



PHASE 3: 3.3

Comprehensive Grant Application Assessment Matrix

December 2024

Revised on January 15, 2025

1. Comprehensive Grant Applications

Category	Criteria Description	Weight (%)
Problem Definition	The industry problem is clearly defined, significant, and supported by evidence.	10
Proposed Solution	The proposed solution is well-articulated, innovative, and addresses the identified industry problem effectively.	15
Feasibility and Methodology	The project methodology is sound, technically feasible, and achievable within the 12-month timeframe.	10
Industry Impact	The project provides clear and measurable benefits to the industry, such as economic value, efficiencies, or safety improvements.	10
Innovation and Transformation Potential	The solution demonstrates potential for significant industry transformation or innovation.	10
Sustainability and Ethical Impact	The project aligns with SDGs and promotes sustainable and ethical industry practices.	10
High-Skilled Job Opportunities	The project outlines clear opportunities for future high-skilled job creation within the industry.	5
Future Research and Curriculum Impact	The project will impact future research, curriculum design, or industry engagement strategies.	5
Team Capability and Collaboration	The project team (industry and academic partners) demonstrates the expertise, experience, and collaboration required to execute the project successfully.	10
Budget and Value for Money	The budget is detailed, justified, and demonstrates cost-efficiency and value for money.	5
Risk Assessment and Mitigation	Risks are identified, and robust mitigation strategies are provided.	5
Compliance and Ethical Considerations	The project complies with all ethical guidelines, legal requirements, and conflict of interest policies.	5

Note: 1. This is an indicative assessment matrix which may be revised subject to the approval of the NPD

2. The weight assigned for different categories will be subdivided by the experts of the review panel for objective evaluation

2. Scoring Guidelines

Score	Grade	Description
1 - 3	Poor	Criterion is poorly addressed or lacks essential details, clarity, depth or supporting evidence
4– 6	Good	Criterion is adequately addressed with some supporting evidence but lacks comprehensive detail
7 - 8	Very Good	Criterion is well-addressed with clear details and relevant evidence
9 - 10	Excellent	Criterion is comprehensively addressed with strong evidence, innovation, and clarity

3. Additional Evaluation Considerations

- (a) Overall Strategic Fit:
How well does the project align with the strategic goals of the BIRDI Grants program (High growth aspiration of the country, sustainability, innovation)?
- (b) Reviewer Consensus:
After individual scoring, the expert review panel should hold a consensus meeting to discuss scores and resolve discrepancies.
- (c) Conflict of Interest Management:
Ensure that no expert review panel member with a conflict of interest scores or comments on relevant applications.

4. Assessment Process Flow

- (a) Step 1: Initial Review
Each expert review panel member reviews and scores applications independently using the matrix.
- (b) Step 2: Consolidation
Scores are consolidated, and average scores for each criterion are calculated.
- (c) Step 3: Panel Discussion
Expert review panel meets to discuss applications, address discrepancies, and finalize scores.
- (d) Step 4: Ranking
Applications are ranked based on their total scores.
- (e) Step 5: Final Selection
Top-ranked applications are reviewed for final selection, ensuring alignment with strategic goals and budget constraints.
- (f) Step 6: Recommendations
Final recommendations are presented to the SDCMU, SICIP.