DHANALAKSHMI SRINIVASAN
INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
(Deemed to be University under section 3 of UGC Act, 1956.)
PERAMBALUR – 621 212, TAMIL NADU, INDIA.

CENTRE FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (CRI)

SEED MONEY, RESEARCH, INNOVATION & INCUBATION SUPPORT SCHEME - 2026

PROJECT EVALUATION / REVIEW FORM

(For Department Screening, Technical Review, External Expert Review and Committee Recommendation)

A. APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION

Application No.		**Date of Review**	
Project Title		**Funding Category**	
Principal Investigator		**Department / School**	
Requested Amount (₹)		**Project Duration**	
Current TRL		**Target TRL**	

B. REVIEWER DETAILS

1. Reviewer Name: _____

2. Designation / Department / Organisation: _____

4. Date of Review: _____

3. Reviewer Type: ☐ Department / School Reviewer ☐ Technical & Research Committee ☐ External Expert ☐ Research & Innovation Committee ☐ Other: _____

Conflict of Interest: ☐ No conflict ☐ Conflict exists — Details: _____

C. ELIGIBILITY & COMPLETENESS SCREENING

Check	Yes	No	Remarks
Applicant eligibility satisfied	☐	☐	
Project within Scheme scope / priority areas	☐	☐	

Application complete	☐	☐	
Budget and justification provided	☐	☐	
Required approvals / clearances identified	☐	☐	
Team / mentor details adequate	☐	☐	
Previous institutional obligations clear, where applicable	☐	☐	
IP / prior-art information provided, where applicable	☐	☐	

D. TECHNICAL / RESEARCH EVALUATION — 100 MARKS

Score each criterion using the maximum marks specified in the DSIRT policy and provide evidence-based comments.

S.No	Evaluation Criterion	Max. Marks	Score	Reviewer Comments / Evidence
1	Scientific / Technical Merit	15		
2	Novelty & Innovation	15		
3	Problem Significance	10		
4	Methodology	10		
5	Feasibility	10		
6	PI / Team Competence	10		
7	Expected Research Outputs	10		
8	IP / Prototype Potential	5		
9	External Funding Potential	5		
10	Industry / Societal Impact	5		
11	Budget Justification	5		
TOTAL		**100**		

E. QUALITATIVE REVIEW

Area	Assessment	Comments / Required Clarification
Scientific / Technical Quality	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Novelty / Innovation	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Problem Significance	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Methodology	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Feasibility	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Team Competence	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Expected Outputs	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Translation Potential	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	
Budget & Value for Money	☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Adequate ☐ Weak	

F. MILESTONE & IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT

Milestone	Expected Stage	Evidence / Deliverable	Adequacy	Comments
M1	Project initiation	Approved procurement / initiation plan	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	
M2	Preliminary data	Preliminary data / baseline evidence	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	
M3	Proof of concept	PoC / technical validation	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	

M4	Prototype / MVP	Prototype, MVP or field validation	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	
M5	IPR / Publication / External Proposal	IP / publication / external proposal evidence	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	
M6	Final Outcome	Final technical & financial closure	☐ Adequate ☐ Revise	

G. BUDGET REVIEW

Verify that costs are necessary, justified and linked to objectives and milestones. Flag prohibited or unrelated expenditure.

Budget Head	Requested (₹)	Recommended (₹)	Decision	Remarks
Equipment			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Consumables			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Prototype / Fabrication / Testing			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Research / Field Activities			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Software / Computational Tools			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Outsourced Testing			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	

DHANALAKSHMI SRINIVASAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY

IPR			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Dissemination / Approved Travel			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
Other			☐ Accept ☐ Modify ☐ Reject	
TOTAL				

H. IP, ETHICS, SAFETY & REGULATORY REVIEW

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — IP / patent / copyright / design potential addressed

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Prior art / existing IP / third-party rights disclosed

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Human / animal / biosafety / ethics requirements identified, where applicable

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Data protection requirements identified, where applicable

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Drone / field / food / veterinary / other regulatory requirements identified, where applicable

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Required approvals can be obtained before relevant activities

I. AGRICULTURE / FIELD PROJECT REVIEW — IF APPLICABLE

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Crop calendar / production cycle realistic

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Farmer / FPO / KVK / field partner identified

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — On-farm trial design and evidence plan adequate

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Farmer consent and data collection addressed

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Seasonality and field validation requirements addressed

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Clarification Required ☐ Not Applicable — Biosafety / regulatory / drone requirements addressed

J. REVIEWER'S MAJOR COMMENTS

Strengths: _____

_____

Major Concerns / Risks: _____

_____

Required Revisions / Clarifications: _____

_____

K. RECOMMENDATION

☐ Recommend for funding as proposed

☐ Recommend for funding subject to revisions / conditions

☐ Recommend with revised budget / scope

☐ Do not recommend for funding

☐ Return for clarification / re-submission

Recommended Funding Amount (₹), if applicable: _____

Conditions / Special Recommendations:_____

L. COMMITTEE DECISION — FOR OFFICIAL USE

Review Stage	**Decision**	**Date**	**Remarks / Reference**
Department / School Screening	☐ Recommend ☐ Revise ☐ Not Recommend		
Technical & Research Committee	☐ Recommend ☐ Revise ☐ Not Recommend		
External Expert Review (where applicable)	☐ Recommend ☐ Revise ☐ Not Recommend		
Research & Innovation Committee Recommendation	☐ Recommend ☐ Revise ☐ Not Recommend		
Competent Authority Approval	☐ Recommend ☐ Revise ☐ Not Recommend		

M. FINAL APPROVAL / FUND RELEASE — FOR OFFICE USE

Approved Funding (₹)		**Category Approved**	
Project Start Date		**Project End Date**	
1st Installment	50%	**Status**	☐ Approved ☐ Pending
2nd Installment	30%	**Status**	☐ Approved ☐ Pending
Final Installment	20%	**Status**	☐ Approved ☐ Pending

N. REVIEWER / COMMITTEE SIGNATURES

Reviewer / External Expert		**Signature**	
Committee Chair / Convener/Dean		**Signature**	
CRI Representative		**Signature**	
Competent Authority/ Vice Chancellor /Registrar/ Management Representative		**Signature**	
Date		**Official Seal**	

O. EVALUATION PROCESS REFERENCE

Submission → Department / School Screening → Technical & Research Committee Review → External Expert Review, where applicable → Research & Innovation Committee Recommendation → Competent Authority Approval → Fund Release.

P. IMPORTANT REVIEW NOTES

• The policy uses an evaluation framework of 100 marks across eleven criteria.

• The minimum qualifying score is to be prescribed by separate notification.

• Fund release is staged at 50% / 30% / 20%.

• Projects are monitored through M1–M6.

• Reviewers must disclose conflicts of interest and not participate where a direct conflict exists.

• Funded projects remain subject to Institute financial, procurement, ethics, IPR, audit and reporting requirements.