

**From:** s22  
**To:** s22  
**Subject:** FW: SOI Email [SEC=OFFICIAL]  
**Date:** Monday, 1 April 2019 10:47:09 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

**From:** Shitij Kapur  
**Sent:** Monday, 1 April 2019 10:44 AM  
**To:** s22 Helen Milroy s47F  
**Cc:** Gleeson, Emma s22  
**Subject:** RE: SOI Email [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Dear all,

I have had a brief exchange with Helen, and a potential way forward would be to write to our committee .. tell them where we are and why the NHMRC panel cannot help. Also emphasize that we have 24 hours to make a decision and secure the funds. And that leaves us with 3 options. They can all vote for it .. and if there is a tie, then the Chairs will cast the decisive vote.

The choices being:

- a) Each area gets 5M+ for their top rank, the rest goes to the next best applications in order.
- b) Each area gets 5M+ for their top rank, the rest goes to the best applications as judged along the "Statement of Intent" interpreted by unconflicted members in discussion with NHMRC/DoH officers.
- c) Divide the funds three ways, in order of ranking within each priority.

I would wait for Helen to OK this .. and if so, lets get this out to the Committee with votes within 24h to have a game plan for the 4<sup>th</sup>.

Sk

---

**From:** Shitij Kapur  
**Sent:** Sunday, 31 March 2019 3:33 PM  
**To:** s22 Helen Milroy s47F  
**Cc:** Gleeson, Emma <[Emma.Gleeson@health.gov.au](mailto:Emma.Gleeson@health.gov.au)>; s22

**Subject:** RE: SOI Email [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Dear s22

Thanks for all the work.

It is unfortunate that the NHMRC cannot take on this additional task, but I understand that they are rigorous in the ToRs for their committees and may not be open to an outside group changing the ToR at short notice.

I think the Panel is absolutely committed to getting our recommendation in in time so the minister can announce, and we have to find a way to do it without conflict.

I would suggest that we stay with the steps that we have outlined but am worried that at #4 you would have very few 2-3 panel members at best, and in most likelihood these will be panel members with no technical expertise in the matter. And even if one of them does have expertise, it is unlikely to be evenly balanced across the three main areas.

So, I think the way forward may be to go back to the Panel and advise them of the latest developments and then give them a choice of two options:

- a) Either follow #4 as below and be comfortable with the level of moderation possible by non-experts;
- b) Or, just follow the rank order after each area has received its 5M+ application.

Helen .. what do you think? We need to take a view so that action can start on Monday.  
Warm regards,  
Sk

---

**From:** s22

**Sent:** Saturday, 30 March 2019 5:13 PM

**To:** Shitij Kapur s47F

Helen Milroy s47F

**Cc:** Gleeson, Emma <[Emma.Gleeson@health.gov.au](mailto:Emma.Gleeson@health.gov.au)>; s22

**Subject:** FW: SOI Email [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Hi Shitij and Helen

Just wanted to check that you are comfortable with the below process – it differs from what we discussed at the teleconference on Tuesday and is the result of NHMRC discussions:

1. The Million Minds Mission peer review panel scores applications against the assessment criteria, as published in the MRFF Million Minds Mission Grant Guidelines.
2. NHMRC undertakes data quality assurance testing to confirm accuracy of the data in its grants management system for subsequent reporting and notification of outcomes.
3. Conflict of Interest declarations are conducted according to NHMRC policy.
4. NHMRC officials, non-conflicted members of the Advisory Panel and relevant Department of Health Officials meet to consider the initial funding recommendation options and formulate a final funding recommendation as guided by the statement of intent.
5. A formal outcome report which includes the final funding recommendation is developed for approval.

If you could let me know by Monday 10am that would be great. The turn around time for members will only be pretty short given we need to confirm both the process and the statement of intent prior to the 4 April meeting.

Kind regards

s22

Director

Primary Mental Health Care Innovation and Engagement Section

s22

---

**From:** s22

**Sent:** Friday, 29 March 2019 5:25 PM

**To:** s47F

**Cc:** Gleeson, Emma; s22

**Subject:** FW: SOI Email [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Hi Shitij and Helen,

Further to my update emails today, we have been working with the NHMRC to work through the process of using the statement of intent within the remit of the grant guidelines. The outcomes/ proposed process resulting from this discussion is below in the email to advisory panel members. We wanted to run this past you for your consideration prior to sending out. Also attached is the revised statement of intent.

Kind regards

s22

s22

Director

Primary Mental Health Innovation and Engagement

Mental Health & Suicide Prevention Branch

-----  
Dear Million Minds Mission Advisory Panel members

At our teleconference on Tuesday, it was agreed that we would prepare a statement of the advisory panel's intent to guide funding recommendations given the significant conflicts in this first round of funding. Following this teleconference, we have liaised with the NHMRC to clarify how the process could work. The NHMRC has advised that funding recommendations are developed within a policy framework and are an intentionally separate process from the peer review panel to maintain the integrity of both processes.

In light of this advice, the Department has worked with the NHMRC to identify the following as an alternative approach:

1. The Million Minds Mission peer review panel scores applications against the assessment criteria, as published in the MRFF Million Minds Mission Grant Guidelines.
2. NHMRC undertakes data quality assurance testing to confirm accuracy of the data in its grants management system for subsequent reporting and notification of outcomes.
3. Conflict of Interest declarations are conducted according to NHMRC policy.
4. NHMRC officials, non-conflicted members of the Advisory Panel and relevant Department of Health Officials meet to consider the initial funding recommendation options and formulate a final funding recommendation as guided by the statement of intent.
5. A formal outcome report which includes the final funding recommendation is developed for approval.

A draft statement of intent has been developed for your consideration and comment. Please review the above process, and the attached statement, and advise as to whether you agree with this approach or of any changes you would like to see by COB on **Monday 1 April 2019**.

Kind regards

---

"Important: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this transmission in error please notify the author immediately and delete all copies of this transmission."