|  |
| --- |
| **INTERNAL EVALUATION FORM****MRUN Research Officer Grant Scheme (MROGS)**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment is based on the marking scale below:** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Poor** | **Poor** | **Acceptable** | **Good** | **Very Good** |
| **1 - 2** | **3 - 4** | **5 - 6** | **7 - 8** | **9 - 10** |

**Evaluation of proposal**

The purpose of the evaluation is to ensure the quality of the proposals in relation to the objectives and priorities set forth in the guideline. The evaluation covers the relevance and consistency with the Scheme, quality, and expected impact.

All proposals will be evaluated based on sections and subsections of the scoring grid at a scale of 1- 10 (1= very poor and 10 =excellent).

All proposals will be ranked according to their total score. The highest scoring applications will be provisionally selected and decisions will be made according to the availability of funds.

An award letter will be sent to the lead applicant of the successful application. It is the responsibility of the lead applicant to respond to the acceptance letter and return to the Secretariat by the time frame specified in the award letter. Any delay in returning the acceptance letter shall be considered giving up of the award.

Any rejected award will be replaced by the next best placed application on the reserve list that falls within the available budget for this call for proposals.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Description** | **Score** | **Panel Score** |
| **1.0** | **Relevance of the Scheme** | **15** |  |
| 1.1 | How relevant is the proposal’s objectives/aims to the objectives and priorities of the Scheme? | 5 |  |
| 1.2 | How relevant is the proposal to the national/regional needs? | 5 |  |
| 1.3 | Does the proposal indicate the expected results to be achieved? | 2 |  |
| 1.4 | Are the expected results of the project aligned with the objectives and priorities of the Scheme? | 3 |  |
| **2.0** | **The proposal** | **55** |  |
| 2.1 | Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the envisaged outputs and outcome(s)?  | 10 |  |
| 2.2 | Does the proposal include credible baseline, targets and sources of verification? | 10 |  |
| 2.3 | Does the proposed activities logic explain the rationale to achieve the expected results? | 10 |  |
| 2.4 | Does the design reflect a robust analysis of the problems involved, and the capacities of the relevant stakeholders (if related)? | 10 |  |
| 2.5 | Is the implementation plan (specified in Gantt chart) clear and feasible? | 10 |  |
| 2.6 | Is the timeline realistic? | 5 |  |
| **3.0** | **Impact**  | **15** |  |
| 3.1 | Does the proposal include a plausible pathway to impact the proposed project? | 5 |  |
| 3.2 | Is the plausible pathway to impact clear and sensible? | 10 |  |
| **4.0** | **Budget** | **15** |  |
| 4.1 | Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget? | 10 |  |
| 4.2 | Is the estimated cost reasonable? | 5 |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Possible Research Output (Please Tick)** |
| **Novel theories/ New discoveries** | **Research Publication** | **IPR** |  **Research Collaboration**  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Please comment on the following:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Criterion** | **Comments** |
| 1. | Strength of Research Proposal |  |
| 2. | Weakness of Research Proposal |  |
| 3. | Others |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **RECOMMENDATION** |
|  **Recommended** **Not Recommended**Name of Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |