

APPENDIX C: GENERAL PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Reviewer: _____ **Panel (circle one):** AN / ED / FC / MF / PD / SCS / ST

Presentation ID	Title	Principal Investigator

1. Relevance to overall DOE objectives – the degree to which the project supports the Hydrogen Program and the goals and objectives in the Multi-Year RD&D plan. (Weight = 20%)

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

Comments:

2. Approach to performing the work – the degree to which technical barriers are addressed, the project is well designed, feasible, and integrated with other efforts. (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.

Comments:

3. Technical Accomplishments and Progress toward overall project and DOE goals – the degree to which progress has been made, measured against performance indicators and demonstrated progress towards DOE goals. (Weight = 40%)

- 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.

Comments:

4. Collaboration and Coordination with other institutions – the degree to which the project interacts with other entities and projects. (Weight = 10%)

- 4 - Outstanding.** Close, appropriate collaboration with other institutions; partners are full participants and well coordinated.
- 3 - Good.** Some collaboration exists; partners are fairly well coordinated.
- 2 - Fair.** A little collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be improved.
- 1 - Poor.** Most work is done at the sponsoring organization with little outside collaboration; little or no apparent coordination with between partners.

Comments:

5. Proposed Future Work – the degree to which the project has effectively planned its future in a logical manner by incorporating appropriate decision points, considering barriers to the realization of the proposed technology and, when sensible, mitigating risk by providing alternate development pathways. (Weight = 10%)

- 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.

Comments:

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:

Go to <https://peernet.orau.gov> to record your comments in PeerNet.

**HYDROGEN STORAGE CENTER OF EXCELLENCE
EVALUATION FORM**

Reviewer:

Panel (circle one): ST COE

Presentation ID	Title	Principal Investigator

1. Approach to performing the R&D including Center Management – 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 Center is well managed. The overall center is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers to development of on-board hydrogen storage technology (focused on 2010 targets). It would be difficult to improve the approach significantly.
- 3 - Good.** The Center is reasonably well managed. 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 several of the barriers.
- 2 - Fair.** The Center is somewhat well managed. Some aspects of the center projects may lead to progress in overcoming some barriers, but the approach has significant weaknesses.
- 1 - Poor.** The Center is not well managed. The approach is not responsive to project objectives and unlikely to make significant contributions to overcoming the barriers.

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 several of the barriers 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 any 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.

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 addressing identified issues and is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers in a timely manner. Future work includes well developed optional path(s) and/or off ramps.
- 3 - Good.** Future work plans build on past progress addressing identified issues and generally address removing or diminishing barriers in a reasonable period. Future work considers optional path(s) and/or off ramps.
- 2 - Fair.** The future work plan may lead to improvements, but should be better focused on removing/diminishing key barriers in a reasonable timeframe. Future work does not consider optional path(s) and/or off ramps.
- 1 - Poor.** Future work plans have little relevance or benefit toward eliminating barriers or advancing the program. Future work does not consider optional path(s) and/or off ramps.

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 director/coordinator provides a mechanism to foster partner interaction, interfaces, 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. (Weight = 20%)

- 4 - Outstanding.** Close coordination is evident among the majority of partners with continuing cross center communications and collaborations.
- 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.

Comments:

5. Collaborations the CoE – the degree to which the CoE interacts, interfaces, or coordinates with the other DOE CoEs and with other institutions and projects and the degree to which technology developed within the CoE is communicated and disseminated to outside the CoE. (Weight = 10%)

- 4 - Outstanding.** Collaboration with other DOE CoEs and other institutions is in place and appropriate; Good coordination is allowing the CoE to clearly leverage other work occurring in the subject area; very effective dissemination of the CoE’s activities through publications, presentations, patents, collaborations and etc.

- 3 - Good.** Outside collaboration exists but could be expanded; coordination is allowing the CoE to partially leverage other work occurring in the subject area; Good dissemination of the CoE's activities through publications, presentations, patents, collaborations and etc.
- 2 - Fair.** A little collaboration exists; coordination could be improved to allow the CoE to leverage other work occurring in the subject area; the CoE does not appear to be fully aware of other major R&D efforts occurring in a particular subject area; the CoE's activities are not widely disseminated to outside entities.
- 1 - Poor.** Most of the work done within the CoE; There appears to be little outside collaboration; There is little or no apparent coordination to leverage other work occurring in the subject area; there is little apparent dissemination of the CoE's activities to the outside world.

Comments:

Overall Center Strengths:

Overall Center Weaknesses:

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:

Go to <https://peernet.orau.gov> to record your comments in PeerNet.

SUBPROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Reviewer: **Subprogram (circle one): AN / ED / FC / MF / PD / SCS / ST**

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. Was the Sub-program area adequately covered? Were important issues and challenges identified? Was progress clearly presented in comparison to the previous year?
(Include information presented in the Plenary presentation of the Sub-program if appropriate.)

2. Are plans identified for addressing issues and challenges? Are there gaps in the project portfolio?

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

4. Other Comments:

Go to <https://peernet.orau.gov> to record your comments in PeerNet.