# General Project Evaluation Form

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

## PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: General Evaluation Form

*Provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation. Please write clearly.*

### 1. Relevance

To overall DOE objectives – the degree to which the project supports the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and the goals and objectives in the *Multi-Year Research, Development, and Demonstration* (RD&D) *Plan*. (Weight = 20%)

**4 - Outstanding.** Project is critical to the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and fully supports DOE RD&D 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 support to the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

☐ 4 - Outstanding

☐ 3 - Good

☐ 2 - Fair

☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on relevance to overall DOE objectives:**

### 2. 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:**

## 3. 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 = 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 toward objectives or any barriers.

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

**Comments on accomplishments and progress toward overall project and DOE goals:**

## 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 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:**

## 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. (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.

&#9744;   4 - Outstanding

&#9744;   3 - Good

&#9744;   2 - Fair

&#9744;   1 - Poor

**Comments on proposed future work:**

**Project strengths:**

**Project weaknesses:**

**Recommendations for additions/deletions to project scope:**

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Project Evaluation Form

This evaluation form was used for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) panel.

## PeerNet Evaluation Criteria: ARRA

*Provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation. Please write clearly.*

### 1a. Relevance

Is the project effort relevant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) goals of creating new jobs as well as saving existing ones, spurring economic activity, and investing in long-term economic growth? (Weight = 20%)

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

☐ 4 - Outstanding

☐ 3 - Good

☐ 2 - Fair

☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on relevance of the project to ARRA—create new jobs as well as save existing ones; spur economic activity and invest in long-term economic growth:**

### 1b. Relevance

Does the project's technology development plan and/or deployment plan address the DOE Fuel Cell Technologies (FCT) Program's 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 project goals.
**1 - Poor.** Project is not relevant and is unlikely to contribute to the FCT ARRA project goals.

☐ 4 - Outstanding

☐ 3 - Good

☐ 2 - Fair

☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on 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?**

## 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 toward achieving most project goals.

**1 - Poor.** Unlikely to make progress toward project goals and/or barriers; risks are not adequately addressed.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding

- ☐ 3 - Good

- ☐ 2 - Fair

- ☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on development/deployment approach:**

## 3. Technical accomplishments and progress

What is the overall progress toward 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 the objectives and milestones; barrier(s) likely to be overcome.

**3 - Good.** Significant progress toward 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 toward objectives, or toward overcoming barriers.

- ☐ 4 - Outstanding

- ☐ 3 - Good

- ☐ 2 - Fair

- ☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on technical approach and progress:**

## 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 enhances 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.** There is little coordination between partners or collaboration with other organizations.

☐ 4 - Outstanding

☐ 3 - Good

☐ 2 - Fair

☐ 1 - Poor

**Comments on collaborations:**

**Project strengths:**

**Project weaknesses:**

**Specific recommendations:**