

## 2017 Annual Merit Review Questionnaire Results Summary

Following the 2017 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program Annual Merit Review (AMR), all participants were asked for feedback on the review process and meeting logistics. This appendix summarizes the results of that feedback and is organized by type of respondent, as follows:

1. All Respondents
2. Responses from “Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter”
3. Responses from Reviewers
4. Responses from Presenters

### 1. All Respondents

#### 1.1. What is your affiliation?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
U.S. federal government	17	7.8%
National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher whose project is under review	57	26.3%
Non-government institution that received funding from the office or program under review	56	25.9%
Non-government institution that does not receive funding from the office or program under review	39	18.0%
Government agency (non-federal, state, foreign government) with interest in the work	3	1.3%
National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher not being reviewed	26	12.0%
Other	16	7.4%
No Responses	2	<1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### “Other” Responses

- *From four respondents:* Industry
- *From two respondents:* Local government that received funding from the office or program under review
- International government
- Foreign university researcher with interest in the work
- Tier I supplier
- Service provider
- Energy company
- IP counsel
- 501(c)(3) non-profit
- Media
- Sub-contractor providing support for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)
- Independent consultant

1.2. The Joint Plenary Session was valuable in providing an overview, including the purpose and scope of the Annual Merit Review (answer only if you attended the Joint Plenary on Monday).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
3	2	23	69	50
2%	1%	16%	47%	34%

36 Comments

- The presentations by General Motors (GM) and Shell were informative and useful. It was beneficial to receive an industry viewpoint. The presentations by the Vehicle Technologies Office (VTO) and the Fuel Cell Technologies Office (FCTO) were useful.
- The overview was good. Presentations from Shell (Joe Powell) and FCTO (Sunita Satyapal) were especially informative.
- The fireside chat presentations, especially the one from GM, were excellent for showing industry interest in DOE-funded research.
- This was a great session. There was a lot of good information, and the interactive portion moderated by Rueben Sarkar was especially interesting.
- The fireside chat was new this year, and I enjoyed it.
- It is critical that the technical community understands the target vision of DOE in both areas.
- It is always useful to hear the priorities at the highest level.
- It gave a broad and wonderful perspective.
- Love the panel discussions.
- Very well done.
- I am missing some pieces of this, such as how DOE and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency communicate and arrive at common goals. I will be looking for further background about that. From industry, I can see that partnering with these large projects to review results could make these endeavors valuable.
- There was a nice variety of viewpoints and yet a more or less aligned vision of where to take the sub-programs. I noticed that an understated concern about the impact of funding cuts seems to permeate them all. I hope Congress gets that message.
- I liked the idea of the fireside chat but would like to see the audience get more incorporated into the discussion.
- This was a good high-level review, but there was no attempt to determine long-term strategy, though I understand the current administrative situation may make that difficult.
- “Highly disagree” for the initial Welcome Remarks, “Agree” for Keynote remarks, and “Agree” to “Strongly Agree” for the two Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Overview presentations.
- The outside speakers provided interesting insights. The “fireside” chat did not.
- The information on the sizable EERE cuts in the President’s budget for 2018 was very troubling. Transparency, if such a consideration exists at all, requires open discussion by the leadership in such a forum. It is indeed basically a technical, not political, meeting, but the top government administrators should not hide behind broad positive statements while deeply cutting the budget.
- Some remarks were poorly prepared and reflected lack of understanding of what was actually being reviewed at the meeting.
- *From eighteen respondents:* I did not attend.

1.3. The two plenary sessions after the Joint Plenary Session were helpful to understanding the direction of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and/or Vehicle Technologies Office (answer only if you attended the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells and/or Vehicle Technologies plenary sessions on Monday afternoon and/or Tuesday morning).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
3	0	22	59	65
2%	0%	15%	40%	44%

30 Comments

- The plenary session set a technical tone for the whole conference and provides important linkage to sponsored technical projects.
- The presentations by GM and Shell were informative and useful. It was beneficial to receive an industry viewpoint. The presentations by the VTO and FCTO were useful.
- Under normal circumstances, I would say that the plenary sessions are very valuable to get an idea of what future funding and directions are. DOE is in an understandably difficult position with regard to giving information about future budgets. So this year, with all of the uncertainty, it was a little less informative. Still, it is a very useful presentation and should continue to be given.
- A great occasion to have an overview of all of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program.
- Great job by the FCTO Director!
- It laid out the context for the individual projects.
- Not so much for me, because I know the direction well, but it would level up those who do not have regular contact with DOE.
- While the downsizing of the budget was disappointing, it was of value to see the strategy going forward.
- The direction of Hydrogen and Fuel Cells under the new administration was not clear from the presentations. The message was mixed. On the one hand, the talks described the importance of the work and all the great progress made, and that we are marching toward targets set for commercialization (assuming a certain level of funding). However, the message from the budget was quite different, with large funding cuts but no changes in the timeline for the targets.
- I attended the VTO plenaries. There was good detail but no real planning for new organization and focus areas for limited future funding.
- It was mainly a discussion about existing sub-programs.
- It would be great to have a summary of all the projects that each sub-program sponsors to show the research portfolio.
- I think these overviews could have been a little more detailed. It would have been good to see explicitly how the sub-programs were broken out in terms of objectives, funding, and funding horizons.
- It was interesting that nobody said anything about fiscal year 2018 budgets and the uncertain future of the whole Office.
- *From sixteen respondents:* I did not attend.

1.4. Program overviews were helpful to understanding the research objectives (answer only if you attended one or more Program overviews).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
6	0	8	78	85
3%	0%	5%	44%	48%

23 Comments

- Excellent high-level summaries of the sub-programs. I recommend that these remain part of the AMR and that the presenting (sub) program managers (continue to) devote attention to high-quality summaries. I found this year’s FCTO summaries to be quite valuable.
- The overviews are critical to the success of the individual sessions. Those presentations provide the context into which the rest of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program fits.
- It is important to have an overview so that the principal investigators (PIs) understand where and how their respective projects fit and to see how else they might be able to contribute.
- I learned about programs that were relevant to my area of research that I would not have otherwise known about. Also, best practices and lessons learned were helpful for my research efforts.
- The overviews focus all attendees on critical targets and short-term/long-term objectives of technical programs.
- The presentations by GM and Shell were informative and useful. It was beneficial to receive an industry viewpoint. The presentations by VTO and FCTO were useful.
- I especially enjoyed the overview “Electric Drive/Grid/Charging R&D Overview.” A nice summary for a non-subject matter expert of how many of the challenges were being addressed.
- The Safety, Codes and Standards presentation was especially helpful.
- The multiyear plans are more valuable; please continue making those available and easy to find.
- The descriptions were well defined. It helped put everyone on the same page.
- It laid the context for the individual projects.
- All did a great job!
- Very informative.
- I think all of the reviews were done very clearly and professionally. There is not much time for background, so I think they would be clearer, but it would likely be upon the reviewer to study in advance. I think it would be helpful to have a clickable bibliography that must be looked through prior to attending the review.
- Energy Efficient Mobility Systems (EEMS) was of particular interest, but after reviewing many projects, some questions remain about the overall strategy regarding simulation research and level of tool maturity to accurately predict market penetration and oil displacement impact.
- They would have been more helpful if the budget had been clearer.
- Sometimes they steal the thunder of the talks.
- *From six respondents:* I did not attend.

1.5. What was your role in the Annual Merit Review? (Check the most appropriate response—if you are both a presenter and a reviewer and want to comment as both, complete the evaluation twice—once as each.)

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter	100	46.2%
Presenter of a project	72	33.3%
Peer Reviewer	43	19.9%
No Responses	1	<1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 2. Responses from “Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter”

### 2.1. The quality, breadth, and depth of the following were sufficient to conduct a meaningful review:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Presentations	1	0	6	49	34
	1%	0%	7%	54%	38%
Question and answer periods	1	0	7	53	28
	1%	0%	8%	60%	31%
Answers provided to programmatic questions	1	0	15	52	21
	1%	0%	17%	58%	24%
Answers provided to technical questions	1	0	9	53	24
	1%	0%	10%	61%	28%

### 9 Comments

- The standardized format of the presentation and slides is very helpful in ensuring that important details are discussed and challenges are clarified.
- There were times some more technical discussion of methods and assumptions was warranted, but reviewers do a fairly thorough job. Most PIs were available for more in-depth discussions, which is helpful.
- I think that there is a nice balance of technical and programmatic information and questions. It would be nice if the reviewers could send questions to the presenters in advance. Some questions could be addressed in the presentation.
- Very good content. There is one concern: the totality of “mobility systems” with respect to energy efficiency has large breadth and may not be sufficiently represented in this AMR program. I feel the program content was primarily focused on “ground-based on-road connected and automated cars/trucks.” I suggest some wordsmithing to align with the content on VTO’s website—“About us” and “Mission”—to represent this focus of mobility.
- These were wonderful days for polymer electrolyte membrane fuel cells. A good deal of content is included in a presentation. It is hard to understand all of it well without past AMR technical information. For example, there were many acronyms and abbreviations: PFIA, SOAMEA, and so on.
- Many presentations were good; some were too “top-level” and lacked sufficient information.
- I am not sure if presenters are directed to pack their slides with tons of text and graphics, but some were outrageously dense and distracting. I would recommend asking presenters to pare down the content in some of their slides.
- Many projects/presentations included multiple parts, making it difficult to present in a single 20-minute presentation. Analysis projects do not fit well in the AMR presentation template.
- Some presentations do not go into the work deeply enough. The summary is too high-level without proof of work progress.

### 2.2. Enough time was allocated for presentations.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	3	5	47	35
0%	3%	6%	52%	39%

5 Comments

- There is a good balance between the technical presentation and enough time for reviewer questions. In the sessions I attended, all allocated question-and-answer (Q&A) time was used.
- I think the talks really need an additional five minutes. There are so many required program slides that they really take away valuable time that should be spent on results.
- Too much time was spent discussing funding and timelines. Presentations should be allowed to focus on the technical aspects.
- Where time ran short, I generally believe the presenters could have been more concise in their discussion and material.
- I feel that some topics could have been discussed more and some topics less.

2.3. The questions asked by reviewers were sufficiently rigorous and detailed.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	18	49	23
0%	2%	20%	53%	25%

7 Comments

- It seemed that some of the reviewers had only a very basic understanding of the technical areas they were reviewing. This clearly caused problems for the presenters.
- Some projects clearly do not have the right reviewers with the right backgrounds even to ask any questions.
- Some presenters received no questions or only one question—this seems an insufficient level of review.
- The answer is highly dependent on the reviewer. Some reviewers asked pointless questions.
- Some of the questions were not really helpful in understanding the work.
- Could be more rigorous at some times.
- Some are more rigorous than others.

2.4. The frequency (once per year) of this formal review process for this Office or Program is:

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
About right	83	38.4%
Too frequent	3	1.3%
Not frequent enough	3	1.3%
No opinion	3	1.3%
No Responses	124	57.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>100%</b>

3 Comments

- Less frequent reviews would miss shorter projects and allow too much time to pass without feedback/redirection from industry.
- This is a good schedule to monitor progress.
- I suggest that more depth could be presented on individual tasks within a large project if the task reviews were staggered. The large project as a whole could be reviewed annually, but more emphasis could be placed on individual tasks within the project, rotating the emphasis to other tasks in the subsequent year.

2.5. Logistics, facilities, and amenities were satisfactory.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	3	8	33	46
1%	3%	9%	36%	51%

18 Comments

- *From three respondents:* The conference rooms were too cold.
- The Wardman Park is a much better location than Crystal City.
- The hotel, food, and refreshments were excellent.
- I thought the logistics of the conference were handled exceptionally well.
- Excellent—this was the best meeting.
- EEMS track attendance was underestimated; the room was too small, with people standing in back, and too warm for the space. It was a nice hotel, closer to the airport. Wayfinding signage was good. Food/refreshments were a plus.
- The new strategy of allowing people to plug into the USB-on-a-string to get the program review files is a little scary, from an IT security perspective. I think it would be wise to return to the old policy of handing out individual USBs or go completely to an online download system.
- Some rooms were crowded, and doors in many of the rooms slammed when people entered/exited during presentations, which was distracting. Noise from the hallway disrupted some sessions when other rooms were released prior to all sessions completing for the break.
- The poster session hall was adequate but quite cavernous. The Lincoln 5 room was remote and difficult to find. The downstairs presentation rooms were long and narrow—not great for the audience.
- Free Wi-Fi only in the lobby is inadequate. Wi-Fi is needed in meeting rooms; I like to look up information related to the presentations.
- When the only option for food served during the poster sessions needs a plate and fork, this makes it difficult for those presenting to be able to eat and awkward for those trying to view the posters.
- Satisfactory, but the Crystal City location was probably better. There is more overflow hotel space nearby there.
- The hotel did not have rooms. Locating rooms in the area was difficult.
- The room for Fuel Cells R&D was too small for the plenary overview but okay for the sessions. Please hold the plenary overviews in the larger room.
- The chairs could have been spaced farther apart; it was very uncomfortable to sit in a crowded session squeezed in between two other people.
- More tables are needed. It was difficult to take notes on my lap.

2.6. The visual quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to see all of the presentations I attended.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	10	11	35	31
2%	11%	12%	39%	35%

24 Comments

- *From four respondents:* The rooms were the wrong ratio—too long and narrow—for the audience to see the presentations.

- *From three respondents:* The screens were not large enough (and/or raised high enough), especially in the long rooms.
- *From three respondents:* Some of the presentation fonts, especially on graphs, were too small for such large rooms.
- The EEMS room presentations were overcrowded, and it was hard to see the presentation over others seated in the next row. When I could see it, the projection quality was very good.
- There was standing room only in a few presentations in Washington Room 3. It was great that there was so much interest, but it was also really challenging to hear and see.
- Overall, it was good, but some presentations were crowded.
- The fonts on some of the slides were different (too big, off the screen) from the ones sent to the presenters for review before the AMR. Someone needs to check these slides on the big screen, not just on a little tablet or computer screen.
- I would like to have received a physical copy of all the presentations on a thumb drive or disk to keep as a separate item rather than just file downloads.
- Some PowerPoint standards in regard to minimum font sizing would help with the “readability” of the slides and reduce the amount of content on each slide for the benefit of the audience.
- There was a lot of information on the slides; they were often hardly readable.
- It was hard to see the screens from the back of the room. The fact that the presentations will be available alleviates that somewhat.
- The screens are not adequate for the size of the rooms. Extra monitors should be included toward the back.
- Presentations in the basement, particularly for Hydrogen and Fuel Cells, were difficult to see and hear.
- Washington 5 was not well organized. It was difficult to see the slides from the most of audience seats.
- Washington 3, especially, was a nightmare of a presentation room.
- The battery room was a little bit big.

2.7. The audio quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to hear all the presentations I attended.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	5	36	48
0%	2%	5%	40%	53%

3 Comments

- There were a couple of blips in the beginning. You should test out the equipment before the session begins and make sure that the speakers know how to use it. Toward the end, presenters were using the mouse instead of the laser pointer, and that worked flawlessly.
- Most speakers had microphones, but for a few presentations, I was unable to hear the speaker.
- In some of the smaller rooms, the sound was weak.

2.8. The meeting hotel accommodations (sleeping rooms) were satisfactory.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	1	17	21	30
0%	1%	25%	30%	43%

16 Comments

- *From nine respondents:* I did not stay at the hotel.
- *From two respondents:* The hotel was too expensive, so I decided to stay elsewhere.
- The hotel was booked, so I stayed at the nearby Churchill Hotel near Embassy, which was also very good and an acceptable walking distance (less than a mile).
- The hotel is good, only there are several reports of bedbugs in customer reviews of the hotel that make the stay there a little scary.
- The meeting hotel offers a rate higher than the DOE allowance. I hope this is adjusted in the future. Note: I have gotten a complaint from my group leader in the past about this.
- I was unable to secure a room at the government rate at the meeting hotel.
- The hotel was expensive.

2.9. The information about the Review and the hotel accommodations sent to me prior to the Review was adequate.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	0	10	41	36
0%	0%	11%	47%	41%

4 Comments

- A big thank you to the organizing team for helping with hotel stays.
- A bigger block of rooms is needed. The discounted rate was unavailable well before the deadline.
- Maybe I missed something, but it would be helpful to have short summaries of the research to accompany the presentation titles. Some of the presentations were not what I expected.
- I have attended many large symposia; however, for some reason, the program here was particularly confusing. I am not sure why, so I apologize for just complaining without offering constructive feedback.

2.10. What was the most useful part of the review process?

44 Responses

- *From six reviewers:* The presentations.
- *From two respondents:* Networking.
- *From two respondents:* The Q&A.
- Learning the status of the projects and highlights of the roadmap of future technologies driven by DOE. I was able to understand the various collaborations between the private and public sectors. All activities of participating national labs with respect to various areas, including vehicle technology, energy source, grid management, and infrastructure, were very helpful.
- Seeing all of the topics presented within the same field was extremely helpful in seeing how each complemented the other. While I was aware of many of the topics, I was still able to meet new people doing interesting work.
- I found the poster sessions very helpful as an opportunity to have more in-depth discussions. They helped me to better understand concepts that were introduced earlier and provided great interaction opportunities with key project personnel.
- Meeting with team members from other institutions. Meeting with reviewers. Meeting with program managers. Meeting with industry. This is an excellent venue for solid technical discussions.
- Understanding other projects in which I have no direct involvement/awareness and how they can relate. There could be a tie-in for next-generation products. That insight is invaluable.

- For me, it was the networking with new/existing connections, as well as getting a sense of where DOE VTO is going with EEMS.
- The social networking part, in which key people in the field are gathered in the same place to exchange progress and lessons learned.
- The opportunity to discuss the presented topics with the experts face to face and to get an overview of the sub-programs.
- Getting updated with the latest developments and challenges. Meeting peers with similar interests.
- The quality of the presentations and the networking opportunities. I enjoyed the technical focus of the talks.
- The ability to learn, all in one venue, the breadth of programs and technology areas under investigation by DOE.
- Overall, I felt reviewers were giving constructive criticisms/suggestions/comments, which is very welcome.
- The meeting of many of the key researchers all together at same time.
- Having a chance to see work similar to our own projects.
- The reviews were by knowledgeable personnel.
- The project accomplishments and how they help DOE targets to be met.
- Seeing how government funding was being used in an accountable way.
- The project review in the plenary session is effective.
- The insight provided by GM and Shell in the plenary.
- The program overview was very informative, especially this year.
- Plenary sessions that provided an overview of the vision.
- Understanding the direction of R&D.
- Sub-program presentations and Q&A sessions.
- Learning about the state of the art in hydrogen energy technologies.
- Having the presentations available for download at the kiosk.
- The depth and breadth of the various sessions.
- The wide variety of content.
- The process was quick and to the point.
- H2@ Scale.
- Both presentations and posters.
- The presentations and Q&A sessions.
- The presentation structure.
- Open discussion.
- Meeting people. More room is needed for networking events during the review.

### 2.11. What could have been done better?

#### 35 Responses

- *From five respondents:* Nothing comes to mind. The AMR was well done.
- There is so much information, and the event was well structured. I am sure it would be challenging to gauge interest in certain sub-programs; however, if there were a way to better assign room space to topics that would have higher traffic that would be good. It would be a challenging feat, but perhaps a worthwhile one.
- Honestly, I am not sure, as I just wish I could have attended more of the sessions.
- I noticed several similar activities are being conducted by various participating parties. It seemed they were to accelerate development, which accounted for the redundancy. There were a few that seemed too repetitive. Some consolidation would be better, especially in the areas of connected automated vehicles and batteries. Also, the food could be better. There were fewer options for vegetarians.
- We had reviewers drop out because of conflict of interest (COI) five minutes before a presentation. The COI questionnaire should include the subs on the project to minimize reviewers dropping out at the last minute.
- There were too many reviewers for each presentation. This is overly taxing for the organizers and reviewers of presentations. A more focused group that includes more reviewers with outside perspectives (e.g., industry) would be more effective and valuable.

- The two-hour blocks of presentations can be a bit long, honestly. Having even a five- to ten-minute break would be nice every hour or hour and a half. Two hours is okay in places, but all day for several days in a row becomes a bit daunting.
- The timing in the rooms was off. In some of the rooms, when a presentation ended early, the moderators would move right on to the next one. This caused the rooms to be running on different schedules and made it difficult to switch between rooms. Moderators need to be told to pause if a session ends early and not to start the next session until the appropriate time.
- The VTO overview sessions on Monday should allow questions from the audience. In addition to reviewer scoring, DOE should consider allowing the audience to give public review scores to projects. I think it is appropriate to weigh public opinion, as the general public is not involved in the reviewer selection process.
- Eliminate repetitive slides. Adjust presentation times according to the amount of material being presented. Keep the room temperature slightly higher; there was too much of a cold draft all day.
- I would have been interested to see more posters/exhibits on combustion and after-treatment topics. It would be interesting to see more industry participation.
- I am not overly fond of the huge sit-down multicourse lunches. Less formal lunches with an opportunity to sit and talk would be helpful. The large lunch room environment was chaotic and difficult to manage. Maybe eating in the meeting rooms would be good.
- I would like to have received a physical copy of all the presentations on a thumb drive or disk to keep as a separate item rather than just file downloads. During the breaks, it would be good to have sections organized by main topic areas, specifically with the recent presenters nearby to congregate and meet with people.
- Presentations should be available online during the AMR meeting. Thumb drive copy was available, but I have very high concerns about viruses. Also, my company would have encrypted the drive once I used it on my computer.
- Please explain the DOE numbers for the projects. I thought they were chronological, but it appears not. I want to know what the latest projects are. I asked multiple people, and nobody knew.
- An opportunity to meet/network with VTO staff. Also, it was impossible for me as a general attendee to be at the AMR the entire week. That is okay, but I missed out on some things as a result.
- Better quality control on the posters is needed. Posters with too-small text are unprofessional and do not serve the purpose of the AMR.
- Sound and lighting could have been better in the poster rooms. The northern room had better lighting and ceiling tiles, while the more southern room did not.
- Rooms should be sized to demand. Many rooms were much larger or smaller than optimal for the number of attendees.
- Mostly changing the rooms so that we could see the screens better. Also, gluten-free food was not available for the poster sessions.
- Hold sessions in wider rooms rather than long skinny ones.
- Panel discussion for each section (e.g., for SSB, or Si anode, or high-voltage electrolyte).
- Every presentation was given the same time (30 minutes). Perhaps it is possible to allocate time depending on the budget or size of the projects.
- There are too many presentations. Focus on the projects that have specific achievements or remarkable results.
- The presentations should have simpler slides and less text/fewer graphics.
- Do not start on a Monday.
- Wait until Thursday to serve ice cream during the afternoon break.
- There should be parking validation or a discount.
- Facilitated networking.
- Lunches.

2.12. Overall, how satisfied are you with the review process?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	0	2	50	39
0%	0%	2%	55%	43%

3 Comments

- This is a very good one-stop shop for meeting many of the key researchers.
- I am satisfied. However, I am concerned that having the reviews open to the public may jeopardize our intellectual property and competitive edge—on a national level. It may be best to limit participation.
- Some of the reviewers were quite engaged (asked incisive questions). Ideally, all would be.

2.13. Would you recommend this review process to others?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes	86	39.8%
No	1	<1%
No Responses	129	59.7%
<b>Total</b>	216	100%

6 Comments

- It provides a unique opportunity for industry/academia/national labs (bringing a different perspective from that of the presenting PI) to provide input on DOE’s project portfolio to adjust and improve the projects and results.
- I am neutral about this. The process has its pros by providing a broad set of information to make people more aware. However, the scale, planning, coordination, cost, and stress that goes into such a meeting seems unnecessary to receive feedback on projects. This could be done more effectively by project or in small groups through webinars or small-scale meetings as needed.
- A yearly basis seems too frequent, but otherwise the process seemed to run smoothly.
- Yes, except for its being open to the public.
- Maybe—the content seems to have too much replication.
- If the presentations are just going to be posted on a website, I may not be as willing to attend this AMR.

2.14. Please provide comments and recommendations on the overall review process.

20 Responses

- Overall, I felt I learned a lot about all the various ongoing activities, especially in my area of interest—vehicle technology. I see the push from DOE for future innovation in the areas of autonomy, connectivity, powertrain, etc. With the persuasion of various cities and national labs, the future looks promising.
- The team at the Marriott was exemplary: the long days that they worked to provide support in the presentation rooms, ensuring timeliness of the presentations; keeping the rooms clean; providing directions and help as needed; and ensuring we all had food and great snacks. They were a really incredible team this year, and I was grateful. Please extend my thanks.
- It is very good to share every achievement of almost all the projects every year.
- Open discussion is quite important to creating new innovation.
- Very organized; moderators and presenters stayed on schedule, and the flow appeared to have worked.
- I was very impressed; the review process was highly systematic.

- The quick turnaround of providing reviewer comments to the PIs was good.
- It was a productive meeting. Thank you very much.
- A good networking opportunity.
- I think this was slightly better than the U.S. Department of Transportation review.
- Keep up the good work.
- This should be done every year.
- Do not cancel it.
- Excellent.
- Everything was fine.
- It was adequate.
- I am satisfied. However, I am concerned that having the reviews open to the public may jeopardize our intellectual property and competitive edge—on a national level. It may be best to limit participation.
- Overall, it was really well done—with the exception of the poor presentation layout in the basement rooms.
- Availability of presentations immediately after the meeting is critical for accurate and effective use by media. In the future, perhaps it would be possible to provide a USB stick to media representatives. I travel without a laptop and use an Android tablet, so the arrangement this year was not helpful.
- Everyone attending is dedicated to increasing energy efficiency, yet everything is so far disconnected from the environment that everyone is working so hard to protect. It was gorgeous weather, and everyone was stuffed into a hotel basement, acting like that is a normal or sustainable process. Perhaps future meetings could be more connected to the environment.

### 3. Responses from Reviewers

#### 3.1. Information about the sub-program(s)/project(s) under review was provided sufficiently prior to the review session.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	2	2	21	15
5%	5%	5%	50%	36%

#### 11 Comments

- I looked at each of my items several times before the review and had enough time to familiarize myself with them.
- There was plenty of time to review presentations and last year’s AMR report.
- I did receive a couple of new projects shortly before the review. However, this did not present a problem.
- PDFs were available for download prior to the meeting. However, I would have liked an entire inventory of presentations, as in prior years, when I arrived at the meeting.
- Individual project information was provided in advance. The overview presentation came in only the night before, however.
- It would be good to obtain access to technical presentations two to three weeks in advance. We all have very busy schedules and need to find extra time to examine technical materials in advance.
- Two weeks before is too short. One more week would be appreciated.
- The presentations were not made available with sufficient time prior to the meeting for a thorough review.
- The presentation that I downloaded from the PeerNet website was not the same as the actual presentation delivered. There must have been a last-minute change. It was upsetting.
- My assignments changed a few days before the review.
- If anything, pull back on the reminders.

3.2. Review instructions were provided in a timely manner.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	1	15	23
0%	5%	2%	37%	56%

7 Comments

- Everything was very easy to do. I had no problems.
- I have been a reviewer before, but the webinar is still a useful reminder.
- Clear as always.
- No issues.
- I suggest distributing the confirmed reviewer agenda ahead of time.
- I was unable to attend the two PeerNet trainings and was unprepared for the software changes, which I see as a step backwards from the original version.
- I had trouble accessing the reviewer webinar on Thursday.

3.3. The information provided in the presentations was adequate for a meaningful review of the projects.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom number is the percentage of total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	5	21	9
0%	5%	14%	57%	24%

16 Comments

- This is a good way to provide information needed for reviews of projects.
- The time limitations make it difficult to know the whole background; however, I think it is about the best we can do.
- There is plenty of information in the presentations, but it is not enough to conduct a thorough review, so the presentations are very important.
- The presentations could not cover everything. The opportunity to ask questions resolved any uncertainties.
- One of the major work products is a summary report that was linked to (generally) in the presentation.
- For the most part, this is true. I noticed that, in particular, the presentations by Oak Ridge National Laboratory were well organized and utilized a format (template) that made it easy to fill out the reviews. If there is some template like this, I would highly encourage *all* presenters to follow that format.
- In general, this is so. A few presenters just have trouble with the format, but with so many projects, that is natural enough.
- In general, the information was very useful for rating the project. However, more content related to the technical aspects of the project would be preferred over the boilerplate slide requirements.
- Suggestion: Allow presenters to include a much more expanded backup for reviewers and others interested in more technical detail. (Maybe this is already the case, but reviews would benefit from more than the ~20 slides to adequately assess a project.)
- There was some inconsistency in how the various projects structured their presentations vis-à-vis the reviewer question format. For example, some projects did not use a “Future Work” slide, instead scattering that information across the presentation.
- I agree, but only when the presenter followed the template. I would “highly agree” if they would all follow it.

- Information provided varied between various projects.
- Some yes, some no.
- There was no information provided in the presentations to answer the review question about adequacy of funding. Where models (especially predictive models) were the end result, these models were not often provided, even in preliminary form.
- Most projects had the money received and the duration of the project, but the final “end” goal of the project was not always clear, so it was difficult to assess whether projects were on schedule.
- There was a lack of clear project planning schedules, and sometimes key performance indicators vs. DOE targets were missing.

3.4. The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized (see below) were clearly defined. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	0	1	1	24	15
	0%	2%	2%	59%	37%
Approach	0	0	2	23	16
	0%	0%	5%	56%	39%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	0	0	1	21	19
	0%	0%	2%	51%	46%
Collaboration and Coordination	0	3	1	23	14
	0%	7%	2%	56%	34%
Proposed Future Research	0	0	2	29	10
	0%	0%	5%	71%	24%
Resources	1	1	8	21	6
	3%	3%	22%	57%	16%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	0	1	16	10	7
	0%	3%	47%	29%	21%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	1	14	11	6
	0%	3%	44%	34%	19%

10 Comments

- The evaluation criteria are clearly defined, though there may be the need to tweak criteria based on some project focus areas, i.e., deployment versus strict research.
- Budget cuts made this an unusual situation, stretching to discuss the future.
- I did not review any deployment projects, so I cannot comment on those. As for the review questions, typically all projects are relevant, and there is rarely any discussion about sufficiency of funding, so those questions do not appear all that critical. As for the overview presentations, there are too many questions, they do not really seem to ask several of the key questions that arise, and several appear duplicative. Twelve well-developed questions should be sufficient.
- Regarding relevance and potential impact, it would have been helpful to list the desired set of impacts with the questions so that every review is reviewing based on identical criteria/interpretations of the criteria. Collaboration is a difficult criterion for review. One had to struggle with interpreting what was being sought. For instance, it is not clear whether the contribution of a sub-contractor is on a par with that of a partner. In many instances, PIs listed sub-contractors as collaborators, or at least implied that they were.

- The definition of “good” collaboration is not clear, i.e., whether it means a lot of collaborators or very involved collaborators or collaboration with industry. The resources question, which just asked yes or no, was not useful.
- The resources question was difficult to address. It was not clear whether this meant adequate going forward. Many projects did not indicate what future funding would be available.
- *From four respondents:* I did not rate, or marked as neutral, criteria that did not apply to the sessions I attended.

3.5. The evaluation criteria were adequately addressed in the presentations. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	0	2	5	22	11
	0%	5%	13%	55%	28%
Approach	0	0	3	23	14
	0%	0%	8%	58%	35%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	0	1	2	24	13
	0%	3%	5%	60%	33%
Collaboration and Coordination	0	3	4	24	9
	0%	8%	10%	60%	23%
Proposed Future Research	0	1	7	25	6
	0%	3%	18%	64%	15%
Resources	1	4	11	15	3
	3%	12%	32%	44%	9%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	1	6	11	11	4
	3%	18%	33%	33%	12%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	1	18	9	3
	0%	3%	58%	29%	10%

17 Comments

- Obviously, it is the responsibility of the presenters and PIs to review weightings and criteria, but many presentations went long, so it was hard to provide appropriate scores for some later items if there was no chance to ask particular questions.
- Collaboration and Coordination: For each review, I would like to see *how* the collaboration is going to benefit the project or if other collaboration is felt to be required. For instance, I do not see other agencies generally mentioned. I also rarely see how the results will be collaborated on to provide a valuable outcome or result. Resources: I cannot see the detailed budget for each project, so I cannot tell how the funds are being used.
- Collaboration and Coordination was often fuzzy—sometimes referring only to a request of the listed organization to review some aspect of the work, or the names of organizations of which the PI was a member, even if the project was not being discussed or coordinated with that entity.
- I did not review any deployment projects, so I have no comments on those. All these projects are relevant, or they would not be done, so that is not that critical a question. As for funding, the sufficiency is rarely discussed.

- Not all presentations provided clearly stated “Proposed Future Research” sections. The “resources” information was confined to the current fiscal year, which does not provide clarity for projects projected to end in a future fiscal year.
- No information was provided in the presentations to answer the resource question: no matrix for the ratio of money spent and work done, no information on money left, and no information on the effort level required to complete the work.
- Not all speakers explained the underlying purpose of their project or showed how it was relevant to energy security or petroleum displacement.
- I do not recall much discussion of technology validation. For example, most presentations did not talk about the statistical significance of the results.
- Uncertainty about future DOE budget funds available for basic studies makes comments regarding future plans/resources impossible to judge.
- There should be more emphasis on technical accomplishments and the technical pathway.
- Project arrangements are often made by people’s connections/acquaintances rather than based on expertise. I get the impression projects are applying for funding to use their fancy/expensive equipment and facility, ignoring easy ways to answer the question.
- I agree, but only when the presenter followed the template.
- This varied widely by presenter.
- Some yes, some no.
- *From three respondents:* I did not rate, or marked as neutral, criteria that did not apply to the sessions I attended.

3.6. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the programs/projects. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	0	1	5	24	9
	0%	3%	13%	62%	23%
Approach	0	1	5	25	8
	0%	3%	13%	64%	21%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	0	0	4	26	9
	0%	0%	10%	67%	23%
Collaboration and Coordination	0	2	7	23	7
	0%	5%	18%	59%	18%
Proposed Future Research	0	0	8	23	8
	0%	0%	21%	59%	21%
Resources	1	0	10	17	5
	3%	0%	30%	52%	15%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	1	1	12	11	5
	3%	3%	40%	37%	17%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	1	13	10	5
	0%	3%	45%	34%	17%

7 Comments

- Collaboration is important only if the project benefits from it; some projects seem to be inclusive just for the collaboration’s sake. Foundational research strategy is missing in many projects. Younger researchers are marching forward, unchecked by overall program management. Researchers are commenting that they are using immature techniques and missing critical data—but they go forward anyway to attempt to meet milestones.
- I do not recall any discussion about whether adequate resources were provided. There was little insight into what the collaboration section means. The relevance was mostly mother and apple pie. There was no real discussion about what it even means to be relevant.
- I do not think I can answer this one. I think we are missing a big one, and that is future value and vision for how the results will be used.
- This question would be easier to answer if the assigned weights were available to refresh my memory. I already submitted the reviews and do not recall the exact weights.
- It really depends on the area and the details. This question is somewhat meaningless.
- Funding sufficiency is probably irrelevant at this point.
- I did not fill in criteria that do not apply to sessions I reviewed.

3.7. During the Annual Merit Review, reviewers had adequate access to the Principal Investigators.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	9	19	11
0%	5%	22%	46%	27%

11 Comments

- Ample opportunities were available for interaction between presenters and reviewers. A sit-down lunch was also valuable for additional discussion.
- This is one of the great things about the AMR.
- There was access for sure for poster sessions but not always for speakers. However, that is not the fault of the AMR; it is the schedules of busy people.
- Yes, largely so.
- Suggestion: Perhaps set a short time for the presenters to meet with reviewers only (this almost happens in poster sessions, when reviewers can directly introduce themselves and get walked through the poster, but not in the oral presentations).
- Some reviewers were keeping their seats even after their sessions. As a result, I lost my chance to raise questions.
- Often a PI was not there. Obviously, that is fine if there is a family emergency, but perhaps the PI should call in for questions if the budget does not allow for his/her travel.
- There was very limited time, and some PIs do not stay after their presentations, making it difficult to have further discussion.
- Some PIs were not available (not attending or attending only during a specific session).
- A few arrived immediately before, and left immediately after, their presentations.
- There was not enough time to ask all my questions.

3.8. Information on the location and timing of the presentations was adequate and easy to find.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	0	3	21	18
0%	0%	7%	50%	43%

4 Comments

- Fine, as always.
- It would be great if an invite to the calendar can be set up to trigger notifications.
- The timing and location of this meeting conflicted with competing conferences. More consideration should be given to making sure overlap with other popular meetings does not present a conflict. Also, for reviewers, blocks of hotel rooms should be reserved so that booking the event does not become a problem.
- A portion of one session was suddenly relocated, which I found disruptive.

3.9. The number of projects I was expected to review was:

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Too many	4	1.8%
Too few	4	1.8%
About right	34	15.7%
No Responses	174	80.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>100%</b>

11 Comments

- This was my fault. I should have offered to do fewer. I was interested in them all, but I could have done a better job sticking to four or five.
- The reviewers should be given an opportunity to preview the presentation materials ahead of time so that they can decide whether they are sufficiently competent or knowledgeable to review the issues. I was assigned to review a presentation that was totally out of my subject matter expertise.
- I received only two assignments at first, which I found to be too few to justify the trip to Washington, DC. I asked for more and was finally given twelve, which was much better.
- There were too many, but not way too many, and anyway, I am used to it.
- Well, it was a lot of work, but someone has to do it.
- I was assigned ten reviews in advance and another four during the meeting.
- I reviewed seven. More would have been difficult.
- I reviewed only one project and would have been willing to review up to five.
- I did two. Three might be better.
- I could have handled more.
- I could have done a few more.

3.10. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the question & answer period provided sufficient depth for a meaningful review.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	2	2	26	11
0%	5%	5%	63%	27%

10 Comments

- A 20-minute presentation with 10 minutes of Q&A is just right.
- I think the Q&As were right-sized.
- There were good follow-up discussions during the sessions I attended.
- It is generally well run, allowing for meaningful reviews.
- No issues.
- For the EEMS presentations, it would have been nice to have a slide that explained (or an introductory slide that included) which pillar was supported by the work and how it fit into the overall pillar goals/objectives.
- I would like to see separate, closed sessions of reviewers, PIs, and DOE folks for direct interactions. Then the PIs can present to the public.
- Perhaps a few more minutes for some of the higher-value projects would be worthwhile. A \$5 million project gets the same time as a \$50,000 one.
- Especially for multimillion-dollar projects, half an hour is too short.
- Not in all cases.

3.11. Please provide additional comments.

15 Responses

- The annual AMR conference is a critical technical conference where attendees can learn about future technology trends and new approaches to problem-solving, meet old colleagues, interact with/coach newcomers, etc. There is *no* other U.S. conference addressing all these activities. *Keep it going, and do not change the format.*
- This is a well-organized, effective use of time. Even the posters had good detail and enthusiasm from presenters.
- Overall, the review process seems to work well.
- Overall, the event went well.
- Thanks for all that you do.
- My main goal is to learn how these very valuable projects and datasets can be applied to industry to help obtain the results that are desired by DOE.
- I liked the lunch format, but the food was not great.
- It will be interesting to justify the expense of coming to this meeting next year, if Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program funds are cut.
- DOE publishes comments by reviewers often many months after the meeting, leaving the PI only a few months to adjust. The release of the report should be more timely. Additionally, for the comments to have a lasting influence, it should be required for the PI to respond to the comments in a more substantial way, whether public or not.
- There were not enough reviewer computers available during the presentations. There were *no* computers during the VTO overview Monday afternoon, and there were only two available in the meeting rooms. I do draft reviews in the PeerNet system as the projects are being presented, and there were two other reviews where I could not get one of the two in the room.

- As a reviewer (at least in my case), I spend many hours and travel at my own cost. DOE should consider providing travel cost reimbursement or a voucher for a tax credit as a public service. All those presenters are reimbursed through their funding, and so are DOE officers.
- The revised PeerNet is terrible. I do not like the one-question-per-page. Sometimes I could not type in the dialogue boxes and had to reload them. The Internet connection was intermittent in some rooms.
- To ensure reviewers are available for the meeting, conflicts with other conferences should be minimized. Also, major conventions in other industries were competing for hotel rooms, which caused booking issues.
- Two hours per session is too long. Raise the screen about a foot so those sitting in the back can see the whole slide.
- The room sizes were too small for most of the Delaware B reviews.

#### 4. Responses from Presenters

##### 4.1. The request to provide a presentation for the Annual Merit Review was provided sufficiently prior to the deadline for submission.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	3	1	26	32
3%	5%	2%	41%	50%

##### 7 Comments

- *From five respondents:* The deadline is too early. In the two months prior to the meeting, work is done that cannot be covered in the presentation, and the data is old by the time it is presented.
- I would recommend providing a minimum of four weeks for a presenter to develop slides before submitting them to DOE. Gathering all information in the two-week timeframe is taxing, particularly with projects that include multiple organizations.
- Requests were way late this year, though we assumed the timing from the past.

##### 4.2. Instructions for preparing the presentation were sufficient.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	1	1	22	29
2%	2%	2%	41%	54%

##### 5 Comments

- *From two respondents:* Very clear.
- I do want to comment that many presentations did not follow the directions on font size and content. Many presentations were unreadable on the big screen.
- The link to download the instructions was hidden within the email. A more prominent link would be useful.
- To a fault.

4.3. The audio and visual equipment worked properly and were adequate.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	0	1	17	44
3%	0%	2%	27%	69%

7 Comments

- The audio/visual equipment was amazing—very clear.
- Inclusion of a laser pointer for presenters was very helpful.
- I encountered a software issue during my presentation that caused confusion throughout the delivery and cost several minutes of my allotted time. There is not enough space here to explain in detail, but the issue could have been anticipated and overcome if the speaker ready stations had used the same dual-screen Presenter View configuration that is used for the actual presentations, rather than using just a single screen. In the future, please use dual screens at the speaker ready stations.
- It would be nice if combination slide advancer/laser pointers were available so we did not have to use laptops to advance the slides.
- We had split presenters, so an additional microphone for questions might have been useful for some questions.
- This is not a big deal, but having a full-size mouse would make it easier for the speaker.
- Some of the presenters were hard to hear if you were sitting in the back.

4.4. The evaluation criteria upon which the Review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	2	0	2	41	17
	3%	0%	3%	66%	27%
Approach	2	0	5	33	22
	3%	0%	8%	53%	35%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	2	0	2	35	23
	3%	0%	3%	56%	37%
Collaboration and Coordination	2	0	4	40	16
	3%	0%	6%	65%	26%
Proposed Future Research	2	0	7	36	17
	3%	0%	11%	58%	27%
Resources	2	2	11	28	12
	4%	4%	20%	51%	22%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	1	3	14	20	10
	2%	6%	29%	42%	21%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	3	17	17	9
	0%	7%	37%	37%	20%

2 Comments

- Clearly defined. I have no idea how it is used or if it is appropriate for all projects under review.
- Neutral responses indicate the criterion did not apply to my project.

4.5. Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	2	0	2	35	23
	3%	0%	3%	56%	37%
Approach	2	0	4	31	24
	3%	0%	7%	51%	39%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	2	0	3	32	23
	3%	0%	5%	53%	38%
Collaboration and Coordination	2	1	2	35	20
	3%	2%	3%	58%	33%
Proposed Future Research	2	1	3	32	21
	3%	2%	5%	54%	36%
Resources	1	0	8	27	13
	2%	0%	16%	55%	27%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	1	2	11	21	11
	2%	4%	24%	46%	24%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	3	13	15	10
	0%	7%	32%	37%	24%

1 Comment

- I was not sure what was meant by approach, so I consulted with a colleague with AMR experience to clarify.

4.6. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project/program. (Note that slightly different criteria are used by each office. Some of the criteria below do not apply to every project.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance/Potential Impact	2	0	6	33	15
	4%	0%	11%	59%	27%
Approach	2	1	6	30	17
	4%	2%	11%	54%	30%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	2	1	5	31	17
	4%	2%	9%	55%	30%
Collaboration and Coordination	2	2	7	30	15
	4%	4%	13%	54%	27%
Proposed Future Research	2	1	9	29	15
	4%	2%	16%	52%	27%
Resources	1	1	12	25	8
	2%	2%	26%	53%	17%
Strategy for Technology Validation or Deployment	1	1	14	20	8
	2%	2%	32%	45%	18%
Alternative Fuel Market Expansion and/or Petroleum Reduction Potential	0	1	16	13	8
	0%	3%	42%	34%	21%

*1 Comment*

- I have no idea of the weightings.

4.7. Please provide additional comments:

*9 Responses*

- This is my second time presenting, and I find it very helpful to self-evaluate my research in the process of developing the presentation.
- Well-organized event. High-quality meals. I made some new connections. Overall, I am satisfied that I attended.
- Great meeting; great progress is being made in several areas. I am looking forward to next year’s meeting.
- Outstanding review; all was great.
- Excellent meeting.
- Based on past experience, PIs should not expect to receive feedback on the project presentations for about six months after the AMR, which is more than eight months after preparing the review material. This lag is too long to have substantive impacts on the project going forward. It would be better to target getting compiled review comments to the PIs in two months or less.
- Some attendees’ questions were hard to understand. I do not know what could be done to improve them technically. It was mainly issues with accents. Maybe the facilitator could restate the question so it could be clearer and understood.
- Uneven reviewer quality over the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program duration was a problem.
- The presentation should focus more on objectives and accomplishments.