

# REGIONAL HEALTH PARTNERSHIPS

## Feedback for applicants

The following feedback has been prepared for all applicants who submitted proposals to the Regional Health Partnerships (RHP) call for proposals.

As outlined in the Application Guidelines, proposals submitted were reviewed for compliance and then individually assessed by a Technical Assessment Committee, which engaged DFAT health, development and geographic specialists to assess proposals against the following selection criteria:

1. Organisational capability (30%)
2. Quality of the broad concept (30%)
3. National and regional public health significance of the development needs to be addressed by proposed activities (30%)
4. Applicant's approach to gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI), including First Nations engagement, and social safeguards (10%)
5. Budget (unweighted; considered against [DFAT's Value for Money principles](#))

Following technical assessment, an Evaluation Committee comprising senior DFAT health and development specialists and one external independent consultant reviewed shortlisted proposals and recommended a portfolio of proposals for funding.

Highly rated proposals tended to include:

- A clear and detailed explanation of the scope of proposed activities and outputs, with corresponding and appropriate budget allocations
- Strong evidence of demand for the proposed activities, and evidence that the proposed activities address identified health needs (e.g., as demonstrated by gap analyses and needs assessments) and align with partner government health priorities/strategies
- A clear articulation of the relevance of the expertise and experience of the Key Personnel, Lead Organisation, and (where applicable) consortium partners to the specific activities proposed
- Demonstration of previous success in capacity building and achievement of outcomes in comparable settings, with specific examples provided (e.g., from independent/formal evaluations)
- Evidence that the proposed activities and intended outcomes are likely to be sustained and have lasting impact beyond the life of the project/partnership
- A comprehensive and coherent Program Logic, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, and Risk Profile, tailored to the specific activities proposed

Proposals which received a lower rating tended to demonstrate weaknesses/gaps in the above areas as compared to the successful proposals. In addition, across the application pool responses to selection criterion #4 (GEDSI) on average scored lower than responses to other three scored criteria. Proposed governance arrangements for managing partnerships (particularly those proposing to include large number of consortium partners) also tended to be underdeveloped.

The call for proposals was heavily oversubscribed, with 191 proposals submitted, and was therefore very competitive. The amount of funding requested in proposals which were rated as 'high quality' according to the selection criteria significantly exceeded the \$160 million allocated for programming under this call for proposals. As outlined in the RHP application guidelines, the final selection of proposals by the Evaluation Committee was guided by (a) the evaluation criteria, (b) advice from technical assessment, (c) feedback from DFAT geographic desks, posts and partner governments, and (d) appropriate balance of thematic areas and geographic spread.

As noted in the Application Guidelines, in the interest of fairness to all applicants the feedback provided here will be DFAT's sole and final communication about the outcome of this selection process. No individual feedback will be provided.