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%)**

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

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%)**

4-Outstanding. 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.		Specific Comments:
3-Good. 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.		
2-Fair. Some aspects of the project may lead to progress in overcoming some barriers, but the approach has significant weaknesses.		
1.-Poor. The approach is not responsive to project objectives and unlikely to make significant contributions to overcoming the barriers.		

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%)**

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

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%)**

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

4-Outstanding. 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:
3-Good. Future work plans build on past progress and generally address removing or diminishing barriers in a reasonable period.		
2-Fair. The future work plan may lead to improvements, but should be better focused on removing/diminishing key barriers in a reasonable timeframe.		
1.-Poor. Future work plans have little relevance or benefit toward eliminating barriers or advancing the program.		

Strengths

Weaknesses

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope

May, 2005

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:**