

वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद
Council of Scientific & Industrial Research
अनुसंधान भवन, 2, रफ़ी मार्ग, नई दिल्ली - 110001
Anusandhan Bhawan, 2, Rafi Marg, New Delhi - 110001

सं./No.: 5-1(44)/2008-पीडी

दिनांक/ Dated: 04.06.2026

कार्यालय ज्ञापन/ OFFICE MEMORANDUM

विषय: "सीएसआईआर के वैज्ञानिकों की निष्पादकता मैपिंग (पीएमएस) संबंधी दिशानिर्देश, 2026" की अधिसूचना - के संबंध में।

Sub.: Notification of "CSIR Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS) Guidelines, 2026" - reg.

अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह कहने का निदेश हुआ है कि जीबी, सीएसआईआर ने दिनांक 25.02.2026 को आयोजित अपनी 212वीं बैठक में "सीएसआईआर के वैज्ञानिकों की निष्पादकता मैपिंग (पीएमएस) संबंधी दिशानिर्देश, 2026" पर विचार किया और उसे अनुमोदित किया है। अतः, सीएसआईआर के वैज्ञानिकों की निष्पादकता मैपिंग (पीएमएस) संबंधी दिशानिर्देश, 2026 सभी संबंधितों की सूचना, मार्गदर्शन और आवश्यक कार्रवाई के लिए संलग्न हैं।

The undersigned is directed to state that GB, CSIR in its 212th meeting held on 25.02.2026 has considered and approved "CSIR Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS) Guidelines, 2026". Therefore, "CSIR Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS) Guidelines, 2026" are enclosed herewith for information, guidance, and necessary action of all concerned.

2. तदनुसार, 01.04.2026 से शुरू होने वाली अवधि के बाद के सभी पीएमएस "सीएसआईआर परफॉर्मेंस मैपिंग ऑफ साइंटिस्ट (पीएमएस) गाइडलाइंस, 2026" के अनुसार होंगे।

2. Accordingly, all PMS after period starting from 01.04.2026 shall be as per the "CSIR Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS) Guidelines, 2026".



(अमरेन्द्र कुमार/ Amrendra Kumar)
अवर सचिव (नीति)/ Under Secretary (Policy)

संलग्न/ Encl.: यथोपरि/ As above

सेवा में/ To,

1. सीएसआईआर की सभी राष्ट्रीय प्रयोगशालाओं/संस्थानों/मुख्यालय/एककों के निदेशक/प्रधान/ The Directors/Heads of all CSIR National Labs./Instts./Hqrs./Units

प्रतिलिपि/ Copy to:

1. महानिदेशक, सीएसआईआर का कार्यालय/ O/o DG, CSIR

2. अध्यक्ष, आरएबी का कार्यालय/ O/o Chairman, RAB
3. प्रमुख, आरएबी का कार्यालय/ O/o Head, RAB
4. संयुक्त सचिव (प्रशासन), सीएसआईआर का कार्यालय/ O/o JS, (Admn), CSIR
5. वित्तीय सलाहकार, सीएसआईआर का कार्यालय/ O/o FA, CSIR
6. मुख्य सतर्कता अधिकारी, सीएसआईआर का कार्यालय/ O/o CVO, CSIR
7. कानूनी सलाहकार, सीएसआईआर का कार्यालय/ O/o LA, CSIR
8. सीएसआईआर की सभी राष्ट्रीय प्रयोगशालाओं/संस्थानों/मुख्यालय/एककों के वरिष्ठ उपसचिव /वरिष्ठ प्रशासन नियंत्रक/ उपसचिव / प्रशासन नियंत्रक / अवर सचिव / प्रशासनिक अधिकारी/ Sr. DS/Sr.CoA/DS/CoA/US/AO of all CSIR National Labs./Instts./Hqrs./Units
9. सीएसआईआर वेबसाइट/ CSIR Website
10. कार्यालय प्रति/ Office Copy

CSIR PERFORMANCE MAPPING OF SCIENTIST (PMS) GUIDELINES, 2026

- (1) These guidelines will be called “CSIR Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS) guidelines, 2026”
- (2) These guidelines will take effect from the reporting year 2026-27.
- (3) These guidelines will be applicable to all scientists up to Scientist ‘F’ in CSIR.
- (4) **Objectives of the Appraisal Process -**
 - a. facilitate communication of all aspects of performance between the scientist and the Evaluation Committee/Empowered Committee
 - b. identify areas in which improvement and learning will help the scientist become more successful in the future, allowing him to make further contributions to CSIR
 - c. identify individual development needs, desires and plans
 - d. establish a permanent record of the employee's work history, which is as quantitative and objective as possible
 - e. serve as one of the bases for assessment promotion and
 - f. Incorporate goals for meeting career development plan of the scientist.
- (5) Evaluation of performance of Scientist under these guidelines will be as per PMS Proforma **(Annexure-A)** having five parts as under:
 - (a) Part – I Basic Information
 - (b) Part – II Self-Appraisal Format
 - (c) Part – III Appraisal by Evaluation Committee
 - (d) Part – IV Appraisal by Empowered Committee
 - (e) Part – V Annual Work Plan of Next Year

A. PART I: BASIC INFORMATION

Basic Information of the Scientists reported upon like Identification Information, Information of Reporting Officer, Reviewing Officer and Core Subject Area / specialization, Status (Project Leader/Member/Any other), details of Evaluation Committees and Empowered Committee, Immovable Property Returns and Previous Years PMS, leave records, educational attainments, employment details etc.

a. FILLING UP OF BASIC INFORMATION:

- i. The establishment on or before 1st April shall distribute PMS after completing the details which are to be filled by establishment in Part-I: Basic Information. The Scientist shall complete the Part – I: (Basic Information), if required, and report the discrepancy, if any.
- ii. The Basic Information in Part- I submitted by the Scientists shall be verified by Establishment of Lab/Instt.

B. PART II: SELF-APPAISAL

- i. Self-appraisal by Scientist reported upon. The purpose of the self-appraisal is to seek relevant information in a manner that would clearly bring out the contributions/achievements, etc. of the scientist for objective evaluation by the Evaluation Committee.
- ii. Part – II contains **Questionnaire – A & Questionnaire - B** and an **Appendix-A** {i.e. Work Format (Section I to Section V)}.
 - a. Questionnaire – A has 2 questions common to all Scientists.
 - b. Questionnaire - B has 3 questions that need to be filled by Scientists in Pay Level 13 & above i.e. Scientist-E and Scientist-F only.

I. PROCEDURE FOR FILLING UP OF SELF-ASSESSMENT

- i. The scientist without fail shall submit the Part – II (Self-Assessment) of the Proforma to establishment latest by **15th May**.
- ii. The scientists have to fill the Questionnaire as detailed in Part – II. The scientist has to provide detailed information through annexures wherever required along with other basic details based on the Annual Work Report format provided in Appendix-A. **ONLY** those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned scientist need to be responded to or filled-in as all sections of Appendix-A may not be relevant to the concerned scientist and may be filled-in.
- iii. In case, a scientist does not submit duly filed self-assessment format within due date to establishment, the Sr. CoA/CoA/AO of Lab/Instt. and Sr. DS/DS/US

concerned in case of Hqrs. and its units shall submit a certificate to this effect and the same may be placed before the Evaluation Committee.

- iv. In cases where Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, is of opinion that the scientist could not submit PMS within the prescribed date due to circumstances beyond the control of the scientist the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, may condone the delay.
- v. All PMS duly filed self-Assessment Proforma received by Establishment and in case of non-submission of self-assessment by scientist copy of PMS duly filed Part- I, II & III along with certificate by Sr.DS/Sr. CoA/DS/CoA/US/AO concerned in this regard be forwarded to Evaluation Committee for appraisal.

C. PART III: EVALUATION COMMITTEE

a. CONSTITUTION OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEES:

- i. Evaluation Committee to be duly constituted by the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, for different grades/levels of scientists. The composition of the Evaluation Committees for evaluation of Scientists would be as under:

Evaluation Committee No	Scientist Grade	Composition of Evaluation Committee	
			Nos.
I	Scientist B Scientist C and Scientist D	Reporting Officer/Area Coordinator	1
		Reviewing officer/ HoD/Scientist F/G	1
		Scientist from the Empowered Committee	1
II	Scientist E	Reporting Officer/ Area Coordinator	1
		Reviewing officer/Scientist F/G/H/OS/DS	1
		Scientist from the Empowered Committee	1
III	Scientist F	Reporting Officer/ Area Coordinator	1
		Reviewing officer/ Scientist G/H/OS/DS	1
		Scientist from the Empowered Committee	1

- ii. The composition of the Evaluation Committee is only indicative and the actual number of members under each Evaluation Committee and the number of Evaluation Committees can be decided based on the size and composition of scientists in the Laboratory/Division. For a large size lab, Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, may like to have Evaluation Committees for every division. However, it may be seen that total number of members in the Evaluation Committee should be odd.
- iii. In case, a suitable Scientists of appropriate level is not available in the concerned lab a scientist of the same area may be nominated as member of the Evaluation Committee from the sister CSIR lab.
- iv. The quorum of the Evaluation Committee shall be half of the members.
- v. The member of Evaluation Committee shall cease to be a member in case he demits the office by any means. In such case Director of the lab/Institute or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, may nominate a Scientist of the area, at least one rank above than the Scientist reported upon, to be the member of Evaluation Committee.

b. APPRAISAL BY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

- i. The Evaluation Committee shall consider all PMS duly filled Self-Assessment Proforma received by Establishment and in case of non-submission of Self-Assessment by scientist, the certificate by the concerned Sr.DS/Sr. CoA/DS/CoA/US/AO, for appraisal.
- ii. The Evaluation Committee should segregate the self-appraisal forms received as per the major knowledge portfolio defined by the scientist. The evaluation of the scientist will be based on the knowledge portfolio defined therein.
- iii. If a scientist has reported to duty less than 90 days in a reporting period, the same are not required to be evaluated and a remark to this effect may be noted by the Evaluation Committee. In case of a scientist on deputation, the APAR/ACR written in borrowing organization will be taken on record.
- iv. In cases where self-appraisal is not available and Evaluation Committee is not in position to evaluate the Performance of scientist; in such case the Evaluation Committee may award 'Zero' marks. However, if Evaluation Committee feels that

even in the absence of self-appraisal by scientist it can evaluate the performance of the scientist on the basis of the inputs provided by the Reporting Officer/Reviewing officer as a member, it may award grading/marks to the scientist.

- v. The process of evaluation-by-Evaluation Committee shall be completed on or before 30th June and the Assessment of Evaluation Committee will be submitted to Empowered Committee.

c. COMPUTATION OF RESULTANT SCORE OF SCIENTISTS

- i. The Evaluation Committee evaluates the responses provided by the concerned scientist to the Questionnaire A or Questionnaire A & B, as the case may be, and assigns a score after careful study. Depending on the performance of the individual, the score of the candidate assigned by the Evaluation Committee will be in the scale of 0-100 (the scores should be awarded in whole numbers).
- ii. It is recommended that the score assigned should relate to the overall performance of the laboratory. A laboratory may choose through consultations and discussions among the members of Empowered Committee and Evaluation Committee a robust and reasonable method to determine performance average lab score that is normalized to a Score of 100 before start of this exercise.

S. No.	Score	Grade
1.	90 and above	Outstanding
2.	85-89	Excellent
3.	75-84	Very Good
4.	60-74	Good
5.	50-59	Satisfactory
6.	Up to 49	Need improvement

- iii. A general explanation of the grades but not necessarily exact is given below:
 - a. **Outstanding (90 and above):** Outstanding means significantly exceeds CSIR's expectations. This is reserved for those whose performance during the review period falls into the top 33% of the scientists at their level. As a motivating factor and a strong support to pursue the outstanding work, the candidate receiving the

“Outstanding” grade will be a potential candidate for assessment ahead of the normal residency period in his present scientist grade if the same consistency is maintained.

- b. **Excellent (85-89):** Excellent means significantly exceeds expectations of the Laboratory. This is for those whose performance during the review period is found to be above the average performance of the Laboratory.
 - c. **Very Good (75-84):** Very Good means that candidate just meets expectations of the Laboratory; however, there is scope for making significant contributions that would exceed the expectations.
 - d. **Good (60-74):** means the candidate just falls short of expectations of the Laboratory and in achieving CSIR's superior standards.
 - e. **Satisfactory (50-59):** Needs to demonstrate additional effort and or undertake further skill development. Identifies an area that would benefit from additional attention and resources and requires specific recommendations for areas of development.
 - f. **Need Improvement (up to 49):** Does not meet expectations of the Laboratory and well-below average. Requires an immediate improvement plan with specific deadlines to meet goals to bring performance up to an acceptable level.
- iv. If a Scientist is graded outstanding (i.e. 90 and above) by Evaluation Committee, then the reasons for the same is to be recorded by the Committee.
 - v. At the same time if the performance of the candidate is graded less than the minimum threshold (75 and below), the reasons for the same shall also be recorded by the committee and the suggestions.
 - vi. The Evaluation Committee evaluates the following Behavioral aspects and assesses the employee accordingly. Please note that this is only a qualitative evaluation and therefore no grade/marks are to be awarded.

A. PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

1. Personality
2. Maturity and logical thinking
3. Level of self-confidence

4. Initiative and drive
5. Mental alertness

B. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

1. Perception of organizational role
2. Competence to handle the job
3. Ability to Communicate (both in speech and writing)
4. Dedication and commitment to the job
5. Comprehension and appreciation of new development related to his job

C. MANAGERIAL & LEADERSHIP CAPABILITIES

1. Ability to get along with colleagues
2. Willingness to accept responsibility
3. Decision making ability
4. Crisis handling
5. Qualities of Leadership

Note: This is also presented as a part of Part III for evaluation by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee will state its comments on the overall qualities of the scientist including areas of strengths and if necessary, areas needing improvement. Along with the evaluation of the scientist, the Evaluation Committee will also submit its opinion on the integrity of the scientist. The Integrity part is mandatory as per the GOI OM No. 51/5/72-Estt "A" 20 May 1972 which is reproduced in Appendix-B. The evaluation report of the Evaluation Committee is then submitted to the Empowered Committee for the final evaluation of the PMS.

D. PART IV: EMPOWERED COMMITTEE

- a. The assessment of the Evaluation Committee would be reviewed by a duly constituted Empowered committee.
- b. **CONSTITUTION OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE –**
 - i. The Empowered Committee will be constituted by the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be. The Empowered Committee will consist of 3/5/7 Scientist G/H/OS/DS (depending on the strength of the Laboratory). However, it may be

seen that total number of members including Chairman in the Committee should be odd and the Chairman shall be Director of the laboratory or DG, CSIR in the case of CSIR HQ.

- ii. In case, a suitable Scientists of appropriate level is not available in the concerned lab a scientist of the same area may be nominated as member of the Empowered Committee from the sister CSIR lab.
- iii. The quorum of the Empowered Committee shall be Chairman and the half of the members.
- iv. The member of Empowered Committee shall cease to be a member in case he demits the office by any means. In such case Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, of the lab/Institute may nominate a Scientist to the Empowered Committee as member.

c. APPRAISAL BY EMPOWERED COMMITTEE

- i. The inputs of the Evaluation Committee are then carried forward to the Empowered Committee which can give its final evaluation and assign a suitable Score. In case, a Scientist is awarded 90 and above Score by Empowered Committee, then the reasons for the same is to be recorded by the Committee.
- ii. The Empowered Committee can revise the Score awarded by the Evaluation Committee (i.e. upgrade or downgrade the Score) citing clear and unambiguous justification.
- iii. It is recommended that any upgrade or downgrade of Score at this stage can be considered based on the following:
 - a. Basic character/nature of the Laboratory
 - b. Average performance of the Laboratory
- iv. The process of evaluation by Empowered Committee shall normally be completed on or before **31st July**.

E. PART V: ANNUAL WORK PLAN

The model Annual Work Plan (AWP) has been provided as Part V of the PMS contains the Annual Work Plan, which is indicative in nature and can be adjusted as per the requirement of the Lab/Instt. The Annual Work Plan for next year is to be filled by the scientist along with the self-appraisal report. Annual Work Plan (AWP) captures both individual and organizational aspirations and the proposed work plan for the next year. Annual Work Plan will provide a base to measure the performance of the Scientist, SWOT analysis of scientists' performance, and to award grading/marks at the end of reporting period. The scientist has to clearly mention the role in each projects/area of activities. The Labs. /Instts. shall decide the procedures relating to the confidential/ national security related project on case-to-case basis.

a. FILLING UP OF ANNUAL WORK PLAN

- i. The Scientist shall submit the duly filled Part – V (Annual Work Plan), under his signature, in the 15th May.
- ii. The Annual Work Plan shall be forwarded to Reporting Officer/HoD/Area Leader/Group Leader as well as Reviewing Officer wherever is applicable to assess/accept the Annual Work Plan submitted by the scientist concerned and as far as possible with the consensus among the Scientist reported upon, Reviewing Officer/Reporting Officer/HoD/Area/Group leader shall finalize the Annual Work Plan of scientist for approval of Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be.
- iii. In case, a scientist does not submit the Annual Work Plan of PMS within prescribed time, the blank Part –V (Annual Work Plan) shall be forwarded to Reporting Officer to take necessary action as per preceding para.
- iv. The Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, has discretion to accept or to modify the Annual Work Plan of the scientist as finalized by Reporting Officer as well as Reviewing Officer/Area Coordinator and the decision of the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, shall be final and binding on the scientist. There shall be no

- appeal against the decision of the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, in this regard.
- v. In case Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, is Reporting Officer and/or Reviewing Officer/Area Coordinator of scientist, separate approval of Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, will not be required in such cases.
 - vi. The Annual Work Plan, as approved by the Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, shall be communicated to concerned scientist.
 - vii. However, the Annual Work Plan can be modified/revised within the first six month of the Reporting Year with approval of Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be. The process of modifying/revising Annual Work Plan can be initiated by scientist reported upon or by Reporting Officer or Reviewing Officer/Area Coordinator/HoD or by Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, by recording reasons for modification/revision. Any modification/revision in Annual Work Plan as approved by Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be, shall be communicated to the concerned scientist immediately.

6. COMMUNICATION OF PMS TO SCIENTIST:

- i. On completion of the assessment by Evaluation Committee and Empowered Committee, complete of PMS shall be communicated to the scientist concerned immediately and in any case within 15 days of appraisal by Empowered Committee.
- ii. The scientist shall accept the award/Score awarded by Evaluation Committee and Empowered Committee within 15 days of receipt of the communication of PMS. In case, no communication is received from the Scientist within the prescribed time limit i.e. 15 days; the award/Score awarded to scientist shall be deemed to be accepted by scientist.

7. PROCEDURE FOR REPRESENTATION:

- i. In case the scientists are not satisfied by the Score /remarks/ observation of the committee may submit a representation against any Score/remarks/observation

- in his PMS with full justifications/reasons, within 15 days from the date of the communication of PMS.
- ii. A Standing Committee, namely, the Grievance Redressal Committee, be constituted by DG, CSIR as an independent mechanism to address representations, chaired by an eminent expert. The Committee should comprise of a limited number of members (five) to address grievances relating to PMS. The Committee's decision shall be final and binding.
 - iii. While considering the representation, comments/views of Empowered Committee may be taken, if considered necessary, by the Grievance Redressal Committee.
 - iv. In case the Evaluation Committee and Empowered Committee, being satisfied with the contentions made by the scientist, wish to change any of the remarks or assessments, they may do so.
 - v. In case they are not satisfied, they may give their observations, if any, on the representation of the scientist. The Grievance Redressal Committee would consider representation along-with any remarks made by the Evaluation Committee and Empowered Committee, on the representation. The decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee would be final & no further representation will be accepted.
 - vi. In case the scientist makes any representation alleging *mala-fide* against the Evaluation Committee and Empowered Committee or any of its members, the Grievance Redressal Committee would examine the claim. In case it is found that the allegation is without factual basis, the Grievance Redressal Committee would enter its finding. All representations shall be disposed of within one month from the date of receipt of representation and decision of the disposal of representation shall be communicated to the concerned scientist latest by 15th November.
 - vii. **Special Note:** All PMS process shall be completed and taken on record latest by 30th November.
 - viii. In case any lab/Instt. fails to complete PMS process within the prescribed time limit it should submit a report with reasons for delay of the process to DG, CSIR with definite time limit within which, the process shall be completed.

8. REPEAL AND SAVINGS

The earlier instructions on PMS are hereby repealed subject to anything done or action taken under the previous guidelines and in force immediately before such commencement shall so far as it is not inconsistent with the provisions of these guidelines be deemed to have been issued, made, granted, done or taken under the corresponding provisions of the guidelines.

9. INTERPRETATION:

Where any doubt arises with regard to interpretation of any of the provision(s) of these guidelines, the matter shall be referred to the Director General, CSIR whose decision shall be final.

10. POWER TO RELAX:

Where Director General, CSIR is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do, it may, by order and for reasons to be recorded in writing, relax any of the provisions of these guidelines with respect to any class or category of persons.


Council of Scientific & Industrial Research-lab name

 Performance Mapping for Scientists

Assessment Year _____

 to _____

**PART - I
BASIC INFORMATION**
Identification Information

Name of Employee	<input type="text"/>	Employee ID	<input type="text"/>
Group/ Grade	<input type="text"/>	Date of Birth	<input type="text"/>
Current Designation	<input type="text"/>	Division/ Department	<input type="text"/>
Date of Joining CSIR	<input type="text"/>	Date of Joining in Present Grade	<input type="text"/>
Category (indicate if belonging to SC/ST/OBC)	<input type="text"/>		
Email ID	<input type="text"/>		
Mobile No	<input type="text"/>		
Reporting Officer	<input type="text"/>		
Reviewing Officer	<input type="text"/>		

Categories information (for the period under evaluation)

 CSIR Core Subject Area

Further sub subject Specialization of the area under which the activities is to be carried out during the assessment period (refer: This may be different from the functional divisions of the Lab.)

About the Evaluation Period (and other obligatory Information)

Status
(Project Leader/Member/Any other)

Part year or full year evaluation

Members-Evaluation Committees

Members-Empowered Committee

Have you filled the annual return on immovable property during this evaluation period [Yes/No]
If yes, Date of Submission

Have you submitted the previous year's PMS on time? [Yes/No]
If yes, Date of Submission

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT(S)

Qualification	Specialization/ Subject(s)	Year	Division (Not Applicable)	University/ Institute	Additional Information

EMPLOYMENT DETAILS

Grade/ Post	Estt./ Lab/ Instt.	Duration From	Duration To	Remarks

LEAVE RECORD

Please list leave record for the year being evaluated (include all leave)

Type of Leave	No. of Days

Verified by Sr.CoA/CoA/AO/SO

Signature of the Scientist

Date:

Date:

PART-II

SELF APPRAISAL

Questionnaire- A

Common to all Scientists

Please provide detailed/ additional relevant information at appropriate places as Annexures suitably marked/ identified as per the Annual Work Report format as per Appendix-A wherever necessary. It is not expected that all sections of Appendix-A will be relevant to the concerned scientist and will be filled-in. ONLY those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned scientist need to be responded to or filled-in.

1. What do you consider to be your most important achievements sector-wise for the past year? List sector-wise contribution in one or more areas (Public goods/ Private goods/ Strategic goods/ Societal goods) *.

2. Define your major knowledge portfolio – state whether you are involved in knowledge Generation, Knowledge Development or Knowledge Management. Please elaborate by filling in the appropriate sections of the form provided in Appendix-A.

Place:

Date:

Signature of the Scientist

***Broad definitions of Public, Private, Social and Strategic Goods**

- i) Public Goods** - Basic research as reflected by publications, development of standards, databases, etc., and the policy support to government could be classified under public goods as they meet the criteria of non-rivalry and non-excludability.
- ii) Private Goods** - Industrial training programmes, consultancy services, certification and testing services, and sponsored research are considered as private goods as beneficiary preferences is reflected in their willingness to pay for these services. Intellectual property, particularly patents, technologies, products, processes and copyrights are in the private domain, but public funds have been used both at their generation (project) stage and at the patenting stage.
- iii) Social / Societal Goods** - Social/Societal good element is evident in activities, which generate livelihood opportunities to people located in far-off regions or to poor as in development of technologies, which use traditional knowledge, and use of local resources endowments.

Examples include natural hazard/disaster mitigation, environmental benefits from development use of technologies such as for coal-washing, mine safety, eco-friendly products and processes, pollution prevention and abatement.

- iv) Strategic Goods** - Strategic goods are those that are visible in the activities directly related to achieving self-reliance and services that meet the national/indigenous needs including national security for which no solution is available and enables creating technological options and 'resource centres', 'spin-offs', etc.

Questionnaire- B

(For only those Scientist who are in Pay Level 13 & above)

3. How has your contribution enhanced the prestige of the laboratory?

4. In light of your current capabilities, your performance against past objectives, and your future personal growth and/ or job aspirations, what activities and tasks would you like to focus on during the next 2-3 years. Again, also think of development and experiences outside of job skills- related to personal aims, fulfilment, passions, etc.

5. What sort of training/ experience would benefit you in the next year? Not just job-skills-also your natural strengths and personal passions you'd like to develop - you, your work and team can benefit from these.

Place:

Date:

Signature of the Employee

ANNUAL WORK REPORT FORMAT

(It is not expected that all sections/sub-sections of Appendix-A will be relevant to the concerned scientist and will be filled-in. ONLY those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned scientist need to be responded to or filled-in.)

Section I

Kindly ensure that there is no repetition while providing information.

I.1 Participation in the "R&D /R&D Managerial activities" of the Laboratory/Institute:

SI. No	Title of Project	Project Type/Category	Participating Agencies (Govt/Industry)	Your Role as defined

I.2 Participation in "major programmes" and/ or "facility creation" identified at the National level:

SI. No	Title of the Project	Coordinating Agency	Contribution being made by you as representative of your organization

I.3 Acquisition, operation and maintenance of "major facilities" of the Laboratory/Institute:

SI. No	Title of the Facility	Your role in brief	Beneficiaries

I.4 Enlist notable contributions (up to ten, indicating status like individual achievement, output of a team work/collaborative work etc.)

(not exceeding 150 words)

1.5 Highlight the significance/impact of your work on industry/ society/environment/nation as a whole

(not more than 100 words)

Section II

II.1 Publications

II.1.1 Papers published in Journals (during the year)

(i) In peer reviewed/SCI Journal (Indicate the total Impact Factor are citations of your publications)

(ii) In non-peer reviewed Journal

(iii) Review papers (non-SCI Journal).

S. No.	Authors	Title of the Article	Year of Publication	Name of Journal	Country	Vol No. Issue, Pages	DOI

Note: Scientist is fully responsible for the accuracy of their references. All references must include

- Author/editor last name plus initials (for six or fewer authors; if there are more than six authors, use "et al." after the sixth) or authoring agency
- Year of publication
- Full title of article or chapter (lower case)
- Title of journal (abbreviated according to standard engineering journal) or book/proceedings in title case
- City/state/country of publication and name of publisher
- Volume and inclusive page numbers
- DOI number, if available.

II.1.2 Papers published in Conference Proceedings

S. No.	Authors	Title of the Article	Date/Year	Name of Conference	Venue	Vol No. Pages	Publisher

II.1.3 Contribution to Books

(Indicate total number of chapters and pages)

S. No.	Editors	Title of the Chapter	Year of Pub.	Title of Book	Country	Edition No.	Publisher

II.1.4 Enlist institutional publications brought out

(specify the nature like Technical brochures, Feasibility reports, Training manuals, Publicity brochures, Organizational plans, Annual reports, Performance reports, Protocols, Brochures, IPR documents etc.)

II.2 Patents filed and granted during the assessment period (*indicate separately total number of national and international patents filed and granted, also provide details as per format given below*):

SI. No.	Title	Country	Filed on (Date)	Granted on (Date)	Names of other inventors

II.3 Financial Contribution

II.3.1 ECF during assessment period:

SI. No.	Title of the project	Project Type/Category	Amount received with your initiative	Govt./Industry	Lab Reserve generation

II.3.2 Technology / Process / Know-how transferred:

SI. No.	Title	Period during which developed	Date of transfer	Organization /Industry	Total fees/ premia / royalty realized	Your Role

II.3.3 Testing, Evaluation and Calibration jobs undertaken and amount charged

II.3.4 No. of EIA jobs undertaken and amount charged

II.3.5 Software developed & delivered and amount charged

II. 3.6 Others (specify, if any)

II.4 Technology / Process / Product development:

SI. No.	Title	Year of Development	Your contribution in the development

In case your work such as 'spin-offs' etc., cannot be depicted in terms of the above parameters, you may like to quantify your contributions in your own way and while doing so you may refer to Section/Para No (s), in case such points are already reflected elsewhere in this report.

Section III

Kindly provide details on the following, whatever applicable, total information being within 300 words.

III.1. Field work undertaken

- a) Field data collection (including oceanic data) indicating the number of days involved per year.
- b) Field implementation/Technology diffusion
- c) Technical guidance/Counseling

III.2. ECF catalyzed and budget handled. (CSIR & other Agencies)

III.3. Participation and contributions made for strategic sector.

III.4. Have you been able to create/add new clients to the organization.

III.5. Contribution to indigenous technology/component/project/device/ engineering systems design & development.

III.6. Activities leading to foreign exchange saving.

III.7. S&T Cooperation established with other countries including regional collaboration.

III.8. Assistance provided for national/international institution building.

III.9. National/ International training programs organized.

III.10. Your contribution toward the advancement of science and technology in the country .

III.11. Any other point, not covered so far, to complete the spectrum of your achievements.

Section IV

Kindly provide information on following lines, whatever applicable, within 300 words.

IV.1. Participation in policy formulation and/ or decision making.

IV.2. Formulating or amending existing rules and procedures to enhance the effective functioning of the organization

IV.3. Interacting within CSIR, with other R&D Organizations, Govt. Departments, Industry and/ or International Agencies for project formulation or effectively meeting the objectives of identified programmes.

IV.4. Obtaining and processing financial approvals and managing associated activities for the implementation of mega projects.

IV.5. Providing major services to the organization to support its efficient functioning and enhance its public image.

IV.6. Membership in organization/ national/ international committees.

IV.7. Important administrative responsibilities taken and success achieved.

IV.8. Major events organized as leader/ coordinator.

IV.9. Major initiatives undertaken to strengthen the organization's overall positioning.

IV.10. Any other aspect of your contribution that demonstrates your leadership qualities.

Section V

Whether there has been shortfall in the performance from the performance committed in the annual work plan (Yes/No)

If yes, give details...

Performance Indicator	Committed performance as per Annual Work Plan	Outcome achieved	Reasons for shortfall

PART - III
APPRAISAL by EVALUATION COMMITTEE



Council of Scientific & Industrial Research
Lab Name

Performance Mapping for Scientists

Assessment Year _____ to _____

Employee Name: - _____ Employee ID: - _____

Pen Picture Behavioural Aspects

(Please note that this is only a qualitative and therefore no marks are to be awarded)

<u>A. PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES</u>	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Needs to be improved
1. Personality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Maturity and logical thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Level of self confidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Initiative and drive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Mental alertness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>B. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE</u>				
1. Perception of organizational role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Competence to handle the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ability to Communicate (both in speech and writing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Dedication and commitment to the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Comprehension and appreciation of new development related to his job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>C. MANAGERIAL CAPABILITIES</u>				
1. Ability to get along with colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Willingness to accept responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Decision making ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Crisis handling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Qualities of Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>D. INTEGRITY</u>				
(Please refer Appendix-B before filling this column)				

E. Any Adverse Remarks

Yes/No

If yes, give details:

F. Critical Assessment of the scientist:

Total Individual Score: _____

Justification

If Score awarded by Evaluation Committee is 90 & above

Reasons

If score awarded by Evaluation Committee is less than minimum prescribed threshold for assessment promotion under assessment promotion rules of scientists in vogue.

Suggestions for improvement, if any:

If score awarded by Evaluation Committee is less than minimum threshold

Remarks by Evaluation Committee:

(Member - Reporting Officer/ Reviewing Officer)

(Member - Scientist)

(Chairperson)

Place:

Date:

PART IV
APPRAISAL by EMPOWERED COMMITTEE



Council of Scientific & Industrial Research-
Lab Name

Reporting Year _____ to _____

Employee Name: - _____ Employee ID: - _____

We concur with the individual score as assigned by the Evaluation Committee: - _____

The individual score may be upgraded to _____

Give reasons justifying the upgradation of score _____

The score may be downgraded to _____

Give reasons justifying the down gradation of score _____

Final score: _____

General Comments on Appraisal: - _____

Critical Assessment of the Scientist:

Score

Assign equivalent score out
of the corresponding range. _____

Justification

If the score awarded by Empowered Committee is 90 & above or less than minimum prescribed threshold for assessment promotion under assessment promotion rules of scientists in vogue.

(Member 1)

(Member 2)

(Member 3)

(Member 4)

(Chairman, Empowered Committee)

Place:

Date:

Integrity: Please read the following guidelines before evaluating the employee for Integrity.

Guidelines issued by the Government of India, Department of Personnel, regarding, 'Integrity', vide OM No. 51/5/72-ES7T A dated 20 May 1972.

In every form of confidential Report there should be a column regarding integrity to enable the Reporting Officer to make his remarks on the integrity of the Government servant reported upon. The following guidelines should be followed in the manner of making entries in the column relating to integrity.

a) Supervisory Officer should maintain a confidential diary, in which instances, which create suspicion about the integrity of a subordinate should be noted from time to time and action to verify the truth of such suspicion should be taken expeditiously by making confidential enquiries departmentally or by referring the matter to the special police establishment. At the time of recording, the Annual Confidential Report his diary should be consulted and the material in it utilized for filing, in the column relating to integrity. If the column is not filled on account of the unconfirmed nature of the suspicious, further action should be taken in accordance with the following sub-paragraphs.

b) The column pertaining to integrity in the character Roll should be left blank and a separate secret note about the doubts and suspicions regarding the Government servants integrity should be recorded simultaneously and followed up.

c) A copy of the secret note should be sent together with the character roll to the next superior officer who should ensure that the follow up action is taken expeditiously.

d) If, as a result of the follow-up action, a Government servant is exonerated, his integrity should be certified and an entry made in the character roll.

e) If suspicions regarding his integrity are confirmed, this fact can also be recorded and duly communicated to the Government servant concerned.

f) There may be cases in which after a secret report/note has been recorded expressing suspicion about a Government servant's integrity, the inquiries that follow do not disclose sufficient material to remove the suspicion or to 'confirm' it. In such a case the government servant's conduct should be watched for a further period, and in the meantime, he should as far as possible be kept away from positions in which there are opportunities for indulging in corrupt practices and thereafter action taken as indicated at(d) and(e) above.

There are occasions when a reporting officer cannot in fairness to himself and to the government servant reported upon, either certify integrity or make an adverse entry or even be in possession of any information which would enable him to make a secret report to the head of the department. Such instances can occur when a government servant is serving in a remote station and the reporting officer has not had occasion to watch his work closely or when a government servant has worked under the reporting officer only for a brief period or has been on a long leave etc. In all such cases, the Reporting officer should make an entry in the integrity column to the effect that he has not watched the government servant's work for sufficient time to be able to make any definite remark or that he has heard nothing against the government servant's integrity, as the case may be. This would be a factual statement, which there can be no objection. But, it is necessary that a superior officer should make every effort to form a definite judgment about the integrity of those working under him, as early as possible, so that he may be able to make a positive statement.

PART - V

Annual Work Plan (AWP)

(It is only indicative in nature and can be adjusted as per the requirement of Lab./Instt.)
for the reporting period 1st April YYYY^(this year) to 31st March YYYY^(next year)

Part A: Personal Details

Name of Employee	Employee ID
Group/ Grade	Date of Birth
Current Designation	Division/ Department
Date of Joining CSIR	Date of Joining in Present Grade
Category (indicate if belonging to SC/ST/OBC)	
Email ID	
Mobile No	
Reporting Officer	
Reviewing Officer	
Have you submitted the previous year's PMS on time?	[Yes/No] If yes, Date of Submission

Part B: Proposed Plan/Performance indicators for the Reporting Year (RY)

Nature of Activity	Role	Time committed (%)
R&D – Fundamental Research		
R&D – Translational Research		
R&D – Allied Services (like Animal House, Instrumentation, etc)		
R&D – Management Services (like PPBD, TTBD, etc)		
Leadership / HoD		
Outreach activities		
Any other		

(1) Research projects for the upcoming reporting year (RY)		
Project Details	Objective(s) to be addressed in the RY	Resources (availability, requirements, constraint, if any)
<u>CSIR Projects</u>		
<u>Externally funded Projects</u> (Govt./Industry)		
<u>Lab mandate specific Projects</u> (assigned by Director or DG, CSIR, as the case may be)		

(2) Research Objectives and Planned Activities	
Indicator	Remarks
<i>(a) Project details</i>	
<i>(b) Human Resource Development</i> (AcSIR / Skill development / Training Interns etc)	
<i>(c) Processes / Technology / Design</i>	
<i>(d) Patents</i>	
<i>(e) Publications</i>	

<i>(f) Any other, please specify</i>	
(3) Professional & Personal Development	
Area	Remarks
<i>(a) Fellowships / Joint Exchange programs</i>	
<i>(b) Training Courses</i>	
<i>(c) Academic work (AcSIR / PhD supervision / Guiding Interns / Proposal writing etc.)</i>	
(4) Any other Institutional work that will be undertaken in the upcoming RY (define work, role, etc)	
(5). Any other not covered in the sections mentioned above.	

Date:

Signature of the Scientist

Place:

I have reviewed the Annual Performance Plan of _____ and am satisfied with it. The proposed plan/performance appears reasonable / does not appear reasonable (strike out whichever is not applicable) in comparison to others at the same level in the division/institution.

If the option chosen is 'does not appear reasonable', please provide specific reasons explaining why it is not considered reasonable –

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

*Signature of the Head of the Division /
Reporting Officer/Area Coordinator*

Date & Place:

*Signature of the Director or DG, CSIR,
as the case may be*

Date & Place:

Annexure-B

Time schedule for preparation /completion of Performance Mapping of Scientist (PMS)
(Reporting Year – Financial Year)

S. No.	Activity	Date by which to be completed
1	Distribution of PMS to all Scientists	01 st April
2	Submission of Self-Appraisal	15 th May
3	Appraisal by Evaluation Committee	30 th June
4	Appraisal by Empowered Committee	31 st July
5	Communication of PMS to Scientist	Immediately within 15 days of Appraisal by Empowered Committee
6	Submission of representation, if any, on PMS by concerned Scientist	15 days from the date of the communication of PMS
7	Disposal of Representation by competent authority	Within one Month from the date of receipt of representation
8	Communication of decision of competent authority on representation	15 th November
9	End of entire PMS process, after which the PMS will be finally taken on record	30 th November