

**GUIDELINES TO THE REVIEWERS
FOR
REVIEW OF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROPOSALS**

Please note that the suggested criteria are meant for guidance only and you may choose additional or any other factors for a better assessment of the Technology Support Proposal. If so, please specify those factors.

I. Principal Investigator (PI) & Industrial Partner:

PI & Industrial partner are the key persons responsible for implementing the research project and to ensure its completion within the stipulated duration by achieving all the stated objectives and goals of the research proposal. Therefore, the success of the research project depends upon the intellectual and managerial skills of the PI & industrial partner. Please assess the PI & industrial partner in terms of;

- Academic qualifications
- Expertise with relevance to the proposed research commercialization
- Professional experience
- Productivity in terms of number and quality of industrial applications of research done so far

II. Proposed goals/objectives:

The goals are all or some of the following:

- Relevance to major / minor industry
- Towards development of a product/process
- To improve an existing product/process
- To help reduce imports/ increase export
- To provide a substitute for an imported product/process
- To remove a technological difficulty or to provide an indigenous solution to technological problem
- Will the end-user / partner industry benefit from the proposed research?
- Is the partner industry willing to cooperate actively and promises to use the output (product/process)?

III. Background to the Research Problems to be addressed & research plan:

- Are the proposed solutions, developed product and/or process well related to the needs of the beneficiary industry?
- **Proposed Research/Business Plan:** Is technically feasible, otherwise doable in Pakistan and lead to achievement of objectives?

IV. Budget:

- Reasonability of request in various categories vis-à-vis justification provided – Is it convincing?

V. Institutional Facilities:

- How do they correlate to the proposed work? Is the requisites infrastructures available at the participating institutions?

VI. Impact:

- Will the research results be applicable to other industries or institutions?

REVIEW REPORT**(To be completed by the Reviewer)****1. Whether Proposal clearly states the following? (Mark the relevant)**

- a. Prototype development which with little effort can be easily transformed into commercializable product
- b. Product development which can easily be commercialized by partner
- c. Process optimization which can easily be opted by partner industry for cost saving, enhancing quality & efficiency and maximizing production

1. Project Title:**2. Name of the Principal Investigator:****3. Name of the University/Department:****4. Name of Co-Principal Investigator****5. Name of the Industry/Department****6. Name of the Reviewer****7a. Weightage Table**

Description	Total Weightage	Score Obtained	Comments, if any
I. Principal Investigator: qualification; expertise; professional experience towards applied research; any NDA or MTA signed or License given to industry, Patents if any etc.	25		
II. Industrial partner expertise; professional experience; Industry R&D experience ,patents (if any) etc.	15		
III. Proposed Goals/ Objectives. How well are the goals conceived realistic and doable?	15		
IV. Background to and review of the Research Problem, market survey and proposed Business plan	15		
V. Budget reasonability and justification	10		
VI. Institutional facilities with both parties.	10		
VII. Impact	10		
Total:	100		

7b Grading of Weightage Score:

Please tick the relevant box

- 70 or more.....Business Research proposal considered RECOMMENDED
- <70 to 60Business Research proposal recommended with minor revision
- <60 to 50.....Business Research proposal considered NOT RECOMMENDED

8. Review of budget estimates:

Cost Estimates	Proposed	Recommended	Reasons for amendments, if any
I. Salaries & Allowances			
II. Permanent Equipment for prototype development			
III. Expendable supplies			
IV. Others D1: Literature, documentation, information etc D2: Local travel D3. Unforeseen/ miscellaneous			
V. Indirect Cost			
VI. Audit/Accountant Fee (As per HEC Policy)			
VII. Indirect cost @ 2% (As per HEC policy) /15% for notifiedORICs			
VIII. Patent Filing Fee			
IX. Local Travel Seminars, Workshops, symposium			

9. Recommendations:

A. if recommended give a brief justification:

B. if not recommended, give reasons:

C. If proposal referred back with minor revisions to make it improved before final award:

Undertaking:

I _____ confirm that the content of progress report evaluated will not use, reproduce or refer at any forum (academic, non-academic and social media).

Dated: _____ Signature _____

Phone: _____

Mobile: _____ Name & designation: _____

Email: _____ Address (where review fee check can be delivered):
