example through improved research, monitoring, or management capability or efficiency, industry development, or international standing.</p> <p>You must also provide clear, realistic and appropriate objectives that will deliver research of</p>	<p>RB 1B Benefit objectives</p> <p>State the project benefit objectives and explain how they align with the needs of end-users.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly state the objectives of the research in the context of the benefits to be delivered • Identify the stakeholders for the research—including next- and end- users. • Explain how the proposed research addresses an end-user need and/or benefit to the nation drawing direct links between your project’s objectives and the need. 	<p>RB 1B: Are project objectives appropriate to addressing the end-user needs or national interests used to justify the research.</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project objectives not relevant to project rationale and will not address national interests or end-user needs; no evidence of end-user input or support <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of project objectives only indirectly or vaguely relevant to national interests or end-user needs for research and end-user support for project unclear. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project objectives credibly- to well-justified by reference to articulated end-user needs or national interests, including some supporting evidence from end-users. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust, documented justification that project objectives will address identified end-user needs and national interests, with sound evidence of support from end-users. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong justification that project objectives are framed specifically to deliver important end-user needs and is in the national interest, with a compelling case, supported by end-users, that the objectives specifically address key end-user needs of national interest.

<p>benefit to your nominated end-user(s).</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>You should clearly establish that the research proposed addresses key issues that have implications for Australia's national interests, as well as being useful to the commissioning user. The national interest might be served, for example, by contributions of knowledge relevant to policy, regulation, environmentally, socially, or economically.</p> <p>Explain why the project is in Australia's national interest, preferably with reference to national priorities, such that a reviewer can see easily that the research will fill one or more important information gaps of national interest and so justify deployment of a national research facility.</p> <p>You must also clearly articulate your objectives and outputs and explain how the national interests nominated are served by meeting those objectives.</p>		
<p>RB 2. Benefit Outputs</p>		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research</p> <p>Describe how your research aligns with your chosen end-user's <u>priority</u>.</p> <p>You should also describe your plan for delivery of research to the nominated end-user.</p> <p>You should discuss your proposed outputs with Stream 1 end-users during preparation of your application and preferably provide supporting statements from them that demonstrate that they see the outputs as essential and have significant potential for adoption. You should also discuss end-users' needs and constraints and factor these into your delivery plan.</p> <p>Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>Describe expected outputs for end-users that are explicitly aligned to those end-user identified needs.</p> <p>You should also describe your plan for delivery of research to your nominated end-user(s).</p> <p>End-users of Stream 2 research might include other researchers who will apply your results to national or international research initiatives, such as improving models of climate, the ocean, biodiversity or informing global research campaigns. Outputs might include research publications but also likely will need to include products or process that fit end-users needs.</p> <p>You should explain how your results will be presented in ways that enable their application to other fields, models, etc.</p> <p>You should discuss outputs with expected end-users (including other researchers) and preferably provide supporting statements that demonstrate outputs are seen as valuable, accessible, and relevant to those end-users.</p> <p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>As a prospective partner, you should describe expected outputs for use by the partnering, or other, end-users that are explicitly being targeted for adoption and application to meet the funded program objectives. You should also provide a plan for the delivery of proposed partnership outputs.</p> <p>Outputs might include research reports or publications but in Stream 3 will need to include more specific products that fit with the partner's operational needs.</p> <p>Strategic partnership leaders should discuss these outputs with the partner end-users during application preparation and provide supporting statements from the partner that demonstrate that the outputs are central to addressing the needs for which they were publicly funded.</p> <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>You should describe expected outputs for delivery to end-users that are explicitly targeted at technology applications for use in Australia's interests.</p> <p>Also describe your plan for delivery of your technology or innovation research to your nominated end-user(s).</p> <p>Stream 4 outputs might include research reports but also likely will need to include more specific products for technology transfer, such as design and operation details, patents, or capability development materials or training.</p> <p>You should discuss expected outputs with expected end-users during application preparation and provide supporting statements from end-users that demonstrate your outputs are seen as fit-for-purpose and readily applicable to further development or adoption of the new or enhanced</p>	<p>RB 2A Alignment</p> <p>Describe the benefit outputs and justify them in the context of their alignment to the identified needs.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the proposed outputs and articulate how these are matched to national interests and/or to meet end-user demand. Demonstrate that the outputs will be fit-for-purpose for adoption by the expected next- or end-users. Include any evidence of co-design with next- or end-users. 	<p>RB 2A: Are the proposed project outputs well matched to articulated national interest or end-user expectations from research?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear definition of benefit outputs and/or no evidence provided of end-user demand for proposed project outputs or outputs not at all relevant to stated demand, or both. Or, there is no alignment between the proposed outputs and national interest. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit outputs defined and there is some evidence of end-user demand for project outputs provided but with poorly framed expectations of what is sought, or proposed project outputs not credibly linked to end-user demand or national interest, or both. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-articulated benefit outputs. Supporting evidence of end-user demand provided with reasonably clear articulation of why research is needed and in the national interest and outputs well-targeted to meet stated demand. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust supporting documentation from end-users that articulates clearly and specifically what outputs sought from the project and outputs strongly aligned with that demand. Strong alignment between outputs and national interest. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project outputs or products match directly those sought by end-users and demonstrably fit with end-user specifications and of national interest, which is demonstrated unequivocally by detailed supporting documentation.
	<p>RB 2B Delivery Plan</p> <p>Outline your benefit delivery plan in the context of your research project timeframe and funding constraints.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a plan (including outputs format and delivery mode and timetable) for delivering the intended benefits within available time and resources. Explain how you have assessed users' needs and constraints and factored these in the design of the delivery plan. Include any commitment/plans from the next- or end-users to utilise the delivered outcomes. Provide evidence that adequate resources are available to deliver the proposed benefits. 	<p>RB 2B: Is there convincing evidence that user-appropriate outputs will be delivered to end users within the project timeline and resources?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear plan for delivering outputs or timeframe and funding clearly insufficient to ensure delivery, or both. End-users either not identified or no evidence of consideration of users' delivery constraints and needs. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit delivery plan needs refinement or clarity and appears either inappropriate or excessive. Available time, resources and funding potentially insufficient to secure delivery, or both. Limited evidence of consideration of users' delivery needs and constraints. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit delivery plan reasonable but with some limitations (e.g., ambitious timeframe; poor consideration of dependencies or risks). Some evidence of early engagement of next- and/or end-users to understand and account for their needs and constraints. National interest clearly articulated, but evidence of end-user support is unclear or tentative. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery plan well justified, realistic, and efficient and clear evidence that both next- and end-users have had the opportunity to shape the project delivery plan and the proposed outputs. <p>Compelling:</p>

<p>technologies.</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>Prospective user-funded applicants should describe expected outputs for the nation, in addition to those expected by the commissioning user. You should also provide a plan for the delivery of proposed outputs to the nation.</p> <p>Outputs likely will include reports or products tailored for the commissioning user but in Stream 5 there also will need to be some outputs that fit with national interest end-users' (information) needs. You should describe expected outputs that you expect to be of national interest, preferably with at least some that are targeted specifically for use by your nominated national interest end-users.</p> <p>You should discuss your anticipated outputs with expected national interest end- users during application preparation and preferably provide supporting statements from those end-users that demonstrate that the outputs will be in the national interest.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit delivery plan very thorough, well justified, and appropriate for the project considering dependencies and constraints. Robust evidence that users' needs and constraints are fully accounted for.
<p>RB 3. Path to Benefit</p>		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research</p> <p>You should clearly lay-out a strong plan for engaging with the Stream's nominated end-user, being clear about the mechanisms and timetable by which you propose to engage with them and how they plan to evaluate the success and impact of the research proposed.</p> <p>You should provide convincing evidence that your delivery strategy is endorsed by your targeted end-user. This should be in the form of supporting documentation, including letters of support from your nominated end-user in which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specify the path to adoption of the project outputs attest that the research and planned outputs are essential to their business or area of responsibility; and express confidence in your ability to deliver the expected outputs of benefit. <p>Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>You should clearly lay-out a plan for delivering the knowledge targeted at nominated end-users, being clear about the mechanisms and timetable by which they will be engaged. Provide convincing evidence that your delivery strategy is likely to align with end-user needs. Your case for benefit will be helped considerably by supporting documentation, including letters of support from end users, including other researchers where relevant, in which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attest that the new knowledge delivered will be useful to them; and Express confidence in the ability of the project team to deliver the expected outputs. <p>You should also detail how you plan to evaluate the success and impact of the research proposed.</p> <p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships</p> <p>You should lay out a clear plan by which the partner end-user intends to apply project outputs, including the mechanisms and timetable by which those outputs will be provided for use. Supply convincing evidence that your delivery strategy is endorsed by the partner end-user. You should aim to provide high levels of supporting documentation, including letters of support from the partner in which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specify the path to application of the research proposed; attest that the research proposed is essential to the purpose for which they were funded; and express confidence in the project team's ability to deliver the expected outputs of benefit. <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>You should clearly lay-out a plan for delivering the technology innovations to your nominated end-users, being clear about the mechanisms and timetable for engagement to transfer technological information or products. Provide convincing evidence that your delivery strategy is endorsed by targeted end-users and aligns with their operational needs. You should aim to provide high levels of supporting documentation, including letters of support from end users in which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attest that the technology or innovation proposed addresses an important gap or deficiency; Specify how they will apply or adopt the results of your research; and Express confidence in the project team's ability to deliver the expected outputs in ways that 	<p>RB 3A Engagement and Adoption</p> <p>Describe key engagement activities for promoting and assisting adoption of project outputs.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how next- and end-users and other relevant stakeholders have been engaged during your project design and how they will be engaged at critical points of the project. Demonstrate how the planned outputs will be applied to effect change in the relevant operational domain. Provide evidence of commitments from next- and end-users to adopt the delivered outcomes. Provide evidence that the end-users endorse your approach and delivery plan. 	<p>RB 3A: Is there a clear plan for post-voyage engagement with expected beneficiaries of the project, including a clear timetable for delivery of outputs to end-users in formats that will facilitate user-application?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End-users either not identified or apparently not involved in project delivery. No plans presented for post-voyage engagement with end-users and not at all clear how end-user outputs will be delivered. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End-users identified but apparently unlikely to be involved in delivery of end-user targeted outputs Vague or cursory reference to post-voyage engagement with end-users with mechanisms and timetable for transmission of user outputs vague. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End-users clearly identified with opportunities articulated for end-user involvement in output preparation or review. Exposition of some post-voyage engagement with end users and reasonable, if somewhat general, mechanisms and timetable for delivering outputs to end-users. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed engagement plan for delivering specific outputs to end-users with clear and credible timetable and clear delivery mechanisms and credible prospect of end-user uptake. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-reasoned and strongly substantiated actions to engage with end-users that have demonstrated end-user support and are scheduled with a specific timetable for delivery explicitly related to end-user processes for receipt and application of outputs.
	<p>RB 3B Evaluation of Performance</p> <p>Describe how you will evaluate your effectiveness in delivering the intended benefit.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate that consideration has been given to what effective delivery will look like, based on understanding of the pathway from research outputs to user benefit to impact. Articulate any performance measures they intend to use to evaluate the success of their project in delivering the stated benefits. Explain how they plan to disseminate information about the impact of their research. 	<p>RB 3B: Is it clear how purported benefits to end users will be measured and documented?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consideration given to performance evaluation. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited consideration of the need and approach to understand and measure the effectiveness of the project delivery and, ultimately, the impact of the research. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence that consideration has been given to understanding and measuring the effectiveness of the project delivery and, ultimately, the impact of the research. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that theory of change/program logic methodologies have been applied to understand the critical pathway to impact. No performance measures identified. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear and convincing theory of change explains the role of the research in effecting the desired change in the national interest context and/or realising the stated benefits.

<p>will be useful to them.</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>You should explain clearly how you will deliver outputs to the commissioning user and also provide a plan for engaging with the nominated national interest end-user(s), being clear about the mechanisms and timetable for engagement. Provide convincing evidence that your delivery strategies, for both the contracting user and national interest end-user, are endorsed by those users. You should aim to provide supporting documentation, including letters of support from commissioning and national interest end-users in which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specify the path to application of the research proposed; • attest that the research proposed is essential to their business or in the national interest (as appropriate); and • express confidence in the project team's ability to deliver the expected outputs. 		
<p>RB 4. Capacity to Deliver Benefit</p>		
<p>Stream 1. Policy-driven research</p> <p>Provide evidence to demonstrate that the team proposed includes people with a track-record of effective engagement with policy end-users, including such things as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence of previous translation of scientific results into outputs that had demonstrable utility in the policy arena; and • Supporting testimonials from previous research end- users with whom members of your team have worked. <p>Stream 2. Discipline-driven research</p> <p>Stream 3. Strategic partnerships and</p> <p>Stream 5. User-funded research</p> <p>Provide evidence to demonstrate that the team proposed includes people with a track-record of effective engagement with end-users, including researchers in other disciplines if relevant, including such things as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence of previous translation of scientific results into outputs that had demonstrable utility to others; and • Supporting testimonials from previous research end-users with whom members of your team have worked. <p>Stream 4. Technology and innovation</p> <p>Provide evidence to demonstrate that the team proposed includes people with a track-record of effective engagement with end-users, including such things as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence of previous application of new technologies or transfer of technologies to end-users; and • Supporting testimonials from end-users with whom team members have worked before to implement new technologies. 	<p>RB 4A Team capability (Benefit Delivery)</p> <p>Provide evidence that the project team includes people with demonstrated capability to deliver benefits effectively to end-users.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> capabilities will be assessed relative to opportunity.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence (e.g. through publications, products, testimonials) that the research team has the capabilities and capacity to engage effectively with next- and/or end-users to deliver benefit (applicable to Early Career Researchers) or previously delivered outputs of demonstrable utility to next- and/or end-users in appropriate forms (applicable to senior researchers). • Demonstrate that the team has the experience and capability required to successfully deliver the intended benefits, including team member responsibilities for delivery (e.g. who will have leadership of delivering outputs or products to end-users). Output delivery can be led by researchers with little relevant experience provided there is a robust strategy for them to be mentored by others with a sound track-record of end-user engagement. • Ensure your answers remain focussed on capacity to deliver benefit. Information relating to research capability should be included in answers to the Research Quality questions 4a and 4b. 	<p>RB 4A: Does the project team include people with demonstrated capability and track record in delivering outputs effectively to end-users?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence presented of any project personnel having experience or track record of working effectively with end-users. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative but non-specific assertions of experience working with research end-users but without clear evidence. <p>Adequate–Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate to solid evidence that one or more project personnel have worked effectively with research end-users before. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated evidence of prior effective experience in working with research end-users to deliver end-user benefit. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding and well-documented track record(s) of project personnel working with end-users to deliver research benefits, supported by end-user testimonial(s).
	<p>RB 4B Education and Training Opportunities</p> <p>Outline the education, training and capacity building opportunities and explain how these contribute strategically to the objectives of the Stream.</p> <p>In answering this question, the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe education, training and/or capacity building activities included in the project, either at sea, prior or post voyage. • Provide evidence of targeted capacity building, training and education opportunities that have been clearly linked to the research objectives and field work plan. • Explain the benefits of research training and education opportunities of the team’s research program with respect to national priorities or next- and/or end-user needs or the wider marine community. 	<p>RB 4B: Does the project include specific capacity building, education, or training activities that will advance national capabilities relevant to the nominated MNF Stream?</p> <p>Unsupportable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team has not articulated capacity building opportunities and does not articulate capacity building activities relevant to the stream priorities. <p>Poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team presents only a vague plan for capacity building or fails to demonstrate how planned capacity building is relevant to stream priorities, or both. <p>Adequate-Good:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team articulates a basic-moderate plan for capacity building that has moderate relevance to stream priorities. <p>Strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team provides a detailed plan for capacity building clearly linked to stream priorities. <p>Compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team provides an outstanding plan for capacity building that will provide conspicuous benefits for the stream priorities.