GENERAL PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

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 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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments regarding approach:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:

TECHNOLOGY VALIDATION PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

1. Relevance to overall DOE objectives - the degree to which the project supports the goals and objectives of the Technology Validation Section of the Multi-Year RD&D plan. (Weight = 20%)

4 - Outstanding. Project is critical to the DOE Hydrogen Program RD&D objectives and fully addresses the Technology Validation key technical targets.
3 - Good. Project strongly supports the DOE Hydrogen Program RD&D objectives and addresses Technology Validation key technical targets.
2 - Fair. Project only partially supports the DOE Hydrogen Program RD&D objectives or the Technology Validation key technical targets.
1 - Poor. Project provides little support to the Hydrogen Program RD&D objectives or the Technology Validation key technical targets.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

3. Technical Accomplishments and Progress toward overall project and DOE Technology Validation 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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

4. Collaborations with other institutions - the degree to which the project interacts with industry partners, universities and laboratories. (Weight = 10%)

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

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

5. Proposed Future Activities – the degree to which the project has effectively planned its future work in a logical manner. (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.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Technology Validation (TV)

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

1a. Relevance
Is the project effort relevant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 goals: Create new jobs as well as save existing ones; spur economic activity and invest in long-term economic growth.(Weight = 20%)

4 - Outstanding. Project is very relevant and will make substantial contributions to the ARRA 2009 goals.
3 - Good. Project is relevant and will make moderate but significant contributions to the ARRA 2009 goals.
2 - Fair. Project is somewhat relevant and will make some contribution to the ARRA 2009 goals.
1 - Poor. Project is not relevant and is unlikely to contribute to the ARRA 2009 goals.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

1b. Relevance
Does the project's technology development plan and/or deployment plan address the FCT ARRA project goals of accelerating the commercialization and deployment of fuel cells and fuel cell manufacturing, installation, maintenance, and support services?

4 - Outstanding. Project is very relevant and will make substantial contributions to FCT ARRA project goals.
3 - Good. Project is relevant and will make moderate but significant contributions to FCT ARRA project goals.
2 - Fair. Project is somewhat relevant and will make some contributions to FCT ARRA goals.
1 - Poor. Project is not relevant, and is unlikely to contribute to the FCT ARRA goals.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

2. Development/Deployment Approach
Are the project's technical and deployment milestones and schedule clearly identified, appropriate, and feasible, and are technical and commercial barriers and risks adequately addressed? (Weight: 30%)

4 - Outstanding. Project team sharply focused on achieving milestones, overcoming barriers, and managing risks; difficult to improve approach significantly.
3 - Good. Appropriate milestones and schedule identified, and barriers and risks addressed. Effort likely to achieve project goals, but approach could be improved.
2 - Fair. Approach has significant weaknesses; but may contribute towards achieving most project goals.
1 - Poor. Unlikely to make progress towards project goals, and/or barriers, risks are not adequately addressed.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

3. Technical Accomplishments and Progress
What is the overall progress towards project's objectives and milestones? Is progress adequately reported and quantified (e.g., number of jobs, installations, etc.) as required by ARRA? (Weight = 40%)

4 - Outstanding. Excellent progress toward objectives and milestones; barrier(s) likely to be overcome.
3 - Good. Significant progress towards objectives and overcoming one or more barriers.
2 - Fair. Rate of technical progress is slow, some progress made in overcoming barriers.
1 - Poor. Little or no demonstrated progress towards objectives, or towards overcoming barriers.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

4. Collaborations
Does the project team effectively use collaborations between partners and with other industrial, commercial, university or research organizations to achieve its objectives?

4 - Outstanding. Effective collaboration between partners and with other institutions enhance probability of success of effort.
3 - Good. Some collaboration exists; partners are fairly well coordinated.
2 - Fair. Minimal collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be improved.
1 - Poor. Little coordination between partners, or collaboration with other organizations exist.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding
- ☐ 3 - Good
- ☐ 2 - Fair
- ☐ 1 - Poor

Comments:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: Hydrogen: ARRA

Specific Recommendations: