

## Research and Development Project Evaluation Form

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

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

*Please provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation. It is important that you write in full sentences and clearly convey your meaning to prevent incorrect interpretation.*

#### 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%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Close, appropriate collaboration with other institutions; partners are full participants and well coordinated.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Good collaboration; partners participate and are well coordinated.

**3.0 - Good.** Collaboration exists; partners are fairly well coordinated.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Some collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be significantly improved.

**2.0 - Fair.** A little collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be significantly improved.

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

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** No apparent coordination with partners.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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, and Demonstration Plan. (Weight = 15%)

**4.0 - 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.

**3.5 - Excellent.** The project aligns well with the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives and has the potential to advance progress toward DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

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

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Project aspects align with some of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

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

**1.5 - Poor.** Project has little potential impact on advancing progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Project has little to no potential impact on advancing progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding

- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**Comments on Proposed Future Work:**

**Project Strengths:**

**Project Weaknesses:**

**Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:**

## Technology-to-Market Project Evaluation Form

This evaluation form was used for the following Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program review panels: Market Transformation and Technology Validation.

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

*Please provide specific, concise comments to support your evaluation. It is important that you write in full sentences and clearly convey your meaning to prevent incorrect interpretation.*

#### 1. 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, and Demonstration Plan. (Weight = 15%)

**4.0 - 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.

**3.5 - Excellent.** The project aligns well with the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives and has the potential to advance progress toward DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

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

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Project aspects align with some of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.

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

**1.5 - Poor.** Project has little potential impact on advancing progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

**1.0 – Unsatisfactory.** Project has little to no potential impact on advancing progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D goals and objectives.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**Comments on Relevance/Potential Impact:**

## 2. Strategy for Technical Validation and/or Deployment

Rate the degree to which barriers are addressed, how well the project is designed, its feasibility, and integration with other efforts. (Weight = 20%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**Comments on the Strategy for Technology Validation and Deployment:**

## 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 = 45%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair

- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Close, appropriate collaboration with other institutions; partners are full participants and well coordinated.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Good collaboration; partners participate and are well coordinated.

**3.0 - Good.** Collaboration exists; partners are fairly well coordinated.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Some collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be significantly improved.

**2.0 - Fair.** A little collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be significantly improved.

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

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** No apparent coordination with partners.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**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.

Note: if a project has ended, please leave blank. (Weight = 10%)

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve significantly.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

- 4.0 - Outstanding
- 3.5 - Excellent
- 3.0 - Good
- 2.5 - Satisfactory
- 2.0 - Fair
- 1.5 - Poor
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory

**Comments on Proposed Future Work:**

**Project Strengths:**

**Project Weaknesses:**

**Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope:**