

Project Evaluation Form

This evaluation form was used for the following program panels: Hydrogen Production and Delivery; Hydrogen Storage; Fuel Cells; Manufacturing R&D; Technology Validation; Safety, Codes and Standards; Market Transformation; and Systems Analysis.

Evaluation Criteria: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program Annual Review

Provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation and write clearly, please.

1. Approach

To performing the work – the degree to which barriers are addressed, the project is well-designed, feasible, and integrated with other efforts. (Weight = 20%)

4 - Outstanding. Sharply focused on critical 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 on Approach to performing the work:

2. Accomplishments and Progress

Toward overall project and DOE goals – the degree to which progress has been made and measured against performance indicators, and the degree to which the project has demonstrated progress toward DOE goals. (Weight = 45%)

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 toward objectives or any barriers.

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

Comments on Accomplishments and Progress toward overall project and DOE goals:

3. 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 significantly improved.

1 - Poor. Most work is done at the sponsoring organization with little outside collaboration; little or no apparent coordination with partners.

4 - Outstanding

3 - Good

2 - Fair

1 - Poor

Comments on Collaboration and Coordination with other institutions:

4. Relevance/Potential Impact

The degree to which the project supports and advances progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program goals and objectives delineated in the Fuel Cell Technologies Office Multi-Year Research, Development & Demonstration Plan. (Weight = 15%)

4 - Outstanding. Project is critical to the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and has potential to significantly advance progress toward DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

3 - Good. Most project aspects align with the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

2 - Fair. Project partially supports the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

1 - Poor. Project provides little potential impact on advancing progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

4 - Outstanding

3 - Good

2 - Fair

1 - Poor

Comments on Relevance/Potential Impact:

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 its goals and, when sensible, mitigating risk by providing alternate pathways.

Note: if a project has ended, please leave blank. (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 on Proposed Future Work:

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope: