APPENDIX D: FY 2007 MERIT REVIEW AND PEER EVALUATION MEETING: EVALUATION FORMS

DOE Hydrogen Program 2007 Annual Merit Review
Project Evaluation Form

Project Number: _____ **Reviewer:** _____

Presenter Name: _____ **Presenter Org:** _____

Provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation -- and, write 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%)**

4 - Outstanding. Project is critical to Hydrogen Initiative and fully supports DOE RD&D objectives.
3 - Good. Most project aspects align with the Hydrogen vision and DOE RD&D objectives.
2 - Fair. Project partially supports the Hydrogen vision and DOE RD&D objectives.
1 - Poor. Project provides little support to the Hydrogen vision and the DOE RD&D objectives.

score _____

comments

•
•
•
•
•
•

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%)**

4 - Outstanding. Sharply focused on technical barriers; difficult to improve approach significantly.
3 - Good. Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.
2 - Fair. Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.
1 - Poor. Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

score _____

comments

•
•
•
•
•
•

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%)**

4 - Outstanding. Excellent progress toward objectives; suggests that barrier(s) will be overcome.
3 - Good. Significant progress toward objectives and overcoming one or more barriers.
2 - Fair. Modest progress in overcoming barriers; rate of progress has been slow.
1 - Poor. Little or no demonstrated progress towards objectives or any barriers.

score _____

comments

•
•
•
•
•
•

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%)**

4 - Outstanding. Close, appropriate coordination with other institutions; partners are full participants.
3 - Good. Some coordination exists; full/needed coordination could be accomplished easily.
2 - Fair. A little coordination exists; full/needed coordination would take significant effort.
1 - Poor. Most work is done at the sponsoring organization with little outside interaction.

score

comments

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%)**

4 - Outstanding. Plans clearly build on past progress and are sharply focused on barriers.
3 - Good. Plans build on past progress and generally address overcoming barriers.
2 - Fair. Plans may lead to improvements, but need better focus on overcoming barriers.
1 - Poor. Plans have little relevance toward eliminating barriers or advancing the program.

score

comments

Project Strengths

Project Weaknesses

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope

Project Number: **Reviewer:**

DOE Hydrogen Program
2007 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 of1

DOE Hydrogen Program
2007 Annual Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting
Hydrogen Storage Center of Excellence Evaluation Form

NOTE: This evaluation form is only for the evaluation of the Center of Excellence overall presentation (NOT for partner evaluations)

Project Number: | Reviewer Name:
Title of Project: | Center of Excellence Overall Presentation
(Sorption, Metal Hydride, or Chemical)

Using the following criteria, rate the work presented in the context of the program objectives and provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation.

1. Approach to performing the R&D – the degree to which the DOE EERE Multi-year Program Plan (RD&D Plan) technical barriers are addressed; the overall CoE effort is well-designed and technically feasible. The technical approach clearly leverages partners' unique skills to complement activities and avoid duplication. The CoE management approach includes, and has demonstrated, effective down-select/decision points and criteria. CoE progress and technical direction are periodically internally "audited" for effectiveness, efficiency, and benefits.
(Weight = 25%)

4 - Outstanding. The overall center is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers to development of onboard hydrogen storage technology (focused on 2010 targets). 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 center projects will contribute to progress in overcoming the barriers.

2 - Fair. Some aspects of the center projects 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.

score	comments

2. Technical accomplishments and progress toward DOE goals – the degree to which the CoE research has achieved progress across the center. CoE's actual progress and technical accomplishments are measured against performance indicators and quantitative milestones as related to DOE's RD&D plan.
(Weight = 25%)

4 - Outstanding. The overall CoE has made excellent progress toward objectives and overcoming one or more key technical barriers. Progress to date suggests that the barrier(s) may be overcome.

3 - Good. The overall CoE has shown significant progress toward its objectives and to overcoming one or more technical barriers.

2 - Fair. The overall CoE has shown modest progress in overcoming barriers, and the rate of progress has been slow.

1 - Poor. The overall CoE has demonstrated little or no progress towards its objectives or any barriers.

score	comments

3. Proposed future research approach and relevance – the degree to which the CoE has effectively planned its future, considered contingencies, built in optional paths or off ramps, etc. (Weight = 20%)

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.

score	comments

4. Coordination, collaborations and effectiveness of communications within the CoE – the degree to which the partners interact, interface, or coordinate with other partners within the CoE. The center coordinator provides a mechanism to foster partner interaction, interface, or coordination within the CoE. The center coordinator has helped to leverage resources to achieve progress and obtained maximum benefit from the center's overall funding. Technical progress gained from the CoE has benefited from the group effort as opposed to a group of independent projects.
(Weight = 20%)

4 - Outstanding. Close coordination is evident among the majority of partners with continuing cross center communications and collaborations; 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. Some partners appear to be insufficiently aware of other work occurring in the CoE.

1 - Poor. Communications among and between partners appears to be insufficient. It appears as if unnecessary duplication of work may be occurring.

score	comments

5. Collaborations/Technology Transfer Outside the CoE – the degree to which the CoE interacts, interfaces, or coordinates with the other DOE CoEs and with other institutions and projects.
(Weight = 10%)

4 - Outstanding. Close coordination with other DOE CoEs and other institutions is in place and appropriate; the CoE is formally leveraging other work occurring in the subject areas.

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. The CoE does not appear to be fully aware of other major R&D efforts occurring in a particular subject area.

1 - Poor. Most of the work done within the CoE; has little outside interactions or collaborations.

score	comments

Overall Center Strengths

Overall Center Weaknesses

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Center Scope
