

**APPENDIX D: EVALUATION FORMS**

May, 2005

**DOE Hydrogen Program  
2005 Annual Program Review**

**Project Evaluation Form**

**Project No.**

**Reviewer Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

<p><b>4-Outstanding.</b> The project is critical to realization of the President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative and fully supports the RD&amp;D plan objectives</p>		Specific Comments:
<p><b>3-Good.</b> Most aspects of the project align with the President's vision the RD&amp;D plan objectives.</p>		
<p><b>2-Fair.</b> The project partially supports the President's hydrogen vision the RD&amp;D plan objectives.</p>		
<p><b>1.-Poor.</b> The project provides little support to the President's vision the RD&amp;D plan objectives.</p>		

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%)**

<p><b>4-Outstanding.</b> The project is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers to development of the hydrogen or fuel cell technologies. Difficult for the approach to be improved significantly.</p>		Specific Comments:
<p><b>3-Good.</b> 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.</p>		
<p><b>2-Fair.</b> Some aspects of the project may lead to progress in overcoming some barriers, but the approach has significant weaknesses.</p>		
<p><b>1.-Poor.</b> The approach is not responsive to project objectives and unlikely to make significant contributions to overcoming the barriers.</p>		

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%)**

<p><b>4-Outstanding.</b> 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.</p>		Specific Comments:
<p><b>3-Good.</b> The project has shown significant progress toward against its objectives and to overcoming one or more technical barriers.</p>		
<p><b>2-Fair.</b> The project has shown modest progress in overcoming barriers, and progress has been slow.</p>		
<p><b>1.-Poor.</b> The project has demonstrated little or no progress towards its objectives or any barriers.</p>		

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%)**

<b>4-Outstanding.</b> Close coordination with other institutions is in place and appropriate; partners are full participants.		Specific Comments:
<b>3-Good.</b> Some coordination exists; full and needed coordination could be accomplished fairly easily.		
<b>2-Fair.</b> A little coordination exists; full and needed coordinatiion would take significant time and effort to initiate.		
<b>1.-Poor.</b> Most all 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%)**

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

**Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope**

# DOE Hydrogen Program 2005 Annual Program Review

## Team Lead Briefing Evaluation Form

Session:      Mon Tue Wed Thu      a.m. p.m.  
        

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Sub-Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Project No.

--

Team Lead's 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. --

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

--

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

--

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

--

9. **Other comments:**

--