

APPENDIX E: 2009 ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS


This report documents two separate activities: 1) feedback from a meeting held May 22, 2009—just after the conclusion of the 2009 DOE Hydrogen and Vehicle Technologies Programs’ Annual Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting and 2) results from a survey questionnaire given to all participants. At the feedback meeting, results were presented from the 55 questionnaires completed by the end of the meeting. Following the meeting, the questionnaire was posted online and all 1,568 attendees were solicited via email to complete the questionnaire. As a result, an additional 181 questionnaires were completed, bringing the total to 236 (15% of the total attendees).

Meeting Overview

The 2009 DOE Hydrogen and Vehicle Technologies Programs’ Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting was held May 18-22, 2009 in Crystal City, Virginia. A plenary session was held on Monday afternoon. Oral presentations were held in eight parallel sessions all day Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and a half day on Friday. There were 232 oral Vehicle Technologies presentations and 174 oral Hydrogen Program presentations for a total of 406. Poster sessions were held Monday through Thursday evenings. There were 95 Vehicle Technologies posters and 124 Hydrogen Program posters for a total of 219. In total, 625 presentations were given during the meeting.

A total of 1,568 people attended the meeting. Attendance of the sessions was counted daily and is shown in the following graph.

2009 AMR Session Attendance by Day



Notes from the AMR Feedback Meeting on May 22, 2009

Numerous Vehicle Technologies and Hydrogen Program staff, Alliance Technical Services personnel who managed the review, and Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education staff who managed the reviewers of the review, attended the feedback meeting. The following are specific comments and recommendations made during this meeting.

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- Presentations should include a Gantt chart to plot project progress.
- Session assignments for reviewers were not always clear.
- Need to see clocks from the podium and moderator locations.
- Use pop-up responses for answering simple questions on reviewer form.
- Hard to tell what is new from year to year in the presentations.
- Add more time for sub-program overview presentations.
- Presentation template was a plus.
- 20 minutes were not enough to assess progress.
- Some reviewers didn't know their schedule until Monday, which was problematic.
- Putting the same reviewers on same projects would be preferred.
- Identifying slides as "new" would be good; helps reviewers sort through previous results.
- Templates were sort of boilerplate—suggested pop-up options in questions for reviewer ease.
- Past presentations being available was good.
- Maybe have DVDs optional and distribute separately from registration packet—also consider thumb drives.
- Reviewer feedback sessions must be added to overall schedule as reminder to the TDMs.
- Solicit areas of expertise going forward for future reviewers.
- May need one more large session room next year.
- Consider having the same reviewers each year for continuity and the ability to assess progress.
- Should consider reducing the number of posters to be reviewed.
- Consider doing the meeting questionnaire online only.
- It was suggested that reviewers indicate their area of expertise on the registration form.
- It was proposed that when the Save the Date goes out next year, we should ask if reviewers want to sign up at that time. (Editorial note: This recommendation was implemented as part of the email soliciting completion of the Web-based questionnaire.)

2009 AMR Survey Questionnaire Results

The following pages present the results of the 2009 survey questionnaire with comparison to 2007 and 2008. Note that no editing of the survey response was done. Following are selected comments and recommendations pertinent to the 2010 meeting.

- Networking and information gathering/exchange were frequently mentioned as the most important aspects of this meeting.
- There were several comments that the hotel was too costly.
- Reviewers would like their assignments earlier to head off conflicts.
- Presenters should use larger fonts.

- There should be water in the session rooms.
- The agenda needs to be clearer with times listed when food is served.
- Presentations were too long and many were allowed to exceed their time limit, reducing time for questions.
- A “not applicable” category should be included in the questionnaire.
- There were too many projects for the time available.
- Sub-program overview presentations and materials did not have sufficient depth for review.
- The criteria used for evaluation do not fit all projects. There should be at least one question to the effect of "Do you think this project should continue to be supported?"
- The review is too large—most projects do not need to be reviewed every year.
- It would be good for the DOE program manager to introduce the speaker and explain how the project fits with his/her portfolio.

The following table presents the results of the questionnaire. Note that other than where totals are given, the answers to the questionnaire questions are averages based on the following scale:

Strongly Agree = 5

Agree = 4

Neutral = 3

Disagree = 2

Strongly Disagree = 1

2007	2008	2009	
61	78	236	Total Number of Respondents
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS			
			1. Attendee Role and Affiliation:
			a. What was your role in the review?
14	19	45	Peer Reviewer
11	23	90	Presenter of a Project – Oral or Poster
1	1	6	Presenter of Program Overview
34	36	90	Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter
			b. What is your affiliation?
0	2	14	Government agency directly sponsoring the program under review
16	31	81	National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher whose project is under review
16	16	70	In an industry directly involved in the program under review
6	4	21	In an industry with interest in the work under review
3	3	28	Government agency with interest in the work
11	4	17	National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher not being reviewed, but who has an interest in the work
5	13	13	Other (descriptions below - not all provided descriptions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • German delegation, Public non-U.S. government agency, consultant • Retired university faculty • Italian Governmental Agency • Consultant (3) • Consultant, Under contract to ORNL • DOE consultant (2) • Educational nonprofit organization/DOE EERE grant award recipient

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONS FOR ALL ATTENDEES			
4.6	4.6	4.5	2. Purpose and scope of the Hydrogen Program Review were well defined.
4.3	4.4	3.9	3. The plenary presentations were helpful to understanding the direction of the Hydrogen Program.
4.3	4.3	4.2	4. Sub-program overviews were helpful to understanding the research objectives.
			5. The quality, breadth, and depth of the following were sufficient to contribute to a comprehensive review:
4.1	4.2	4.1	a. Presentations
3.9	4.2	4.1	b. Question & Answer periods
3.8	3.9	3.9	c. Answers provided concerning programmatic questions
3.9	4.1	4.1	d. Answers provided concerning technical questions
4.2	4.4	4.2	6. Enough time was allocated for presentations.
4.0	4.2	4.0	7. Time allowed for the Question & Answer period following the presentations was adequate for a rigorous exchange.
3.8	3.7	3.7	8. The questions asked by reviewers were sufficiently rigorous and detailed.
			9. There were no problems with:
4.5	4.4	4.3	a. Groupings of projects by technical area
4.3	4.4	4.2	b. Proprietary data (should not be any at this Review)
3.9	3.9	4.0	c. Quantity/level of the information presented
4.5	4.7	4.6	10. The review was conducted in an organized fashion.
			11. The frequency (once per year) of this formal review process for this Program is:
98%	96%	90%	About Right
0%	4%	8%	Too Frequent
2%	0%	1%	Not Frequent Enough
0%	0%	0%	Don't Know the Frequency of Reviews
4.6	4.5	4.4	12. Logistics and amenities were satisfactory
4.0	4.3	4.3	13. The visual quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to see all of the presentations I attended.
4.3	4.5	4.4	14. The audio quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to hear all the presentations I attended.
4.3	4.7	4.3	15. The hotel accommodations were satisfactory.
4.5	4.4	4.5	16. The information about the Review and the hotel accommodations sent to me prior to the Review was adequate.
			17. What was the most useful part of the review process?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent presentation format made them easy to follow. Common grouping of presentations. Knowledgeable reviewers with good questions. • Provides considerable interaction of researchers in the hydrogen field, which does not occur at other gatherings. • Board outside room. • Opportunity to have an overview of all projects funded by the DOE under the H2 and vehicle programs. • Opportunity to talk with participants - especially at posters. • Networking. • Meeting with fellow colleagues to discuss research ideas. • Easy to see and hear presentations. • Program overviews and technical advances/future direction of projects. • Meeting others of similar business interests and goals. • Seeing high-quality technical content in the context of practical goals. • Networking. • Exchange of information and suggestions between organizations and labs. • Program details. • Networking. • Progress update and program direction. • Good improvement. The reviewers were much more constructive and respectful in their comments than last year. • Discussion with colleagues and collaborators. • Opportunity for exchange with other researchers. • Meeting program organizers far-flung collaborators. • Keeping Schedule. • Learning about other projects. • Presentations, contacts, and informal discussions. • Seeing what the national labs are working on versus industry. • Presentations. • Getting reasonably complete updates on all the projects in this program. • Comparison of funded programs and projects. • Review of fund allocation. • Review of progress and tasks to be completed. • In Energy Storage, the battery projects' reviews were very useful! • Having the presentations available on CD.

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- Talking to people at breaks.
- Some of the presentations were useful.
- Presentations.
- To keep me informed on the process in the relevant area and to learn new developments.
- Learning about progress in the technology.
- Hallway discussions.
- CD with the briefs – there were too many parallel sessions to sit in on them all, but can review later.
- Presentations.
- Meeting peers working on similar projects.
- Exchange of technical details and opportunity for further collaborations.
- I learned a lot about the actual status of projects and the many results obtained.
- Cross industry/government/academic interactions.
- Compared to the NETL peer review, this EERE review is significantly more helpful.
- Meeting collaborators and peers.
- Overview of total range of programs.
- Ability to compare presentations from similar projects.
- Ability to guide research and program into most useful channels.
- Ability to see the entire DOE research portfolio in one meeting.
- Amount and quality of information, ability to speak directly to others in industry.
- As a general attendee (not presenter or reviewer), this annual review was very good chance to understand how the whole DOE program is going, and I've learned a lot about the state of the art of lithium ion battery research in the U.S.
- Both the talks and the poster session were extremely helpful to me in getting a perspective on the current directions of battery research in the U.S. The talks had the right level of detail and the presenters were generally clear and concise.
- Comments by the reviewers.
- Discussions with reviewers and peers.
- Efficiently meeting everyone involved in this area.
- Everything is good!
- Exchange of ideas among peer groups.
- Exchange of technical information and networking.
- Feedback on program and results.
- Getting an overview of the new direction for the DOE program and getting information on new advances. In many cases the technical progress is perhaps not as great as at the last review, but I think this mainly reflects that the program was redirected to look at some much tougher areas (such as higher energy density anodes); also the last review was really an 18-month review. The PeerNet system worked much better than the last time, although I did lose one review early on and had to recreate it when PeerNet wouldn't save it.
- Facilities were very good; food was great!
- Getting the latest state of the art technology information.
- Going to talks in subjects other than my own.
- Good detail on projects of interest.
- Good organization. Enough time for the speaker.
- Great opportunity to meet up with program administrators, as well as experts in the field. Wonderful information gathering.
- Great snapshot of the breadth of research projects being funded by DOE. Liked the fact that H2/FC and Vehicle Technologies were co-located this year in nearby hotels.
- Having access to presentations prior to talks. Having the opportunity for asking questions.
- Having all the presentations and presenters together in one place at one time.
- Having the same consistent first page of each presentation layout the same critical information.
- I appreciated learning about the other areas in our program and what they are doing, within a short period of time.
- I find the Review an information meeting and where I can connect with government personnel and other companies.
- I liked the poster sessions where a direct dialog is possible with authors/Pis.
- In addition to having the opportunity to attend the presentations I was most interested in (and to ask questions of presenters), it was very valuable to have the opportunity to interact with some of our colleagues who work in Washington and with some of our subcontractors who had flown in to attend the Peer Review at breaks and when they came to our poster presentation. Face to face meetings are not frequent over the course of the year due to budget constraints; however, these annual meetings give us a valuable opportunity to interact in this way.
- In several cases, the upcoming review seemed to be a primary motivation for researchers to complete certain parts of their work and to organize it. I think the review process actually helps keep many projects on track.
- Information - technology status & updates. Overall program direction. Commercial status of technologies.
- Interacting with colleagues and discussions with poster presenters.
- It gave a good overview of the goals of the programs and the results obtained to date.
- It is useful to hear about the progress made in the Hydrogen Program.
- Learn the progress made up to date.
- Learning and understanding what and why others are doing particular R&D.
- Learning from others.

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- Learning on a technical level what DOE is funding and the direction of the research.
- Learning what has been tried; even when the no-go conclusion was obtained. Synthetic methods used for other purposes.
- Listening to the other oral presentations - plenary and technical.
- Meeting others in the hydrogen community and networking.
- Meeting various representatives from industry, universities, and national labs.
- Most interesting and helpful.
- My own education was valuable.
- Networking.
- Networking.
- Networking with other scientists and industry.
- Networking with others for my research.
- Networking.
- Opportunity for networking and the chance to see progress in technical areas other than my own.
- Opportunity to learn more.
- Opportunity to meet with the PIs and network.
- Oral and poster sessions.
- Organized well. I was able to attend and learn from presentations in the same category/field.
- Overview of what is going on in several areas of the hydrogen and fuel cell car programs.
- Overviews of subprogram areas.
- Plenary session from DOE.
- Poster sessions and adequate number of oral presentations, keeping strict timing for people to attend the parallel sessions and enough breaks.
- Poster sessions and presentations.
- Posters and discussions.
- Presentation of all aspects of hydrogen energy at a single meeting. Opportunity to meet various researchers working on different areas of hydrogen storage.
- Presentations.
- Presentations – keeping research relevant to the current problems and not reflecting on “pie in the sky” research.
- Presentations, both oral and poster; interactions; and networking.
- Project status.
- Question and answer period.
- Question and answer session for each presentation.
- Questions from the audience, suggestions from peers during breaks, poster sessions, the enthusiasm of attendees, and the willingness to help each other with guidance.
- The review was well organized and provided an excellent opportunity to assess progress. For the most part, the new online review process worked well.
- Seating and tables for reviewers.
- Seeing the wealth of projects. Communication and partnerships. Providing lunches and dinners kept people on site.
- Seeing an industry-wide review of PHEV & EREV research.
- Talking directly with the program folks from DOE.
- Technical presentations of on-going projects/programs.
- Technical presentations on projects being reviewed.
- Technical progress in the important energy storage area.
- The AMR is both an excellent opportunity to see the progress of current research and to facilitate discussions among researchers.
- The breadth of the presentations allowed insight into the overall state of technical progress.
- The chance to see other projects related to the Hydrogen Program along with the great opportunity to network and discuss with the breadth of knowledge in one area on this topic.
- The flexibility to be able to choose which presentations one wanted to sit in on was nice. Providing none conflicted with each other due to time, but overall I was able to sit in on any and all that I found of relevance and interest.
- The informal networking ability outside of the schedule.
- The materials.
- The morning intro sessions and schedule of presentations outline.
- The most important part of the meeting for me was to learn about the development status of the fuel cell technologies supported by DOE.
- I got incredibly condensed and useful information regarding what was going on across the different fields of fuel cell industry, and how far or close.
- How close we were to full-scale commercialization in certain areas, and what needs to be done in order to achieve the industry goals.
- The most useful information presented is the new, updated, and breakthrough information from the projects and the programs.
- The opportunity to interact with fellow participants, particularly at the poster series.
- The opportunity to interact with the researchers and the excellent question and answer sessions after each presentation.
- The opportunity to meet key researchers and talk about their research activities was extremely valuable, and

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

		<p>much appreciated. By the way, thank you for the lunches and refreshments between sessions! The prepared handouts with registration were also quite useful to understand who's who and who's working with whom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentations and the exchange during the poster sessions. • The presentations from the FCV and refueling industry representatives. If anything, these were FAR too short. When you have programs that eat up \$40 million of DOE's program budget at a crack, these programs absolutely require more explanation, more detailed results, and status discussions. Instead, the program organizers allocated equal presentation and discussion time. This is not acceptable. Moreover, DOE MUST require the industry "partners" to be true partners. Cost-shared funding should mandate info sharing. DOE (and NREL) has become very lax in this regard. Far too many important R&D findings (and costs) are hidden from public and academic view. • The presentations themselves. • The presentations were kept on a reasonable schedule. • The presentations were systematic and well prepared. • The presentations. • The Q and A. • The question and answer sections of the presentations were very informative and pretty rigorous. • The review process allowed me to gain a more thorough insight into the scope of the DOE program. • The review provides an opportunity to summarize data collected in the past year. Meeting other researchers doing similar work and in related areas is probably the best part of conducting a review in this manner. • The talks were excellent and provided an up-to-the-minute snapshot of current research. • The technical presentations. • This was a great opportunity to become exposed to a cross section of the work being done on hybrids and alternative powertrains. • Sessions were generally very informative. • To see the activities currently on going with the vehicle technology program. • Web-based review platform. • Well-organized review process. Apart from some minor glitches, the new online review process worked well.
		<p>18. What could have been done better?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review is too large - most projects do not need to be reviewed every year. Combining the two large programs only exacerbated this issue. There is very little overlap. Please do not repeat. • There was not enough communication on when and where food was provided. Too many required slides on background and context for time allotted. Font was too small on many presentations. • Cheaper hotel for the meeting. • The Fuel Cell section needed a larger session room. • Too BIG - combining Hydrogen and VT is a BAD idea. • Individual subprogram reviews were much better, i.e. systems/materials/engines. • The amount of time devoted to formal presentations should be shortened and more casual meetings should be encouraged where researchers can freely discuss. • Their ideas – find new collaborations. • Presentations should finish by 5:00pm and not start before 8:00am. • Presenters need to use bigger font so that the audience in the back of the room can see/read it. • Distribute data on a to memory stick instead of CD. • A more thorough overview should be presented on subprograms. • Hotel rooms are too expensive. • Poster displays were not uniform in display format, size of text, and figures. Some were difficult to read, particularly for "older" eyes. • If the formats of slides (such as the minimum font size) were defined, it would help the audiences follow the presentation. • More time for reviewer/researcher interaction. • This meeting is not useful as a review. Consider a half-day of brief overview presentations followed by a half-day of posters – where only reviewers are permitted in poster session presentations during that "on" day. Then the public goes to posters on another "off" day. • Battery developers provided too little data. • A less formal review with lots of group discussion may be more productive and far less expensive. • Temperature control - many sessions were too cold. • The venue was OK, much better than last year. Organization is fine and I looked at the poster/talk breakdown. • Some presentation rooms needed to be bigger. • Nothing. • Questions/criteria/presentations preliminary better controlled for uniformity. • Making sure that OEM's recurring money has to show data with real units on. Two GM presentations were unacceptable with little or no data or missing axis. They should not get funding if they are going to do this. • Water at breakfast. • The fuel cell section got moved to a room that was way too small. • It would have been helpful if DOE staff could have been more forthcoming regarding the implications of the Secretary's proposed budget changes. • Questions during the plenary session. • Water should be available for reviewers.

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- DOE should work with presenters to come up with press releases and other promotions to identify value of work. Project work may be supported by public and Congress with more PR. Some valuable work progress should be released.
- In Energy Storage the ABRT presentations said much too little about the technology specifics and science specifics involved. I know there were 25 posters covering this, but I live in Gaithersburg: 90 minutes on Metro, briefings from 8:15 to 7:45, 90 more minutes on Metro. How was I supposed to have time to review 25 posters on subjects I care about? Energy storage could have used Friday to give some of these posters as presentations.
- Room numbers should have been provided ahead of time along with the agenda.
- DOE is spending too much money unnecessarily - instead of hiring two people who are sitting around most of the time to monitor questions and take microphones around the floor, why doesn't DOE just have a standing floor microphone and have people line up behind the microphone to ask questions?
- Poster sessions are stigmatized - both presenters and attendees feel the poster sessions are consolation for those who can't make "the cut" (not good enough to be assigned for oral presentation) and assigned "after hours" when most attendees are gone.
- The format of the presentations is not conducive to understanding a project you didn't already know about.
- Clearly state that breakfast and lunch are included.
- Allow presenters to take part remotely by Web-based meeting software.
- Seating logistics.
- Thermal sessions in APE and AC were scheduled at same time (Friday morning). The same problem occurred last year.
- Need to ask what sessions will be attended during registration process. The initial room for the energy storage session was far too small for what is definitely a key area. The room was changed, but seemed to take a lot of complaints to make that change happen. Also, this didn't make up for missed talks because the room was full and people were standing in the hall.
- I think it would be good for the DOE program manager to introduce the speaker and explain how the project fits with his/her portfolio.
- Allow more time for Q&A to allow the collective knowledge to progress.
- More snacks in the morning!
- Several things were improved compared to last year especially with respect to Internet access and PCs available to reviewers.
- This is not really a review; it is a Kangaroo Court. The DOE program managers should engage in asking hard program and feasibility questions.
- The meeting is expensive, with not much choice for hotel accommodations.
- The meeting should be held in ONE venue! Two sites caused me to miss talks.
- The larger programs (> \$1M) get too little time; small ones (~\$100K) could be shorter.
- A few of the presentations used too small type. Most, by far, were OK.
- A lot. It is really surprising to see the focus on hydrogen and fuel cells when there are no clear technological solutions or solicitations for short- to near-term technologies to meet and exceed the current government targets for fuel efficiency. For technology start-ups in attendance, this year's review may have missed a key focus in today's auto market.
- The presentations were outdated. Numerous speakers spoke to the fact that the data was old compared to what they had. Apparently DOE required them to submit final presentations three months before. It's better if they were asked to submit two weeks in advance and upload to a website. Attendees can download them on their memory disk, from the Web, or even come to the conference and take a disk if needed.
- All presentations should be in one hotel; could not go back/forth because of the location distance.
- Arrange appropriate conference rooms for the hot topic so that attendees can have a seat and be actively involved.
- As often the case with such meetings, one is occasionally confronted with two talks of specific interest that are scheduled at the same time in different sessions. Another problem was the difficulty of moving between the two meeting hotels to catch talks of interest.
- Assignments of rooms. Those of us interested in both Fuel Cells and Batteries were in a tough spot. Once the switch was made, the Fuel Cell room was a bit small. If an audience member did not use the microphone, the speaker should be requested to repeat the question for everyone's benefit before answering.
- Assignments for reviewers. I told the AMR team that I was arriving Wednesday afternoon, but I was assigned hydrogen production projects reviews for Tuesday. After this was corrected, I was then at the last minute assigned fuels technology projects again on Tuesday.
- Assignment of reviews according to personal expertise.
- Attendance by Secretary Chu, in general and especially due to recent announcement.
- Better explanation of why the Hydrogen Program was decimated. The DOE staff was either "muzzled" or did not know. Of course the story is still unfolding.
- Better overview to first-time presenters for oral review regarding what to expect, format, size of audience, and etc.
- Can't think of any thing; job well done.
- Crowd control.
- Do not know.
- DOE plenary presentation should be longer in time allocation and more detailed.
- DOE representatives could/should have better clarified the new administration's intention and direction on fuel cells R&D.
- Don't know; everything seemed well organized to me.

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- Earlier and more consistent notification and confirmation of potential reviewers.
- Everything was fine.
- Fewer parallel sessions - there were several times during which I wanted to attend sessions that were happening simultaneously. Please also try to have posters available on the CD given to attendees.
- Focus more on fuel cells of all types, not just hydrogen.
- Free wireless Internet.
- Given the extensive nature of the program, I believe the review was well organized.
- In many cases, the rooms were way too small for the audience. I had to stand in the back (or leave) for more than half of the presentations I wanted to attend.
- Insufficient food at dinner poster sessions.
- It may be difficult or impossible, but more accurate planning of room size for potential audience size for each session would have been beneficial.
- It seems it would make sense for DOE program managers to assess in advance what level of progress was made on a particular project throughout that year, and then decide if an oral or poster presentation is more appropriate to present findings. It wasn't clear how format was selected but some progress especially that which is primarily pictorial lends itself better to poster than to oral, whereas hard data needs the oral format.
- It was hard to see some of the slides because of the light level in the room. Some slides contained too much information in too small of a font. I realize that I can get the slides online and read them, but what's the point of projecting a slide that has minimal value to the oral presentation.
- It went very well. I can't think of a way to improve.
- It will be helpful to have all the sessions in one place.
- It would be great to have additional rooms available to everyone to organize meetings with co-workers from other labs.
- It would have been helpful to allow more time for questions and discussion after oral presentations.
- It would have been nice to not split the meeting between two hotels - but I assume this is the reason for the new venue next year. Also, one of the meeting rooms was a bit cramped.
- I've felt that over the past three years that I have attended, the Peer Review has become more organized and focused, and this past meeting was the best of the three. I can't think of anything that I would suggest changing.
- Larger facility. Having the meeting in two different hotels is not a good idea. Never schedule the meeting the week before Memorial Day.
- Larger font size for the timetable of events.
- Larger room for the fuel cell session.
- Less time for presentations; more oral presentations.
- Logistics and costs.
- Make it a bit smaller.
- Many of the presentations moved so fast that they were hard to follow. This is likely because the presenters wanted to include everything to show that they used their funding to the fullest, so I'm not sure what can be done about it. But combining the pace of the talks with the lack of proprietary information sometimes requires leaving out a lot of detail that could be helpful.
- Many reviewers are currently DOE-funded project PIs. If their expertise areas are the same, it could cause conflict of interests; if not, they are not the most qualified. Such a practice definitely limits DOE's view on the quality of the projects and the future directions.
- More information about hotel service.
- More information could have been provided earlier to the reviewers about the scheduling and agenda.
- More seating needed for FC presentations.
- N/A.
- No particular ideas at this time.
- No particular suggestions.
- Not much. With a group this size, it was all handled very well.
- Nothing.
- Nothing – no complaints.
- Perhaps separating the Hydrogen and Vehicle Technologies programs back out would ease confusion and overcrowding of plenary session review room.
- Please arrange for all sessions in one location. Having two hotels was inconvenient.
- Please give more time for the reviewers to ask more questions.
- Please list the reviewers and their affiliations for each session.
- Please provide water in the conf or presentation room.
- Presentations were outdated material because of the limitations of no proprietary information and the several months that lapsed between the time when the presentations were due and when they were given.
- Presenters could have considered their audience better.
- Provide refreshments at all times, not just at the breaks.
- Raise the display screens for the video projectors to make the bottom of the presentations visible to the entire room.
- Really, this is very good. Better Internet connectivity for the HTML-based review process would have prevented frustrating disconnection in the middle of a review.
- Revert to the former system for inputting reviews. The Web-based system is poorly adapted to this process; it is better suited for reviewing confidential proposals. The FedEx packages containing nothing more than a password

- were a ridiculous waste of money. Better to hand each reviewer a flash drive with all information on it to be returned at the end of the review so that Internet connection is not required.
- Rooms were sometimes overfilled. Panel discussion was avoiding topics of very high interest, i.e. development of budget for H₂ program.
 - Seating capacity for some sessions was inadequate. This created a situation where people had to stand in the aisles or outside the meeting room. It was somewhat disruptive. There were audio/visual equipment problems in one of the sessions that contributed to a delay.
 - Set dates for the meeting early, advertise the dates, and try not to change the dates.
 - Some confusion between Battery and Fuel Cell related presentations. Hydrogen/fuel cell and vehicles presentations could have been organized in the same hotel/space for ease of intermingling between the two areas.
 - Some initial problems in the online review with reviewer assignments – i.e., assignments were added and deleted at the last minute without notification. Hopefully this is simply a "break-in" problem that won't occur in the future. Many of the presenters failed to address remaining obstacles/barriers to progress. As a reviewer, it was often difficult to "read between the lines" and determine the actual status of the project with respect to technical barriers.
 - Some of the presentations were light on detail; I would prefer if more detail were available. Outside of that -- I learned a lot and am looking forward to next year.
 - Some of the rooms were crowded (most were good).
 - Some rooms were too small and could not accommodate people who came to attend the presentation.
 - Some, but not all, of the talks from the commercial companies were basically marketing fluff and too vague for a merit review. While I recognize that this is an open forum, they should be able to sanitize the data sufficiently to at least say something. From a reviewer's point of view, one or two talks were devoid of any useful information whatsoever; it appeared to me that they didn't care what we thought because they were going to get funding anyway. The real problem of course is that this can be used as a ploy to hide really shoddy work. Several topics really need the ability to show movies as part of their presentations, but generally this was not allowed (or if it was it didn't work). Try and permit this in future.
 - Sometimes, the schedule was too tight. For example, the review started 8:00am and ended 9:00pm. I believe that, especially, the reviewers (and of course also the presenters) would be very exhausted at that time. For the good review, I think it is necessary to schedule the review process not too tight.
 - The meeting is too big, and the speakers can only be well selected.
 - The presentation rooms were too cold; the lobby area was too crowded.
 - The question and answer sessions could have been longer in order to provide a more thorough understanding of the results obtained and possible problems not considered or addressed by the presenter.
 - The reviewers could have been notified earlier as to exactly how many and which reviews they had to do. I got my information late and was assigned 23 reviews 4 of which overlapped (were at the same time with other reviews I had). I did manage to work this out and get down to a reasonable number of 12 reviews.
 - The Reviewers did not seem to be technically good enough to ask good tough questions. In fact often they did not ask any questions at all. It seems they are trying hard to be nice as they may have some stake in the outcome. Experts from fields should be carefully chosen and changed every year or every two years. Not good to have the same reviewers every year.
 - The talks given by the European representatives were inconsistent. One or two of their talks were poorly executed and not informative. The talks given by the DOE representatives were very useful.
 - The time reminder for the presenter could have done better.
 - The timing conflict between BATT and Fuel Cell sessions made it difficult, if not impossible, to attend all sessions of interest.
 - There needs to be time for Q&A at the plenary session.
 - There was a slight problem with the room size being too small initially, but this was quickly rectified. The food was excellent. Very large review. This hindered discussion for my specific program.
 - There were not enough chairs in some rooms, and it was hot. The room ventilation was poor. It's hard to focus on the discussions when sweat is running down your forehead.
 - There were problems with reviewer assignments in the online review. Review assignments were added/removed without notification. This created some confusion; hopefully it was simply a problem associated with first-time use of the review method.
 - There's not sufficient time to present all data accumulated during the year. So the presentations end up being marketing talks, instead of being technical talks.
 - This is critical—in order to accurately assess technical work, the details must be presented. This is impossible without an NDA, and is the reason for my negative ratings.
 - This is too large. Too many presentations. Too many people.
 - To limit presenters to complete their presentations within the assigned time. Some presenters left very little or no time for questions that is a very important part of the reviewing process.
 - Too many programs were reviewed all at once by a review panel whose members are also being reviewed! Given that a vast number of programs are being reviewed it must be exhausting for the review panel to keep their focus during the whole week. It will be better to split the meeting so that a smaller number of programs get reviewed much better.
 - We had a lot of problems with reviewers. The reviewers did not know what projects they were reviewing. The reviewers did not show up. The status of reviewers was not provided to the program leads. A better communication process for reviewers and informing the program leads needs to improve.
 - When you switch rooms for a series of presentations, you might want to make things a bit clearer ... something as

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

			simple as a yellow post-it note with directions.
4.3	4.4	4.2	19. Overall, how satisfied are you with the review process?
			20. Would you recommend this review process to others and should it be applied to other DOE programs?
100%	96%	93%	Yes
0%	4%	7%	No
			21. Please provide comments and recommendations on the overall review process.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The online process used this year is easy to use and convenient. • Need clearer agenda with times and locations for food. Time for each presentation was OK, but the required "context and background" slides should not be presented. Focus on what was achieved and conclusions. Use larger font. • The annual review meeting is becoming too large. It may serve the needs of the sponsors, but the review has become too unwieldy and rigid to be of much use for the researchers. • Reviews should be based on research topic (fuel cells, hydrogen/batteries/engines/components/etc.) and not all-encompassing DOE offices. • The process is very well organized. Rich Bechtold and the colleagues should be commended for an outstanding job. Coffee breaks, continental breakfasts, and lunches were very good. Plenty of time provided for meetings and networking between sessions. Good job keeping everything on schedule so people can move around between sessions. • Improve readability of posters. • The review was very well planned. • I do not understand why this review is open to the public. • I believe reviewers were overwhelmed by the poster session. I'm not sure if projects were not "prejudged." • I liked the overall organization of the meeting. • Feedback from reviewers needs to be within two months; otherwise, don't bother providing the comments. • The hotel cost at \$250 is getting a bit too high to afford for many of us. • Require presenters to start with the status of last year's review and focus mostly on work done over the past year. Too many talks had more than half of their talks the same as last year. • I don't like mega-reviews with many parallel sessions! Since I am primarily a battery person, I was forced to miss all of the Hydrogen work and only caught the SOFC sessions for fuel cells. Also, none of the Basic Energy Science sessions! • Vehicle Technologies program presentations were extremely short changed. Too few sessions, and the papers were so condensed that most lacked any appreciable depth! • A representative from U.S. DOT (e.g. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration), which participates in the 21st Century Truck Partnership, should have been invited as a reviewer! • Too big, too noisy, and too shallow. Review smaller program chunks in more depth. • Seating in salons was unsatisfactory. On Tuesday, Energy Storage was crammed – Standing Room Only. The rest of the week Fuel Cells was jammed. Someone came to count people in the FC session but she missed the times when all seats were taken and people were still jammed at the doorway and on the floor. • I think this is a very time and resource expensive process. • Facilities and organization were superb. • Technical details and discussion should be extended to all research groups year round as it becomes available. • The review should be held someplace other than DC. If you want it to be a review, then the DOE program managers need to be more involved. • A great job, with great planning and wonderful accommodations. A real pleasure to be there and a great source of informal connections and information exchange. I will highly recommend that we keep attending in the future. • Again, the review was quite large. This may make for simpler and cheaper coordination, but I do not feel that it lead to improved discussions between folks in battery, fuel cell, hydrogen storage, etc. • Biggest criticism: For a peer review to be meaningful, it needs to be closed, with the peer reviewers signing Non-Disclosure Agreements. The success or failure of these technologies often hinges on specific technical issues and the details/data, etc. are, unfortunately, almost always proprietary. Consequently, the value of the peer review suffers because the peer reviewers only see high-level information. • Feed back! The presenters would like to know the outcome of the review and a summary of constructive criticisms that reviewers may have had after presentation, preferably confidential (within a few days upon compilation of the results). • First of all, congratulations to the organizers of this meeting! Everything went so smoothly and as planned. Keep doing a great job! • For a DOE review it would be a better display to the press and public if the energy generated (as well as local transportation) was coming from the technology being reviewed. • From a reviewer's point of view, I found this to be better than last year. By having us rate every other talk or so, we could keep up with our tasks and in my view give a more thoughtful response with the detailed commentary that I (and I think the DOE) find more useful than the scoring system. The downside was that I could not always follow the talks I was not covering, but you can't have everything. There is still not enough time for the presenters to really explain what they have done, still trying to cram too much into the week. However, by using posters instead of talks for some people, it was better than before. Although I understand that those giving posters may not have been happy, I actually find them a good way to get a true Q&A dialog going. • Funds received did not always reflect quantity/quality of work being reported. Often two similar programs with similar goals would present back to back but one program would receive twice the funding. Presenters should

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

- explain where a majority of the cash was spent (i.e. total man hours, major capital investments).
- Good.
 - Good.
 - Good job Rich and team.
 - Great job.
 - Great job!
 - Having a merit review gives researchers an external view of their projects, and DOE has an external view of the projects they fund.
 - Helpful and feel confident on what we are doing after the review process.
 - Hotel room rates, even though discounted were too high (~\$285/night). Some presentations could have been grouped better to minimize the number of days a reviewer would need to stay.
 - I am satisfied with the overall process.
 - I can see how this review must take a considerable effort to prepare and present in such an organized manner. Those involved at DOE should be commended for a job that always seems to be so well organized.
 - I didn't know which projects to review till Monday, May 18th.
 - I felt that the whole story was not being told. The auto makers presented that this was still a viable project, which it isn't as reflected by DOE's lack of funding. This was the only thing the car company's can agree upon between them. I think the costs are not being presented accurately and not frequently enough.
 - I found the review very informative. I got a sense of the scope and strategy of the programs and enough detail to identify potential collaborators.
 - I was satisfied and found it a good experience for my first year involved with the DOE AMR.
 - In addition to us benefiting from the meeting more each year, we have recommended to some of our subcontractors that they attend in order to get an idea of what others in the industry are doing and perhaps get ideas from others at these meetings which might speed up their contributions on our timeline. This has consistently been a motivator for the progress of our project.
 - In my view, a large panel reviews a vast number of programs. Given the length of the AMR meeting the review process may get compromised. This also will be overwhelming for the program managers.
 - It is important that the reviewers truly understand the project. Sometimes the scientific/academic types are out of touch with the industry approaches and understandings.
 - It seems that we continue to push the deadline for getting the review material into the hands of the reviewers. Earlier is better.
 - It was the first time I attended. I was impressed with the entire event. Good job!
 - It went very well. Thank you.
 - Last year I did not receive my review until the actual review summary was published on the DOE website. I would hope that I would receive my review before publishing this year.
 - More (or less restrictive) categories for input in the review process would be desirable.
 - Most of the presentations were too long. The number of slides should be restricted to a maximum of 30, and time allotted should be controlled properly by the session lead. Reviewers should be changed every year or 2 years and experts in the field should be chosen.
 - N/A.
 - No comments.
 - Of the presentations I saw, I feel that the peer reviewers and many presenters see the merit review as a presentation of a technical paper and not a program review. There was too much data, which initiated too many questions regarding data. With regard to Office of Vehicle Technology programs, it is becoming more of a DEER type conference where the presentation is just a version of an SAE paper. Based on the outline and guidance I was given for the review, I would reduce presentation time to 15 minutes and 5 minutes for questions – and cut presenters off at exactly 15 minutes.
 - On condition that it answers is short and near term technologies. We cannot leap into hydrogen and fuel cell powertrains just yet so the full scope of mainstream hybrid powertrain solutions, for example, is critical at this point.
 - Overall satisfactory. It was nice but personally I wanted to more news and comment for next future funding for hydrogen vehicle side from DOE officials. It was not clear for future activity for vehicle demonstration.
 - Overall, the review was very well organized and provided a good opportunity to evaluate progress in the Hydrogen Program. The schedule was well thought out, and parallel sessions worked well.
 - Presentations should be updated material and allowed to be updated until they are presented.
 - Procedure is all right for such a large program. Smaller programs should have a more informal setting for discussion between reviewers and presenters.
 - The process ran smoothly; the presentation schedule was well thought out. Parallel sessions worked well.
 - The review was good. In addition to the various categories, it would be nice if each presenter was asked to address a goal (cost, efficiency etc) and bottom-line numbers so that technologies can be compared. Comments about the outdated presentations are in question 21.
 - The review was well conducted.
 - Rich Bechtold was great to work with -- very responsive and most helpful. I thank him for all his guidance. Specific to this survey design, I would ask that you allow for a "not applicable" response, as many of these questions did not apply to me, as I had no basis to evaluate.
 - See 18.
 - See item 17. Especially the last three sentences. Too much industry R&D is veiled. There should be a common FCV R&D project with shared results, not five different, isolated, secret, industry R&D projects. There also needs

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

			<p>to be more strategic thinking. The Nuclear Hydrogen program is facing project down selecting. Why? It's because of the nuclear moniker and not because of the technology being researched. High- temp electrolysis research is important for "green" solar and geothermal applications and not just "nuclear" applications. Linking this important R&D on chemically assisted electrolysis and heat-assisted electrolysis to ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER PLANT DESIGNS was a mistake. Now, good programs will be cancelled because the reactor concept was unworkable. That is not right. Finally, there was a HUGE gap in coverage regarding the safety of creating genetic mutations (e.g., algar) in order to produce hydrogen. A SAFETY analysis should be a necessary requirement of EVERY genetic mutation contract that DOE requires and a discussion of the safety measures proposed should be an essential part of every review and contract award. Existing projects do not meet this or become sloppy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOE could save a lot of money by not making the meeting so extravagant. I enjoyed it, but a lot of the expensive parts of the meeting were unnecessary. • The hotel was well appointed and comfortable but relatively very expensive even at the discounted rate. Perhaps there are other more reasonable (under \$200 per night) choices that could be considered next year. • The organization part of the review was excellent – nothing to complain about. The devil is in the details. It is obvious that many of the reviewers are not at an arm's length from the PIs and they were very reluctant to ask critical questions. In many occasions, the presenter would tease the reviewers about enough questions. • The planning, accommodations, and quality of technical presentations were outstanding. • The process is pretty reasonable given the large number of presentations. Congratulations to the DOE team for efficiently reviewing such a large number of projects! • The program leads should not be placed at the side of the projection screen because we could not determine the status of the presenter in their presentation. The presenters were shining the laser pointer in the eyes of the program leads at the head desk. • The reviewers presented adequate information on the background and resources used on the projects • This is too large. Too many presentations. Too many people. • Very nice job. • Very well planned and executed. • While rare, there were a few presenters who seemed to be very ill prepared. If possible, such people should not take part, or at least not present, in subsequent reviews. • Reviewers should sign NDAs and have access to important technical details that more often than not are keys to assessing the viability of the work. • Would like to get reviewers comments back sooner and a have chance to discuss their comments with them immediately. In the past, at least the reviewer's comments were made with the reviewer being unaware of specific DOE program manager instructions to a project team as to the direction and emphasis of a project's approach.
--	--	--	---

QUESTIONS FOR PEER REVIEWERS ONLY

3.6	3.5	3.8	22. Information about the program/project(s) under review was provided sufficiently prior to the review session.
4.0	4.2	4.1	23. Review instructions were provided in a timely manner.
3.4	3.8	3.8	24. The information provided in the presentations was adequate for a meaningful review of the projects.
			25. The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately.
4.2	4.2	4.0	1 – Relevance
4.2	4.3	4.2	2 – Approach
4.2	4.4	4.3	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
3.5	4.2	3.9	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
3.5	4.3	4.1	5 – Proposed Future Research
			26. Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient.
4.0	4.5	4.1	1 – Relevance
4.2	4.5	4.1	2 – Approach
4.2	4.5	4.2	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
3.8	4.5	4.1	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
4.0	4.4	4.2	5 – Proposed Future Research
			27. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program.
3.9	4.2	3.9	1 – Relevance
4.3	4.3	4.1	2 – Approach
4.1	4.4	4.1	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
4.2	4.3	3.9	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
3.9	4.2	4.0	5 – Proposed Future Research
3.9	4.4	4.2	28. During the review, reviewers had adequate access to the Principal Investigators.
4.4	4.7	4.3	29. Information on the location and timing of the projects was adequate and easy to find.
			30. The number of projects I was expected to review was:
1.9	2.7	3.0	Too Many
2.3	2.8	2.7	Too Few
4.0	4.7	3.9	About Right
3.8	4.3	3.6	31. The reviewers in your session had the proper mix and depth of credentials for the purpose of the review.
7	13	10	**Don't know their Credentials
3.7	4.0	3.8	32. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the Q&A period provided sufficient depth for a

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

			<p>meaningful review. (Additional comments are provided below.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subprogram overview presentations and materials did not have sufficient depth for review. • The projects assigned to me were mostly well outside my areas of expertise. I can't recall if I gave info when registering as a reviewer regarding my background, but this could be helpful. • Bring back the water! • The presentations were too short to put work in context. Maybe some reviewers should follow for years. • Explanation of the questions within the criteria was often not appropriate for the work. • Also - time for our side meeting Monday morning was a half hour so all DOE folks attending the meeting were late. • Did not receive materials in advance. • Should send user ID and password electronically, or send it much earlier. Inadequate time to access website prior to review because didn't get info in FEDEX package early enough due to travel. Especially important if feedback is needed on conflict of interest or overlapping review assignments. • Good. • Having last year's presentation available to evaluate true progress was very helpful. Except for personal emergencies of a medical nature, Pls should present, not their grad students! I would tie future funding to that requirement. • I attended remotely- I can't comment on questions that can only be answered via physical attendance. • I can't uncheck and leave anything blank. Since I was not a reviewer this should have been blank. • I really hope that the DOE ceases the current problems in the auto industry to challenge experts especially outside private companies to get involved with innovative solutions. • I was not a reviewer. • In many cases I agree with the above, although please see the comments I made before about the commercial presentations, some of which were frankly pathetic. The program is still too rushed for an in-depth review, but is much better than last year. • N/A. • Review materials should have been available in advance via email / website. • See earlier comments. • See previous comments about lack of focus by the presenters on remaining technical obstacles/barriers--a candid assessment by the presenters concerning the status with respect to those barriers would help to provide a context for reviewing progress. • See previous section for comment. • The criteria used for evaluation do not fit all projects (although I am aware that you must have standardized criteria). There should be at least on question to the effect "Do you think this project should continue to be supported?" You would get quite a few enthusiastic yes responses and a few enthusiastic no responses. • The presentation scheme does not fit completely with the reviewing criteria. • The questions in this survey are poorly written as they assume I was a reviewer, even though the first question listed possible affiliations. • The Relevance, Approach, and Technical Accomplishments should be more heavily weighted than the Collaborations and Future Work sections. Also, what's the point of scoring the Future Work category for projects that have been completed? • There should not be a "Not Applicable" option for these survey questions. I was not a reviewer, so many of these questions do not apply to me.
QUESTIONS FOR PRESENTERS ONLY			
4.7	4.7	4.2	33. The request to provide a presentation for the review was provided sufficiently prior to the deadline for submission.
4.8	4.7	4.4	34. Instructions for preparing the presentation were sufficient.
4.8	4.3	4.1	35. The template for the presentation was helpful.
4.8	4.3	4.1	36. The PDF format provided adequate functionality for my presentation.
4.9	4.0	4.1	37. The time limit for my presentation was adequate to present the information needed by reviewers.
4.8	4.4	4.3	38. The audio and visual equipment worked properly and were adequate.
			39. The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately.
4.5	4.6	3.8	1 – Relevance
4.5	4.7	4.0	2 – Approach
4.6	4.6	4.0	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
4.5	4.4	3.8	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
4.6	4.8	4.0	5 – Proposed Future Research
			40. Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient.
4.5	4.5	3.8	1 – Relevance
4.5	4.5	4.0	2 – Approach
4.7	4.5	4.1	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
4.5	4.5	3.9	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
4.6	4.5	4.0	5 – Proposed Future Research
			41. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program.
4.6	4.5	3.8	1 – Relevance

APPENDIX E: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

4.6	4.5	3.9	2 – Approach
4.6	4.6	3.9	3 – Technical Accomplishments and Progress
4.7	4.6	3.8	4 – Technology Transfer/Collaboration
4.5	4.5	3.9	5 – Proposed Future Research
4.2	4.2	3.7	42. During the review, presenters had adequate interaction with the reviewers.
4.4	4.0	3.9	43. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the Question & Answer period provided sufficient depth of review. (Additional comments are provided below.)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenters should be given a slide maximum for submission. Some presenters came with too many slides for 20 minutes and tended to go to 25 minutes (plus). This should be deterred and not tolerated. • The system where each program was reviewed over a 1-3 day period by a team of experts provides a much more meaningful review of value to presenters and to DOE. • DOE should GET EXPERTS and pay their expenses to review - many (though not all) of the reviewers were, in my opinion, NOT very technical. • The deadline for submitting the presentation was too far in advance of the meeting. • The instructions for preparing the presentation were too detailed. There was no room for individuality. • Need to proof this form before duplicating. • Two-month lead-time for slides was excessive - did not allow for presentation of new results and insights. • I appreciate having response to reviewers, tech transfer slides etc. for "reviewers only" and not publicly discussed. • PDF conversion caused slides to be skipped. Luckily they were there and could be retrieved by moving backward. • I didn't notice a laser pointer. It would have been helpful. • Requiring talks two months in advance was excessive. • The meeting is too many days long. Make it Monday through Wednesday and that's it. • Don't fully know answers in review criteria Q39-41 until I get comments back on my presentation. • Should introduce reviewers - are we allowed to talk to them? • The meeting is way too long with too much stuff of little interest. • Three hours is too long for posters. • Who WERE my poster reviewers? They didn't identify themselves as reviewers. Did any come by? • Instructions for preparing the presentation were sufficient, but the switch in content was inconvenient. • Salon 4 was too cold. Turn down the AC! • The microphone ladies should not be chitchatting in the back of the room during presentations. • The format is fine but no real decisions were made. • The original premise for this meeting was good but the execution relative to the H2 programs at DOE should be revisited. • The deadline for submitting the presentation was way too early. • The poster session was too long. • Although I recognized some of the reviewers, it was not clear who all of the reviewers were for my session and what their affiliations were. • Having to send the files 8 weeks in advance was too early. • I would have liked to see the rubric against which my presentation was going to be reviewed. I still don't have a clear sense of when I can expect final feedback. • N/A. • Question 41: I don't believe presenters were informed of the weightings. • Review materials should have been provided to the audience in advance of the AMR meeting. • Reviewers need more time for their questions. We need a more time for a good exchange of ideas/questions/answers. • Thank you for your efforts. We really appreciate it. Wishing continued success. • The presenters on DNA modification and genetic mutation research of algae-produced hydrogen stated that their mutations would preferentially take over and possibly wipe out wild (natural) algae if they were released. Yet research was continuing with few or no safety controls. Other researchers were working with innovative nanoparticle technology that has respiratory and digestive safety concerns. • There is a very serious gap in the merit review process when it comes to public safety. • The template is very helpful along with the examples, however not all projects fit the template and areas as defined very well which making the presentation difficult to put together in the allotted number of slides to make the point. • This was my first time presenting and first time attending this meeting. I felt it was lacking someone to explain how the process works even though it was very straightforward once you got into it. It would have also been nice to be able to meet the reviewers in advance of presenting your project. Even after I was finished I wasn't exactly sure who all the people were that were reviewing my content or which disciplines they represented. • The time assigned to presentations should depend on the size of the project. Maintaining the same presentation time length for all oral presentations is not logical.

(This page intentionally left blank.)