ANNEX 3:

 PEER REVIEW PRO-FORMA FOR PCN

***CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant***

NARDEF Reference Code:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Proposal [as it appears on the proposal]** |  |
| **Name of reviewer** |  |
| **Date Sent to reviewer** |  |
| **Date returned from reviewer** |  |

**ANONYMITY**

**Please choose (√) one from the following:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **I know the identity** of the proponent of this proposal |  | Please return the proposal to NARDF Secretariat without peer review |
|  | **The proponent approached me** |  |
|  | **I do not know the identity** of the proponent of this proposal |  | Please proceed for the peer review of the proposal |

Declaration:

I, ................................................. (Name) declare hereby that I do not know the identity of the proponent of this proposal.

Signature

Date

Not for Reviewers:

Reviewer's Code

***CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Is the project justifiable and demand driven in addressing the research/ development opportunities? Is the background information for the justification to implement the project sufficient?NARDEF Reference Code: |  |
| Comment:  |
|  | 15 |
| 2. Is it technically feasible, if yes, is the proposed methodology multi- disciplinary and participatory, involving end-users as well as scientist and extension/development workers, and is there collaboration between institution and organization? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | 20 |
| 3. Is it shown how technologies (output) developed by the work will be made available to a larger client audience (up-scaling), and has consideration been given to the cost of this? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | 15 |
| 4. Will the proposed outputs address the government’s policy of agricultural commercialization, rural poverty reduction and improvement in livelihood? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | 10 |
| 5. Have the different gender roles of farmers been considered in the design of the work? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | 15 |
| 6. Is the project cost effective? Has the budget for project activities been kept realistic and justifiable? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | 20 |
| 7. Can the work proposed be completed in the time available (maximum of 3 years) given the resources available and nature of the proposal? |  |
| Comment: |  |
|  | 5 |

Signature

Date

# *CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant*

# Summary of evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Score** | **Project Score** |
| 1. Is the project justifiable and demand driven in addressing the research/development opportunities? Is the background information for the justification to implement the project sufficient? | 15 |  |
| 2. Is it technically feasible, if yes, is the proposed methodology multi-disciplinary and participatory, involving end-users as well as scientist and extension/development workers, and is there collaboration between institution and organization? | 20 |  |
| 3. Is it shown how technologies (output) developed by the work will be made available to a larger client audience (up-scaling), and has consideration been given to the cost of this? | 15 |  |
| 4. Will the proposed outputs address the government’s policy of agricultural commercialization, rural poverty reduction and improvement in livelihood? | 10 |  |
| 5. Have the different gender roles of farmers been considered in the design of the work? | 15 |  |
| 6. Is the project cost effective? Has the budget for project activities been kept realistic and justifiable? | 20 |  |
| 7. Can the work proposed be completed in the time available (maximum of 3 years) given the resources available and nature of the proposal? | 5 |  |
| Total: | 100 |  |
| Rating: |  |  |

Signature

Date

# *CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant*

**(Rating in and Numbering System)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.N.** | **Marks Obtained** | **Rating Base** | **Rating** |
| 1. | 80 or above | Minimum amendment | A |
| 2. | 60 to below 80 | Moderate amendment | B |
| 3. | Below 60 | Rejected | C |

NOTE: The reason of rating should be described on result of evaluation sheet.

# RESULTS OF EVALUATION

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Result** |  | **Rating****(√ One)** | **Reasons** |
| A) Can be accepted with  | minor amendments |  |  |
| B) Can be accepted with  | moderate amendments |  |
| C) Rejected |  |  |

Signature

Date

# Evaluation report to the applicant

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title |  |

# Information to be passed to the Applicant

### For Projects accepted with minor or moderate amendments (Please Tick One)

###

### Reasons for recommendation

a.

b.

c.

**Suggestions for improvement**

a.

b.

c.

### For rejected projects give reasons/base for such rejection

a.

b.

c.

 [Please Sign on the Back of this Page]