



Australian Government

Community
Grants Hub
Improving your grant experience



Australian Biological Resources Study: National Taxonomy Research Grant Program

Feedback for applicants

Overview

The National Taxonomy Research Grant Program (NTRGP) provides grants for research into taxonomy and systematics and to support the training and/or recruitment of taxonomists.

Grants are awarded for projects with the primary aim of undertaking research into the taxonomy of the Australian biota. The Australian Biological Resources Study (ABRS) has a number of Priority Areas for Research Grants. ABRS aim to support the highest quality research in the field of taxonomy and systematics that also aligns strongly with the ABRS Priority Areas for Research Grants.

Selection Process

A targeted competitive selection process was used, allowing a range of organisations that met eligibility criteria (as shown below) to apply.

Applications were first screened for eligibility and compliance against the requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines, including the provision of the required attachments.

All eligible and compliant applications were then assessed based on the weighting given to each criterion. Information on what made a strong response to each criterion is provided below.

Following assessment, a Selection Advisory Panel (the panel) comprised of scientists from a number of Australia's biological institutions (museums, herbaria and universities) made final funding recommendations via ABRS to the Minister for the Environment, the Hon Sussan Ley MP (the delegate).

47 applications were received, making the selection of successful grant recipients competitive.



The panel recommended applicants based on the strength of their responses to the selection criteria and their ability to meet the grant requirements outlined in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines. Specifically, the panel recommended applicants that:

- clearly articulated a set of organised and realistic project activities that align with the ABRS Research Priorities
- demonstrated the relevant experience and expertise of the principle and joint researchers to undertake the proposed activities
- identified how the proposed activities would contribute to taxonomy and/or systematics research, and benefit an ABRS resource or product
- provided a detailed and well-justified budget that represented good value for money.

The panel recommended 11 organisations to the delegate for funding. The delegate made the final decision to approve the grant, including the grant funding amount to be awarded.

Selection Criteria

More information is provided in the Grant Opportunity Guidelines online at the [Community Grants Hub website](#).

Criterion 1 – Relevance of the project to ABRS and taxonomic science (40%)

Strength

Q1. Does the project adequately address the ABRS Research Priorities? (score out of 10)
Strong applications clearly addressed at least one of the ABRS Research Priorities.

Q2. Does the project benefit an ABRS resource or product? (score out of 10)
Strong applications clearly outlined, directed and influenced ABRS information products, including the *Australian Faunal Directory*, *Flora of Australia*, publications, identification keys and/or any other taxonomic communication tools.

Q3. Does the project adequately contribute to taxonomy and/or systematics research? (score out of 10)
Strong applications clearly demonstrated successful research projects would adequately and positively contribute to the fields of taxonomy and/or systematics.

Q4. Is the science of a good quality? (score out of 10)
Strong applications clearly demonstrated the activity under the project be of good, rigorous, defensible quality.

Example

Strong responses clearly described:

- how the project aligns with one or more of the ABRS research priorities
- how the proposed projects will advance the field of taxonomy and/or systematics
- the number of taxa that will be described and/or revised
- outputs such as *Flora of Australia* taxon profiles and proposed scientific publications.



Criterion 2 – Feasibility of proposed research project (40%)

Strength

Q5. Is the budget appropriate and represents good value for money? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated the funding requested as representing good value for money.

Q6. Are the project outcomes adequately addressed? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly and succinctly described what outcomes will be achieved through completion of the project.

Q7. Are the methods and project activity appropriate for success? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated successful research projects would adequately and positively contribute to the fields of taxonomy and/or systematics.

Q8. Is the timeframe of the project realistic? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated the researchers can complete all activity, along with giving due attention to the administrative management of the project (reporting etc.), within the timeframe of the project.

Example

Strong responses clearly described:

- a detailed and justified budget with eligible grant activities and expenditure items
- budget items appropriate to achieving the proposed outcomes
- project outputs/outcomes commensurate to the funding requested
- appropriate, detailed methods for achieving the proposed outcomes (e.g. demonstrated application of the methods for similar projects or proof of concept)
- organised projects with realistic project milestones and timelines
- consideration and proposed mitigation of any risks (e.g. ability to undertake any necessary fieldwork to achieve the project outcomes)
- appropriate co-funding contributions.



Criterion 3 – Capacity of researchers and/or institutions to deliver (20%)

Strength

Q9. Are the researchers and host institution appropriately experienced in delivering taxonomic projects? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated the proposed researchers have the appropriate expertise to complete their proposed project.

Q10. Grantee track record in the activity (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated appropriate academic record, Curriculum Vitae, references and statements of skill and experience.

Q11. Is the student/researcher of sufficient experience/expertise? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated the student/researcher is of sufficient experience/expertise to warrant grant funding.

Q12. Will the student/researcher have access to appropriate institutional resources to complete the project? (score out of 10)

Strong applications clearly demonstrated access to appropriate institutional resources for the completion of any project.

Example

Strong responses clearly described:

- principle and joint researchers with experience and expertise relevant to the proposed projects (e.g. publications in a related field or similar taxa or methods)
- appropriate access to resources necessary to complete the proposed projects (e.g. availability of existing collections, approval for any destructive sampling)
- realistic contributions of joint investigators and appropriate supervision of early career researchers.