

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CEMENT AND BUILDING MATERIALS
BALLABGARH (HARYANA)

26 November 2021

**Amendment of Annual Performance Appraisal Report
Format of NCB Officials proposed to be effective
from 01 January 2022**

The undersigned is directed to inform that, pursuant to the directions of Board of Governors (BOG) of NCCBM, in its 122nd Meeting held on 16 November 2021, the proposed format of revised Annual Performance Appraisal Report is attached.

The stakeholders interested in making any comments/suggestions on the above may do so in writing, within a period of 30 days from the date of uploading of the same at NCCBM's website, for further necessary action for finalization of the same.

For National Council for Cement and Building Materials



Head – HRS (Personnel)

To :

- DG's office – for information.
- Heads of Centres/ Services & Unit-In Charges.
- Notice Boards- All NCCBM units.
- CIS- for uploading on website.

Review existing performance appraisal methodology of NCB

For Scientists and Engineers (Level-10 and above): The following evaluation system is proposed to align with Key Result Areas (KRA) and define the set objectives. These can be brought about with prospective effect in APAR with effect from year 2022. The changes brought about can be made effective for the year 2022 after circulating the same on notice boards/ websites for any comments from the stakeholders.

Annual Performance Appraisal Format				
S. N.	Description of Key Result Area (KRA)	Weightage	Assigned Weightage as per KRA *	Evaluation
1	Research Projects, Expertise group activities & associated research oriented contribution	25		
2	Sponsored Projects	20		
3	Patents/Paper Publications	5		
4	Additional Responsibilities:	20		
4-a	Inter Department assignments			
4-b	Contribution in Various Outside Committees			
4-c	Contribution in Hindi Committee, Safety Committee, Technical Assistance to Govt. Ministries/Departments, NCB's International/National Seminars, Internal Audits etc. (To be specified)			
4-d	Any other work/ Special Awards/Accolades/Appreciation certificates (to be specified)			
4-e	Contribution in CCE as faculty (Lectures)			
	Sub-Total	70	70	0
5	Professional, Managerial & Personal Attributes (As per existing appraisal format as at Annexure)	Fixed 30	Fixed 30	
	TOTAL			0

To be assigned by Department Head for each official separately & can be +/- 10 points totalling 70.

* Outstanding	90 & above
Very good	75-89
Good	60-74
Fair	50-59
Poor	49 & below

The Committee is of the opinion that in view of the diversified areas of functioning in various departments as well as within a department, the KRA is to be defined separately for each scientist/engineer. For example, being an R&D organization, partly funded by Govt. of India, proper weightage is to be assigned for research oriented work. On the other hand, in view of Govt. instructions to increase self generation of revenue, a justified weightage for revenue generation is also required. Also, a half-yearly review of KRA should be undertaken by Heads of Departments.

Accordingly, a process of Moderation is recommended, which should be carried out by a Moderation Committee constituted by Director General-NCCBM. The Moderation Committee may include 1 or 2 external experts in the initial years for smooth implementation of this system in NCCBM alongwith Heads of Departments and any other senior official as nominated by DG-NCCBM. The moderation is to be finalized/approved by DG-NCCBM. The Bell Curve approach is to be ensured through this moderation so as to limit Outstanding as well as Fair/Good appraisals. The final APAR score shall be communicated to the official by Personnel department.

The MODERATION is proposed as here under:-

1. The moderation will review the weightages assigned to each KRA in accordance with the objectives of the respective Center taking into account various parameters such as targeted revenue, sources of revenue, research work, projects approved, sponsored projects etc.
2. Objectives should be assigned to all Scientists & Engineers in advance in the beginning of the reporting year with an intent of having a fair and well communicated performance evaluation of the employee concerned against these assigned tasks at the time of writing reports.
3. At the end of the year, the Moderation shall be towards deciding the maximum number of outstanding grading as well as fair/good grading, that can be granted to employees of the concerned center taking into account the performance of the official and various parameters such as revenue, research work, sponsored projects, other assignments, additional responsibilities etc.

The revised annual appraisal system as recommended above needs to be circulated for comments/feedback of stakeholders after in-principle approval of BOG and then can be implemented prospectively with effect from the year 2022.