ANNEX 4:

PEER REVIEW PRO-FORMA FOR FPP

NARDF Reference Code :

# *CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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***

NARDF Reference Code :

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Is it technically feasible? How is it justified? Is the proposed methodology multi-disciplinary and participatory, involving end-users as well as scientists and extension/development workers, and is there collaboration between institutions and organizations? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **20** |
| 2. Is there a clear indication that the proposal has been developed based on needs and client demand? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **15** |
| 3. Is it shown how technologies (outputs) 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** |
| Will the proposed outputs address the government's targets of rural poverty reduction? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **10** |
| 5. Have the social inclusiveness and different gender roles of farmers been considered in the design of the work? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **10** |
| 6. Have environmental issues, both positive and negative, been addressed in the design of the proposal? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **5** |
| 7. Is the project activities appropriate and cost effective? Has the budget for project activities been kept realistic and justifiable? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **20** |
| 8. Can the project be completed in the proposed time (maximum 3 years) given the resources available and nature of the proposal? |  |
| Comment: |
|  | **5** |

Signature: Date:

***CONFIDENTIAL not for Applicant***

# Summary of evaluation

NARDF Reference Code :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Score** | **Project Score** |
| 1. Is it technically feasible? How is it justified? Is the proposed methodology multi-disciplinary and participatory, involving end-users as well as scientists and extension/development workers, and is there collaboration between institutions and organizations? | 20 |  |
| 2. Is there a clear indication that the proposal has been developed based on needs and client demand? | 15 |  |
| 3. Is it shown how technologies (outputs) 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 targets of rural poverty reduction? | 10 |  |
| 5. Have the social inclusiveness and different gender roles of farmers been considered in the design of the work? | 10 |  |
| 6. Have environmental issues, both positive and negative, been addressed in the design of the proposal? | 5 |  |
| 7. Is the project activities appropriate and cost effective? Has the budget for project activities been kept realistic and justifiable? | 20 |  |
| 8. Can the project be completed in the proposed time (maximum 3 years) given the resources available and nature of the proposal? | 5 |  |
| **Total** | 100 |  |

Signature: Date:

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

**Results of the Evaluation:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RESULTS  | Please tick (**√**) 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 TitleNARDF Reference Code : |  |

# Information to be passed to the Applicant

# Please tick (√ ) one

**1. For Projects accepted with minor or moderate amendments**

Reasons for recommendation:

a.

b.

c.

* 1. Suggestions for improvement :

a.

b.

c.

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

a.

b.

c.

**[Please sign BACK of this page]**