



Health Peak and Advisory Bodies Program round 4 grant opportunity (GO7902) feedback for applicants

March 2026

The Department of Health, Disability and Ageing has completed the assessment process for round 4 of the Health Peak and Advisory Bodies (HPAB) Program. We thank all organisations for their interest and participation in this important initiative.

Here is general feedback to highlight the qualities of strong grant applications for this grant opportunity.

About the program

The aim of the HPAB Program is to enable health peaks to contribute to the national health agenda.

The HPAB Program provides the Australian Government with access to high quality health sector information to improve the capacity, quality and safety of Australia's healthcare system.

Health peaks will provide expert, evidence-based and impartial advice to inform current health policy and program development.

HPAB Program round 4 overview

The grant opportunity prioritised health peaks that focus on cross sectoral and government health sector priorities.

Organisations needed to demonstrate strong governance, sector leadership, and the ability to deliver evidence-based advice to government.

Funding allocations were determined based on published eligibility and assessment criteria, including organisational capability, strategic alignment and value for money.

Total funding and key dates:

- Total funding available: up to \$33.44 million over 4 years
- Grant opportunity opened: 29 September 2025
- Closing date for applications: 7 November 2025
- Assessment period: November 2025 - February 2026
- Outcome notifications: 13 March 2026

Outcome of applications

The grant opportunity was highly competitive and oversubscribed by more than \$313.5 million (GST exclusive), with 138 applications received.

Organisations were assessed for eligibility and then on best alignment with the government health agenda (Tier 1 organisations) and/or government health sector priorities (Tier 2 organisations).

Tier 1 organisations were prioritised, in accordance with the Grant Opportunity Guidelines.

Twelve applications were successful for funding through this open competitive grant process. Successful organisations are listed on the [GrantConnect](#) website.

Assessment of applications

Applications were assessed on their merits and comparatively against other applications based on:

- how well they met the assessment criteria
- whether they demonstrated value with relevant money, and
- how they proposed to meet program objectives and outcomes.

The guidelines outlined that the amount of detail and supporting evidence provided in applications should be relative to the size, complexity and funding amount requested.

Assessment feedback

Below we outline the common elements of strong applications and provide examples of how these applications met the selection criteria.

Criterion 1: Alignment with grant opportunity objectives and outcomes

Strong responses:

- demonstrated how the proposed activities would meet the grant objectives and deliver the intended outcomes
- explained which government policies and frameworks the project aligns with
- described who would be involved (e.g. members, stakeholders, governing bodies) and how they would help design, guide and/or deliver the work.

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
Demonstrate direct links between the grant objectives and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clearly articulated how the proposed activities align with the objectives of the grant opportunity and how they will deliver meaningful outcomes (for example, tangible benefits for consumers or members).• Used relevant evidence or precedent (such as previous programs, evaluations or sector

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
	<p>data) to demonstrate that the proposed approach is likely to achieve the stated outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated that the organisation examines policy linkages across the health system.
<p>Demonstrate linkages with relevant government policy frameworks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated how the proposal aligns with relevant government health policy frameworks, priorities and reform agendas. • Showed an understanding of the broader policy context and clearly explained how the proposed activities would support, complement or advance government objectives. • Clearly articulated how the proposed work would contribute to policy implementation, reform priorities and/or system level outcomes.
<p>Describe which groups or stakeholders within the health sector your organisation represents and how the proposed activity addresses the specific needs and interests of your members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identified the organisation's national membership base and key stakeholders relevant to the proposal, including peak bodies, advisory groups or community organisations. • Demonstrated genuine, ongoing engagement with members, stakeholders and governing bodies, particularly those representing priority populations or communities the grant is intended to benefit. • Demonstrated collaboration or partnerships with stakeholders from across the health system (for example primary care, regulation and/or workforce). • Explained how stakeholders have been, or will be, involved in shaping, guiding or delivering the proposed activities during grant implementation. • Showed an understanding of their membership base and clearly explained how the proposed activities would support or benefit member interests.

Criterion 2: Community and stakeholder engagement

Strong responses:

- Demonstrated engagement with members, stakeholders and priority population groups and how the feedback was/will be used to shape the proposed activities. For example, engagement through targeted consultations, surveys, roundtables or advisory groups.

- Explained what advocacy or advice they would deliver and linked it to specific government policy objectives and intended system level outcomes. For example, policy briefs, submissions, position statements or implementation guidance.

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
<p>How will you ensure your organisation represents the views and needs of all members and stakeholders, including priority populations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly articulated how the organisation represents the diverse views, needs and experiences of its membership and broader stakeholder base. This includes outlining how different perspectives are balanced (for example explaining how feedback/engagement with varied groups will be integrated into policy advice, ensuring inclusive and culturally responsive representation). • Clearly described structured and ongoing processes to identify, engage and collaborate with members and relevant external organisations. Show how this is supported by established partnerships and/or cross-sector relationships with other peaks, advisory bodies or community-based organisations. • Demonstrated active approaches to recruit representatives from priority population groups into boards, committees, working groups and/or advisory forums. • Described practical strategies to address barriers to participation and support meaningful, inclusive and accessible engagement. • Demonstrated experience in consulting with priority population groups, both internally and externally. • Described how consultation outcomes and collaboration have or will inform the organisation’s policy positions and advice to government.

Criterion 3: Organisational capability to deliver the grant activities

Strong responses:

- Provided clear examples of the organisation’s capability to deliver the proposed activities, including relevant experience, governance structures, risk controls and quality assurance processes for producing timely advice to the government.

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
<p>Describe your organisation’s capability to deliver the grant activities, and how your proposal addresses the risks involved in undertaking the grant activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly described the size, composition and geographic reach of the organisation’s membership. For example, representing members across all regions of Australia, and ensuring advice is informed by diverse geographic, service delivery and community contexts. • Demonstrated how their membership base supports a national, cross jurisdictional or sector wide perspective. For example, applicants illustrated how insights from their broad members/collaborators

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
	<p>strengthened the relevance of their national policy advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated the ability to provide accurate, evidence-based and impartial advice on health policy and program issues. • Clearly articulated the scope of expertise and policy issues the organisation is well placed to advise on. For example, applicants identified specific policy, service delivery models or funding mechanisms, and explained why their organisational experience and leadership positioned them to advise credibly in these areas. • Demonstrated capability and capacity to support and influence national health policy across the health system, aligned to the relevant funding tier outlined in the guidelines. • Described clear and effective mechanisms for internal and external communication, such as websites, newsletters, policy papers, forums or meetings. • Demonstrated appropriate governance and accountability arrangements to support delivery of the grant activities.

Criterion 4: Efficient, effective, economical and ethical use of relevant money

Strong responses:

- Demonstrated how organisations would manage grant funds (for example, providing a clear budget and outlining accountability measures such as regular financial reporting).
- Explained how the grant activities would achieve high quality outcomes in a cost-effective way.

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
<p>Efficient, effective, economical and ethical use of relevant money</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly explained how the proposed grant activities would deliver high quality outputs and outcomes while making efficient use of public funds, supported by strong governance and financial oversight arrangements. • Demonstrated that proposed costs were reasonable, proportionate to the scope, scale and national reach of the activities, and directly linked to eligible grant funded activities. • Provided transparency around governance, funding arrangements and reporting processes to support assessment of value for money and accountability. • Clearly identified funding from other organisations or government departments relevant to the proposed activities. • Where relevant, demonstrated that external funding improved the delivery model, ensured value for money, and

Criteria	Common Elements and Examples
	outlined how funding would be managed to prevent duplication through partnerships and established mechanisms.

Additional feedback

Other important factors that applicants should consider when preparing grant applications include:

Other factors	Considerations
Indicative activity budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check budgets to ensure all expense items add up to the total grant funds requested. • Ensure budgets are consistent with the described activities, detailing the cost of proposed activities. The budget should only include eligible expenditure items as detailed in the guidelines.
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carefully consider how applications are assessed regarding value for money, as outlined in the guidelines. For this grant opportunity, assessment of value for money included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the overall objective/s to be achieved in providing the grant ○ the extent to which the evidence in the application demonstrates that it will contribute to meeting the outcomes/objectives ○ the relative value of the grant sought ○ the extent to which the grant activities match identified priorities; and ○ how the grant activities will benefit groups and/or individuals. • To support value for money assessment, applicants should clearly identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ proposed grant activities ○ how the proposal aligns with relevant government health policy frameworks, priorities and reform agendas ○ proposed activity benefits and how they align with the objectives and outcomes of the grant opportunity; and ○ the potential grantee's relevant experience and performance history.
Risk management approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate sound knowledge of risk management principles. • Clearly articulate practical measures and controls to mitigate risks associated with the proposed activities.
Activity work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activity work plan should provide clear, high level, supporting evidence of proposed deliverables, measures of success and key milestones.

Outcome notification

All applicants have been notified of the outcome directly through the Community Grants Hub, in accordance with the guidelines.