



EVALUATION RUBRICS FOR HIGH LEVEL EXPERT PANEL REVIEW GRAND CHALLENGE FUND (GCF)

Presentation of Research Proposals under the **Grand Challenge Fund (GCF)** by the Principal Investigator(s) along with research team and institutional leadership will be assessed by the High level expert panel based on the following **Evaluation Criteria**. The panel will comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal against each criteria and assign score on the basis of **Grading Scale**. An overall score will also be assigned to the application on the grading scale:

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria for Evaluation	Weightage	Score on Grading Scale (1-7)
Project Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Principal Investigator suitably qualified and motivated to lead a large scale GCF project? • Does the Principal Investigator have the requisite understanding of the various project elements (both technical and non-technical) to effectively lead implementation? • Has the PI made an effort to bring onboard individuals with critical and necessary expertise needed to successfully implement and deliver impact? • Are the partners supportive of the project leadership? • Is the project management plan reasonable and clearly delineated? 	20	
Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed GCF project have the physical resources – laboratories, computational resources, library resources, etc. – necessary to undertake its research plan? • Does the proposed GCF project have a convincing plan to procure new equipment, materials and other items necessary to complete the proposed workplan? • Are there any critical weaknesses in the project team or implementation plan that will jeopardise the ability to deliver the national impact? • Does the proposed GCF project have a convincing plan to work with partners to ensure access to necessary resources? 	10	
Institutional Capacity to Implement GCF Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the institution have a record of achievement in supporting large project awards? Does the institution have effective policies and practices in place to manage large awards? • Do the project leadership and institution have an adequate understanding of potential risks, and a management strategy to mitigate issues that may arise? • Does the project team have the personnel (and support) capacity to implement the proposed GCF research program? • Will the project team be able to achieve the proposed project outcomes in a timely manner? 	10	

GCF Project Vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the High Level Expert Panel presentation inspire confidence in the vision for the proposed GCF project? • Do all project participants – institutional leadership, faculty, partners - support the vision of the proposed GCF project? • Does the vision include a viable plan to make a significant contribution to the Priority Thematic Area and Pakistan socioeconomic development? • Does the project explicitly address a large problem and with a large potential impact of National Importance. 	15	
Relevance to Priority Thematic Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal present a compelling case for the research plan to address the Priority Thematic Area? • Are the identified aspects of the Priority Thematic Area significant and important enough to merit a GCF award? • Does the proposal carefully discuss and take into account the non-scientific stakeholders, bottlenecks, and goals and plan for subsequent take up and deployment? 	20	
Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal describe an integrated research plan to address particular aspects of the Priority Thematic Area? • Is the proposed research plan consistent with a large scale GCF Project? • What is the scientific merit of the proposed research? 	25	

Grading Scale

Grading Scale	Description
7- Outstanding	Exceptionally strong proposal with negligible weaknesses
6-Excellent	Very strong proposal with negligible weaknesses
5-Very Good	Very strong Proposal with minor weaknesses
4-Good	Strong proposal with minor weaknesses
3-Average	Proposal having some strengths but moderate weaknesses
2-Weak	Proposal having few strengths with major weaknesses
1-Poor	Proposal having very few strengths with numerous major weaknesses