APPENDIX D: FY 2006 MERIT REVIEW AND PEER EVALUATION MEETING: EVALUATION FORMS

DOE Hydrogen Program
2006 Annual Merit Review

Project Evaluation Form

Project Number: _____ **Reviewer:** _____

Title of Project: _____

Presenter Name: _____

Using the following criteria, rate the work presented in the context of the program objectives and provide **specific, concise** comments to support your evaluation. *** Write/print **clearly** please. ***

1. **Relevance** to overall DOE objectives – the degree to which the project supports the President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative and the goals and objectives of the applicable Multi-Year RD&D plan. **(Weight = 20%)**

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. The project is critical to realization of the President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative and fully supports the RD&D plan objectives. 3 - Good. Most aspects of the project align with the President's hydrogen vision and the RD&D plan objectives. 2 - Fair. The project partially supports the President's hydrogen vision and the RD&D plan objectives. 1 - Poor. The project provides little support to the President's hydrogen vision and the RD&D plan objectives.		

2. **Approach** to performing the R&D – the degree to which technical barriers are addressed, the project is well-designed, technically feasible, and integrated with other research. **(Weight = 20%)**

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. The project is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers to development of hydrogen or fuel cell technologies. Difficult for the approach to be improved significantly. 3 - Good. The approach is generally well thought out and effective but could be improved in a few areas. Most aspects of the project will contribute to progress in overcoming the barriers. 2 - Fair. Some aspects of the project may lead to progress in overcoming some barriers, but the approach has significant weaknesses. 1 - Poor. The approach is not responsive to project objectives and unlikely to make significant contributions to overcoming the barriers.		

3. **Technical Accomplishments and Progress** toward overall project and DOE goals – the degree to which research progress is measured against performance indicators and to which the project elicits improved performance (effectiveness, efficiency, cost, and benefits). **(Weight = 35%)**

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. The project has made excellent progress toward objectives and overcoming one or more key technical barriers. Progress to date suggests that the barrier(s) will be overcome. 3 - Good. The project has shown significant progress toward its objectives and to overcoming one or more technical barriers. 2 - Fair. The project has shown modest progress in overcoming barriers, and the rate of progress has been slow. 1 - Poor. The project has demonstrated little or no progress towards its objectives or any barriers.		

Page 1 of 2

4. **Technology Transfer/Collaborations** with industry/universities/other laboratories – the degree to which the project interacts, interfaces, or coordinates with other institutions and projects. **(Weight = 10%)**

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. Close coordination with other institutions is in place and appropriate; partners are full participants. 3 - Good. Some coordination exists; full and needed coordination could be accomplished fairly easily. 2 - Fair. A little coordination exists; full and needed coordination would take significant time and effort to initiate. 1 - Poor. Most of the work is done at the sponsoring organization with little outside interaction.		

5. **Proposed Future Research** approach and relevance – the degree to which the project has effectively planned its future, considered contingencies, built in optional paths or off ramps, etc. **(Weight = 15%)**

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. The future work plan clearly builds on past progress and is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers in a timely manner. 3 - Good. Future work plans build on past progress and generally address removing or diminishing barriers in a reasonable period. 2 - Fair. The future work plan may lead to improvements, but should be better focused on removing/diminishing key barriers in a reasonable timeframe. 1 - Poor. Future work plans have little relevance or benefit toward eliminating barriers or advancing the program.		

Strengths

Weaknesses

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope

Project Number: _____ **Reviewer:** _____

Page 2 of 2

DOE Hydrogen Program
2006 Annual Merit Review

Sub-Program Evaluation Form

Reviewer:

Title of Sub-Prog: _____

Presenter Name: _____

Using the following criteria, rate the work presented in the context of the program objectives and provide **specific, concise** comments to support your evaluation. *** Write/print **clearly** please. ***

1. Degree to which the Sub-Program area was adequately covered and/or summarized:

2. Were important problem/issue areas and challenges identified/discussed, including plans for addressing these in the future?:

3. Does the Sub-Program area appear to be focused, managed well, and effective in addressing the DOE Hydrogen Program R&D needs?:

4. Other Comments:

Page 1 of 1

(This page intentionally left blank.)