

Program Name: Project Titles: (List)

Program Leader:

Project Leader:


Implementing Agency:

Duration:

Cooperating Agency/ies:

Call for Proposal Name:

Rationale (sample only)



Program Diagram (how they relate to each other)

NSDB (per project)

(Needs, Solutions, Differentiation, Benefits)

Needs

- Provide list here

Solutions

- Provide list here

Differentiation

- Provide list here

Benefits

- Provide list here

Cooperating Agencies and/or Beneficiaries

(Local or International with Responsibilities)

<u>Local</u>		<u>International</u>	
Name of Partner/s	Responsibilities	Name of Partner/s	Responsibilities

Indicate Project #: Objectives and Outputs

Objectives	Expected Outputs
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

Roles and Responsibilities of Partner Agencies/ Foreign Counterpart

Implementing Agency Name	Partner Agencies/Foreign Counterpart
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

Indicate Project #: LIB

(Source of Funds: DOST- GIA or PCIEERD- GIA)

	Implementing Agency Counterpart	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
PS					
MOOE					
EO					
Total					

Indicate Project #: Workplan (Gantt
Chart)

Indicate Project #: 6Ps Output for the Whole Duration

	Year 1
P ublications	
P roducts	
P laces/ P artnerships	
P eople	
P atent	
P olicy	

Thank you for your attention.

Attachments/Additional Slides

- Differentiation from previous projects
- Endorsement from the Head of Agency
- Curriculum Vitae for the Program Leader and each of the Project Leaders
- Institution's Track Record (no template but previous and ongoing researchers and projects, MS and PhD count of the University/ Department and existing equipment may be listed)
- GAD Score (inputted in the DPMIS)
- Organization Chart (possibly with duties and responsibilities)
- Justification per equipment (can be in one document)
- Cooperating Agency/ies commitment letter/s

Division Comments

Division Comments	Response/ Actions Done by the Proponents
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

TP Comments (if applicable)

TP Comments	Response/ Actions Done by the Proponents
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

PMT Comments (if applicable)

PMT Comments	Response/ Actions Done by the Proponents
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

PMT Scores

PMT Score	Raw Score	Weighted Average	Salient Points
Socio-Economic Impact (35%)			
Environmental Impact (10%)			
Plans for Research / Project Results Utilization (30%)			
Marketability (25%)			
TOTAL			
Recommended for Funding or NOT			

TP Scores

TP Score	Raw Score	Weighted Average	Salient Points
Scientific Merit (30%)			
Methodology (30%)			
Financial Soundness (15%)			
Timeframe (15%)			
Other Issues (10%)			
TOTAL			
Recommended for Funding or NOT			