

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh

*Improving Computer and Software Engineering Tertiary
Education Project (ICSETEP)
Research and Development Grant (RDG)*

Area-A (Academy-Industry Collaboration)

Sub-project Proposal Evaluation Form

for

Area Review Panel (ARP) Member

Sub-project No:

.....

Sub-project Title:

Total Marks Given.....

Evaluator*: (Name, position, institution)

.....

.....

Mobile Number.....

Email.....

Signature:

Date:

Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-project proposals for Area-A

*[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below shall be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the sub-project will be considered incomplete. **Please award a score for each item up to two decimal place.** The information within parentheses (..) indicates relevant sections of the SPP Template.]*

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Allocated Score	Awarded Score												
1. Clarity and Quality of General Objectives and Specific Objectives	15.0													
<p>1.1 Proposal design (Section A: 1-16) How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to the scope of ICSETEP?</p> <p>The title is concise, meaningful and reflecting the objectives; Motivations are clear; Expected results and outcomes are clear and realistic; Feasibility and potential benefits are stated; Well-articulated novelty/innovativeness; Sound background study reflecting a gap analysis; Scientific quality of technical approach and methodologies; Justified performance indicators and workplan; Well-explained commercialization prospect; Justified and realistic budget and procurement plan; Well-designed plan on sustainability; Reflection of academic scholarship in the proposal</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>	5.0													
<p>1.2 Objectives and specific objectives (Section A: 4) Are the proposal's general objectives, specific objectives and motivation clear, coherent and realistic?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Characteristics of proposed project objectives</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on industry needs?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score	● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0		● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0		● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on industry needs?	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score												
● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0													
● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0													
● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on industry needs?	1.0													
<p>1.3 Innovation nature (Section A: 7) To what extent does the proposal reflect innovation tuned with the industry needs?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Innovation nature of the SPP</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-A compared to existing work?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-A compared to existing work?	3.0		● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0		5.0				
Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-A compared to existing work?	3.0													
● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0													
2. Quality and Clarity of Milestones, Performance Indicators and Log frame	10.0													

<p>2.1 Milestones (Section A: 6, 10 (Annex-1)) To what extent do the milestones described indicate the crucial activities, deliverable outcomes and expected results considered in the proposal?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 360 1174 551"> <thead> <tr> <th>Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?	2.0		• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?	2.0		• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?	2.0													
• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?	2.0													
• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions	1.0													
<p>2.2 Performance Indicators (10 (Annex 1), 11) and Logical Framework (10 (Annex 1)): To what extent is the logical framework relevant to the specific objectives?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 752 1174 1025"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate	2.5		• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate	2.5		5.0				
Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate	2.5													
• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate	2.5													
<p>3. Significance with respect to ICSETEP (Section A: 5)</p>														
<p>To what extent does the SPP contribute to the objectives of ICSETEP, aligned with relevant national policy and the UN's Sustainable Development Goal?</p>	5.0													
<p>4. Commercialization Prospect</p>														
<p>4.1 Market Analysis (Section A: 13) The quality of market demand and competition analysis (size and possibility of extension beyond Bangladesh). A detailed SWOT analysis to identify internal strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Market and its size are clearly defined, the solution is better than others in the market in terms of delivering value, a detailed SWOT analysis.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 1608 1174 1921"> <thead> <tr> <th>Market demand and competition analysis, and SWOT analysis</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• The market is clearly defined, the potential market size of the solution and possibility of extension beyond Bangladesh are explained and justified</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• The solution is convincingly shown to be better than others in the market in terms of delivering value</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• A detailed SWOT analysis is presented to identify internal strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Market demand and competition analysis, and SWOT analysis	Allocated score	Awarded score	• The market is clearly defined, the potential market size of the solution and possibility of extension beyond Bangladesh are explained and justified	2.0		• The solution is convincingly shown to be better than others in the market in terms of delivering value	1.0		• A detailed SWOT analysis is presented to identify internal strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats	2.0		5.0	
Market demand and competition analysis, and SWOT analysis	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• The market is clearly defined, the potential market size of the solution and possibility of extension beyond Bangladesh are explained and justified	2.0													
• The solution is convincingly shown to be better than others in the market in terms of delivering value	1.0													
• A detailed SWOT analysis is presented to identify internal strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats	2.0													

<p>4.2 Business Model and Commercialization (Section A: 13) The quality of the business model and the potential for successful commercialization.</p> <p>The value proposition, revenue and funding model, risk assessment and mitigation plan, resource utilization, and commercialization prospect.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 421 1173 629"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quality of the business model and potential for commercialization</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ A detailed business model is provided, which is clearly aligned with the objectives of the proposal</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Potential for successful commercialization is explained and justified</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of the business model and potential for commercialization	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ A detailed business model is provided, which is clearly aligned with the objectives of the proposal	2.5		▪ Potential for successful commercialization is explained and justified	2.5		5.0				
Quality of the business model and potential for commercialization	Allocated score	Awarded score												
▪ A detailed business model is provided, which is clearly aligned with the objectives of the proposal	2.5													
▪ Potential for successful commercialization is explained and justified	2.5													
<p>5. Justification of the Budget and Expenditure (Section A: 14 & Annex-3, 4)</p>	10.0													
<p>5.1 Budget and financing plan (Section A: 14) The consistency of the proposed investments for all the activities (Annex 2) and the financing plan (Annex 3) with the proposal and whether it leads to the stated specific objectives (Section A: 4) and expected outputs (Section A: 6)</p>	5.0													
<p>5.2 Expenditure (Section A: 14) and procurement plan (Annex 4) To what extent the amounts requested for each item of expenditure in the proposal are rational and justified?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 1149 1173 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quality of expenditure and procurement plan</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ Units/quantity of items as well as cost/expenditure included in budget are balanced and justified</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Required goods, works and services included in procurement plan are rational and justified</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Fund required for all items to be procured are allocated in budget</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Units/quantity of items as well as cost/expenditure included in budget are balanced and justified	3.0		▪ Required goods, works and services included in procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0		▪ Fund required for all items to be procured are allocated in budget	1.0		5.0	
Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score												
▪ Units/quantity of items as well as cost/expenditure included in budget are balanced and justified	3.0													
▪ Required goods, works and services included in procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0													
▪ Fund required for all items to be procured are allocated in budget	1.0													
<p>6. Quality of the Work Plans</p>	15.0													
<p>6.1 Work plan (Section A: 12 (Annex 2)) How are the clarity and quality of the work plan and its relevance to the proposal objectives?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="129 1671 1141 1827"> <thead> <tr> <th>Clarity and quality of the work plan</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ Work plan includes all activities of log frame and sequence, and duration of activities are rational</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ The work plan is relevant to proposal objectives</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Work plan includes all activities of log frame and sequence, and duration of activities are rational	2.5		▪ The work plan is relevant to proposal objectives	2.5		5.0				
Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score												
▪ Work plan includes all activities of log frame and sequence, and duration of activities are rational	2.5													
▪ The work plan is relevant to proposal objectives	2.5													
<p>6.2 Technical Approach and Methodology (Section A: 8, 9) How are the clarity and quality of the technical approach and research methodology? The approach is designed based on an in-depth background study; the proposed technical steps are realistic and achievable within scope and</p>	10.0													

<p>resources; the methodology is scientifically sound and structured; appropriateness of the proposed tools, models, algorithms, or frameworks; strategies for testing, validation, benchmarking, and measuring outcomes are clear and justified</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>														
<p>7. Institutional and SPMT Strength</p>	<p>20.0</p>													
<p>7.1 Institutional Capacity (Section B: 3)</p> <p>How are the fund recipient university and entity going to facilitate the sub project?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="129 616 1206 804"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="129 616 922 667">Institutional Strength</th> <th data-bbox="922 616 1075 667">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1075 616 1206 667">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 667 922 734"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? </td> <td data-bbox="922 667 1075 734">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1075 667 1206 734"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 734 922 804"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? </td> <td data-bbox="922 734 1075 804">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1075 734 1206 804"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5		<p>5.0</p>				
Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5													
<p>7.2 Overall Research Strength of SPMT (Section B: 1, Annex 8, 8A)</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="129 960 1201 1265"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="129 960 876 1028">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI</th> <th data-bbox="876 960 1043 1028">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 960 1201 1028">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 1028 876 1265"></td> <td data-bbox="876 1028 1043 1265">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1028 1201 1265"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="129 1364 1201 1760"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="129 1364 876 1431">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI</th> <th data-bbox="876 1364 1043 1431">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 1364 1201 1431">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 1431 876 1760"></td> <td data-bbox="876 1431 1043 1760">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1431 1201 1760"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		3.0		Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		2.0		<p>5.0</p>	
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score												
	3.0													
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score												
	2.0													

<p>7.3 The relevance of the experience of the SPMT (Section B: 2, Annex 8A)</p> <p>The relevance of the experience of the SPMT and aid in implementing the sub-project, as demonstrated through supporting documents and explanations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="185 400 1195 575"> <thead> <tr> <th>Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="185 607 1195 781"> <thead> <tr> <th>Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*For publications, number of papers published in Q1/Q2 and/or WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences, or any peer-reviewed venue indexed in DBLP</p>	Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 4	3.0			3-2	2.0			1	1.0		Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 4	2.0			3-2	1.0			1	0.5		5.0	
Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																															
	>= 4	3.0																																
	3-2	2.0																																
	1	1.0																																
Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																															
	>= 4	2.0																																
	3-2	1.0																																
	1	0.5																																
<p>7.4 Prior experience of the SPMT (Section B: 1, 2, Annex 8A)</p> <p>The prior experience of the SPMT to work with industry / in funded projects, as evidenced by a list of outcomes delivered, supporting documents and explanations</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="185 1084 1206 1258"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="185 1290 1206 1464"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of Co-PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score		>= 4	3.0			3-2	2.0			1	1.0		Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Allocated Score		>= 4	2.0			3-2	1.0			1	0.5		5.0	
Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score																															
	>= 4	3.0																																
	3-2	2.0																																
	1	1.0																																
Number of Industry-Collaboration/Funded Project experience of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Allocated Score																															
	>= 4	2.0																																
	3-2	1.0																																
	1	0.5																																
<p>8. Collaborating Entity's SPMT Strength (Section B: 4, Annex 9, 10)</p>			10.0																															
<p>8.1 Experience and Quality of SPMT Member</p> <p>Relevant Experience and quality of the SPMT member from Industry in terms of product development, publications, patent/copyright, years of experience in industry, academic qualification</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="153 1756 1177 1930"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of products/services developed/designed, projects completed, publications, patent/copyright, etc. of SPMT member</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 10</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>7-9</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-6</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of products/services developed/designed, projects completed, publications, patent/copyright, etc. of SPMT member	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 10	2.0			7-9	1.0			3-6	0.5		5.0																	
Number of products/services developed/designed, projects completed, publications, patent/copyright, etc. of SPMT member	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																															
	>= 10	2.0																																
	7-9	1.0																																
	3-6	0.5																																

Years of experience in industry	Years	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		
	>= 8	2.0			
	4 to 7	1.0			
Academic Qualification	Degree	Score			
	Postgraduate	1.0			
	Undergraduate	0.5			
For Co-PI from foreign universities:					
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc.; Industry collaboration experience of Co-PI		Allocated Score	Awarded score		
		3.0			
Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		
	>= 4	2.0			
	3-2	1.0			
	1	0.5			
** If one Co-PI is from foreign university, contribution of this collaborating Co-PI's awarded score to the total Experience and Quality of SPMT Member score will be 40%.**					
8.2 Experience and Capacity of Collaborating Entity (applicable to both industry/foreign universities as collaborating entity)				5.0	
Relevant experience, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement and justification of contributions to the project.					
Institutional Strength		Allocated score	Awarded score		
● Relevant experience, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement		3.0			
● Justification of contributions to the project is clearly articulated		2.0			
** If one Co-PI is from foreign university, contribution of this collaborating entity's awarded score to the total Experience and Capacity of Collaborating Entity score will be 40%.**					
9. Sustainability (Annex-11)				5.0	
Quality of the sustainability analysis and long-term plan to continue after RDG implementation through measures and budget provisions the entity/university is likely to commit to future progress/ sustain the activities and outcomes after the completion of the sub-project.				5.0	

	Total marks	100.0	

Signature of Scrutinizer

Signature of Evaluator

REVIEW COMMENTS

Please give specific and in-depth comments. The comments should be in conformity with the **awarded score**.

Section A

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Section B

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Signature of Evaluator

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh

*Improving Computer and Software Engineering Tertiary
Education Project (ICSETEP)
Research and Development Grant (RDG)*

Area-B (Interdisciplinary R&D)
Sub-project Proposal Evaluation Form
for
Area Review Panel (ARP) Member

Sub-project No:

.....

Sub-project Title:

Total Marks Given.....

Evaluator*: (Name, position, institution)

.....
.....

Mobile Number.....

Email.....

Signature:

Date:

Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-project proposals for Area-B

*[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below shall be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the sub-project will be considered incomplete. **Please award a score for each item up to two decimal place.** The information within parentheses (..) indicates relevant sections of the SPP Template.]*

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Allocated Score	Awarded Score												
1. Clarity and Quality of General Objectives and Specific Objectives	20.0													
<p>1.1 Proposal design (Section A: 1-16) How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to the scope of ICSETEP? The title is concise, meaningful and reflecting the objectives; Motivations are clear; Expected results and outcomes are clear and realistic; Feasibility and potential benefits are stated; Well-articulated novelty/innovativeness; Sound background study reflecting a gap analysis; Scientific quality of technical approach and methodologies; Justified performance indicators and workplan; Justified and realistic budget and procurement plan; Well-designed plan on sustainability; Academic scholarship and interdisciplinary nature of the proposal</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>	5.0													
<p>1.2 Objectives and specific objectives (Section A: 4) Are the proposal's general objectives and specific objectives clear, coherent and realistic?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Characteristics of proposed project objectives</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on interdisciplinary needs?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0		• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0		• Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on interdisciplinary needs?	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0													
• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0													
• Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on interdisciplinary needs?	1.0													
<p>1.3 Background Study (Section A: 9) Is the background study clear and relevant?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Characteristics of background study</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Soundness of gap analysis</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Relevance of literature review to the SPP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of background study	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality	1.0		• Soundness of gap analysis	2.0		• Relevance of literature review to the SPP	2.0		5.0	
Characteristics of background study	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality	1.0													
• Soundness of gap analysis	2.0													
• Relevance of literature review to the SPP	2.0													

<p>1.4 Innovation nature (Section A: 8) To what extent do the proposal and proposed activities reflect innovation tuned with the interdisciplinary needs?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="92 327 1169 521"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 327 884 376">Innovation nature of the SPP</th> <th data-bbox="884 327 1042 376">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1042 327 1169 376">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 376 884 450"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-B compared to existing work? </td> <td data-bbox="884 376 1042 450">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1042 376 1169 450"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 450 884 521"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions? </td> <td data-bbox="884 450 1042 521">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1042 450 1169 521"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-B compared to existing work? 	3.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions? 	2.0		5.0				
Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-B compared to existing work? 	3.0													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions? 	2.0													
<p>2. Quality and Clarity of Milestones, Performance Indicators and Log frame</p>	10.0													
<p>2.1 Milestones (Section A: 6, 11 (Annex-1)) To what extent do the milestones described indicate the crucial activities, deliverable outcomes and expected results considered in the proposal?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="92 801 1169 996"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 801 898 851">Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators</th> <th data-bbox="898 801 1042 851">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1042 801 1169 851">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 851 898 925"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? </td> <td data-bbox="898 851 1042 925">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1042 851 1169 925"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 925 898 960"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? </td> <td data-bbox="898 925 1042 960">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1042 925 1169 960"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 960 898 996"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions </td> <td data-bbox="898 960 1042 996">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1042 960 1169 996"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? 	2.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? 	2.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions 	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? 	2.0													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? 	2.0													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions 	1.0													
<p>2.2 Performance Indicators (11 (Annex 1), 12) and Logical Framework (11 (Annex 1)): To what extent is the logical framework relevant to the specific objectives?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="92 1178 1169 1456"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 1178 906 1249">Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP</th> <th data-bbox="906 1178 1042 1249">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1042 1178 1169 1249">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1249 906 1355"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate </td> <td data-bbox="906 1249 1042 1355">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1042 1249 1169 1355"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1355 906 1456"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate </td> <td data-bbox="906 1355 1042 1456">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1042 1355 1169 1456"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate 	2.5		5.0				
Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in log frame are clear, coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verifications and assumptions is appropriate 	2.5													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and calculation method, verification method, assumptions are appropriate 	2.5													
<p>3. Significance in particular RDG area (Section A: 5)</p>	5.0													
<p>Significance and justifications on the contributions to ICSETEP objectives through the improvement of the SPP submitting entity's academic institution through interdisciplinary engagement (e.g., faculty/student involvement in research and project activities to enhance research and skill development, etc.)</p>	5.0													

4. Relevance to the national policy and SDG (Section A: 7)			5.0	
To what extent does the SPP is aligned with relevant national policy and the UN's Sustainable Development Goal?			5.0	
	Allocated score	Awarded score		
▪ Conformity to relevant national policies is mentioned and justified in the SPP	2.5			
▪ Conformity to relevant sustainable development goals is mentioned and justified	2.5			
5. Justification of the Budget and Expenditure (Section A: 14 & Annex-3, 4)			10.0	
5.1 Budget and financing plan The consistency of the proposed investments for all the activities (Annex 2) and the financing plan (Annex 3) with the proposal and whether it leads to the stated specific objectives (Section A: 4) and expected outputs (Section A: 6)			5.0	
5.2 Expenditure (Section A: 14) and procurement plan (Annex 4) To what extent the amounts requested for each item of expenditure in the proposal are rational and justified?			5.0	
Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score		
▪ Units/quantity of items as well as cost/expenditure included in budget are balanced and justified	3.0			
▪ Required goods, works and services included in procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0			
▪ Fund required for all items to be procured are allocated in budget	1.0			
6. Quality of the Work Plans			15.0	
6.1 Work plan (Section A: 13 (Annex 2)) How are the clarity and quality of the work plan and its relevance to the proposal objectives?			5.0	
Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score		
▪ Work plan includes all activities of log frame and sequence and duration of activities are rational	2.5			
▪ The work plan is relevant to proposal objectives	2.5			

<p>6.2 Technical Approach and Methodology (Section A: 9, 10) How are the clarity and quality of the technical approach and research methodology? The approach is designed based on an in-depth background study; the proposed technical steps are realistic and achievable within scope and resources; the methodology is scientifically sound and structured; appropriateness of the proposed tools, models, algorithms, or frameworks; strategies for testing, validation, benchmarking, and measuring outcomes are clear and justified</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>	10.0													
<p>7. Institutional and SPMT Strength</p>	20.0													
<p>7.1 Institutional Capacity (Section B: 3) How are the fund recipient university and entity going to facilitate the sub project?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 808 1174 1003"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 808 911 860">Institutional Strength</th> <th data-bbox="911 808 1043 860">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 808 1174 860">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 860 911 929"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? </td> <td data-bbox="911 860 1043 929">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 860 1174 929"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 929 911 1003"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? </td> <td data-bbox="911 929 1043 1003">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 929 1174 1003"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5		5.0				
Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5													
<p>7.2 Overall Research Strength of SPMT (Section B: 1, Annex 8, 8A) Please evaluate holistically</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="153 1151 1174 1491"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="153 1151 850 1220">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI</th> <th data-bbox="850 1151 1018 1220">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1018 1151 1174 1220">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="153 1220 850 1491"></td> <td data-bbox="850 1220 1018 1491">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1018 1220 1174 1491"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="153 1525 1174 1865"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="153 1525 850 1594">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI</th> <th data-bbox="850 1525 1018 1594">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1018 1525 1174 1594">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="153 1594 850 1865"></td> <td data-bbox="850 1594 1018 1865">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1018 1594 1174 1865"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		3.0		Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		2.0		5.0	
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score												
	3.0													
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score												
	2.0													

7.3 The relevance of the experience of the SPMT (Section B: 2, Annex 8A)

5.0

The relevance of the experience of the SPMT and aid in implementing the sub-project, as demonstrated through supporting documents and explanations

Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score
	>= 4	3.0	
	3-2	2.0	
	1	1.0	

Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score
	>= 4	2.0	
	3-2	1.0	
	1	0.5	

*For publications, number of papers published in Q1/Q2 and/or WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences, or any peer-reviewed venue indexed in DBLP

7.4 Prior experience of the SPMT (Section B: 1, 2, Annex 8A)

5.0

The prior experience of the SPMT to work with interdisciplinary research/funded projects/international collaboration/ interdisciplinary product/service development, as evidenced by a list of outcomes delivered, supporting documents and explanations

Number of interdisciplinary research/funded projects/international collaboration, interdisciplinary product/service development experience of PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score
	>= 4	3.0	
	3-2	2.0	
	1	1.0	

Number of interdisciplinary research/funded projects/international collaboration, interdisciplinary product/service development experience of Co-PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score
	>= 4	2.0	
	3-2	1.0	
	1	0.5	

8. Collaborating Entity's Strength (Section B: 4, Annex 9, 10)		10.0	
8.1 Experience and Quality of SPMT Member		5.0	
Relevant Experience and quality of the SPMT member from interdisciplinary area in terms of publications, research and development, international visibility, interdisciplinary collaborative research.			
SPMT Member Strength		Allocated score	Awarded score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposed contribution by the SPMT member to the project justified? 		2.0	
Please judge holistically			
Number of papers in internationally recognized venue, patents, books; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc.; Interdisciplinary collaborative research projects experience of Co-PI		Allocated Score	Awarded score
		3.0	
** If one Co-PI is from other university, contribution of this collaborating Co-PI's awarded score to the total Experience and Quality of SPMT Member score will be 40%.**			
8.2 Experience and Capacity of Collaborating Entity		5.0	
Relevant experience, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement and justification of contributions to the project.			
Institutional Strength		Allocated score	Awarded score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience of the entity in working in collaborative research projects, research and development experience relevant to the proposed work, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement 		3.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification of contributions to the project is clearly articulated 		2.0	
** If one Co-PI is from other university, contribution of this collaborating entity's awarded score to the total Experience and Capacity of Collaborating Entity score will be 40%.**			
9. Sustainability (Annex-11)		5.0	
Quality of the sustainability analysis and long-term plan to continue after RDG implementation through measures and budget provisions the entity/university is likely to commit to future progress/ sustain the activities and outcomes after the completion of the sub-project.		5.0	
Total marks		100.0	

Signature of Scrutinizer

Signature of Evaluator

REVIEW COMMENTS

Please give specific and in-depth comments. The comments should be in conformity with the **awarded score**.

Section A

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Section B

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Signature of Evaluator

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh

*Improving Computer and Software Engineering Tertiary
Education Project (ICSETEP)
Research and Development Grant (RDG)*

Area-C (Cutting Edge CSE/IT Research)

Sub-project Proposal Evaluation Form

for

Area Review Panel (ARP) Member

Sub-project No:

Sub-project Title:

Total Marks Given.....

Evaluator*: (Name, position, institution)

.....
.....

Mobile Number.....

Email.....

Signature:

Date:

Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-project proposals for Area-C

*[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below shall be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the sub-project will be considered incomplete. **Please award a score for each item up to two decimal place.** The information within parentheses (..) indicates relevant sections of the SPP Template.*

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Allocated Score	Awarded Score												
1. Clarity and Quality of General Objectives and Specific Objectives	10.0													
<p>1.1 Proposal design (Section A: 1-16) How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to the scope of ICSETEP?</p> <p>The title is concise, meaningful and reflecting the objectives; Motivations are clear; Expected results and outcomes are clear and realistic; Feasibility and potential benefits are stated; Well-articulated novelty/innovativeness; Sound background study reflecting a gap analysis; Scientific quality of technical approach and methodologies; Justified performance indicators and workplan; Justified and realistic budget and procurement plan; Well-designed plan on sustainability ; Reflection of academic scholarship in the proposal</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>	5.0													
<p>1.2 General objectives and specific objectives (Section A: 4) Are the proposal's general objectives, specific objectives and motivation clear, coherent and realistic?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Characteristics of proposed project objectives</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Does the motivation explain why this research is important?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0		• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0		• Does the motivation explain why this research is important?	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0													
• Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0													
• Does the motivation explain why this research is important?	1.0													
2. Background and innovativeness	20.0													
<p>2.1 Background Study, its quality and gap analysis (Section A: 8)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Background Study of the SPP</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Relevance of literature review to the SPP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Identification and analysis of Gaps</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Background Study of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Relevance of literature review to the SPP	5.0		• Identification and analysis of Gaps	3.0		• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality	2.0		10.0	
Background Study of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Relevance of literature review to the SPP	5.0													
• Identification and analysis of Gaps	3.0													
• Structure, Clarity & Citation Quality	2.0													
<p>2.2 Innovation nature (Section A: 7) The innovativeness and novelty of the idea of the proposal</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Innovative nature of the SPP</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-C compared to existing work?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Innovative nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-C compared to existing work?	3.0		• Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0		5.0				
Innovative nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-C compared to existing work?	3.0													
• Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0													

<p>2.3 Impact of the proposed project on the advancement of science and technology (Section A: 7)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 338 1169 461"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 338 887 387">Impact on Science and Technology</th> <th data-bbox="887 338 1043 387">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 338 1169 387">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 387 887 421">• Scientific Contribution by the SPP</td> <td data-bbox="887 387 1043 421">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 387 1169 421"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 421 887 461">• Technological / Practical Impact</td> <td data-bbox="887 421 1043 461">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 421 1169 461"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Impact on Science and Technology	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Scientific Contribution by the SPP	2.5		• Technological / Practical Impact	2.5		5.0				
Impact on Science and Technology	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Scientific Contribution by the SPP	2.5													
• Technological / Practical Impact	2.5													
<p>3. Quality and Clarity of Milestones, Performance Indicators and Log frame</p>	10.0													
<p>3.1 Milestones (Section A: 9, 11 (Annex-1)) To what extent do the described milestones indicate the critical activities, outcomes and expected results considered in the proposal?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 752 1169 943"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 752 900 801">Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators</th> <th data-bbox="900 752 1043 801">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 752 1169 801">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 801 900 875">• Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?</td> <td data-bbox="900 801 1043 875">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 801 1169 875"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 875 900 909">• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?</td> <td data-bbox="900 875 1043 909">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 875 1169 909"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 909 900 943">• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions</td> <td data-bbox="900 909 1043 943">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 909 1169 943"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?	2.0		• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?	2.0		• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project?	2.0													
• Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic?	2.0													
• Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions	1.0													
<p>3.2 Performance Indicators (11 (Annex 1), 12) and Logical Framework (11 (Annex 1)): To what extent is the logical framework relevant to the specific objectives?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 1155 1169 1429"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 1155 911 1229">Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP</th> <th data-bbox="911 1155 1043 1229">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 1155 1169 1229">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1229 911 1328">• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate</td> <td data-bbox="911 1229 1043 1328">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1229 1169 1328"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1328 911 1429">• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate</td> <td data-bbox="911 1328 1043 1429">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1328 1169 1429"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate	2.5		• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate	2.5		5.0				
Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
• Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate	2.5													
• Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate	2.5													
<p>4. Significance with respect to ICSETEP and particular RDG area (Section A: 5)</p>	5.0													
<p>The improvement of the SPP submitting entity's academic institution (e.g., faculty/student involvement in research and project activities to enhance research and skill development) to achieve ICSETEP objectives is justified</p>	5.0													
<p>5. Relevance to the national policy and SDG (Section A: 6)</p>	5.0													
<p>To what extent does the SPP conform to the objectives of the Government's policy and the UN's Sustainable Development Goal?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="97 1883 1169 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 1883 911 1933"></th> <th data-bbox="911 1883 1043 1933">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 1883 1169 1933">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1933 911 2007">▪ Conformity to relevant national policies is mentioned and justified in the SPP</td> <td data-bbox="911 1933 1043 2007">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1933 1169 2007"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 2007 911 2033">▪ Conformity to relevant sustainable development goals is</td> <td data-bbox="911 2007 1043 2033">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 2007 1169 2033"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Conformity to relevant national policies is mentioned and justified in the SPP	2.5		▪ Conformity to relevant sustainable development goals is	2.5		5.0				
	Allocated score	Awarded score												
▪ Conformity to relevant national policies is mentioned and justified in the SPP	2.5													
▪ Conformity to relevant sustainable development goals is	2.5													

mentioned and justified																
6. Justification of the Budget and Expenditure (Section A: 14 & Annex-3, 4)			10.0													
6.1 Budget and financing plan (Section A: 14) The consistency of the proposed investments for all the activities (Annex 2) and the financing plan (Annex 3) with the proposal and whether it leads to the stated specific objectives (Section A: 4) and expected outputs (Section A: 9)			5.0													
6.2 Expenditure (Section A: 14) and procurement plan (Annex 4) The proposed cost for each item of expenditure and procurement plan is rational and justified			5.0													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="81 745 911 797">Quality of expenditure and procurement plan</th> <th data-bbox="911 745 1043 797">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 745 1182 797">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="81 797 911 869">▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified</td> <td data-bbox="911 797 1043 869">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 797 1182 869"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="81 869 911 938">▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified</td> <td data-bbox="911 869 1043 938">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 869 1182 938"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="81 938 911 1003">▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget</td> <td data-bbox="911 938 1043 1003">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1043 938 1182 1003"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified	3.0		▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0		▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget	1.0			
Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score														
▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified	3.0															
▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0															
▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget	1.0															
7. Quality of the Work Plans			15.0													
7.1 Technical Approach and Methodology (Section A: 9, 10) How are the clarity and quality of the technical approach and research methodology? The approach is designed based on an in-depth background study; the proposed technical steps are realistic and achievable within scope and resources; the methodology is scientifically sound and structured; appropriateness of the proposed tools, models, algorithms, or frameworks; strategies for testing, validation, benchmarking, and deliverable outcomes are clear and justified. For TCS, non-triviality, optimality, lower/upper bounds, correctness, potential proof techniques and/or frameworks, etc. are also to be considered for evaluation, as applicable. Please evaluate holistically			10.0													
7.2 Work plan (Section A: 13 (Annex 2)) How are the clarity and quality of the work plan and its relevance to the proposal objectives?																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="81 1832 911 1883">Clarity and quality of the work plan</th> <th data-bbox="911 1832 1043 1883">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1043 1832 1182 1883">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="81 1883 911 1953">▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational</td> <td data-bbox="911 1883 1043 1953">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1883 1182 1953"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="81 1953 911 1989">▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives</td> <td data-bbox="911 1953 1043 1989">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1953 1182 1989"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational	2.5		▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives	2.5						
Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score														
▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational	2.5															
▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives	2.5															

8. Institutional and SPMT Strength	20.0																	
8.1 Institutional Capacity (Section B: 3) How are the fund recipient university and entity going to facilitate the sub project? <table border="1" data-bbox="129 434 1193 622"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="129 434 943 486">Institutional Strength</th> <th data-bbox="943 434 1075 486">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1075 434 1193 486">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 486 943 553"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? </td> <td data-bbox="943 486 1075 553">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1075 486 1193 553"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 553 943 622"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? </td> <td data-bbox="943 553 1075 622">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1075 553 1193 622"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5		5.0								
Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5																	
8.2 Overall Research Strength of SPMT (Section B: 1, Annex 8, 8A) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please evaluate holistically Consider Co-PI(s) from outside the entity, if any, in the overall evaluation <table border="1" data-bbox="185 855 1193 1160"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="185 855 880 922">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI</th> <th data-bbox="880 855 1050 922">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1050 855 1193 922">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="185 855 880 1160"></td> <td data-bbox="880 855 1050 1160">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 855 1193 1160"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="185 1193 1193 1498"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="185 1193 880 1261">Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI</th> <th data-bbox="880 1193 1050 1261">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="1050 1193 1193 1261">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="185 1193 880 1498"></td> <td data-bbox="880 1193 1050 1498">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 1193 1193 1498"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		3.0		Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		2.0		5.0					
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score																
	3.0																	
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score																
	2.0																	
8.3 The relevance of the experience of the SPMT (Section B: 2, Annex 8A) The relevance of the experience of the SPMT and its aid in implementing the sub-project is demonstrated through supporting documents and explanations. Consider Co-PI(s) from outside the entity, if any, in this sub-criteria evaluation <table border="1" data-bbox="129 1749 1139 1921"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="129 1749 643 1809">Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI</th> <th data-bbox="643 1749 812 1809">Number</th> <th data-bbox="812 1749 981 1809">Allocated Score</th> <th data-bbox="981 1749 1139 1809">Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 1749 643 1809"></td> <td data-bbox="643 1749 812 1809">≥ 4</td> <td data-bbox="812 1749 981 1809">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="981 1749 1139 1809"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 1749 643 1809"></td> <td data-bbox="643 1749 812 1809">3-2</td> <td data-bbox="812 1749 981 1809">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="981 1749 1139 1809"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="129 1749 643 1809"></td> <td data-bbox="643 1749 812 1809">1</td> <td data-bbox="812 1749 981 1809">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="981 1749 1139 1809"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		≥ 4	3.0			3-2	2.0			1	1.0		5.0	
Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score															
	≥ 4	3.0																
	3-2	2.0																
	1	1.0																

Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		
	>= 4	2.0			
	3-2	1.0			
	1	0.5			
*For publications, number of papers published in Q1/Q2 and/or WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences, or any peer-reviewed venue indexed in DBLP					
8.4 Prior experience of the SPMT (Section B: 1, 2, Annex 8A)				5.0	
The prior experience of the SPMT working in funded projects, as evidenced by a list of outcomes delivered, supporting documents and explanations					
Consider Co-PI(s) from outside the entity, if any, in this sub-criteria evaluation					
Number of Funded Projects experience of PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score		
	>= 4	3.0			
	3-2	2.0			
	1	1.0			
Number of Funded Projects experience of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Allocated Score		
	>= 4	2.0			
	3-2	1.0			
	1	0.5			
9. Sustainability (Section A: 16, Annex-11)				5.0	
The quality of the sustainability analysis and long-term plan, which outlines measures and budget provisions to continue after RDG implementation, indicates that the entity/university is likely to commit to future progress/ sustain the activities and outcomes after the completion of the sub-project.				5.0	
Total marks				100.0	

Signature of Scrutinizer

Signature of Evaluator

REVIEW COMMENTS

Please give specific and in-depth comments. The comments should be in conformity with the **awarded score**.

Section A

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Section B

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Signature of Evaluator

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh

*Improving Computer and Software Engineering Tertiary
Education Project (ICSETEP)
Research and Development Grant (RDG)*

Area-D (IT Solutions Addressing Disability Issues)

Sub-project Proposal Evaluation Form

for

Area Review Panel (ARP) Member

Sub-project No:

.....

Sub-project Title:

Total Marks Given.....

Evaluator*: (Name, position, institution)

.....

.....

Mobile Number.....

Email.....

Signature:

Date:

Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-project proposals for Area-D

*[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below shall be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the sub-project will be considered incomplete. **Please award a score for each item up to two decimal places.** The information within parentheses (..) indicates relevant sections of the SPP Template.*

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Allocated Score	Awarded Score												
1. Clarity and Quality of General Objectives and Specific Objectives	15.0													
<p>1.1 Proposal design (Section A: 1-16) How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to the scope of ICSETEP?</p> <p>The title is concise, meaningful and reflecting the objectives; Motivations are clear; Expected results and outcomes are clear and realistic; Feasibility and potential benefits are stated; Well-articulated novelty/innovativeness; Sound background study reflecting a gap analysis; Scientific quality of technical approach and methodologies; Justified performance indicators and workplan; Well-explained needs and impact; Justified and realistic budget and procurement plan; Well-designed plan on sustainability; Reflection of academic scholarship in the proposal</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p>	5.0													
<p>1.2 Objectives and specific objectives (Section A: 4) Are the proposal's general objectives, specific objectives and motivation clear, coherent and realistic?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Characteristics of proposed project objectives</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on disability issues?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score	● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0		● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0		● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on disability issues?	1.0		5.0	
Characteristics of proposed project objectives	Allocated score	Awarded score												
● Are all objectives specific, clear and achievable?	2.0													
● Are the specific objectives clear and coherent?	2.0													
● Does the motivation explain why this research is important and relevant, focusing on disability issues?	1.0													
<p>1.3 Innovation nature (Section A: 7) To what extent does the proposal reflect the innovativeness of the idea?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Innovation nature of the SPP</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocated score</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-D compared to existing work?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-D compared to existing work?	3.0		● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0		5.0				
Innovation nature of the SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score												
● Does the proposal demonstrate clear novelty and originality in Area-D compared to existing work?	3.0													
● Does the proposal reflect creativity in problem framing and proposed solutions?	2.0													

2. Quality and Clarity of Milestones, Performance Indicators and Log frame	10.0																
2.1 Milestones (Section A: 6, 12 (Annex-1)) To what extent do the described milestones indicate the key activities, deliverable outcomes and expected results considered in the proposal?	5.0																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 421 914 465">Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators</th> <th data-bbox="914 421 1050 465">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1050 421 1185 465">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 465 914 533"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? </td> <td data-bbox="914 465 1050 533">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 465 1185 533"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 533 914 566"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? </td> <td data-bbox="914 533 1050 566">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 533 1185 566"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 566 914 611"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions </td> <td data-bbox="914 566 1050 611">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 566 1185 611"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? 	2.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? 	2.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions 	1.0						
Characteristics of stated milestones and indicators	Allocated score	Awarded score															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do milestones for all major phases, achievements and expected results conform to all objectives of the project? 	2.0																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are deliverable outcomes achievable and realistic? 	2.0																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows verification methods and meaningful assumptions 	1.0																
2.2 Performance Indicators (12 (Annex 1)) and Logical Framework (13, (Annex 1)): To what extent is the logical framework relevant to the specific objectives?	5.0																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 779 914 846">Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP</th> <th data-bbox="914 779 1050 846">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1050 779 1185 846">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 846 914 947"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate </td> <td data-bbox="914 846 1050 947">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1050 846 1185 947"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 947 914 1048"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate </td> <td data-bbox="914 947 1050 1048">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1050 947 1185 1048"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate 	2.5									
Quality of the Performance Indicators and Logical Framework of the proposed SPP	Allocated score	Awarded score															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal, purpose, output, activities/inputs in the log frame are clear and coherent. The mapping with indicators, means of verification and assumptions is appropriate 	2.5																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are aligned with specific objectives, and the calculation method, verification method, and assumptions are appropriate 	2.5																
3. Significance with respect to ICSETEP and particular RDG area (Section A: 5)	5.0																
To what extent does the SPP contribute to the objectives of ICSETEP, aligned with relevant national policy and the UN's Sustainable Development Goal?	5.0																
4. Expected Benefits: Background Study, Need and Impact Analysis (Section A: 6, 8 and 9)	10.0																
The Background Study, the need analysis of the targeted people and expected benefits/impacts on the quality of their life	10.0																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="92 1518 914 1574">Background Study, Need and Impact Analysis</th> <th data-bbox="914 1518 1050 1574">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1050 1518 1185 1574">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1574 914 1641"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality, depth, and relevance of the literature/background work are mentioned (Section A: 8) </td> <td data-bbox="914 1574 1050 1641">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 1574 1185 1641"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1641 914 1742"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effectively are the needs of the targeted people assessed? Are data or evidence, social, or contextual factors considered? (Section A: 9) </td> <td data-bbox="914 1641 1050 1742">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 1641 1185 1742"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1742 914 1843"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How clearly and realistically are the expected benefits described? Are potential positive changes in quality of life specified and measurable? (Section A: 6 & 9) </td> <td data-bbox="914 1742 1050 1843">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 1742 1185 1843"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="92 1843 914 1944"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the section logically organized, well-written, and does it connect background, needs, and benefits/impacts smoothly? </td> <td data-bbox="914 1843 1050 1944">1.0</td> <td data-bbox="1050 1843 1185 1944"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Background Study, Need and Impact Analysis	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality, depth, and relevance of the literature/background work are mentioned (Section A: 8) 	3.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effectively are the needs of the targeted people assessed? Are data or evidence, social, or contextual factors considered? (Section A: 9) 	3.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How clearly and realistically are the expected benefits described? Are potential positive changes in quality of life specified and measurable? (Section A: 6 & 9) 	3.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the section logically organized, well-written, and does it connect background, needs, and benefits/impacts smoothly? 	1.0			
Background Study, Need and Impact Analysis	Allocated score	Awarded score															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality, depth, and relevance of the literature/background work are mentioned (Section A: 8) 	3.0																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effectively are the needs of the targeted people assessed? Are data or evidence, social, or contextual factors considered? (Section A: 9) 	3.0																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How clearly and realistically are the expected benefits described? Are potential positive changes in quality of life specified and measurable? (Section A: 6 & 9) 	3.0																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the section logically organized, well-written, and does it connect background, needs, and benefits/impacts smoothly? 	1.0																

5. Justification of the Budget and Expenditure (Section A: 15 & Annex-3, 4)		10.0													
5.1 Budget and financing plan (Section A: 14) The consistency of the proposed investments for all the activities (Annex 2) and the financing plan (Annex 3) with the proposal and whether it leads to the stated specific objectives (Section A: 4) and expected outputs (Section A: 6)		5.0													
5.2 Expenditure (Section A: 15) and procurement plan (Annex 4) The proposed cost for each item of expenditure and procurement plan is rational and justified		5.0													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quality of expenditure and procurement plan</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified	3.0		▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0		▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget	1.0			
Quality of expenditure and procurement plan	Allocated score	Awarded score													
▪ Units/quantity of items, as well as cost/expenditure included in the budget, are balanced and justified	3.0														
▪ Required goods, works, and services included in the procurement plan are rational and justified	1.0														
▪ Funds required for all items to be procured are allocated in the budget	1.0														
6. Quality of the Work Plans		15.0													
6.1 Work plan (Section A: 14 (Annex 2)) How are the clarity and quality of the work plan and its relevance to the proposal objectives?		5.0													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Clarity and quality of the work plan</th> <th>Allocated score</th> <th>Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational	2.5		▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives	2.5						
Clarity and quality of the work plan	Allocated score	Awarded score													
▪ Work plan includes all activities of the log frame, and the sequence and duration of activities are rational	2.5														
▪ The work plan is relevant to the proposal objectives	2.5														
6.2 Technical Approach and Methodology (Section A: 10) How are the clarity and quality of the technical approach and research methodology? The approach is designed based on an in-depth background study; the proposed technical steps are realistic and achievable within scope and resources; the methodology is scientifically sound and structured; appropriateness of the proposed tools, models, algorithms, or frameworks; strategies for testing, validation, benchmarking, and measuring outcomes are clear and justified. Please evaluate holistically		5.0													

<p>6.3 Rollout plan (Section A: 11)</p> <p>The measurement of the rollout plan of the proposed research to achieve the objectives</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="124 376 1189 633"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="124 376 922 427">The measurement of the rollout plan</th> <th data-bbox="922 376 1066 427">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1066 376 1189 427">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="124 427 922 562"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the plan to roll out the research phases clearly described (timeline, steps, system development plan, clear performance indicators to track progress and success at each stage of the rollout)? </td> <td data-bbox="922 427 1066 562">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1066 427 1189 562"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="124 562 922 633"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the rollout activities directly support the specific objectives? </td> <td data-bbox="922 562 1066 633">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="1066 562 1189 633"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	The measurement of the rollout plan	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the plan to roll out the research phases clearly described (timeline, steps, system development plan, clear performance indicators to track progress and success at each stage of the rollout)? 	3.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the rollout activities directly support the specific objectives? 	2.0		5.0	
The measurement of the rollout plan	Allocated score	Awarded score									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the plan to roll out the research phases clearly described (timeline, steps, system development plan, clear performance indicators to track progress and success at each stage of the rollout)? 	3.0										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the rollout activities directly support the specific objectives? 	2.0										
<p>7. Institutional and SPMT Strength</p>		20.0									
<p>7.1 Institutional Capacity (Section B: 3)</p> <p>How are the fund recipient university and entity going to facilitate the sub project?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="124 853 1189 1043"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="124 853 935 904">Institutional Strength</th> <th data-bbox="935 853 1066 904">Allocated score</th> <th data-bbox="1066 853 1189 904">Awarded score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="124 904 935 972"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? </td> <td data-bbox="935 904 1066 972">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1066 904 1189 972"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="124 972 935 1043"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? </td> <td data-bbox="935 972 1066 1043">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1066 972 1189 1043"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5		5.0	
Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the university facilitate research, development and innovation? 	2.5										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are the arrangements for engagement in the proposal for efficient implementation? 	2.5										
<p>7.2 Overall Research Strength of SPMT (Section B: 1, Annex 8, 8A)</p> <p>Please evaluate holistically</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="178 1240 1189 1883"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="178 1240 874 1543"> Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI </td> <td data-bbox="874 1240 1043 1543"> Allocated Score 3.0 </td> <td data-bbox="1043 1240 1189 1543"> Awarded score </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="178 1576 874 1883"> Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI </td> <td data-bbox="874 1576 1043 1883"> Allocated Score 2.0 </td> <td data-bbox="1043 1576 1189 1883"> Awarded score </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score 3.0	Awarded score	Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score 2.0	Awarded score	5.0				
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of PI	Allocated Score 3.0	Awarded score									
Number of papers (published in WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences), patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc. of Co-PI	Allocated Score 2.0	Awarded score									
<p>7.3 The relevance of the experience of the SPMT (Section B: 2, Annex 8A)</p> <p>The relevance of the experience of the SPMT and its aid in implementing the</p>	5.0										

sub-project is demonstrated through supporting documents and explanations.																																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 4	3.0			3-2	2.0			1	1.0																			
Relevant Publications*/Projects of PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																																
	>= 4	3.0																																	
	3-2	2.0																																	
	1	1.0																																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 4	2.0			3-2	1.0			1	0.5																			
Relevant Publications*/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																																
	>= 4	2.0																																	
	3-2	1.0																																	
	1	0.5																																	
*For publications, number of papers published in Q1/Q2 and/or WoS-indexed journals (Clarivate), Core ranked conferences, or any peer-reviewed venue indexed in DBLP																																			
7.4 Prior experience of the SPMT (Section B: 1, 2, Annex 8A) <p>The prior experience of the SPMT to work with NGO/ Hospitals in disability issues / in funded projects, as evidenced by a list of outcomes delivered, supporting documents and explanations</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>3.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the Co-PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score		>= 4	3.0			3-2	2.0			1	1.0		Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Allocated Score		>= 4	2.0			3-2	1.0			1	0.5		5.0	
Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the PI	Number	Awarded Score	Allocated Score																																
	>= 4	3.0																																	
	3-2	2.0																																	
	1	1.0																																	
Number of Funded Projects on disability issues experienced by the Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Allocated Score																																
	>= 4	2.0																																	
	3-2	1.0																																	
	1	0.5																																	
8. Participating Entity's SPMT Strength (Section B: 4, Annex 9, 10)		10.0																																	
8.1 Experience and Quality of SPMT Member <p>Relevant Experience and quality of the SPMT member as Co-PI from participating entity (Institutes/ Schools/ NGO/ Hospitals, etc.) in terms of product/service design/development, publications, years of experience in respective organizations, academic qualification</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of products/services designed/developed, projects completed, publications, etc. of the SPMT member as Co-PI</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 10</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>6-9</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3-5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Years of experience in the organization</th> <th>Years</th> <th>Allocated Score</th> <th>Awarded Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>>= 8</td> <td>2.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>4 to 7</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of products/services designed/developed, projects completed, publications, etc. of the SPMT member as Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 10	2.0			6-9	1.0			3-5	0.5		Years of experience in the organization	Years	Allocated Score	Awarded Score		>= 8	2.0			4 to 7	1.0		5.0					
Number of products/services designed/developed, projects completed, publications, etc. of the SPMT member as Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																																
	>= 10	2.0																																	
	6-9	1.0																																	
	3-5	0.5																																	
Years of experience in the organization	Years	Allocated Score	Awarded Score																																
	>= 8	2.0																																	
	4 to 7	1.0																																	

Academic Qualification	Degree	Score		
	Postgraduate	1.0		
	Undergraduate	0.5		
For Co-PI from universities:				
Number of papers in reputable indexed journals/conferences, patents, books, RFC; Experience in student's research supervision; Experience in funded research projects; National/international awards in R&D; International visibility in terms of journal/conference editorial board/committee, international standardization, thesis/exam evaluator of students in foreign universities, etc.; of Co-PI	Allocated Score	Awarded score		
	3.0			
Relevant Publications/Projects of Co-PI	Number	Allocated Score	Awarded Score	
	≥ 4	2.0		
	3-2	1.0		
	1	0.5		
** If one Co-PI is from university, contribution of this collaborating Co-PI's awarded score to the total Experience and Quality of SPMT Member score will be 40%.**				
8.2 Experience and Capacity of Participating Entity (applicable to Institutes/ Schools/ NGO/ Hospitals, etc. /universities as participating entity)			5.0	
Relevant experience, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement and justification of contributions to the project.				
Institutional Strength	Allocated score	Awarded score		
● Relevant experience, facility and capacity of the collaborating entity to perform the partnership engagement	3.0			
● Justification of contributions to the project is clearly articulated	2.0			
** If one Co-PI is from university, contribution of this collaborating entity's awarded score to the total Experience and Capacity of Participating Entity score will be 40%.**				
9. Sustainability (Section A:16, Annex-11)			5.0	
Quality of the sustainability analysis and long-term plan to continue after RDG implementation through measures and budget provisions the entity/university is likely to commit to future progress/ sustain the activities and outcomes after the completion of the sub-project.			5.0	
Total marks			100.0	

Signature of Scrutinizer

Signature of Evaluator

REVIEW COMMENTS

Please give specific and in-depth comments. The comments should be in conformity with the **awarded score**.

Section A

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Section B

Strengths of the SPP
Weaknesses of the SPP
Justification of overall assessment
Any other comments

Signature of Evaluator