

Questions for VT Panels – TI (Clean Cities Projects)

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. Project Objectives – the degree to which the project objectives support the DOE/VTO objectives of reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions. This includes the impact the project has on addressing the technical barriers from the Vehicle Technologies Office (VTO) Multi-Year Program Plan. (Weight = 20%)

4.0 - Outstanding. Project Objectives are sharply focused on supporting DOE/VTO goals of reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions; project has a direct and substantial impact upon addressing technical barriers; difficult to improve project objectives significantly.

3.5 - Excellent. Project objectives are effective; project addresses a significant number of technical barriers; effectively contributes to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions.

3.0 - Good. Project objectives are generally effective, but could be improved; project addresses some technical barriers; contributes to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions.

2.5 - Satisfactory. Project objectives have some weaknesses; project addresses some technical barriers; project may have some impact contributing to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions.

2.0 - Fair. Project objectives have significant weaknesses; project addresses few technical barriers; project may have a small impact contributing to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions.

1.5 - Poor. Project objectives are minimally responsive to DOE/VTO objectives; project does not address technical barriers; project is unlikely to contribute to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels and reducing emissions.

1.0 - Unsatisfactory. Project objectives are not responsive to DOE/VTO objectives; project fails to address any technical barriers; project is highly unlikely to contribute to reducing reliance on petroleum based fuels or reducing emissions.

Comments on Project Objectives:

2. Project Approach to supporting deployment of petroleum reduction technologies and practices, alternative fuel vehicles, infrastructure, emissions reductions and related efforts – the degree to which the project is well-designed, feasible, and integrated with other efforts; (Weight = 20%)

4.0 - Outstanding. Project approach is sharply focused on achieving project objectives; difficult to improve project approach significantly.

3.5 - Excellent. Effective; project approach contributes to achieving the majority of project objectives.

3.0 - Good. Generally effective but project approach could be improved; contributes to achieving some of the project objectives.

2.5 - Satisfactory. Has some weaknesses; project approach contributes to achieving some project objectives.

2.0 - Fair. Has significant weaknesses; project approach may have some impact on achieving project objectives.

1.5 - Poor. Minimally responsive to project objectives; project approach is unlikely to contribute to achieving project objectives.

1.0 - Unsatisfactory. Not responsive to project objectives; project approach is highly unlikely to contribute to achieving project objectives.

Comments on Project Approach:

3. Project Accomplishments and Progress toward overall project and DOE goals – the degree to which progress/significant accomplishments have been achieved, measured against performance indicators and demonstrated progress toward project and DOE goals. (Weight = 40%)

4.0 - Outstanding. Project demonstrates significant accomplishments; strong progress toward achieving both project and DOE objectives; difficult to improve progress significantly.

3.5 - Excellent. Project demonstrates many accomplishments; very effective progress toward achieving overall project objectives and DOE goals.

3.0 - Good. Project accomplishments are generally effective; progress is on schedule to contribute to some project objectives and DOE goals.

2.5 - Satisfactory. Project has some accomplishments, but also displays some weaknesses; progress could be improved; contributes to some project objectives and DOE goals.

2.0 - Fair. Project has few accomplishments and demonstrates significant weaknesses; rate of progress is slow; minimal contribution to project objectives or DOE goals.

1.5 - Poor. Minimal demonstration of accomplishments; progress is significantly behind schedule; unlikely to contribute to project objectives or DOE goals.

1.0 - Unsatisfactory. Project demonstrates no accomplishments; limited or no demonstrated progress; not responsive to project objectives;

Comments on Project Accomplishments and Progress:

4. Collaboration and Coordination Among Project Team – the degree to which the appropriate team members and partners are involved in the project work and the effectiveness of the collaboration between and among partners. (Weight = 10%)

4.0 - Outstanding. Sharply focused on collaboration among project team members; team is well-suited to effectively carry out the work of the project and have strong working relationships; no notable weaknesses.

3.5 - Excellent. Effective; team members meaningfully contribute to carrying out the work of the project, are well-suited to perform the work and have excellent working relationships.

3.0 - Good. Generally effective but could be improved; collaboration exists; team members are fairly well-suited to project work and have good working relationships.

2.5 - Satisfactory. Has some weaknesses; collaboration among team members is satisfactory for carrying out the work of the project; project partnerships, team members and working relationships could be improved.

2.0 - Fair. Has significant weaknesses; little collaboration exists and team could be improved.

1.5 - Poor. Minimally responsive; little collaboration exists and team lacks effective working relationships.

1.0 - Unsatisfactory. Little or no apparent collaboration between team members; project team is lacking critical expertise to effectively carry out the work of the project

Comments on Collaboration and Coordination with Project Team:

5. Market Impact and Sustainability – the degree to which the project has already contributed, as well as the potential to continue to contribute in the future, to a sustainable alternative fuel vehicle market, alternative fuel market expansion, and reduced petroleum dependence/greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector. This would include the potential to reduce barriers to large scale alternative fuel vehicle market penetration, making information about alternative fuels and petroleum reduction opportunities widely available to target audiences, and ability for the project to be replicated in other geographic areas or with other technologies. (Weight = 10%)

4.0 - Outstanding. Sharply focused on critical barriers and effective information products; clearly contributes to alternative fuel vehicle market expansion and/or petroleum/greenhouse gas reduction; difficult to improve significantly.

3.5 - Excellent. Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers and informing appropriate audiences; contributes to alternative fuel vehicle market expansion and/or petroleum/greenhouse gas reduction.

3.0 - Good. Generally effective in overcoming barriers and providing information; has the potential to contribute to alternative fuel vehicle market expansion and/or petroleum/greenhouse gas reduction.

2.5 - Satisfactory. Has some weaknesses; may contribute to market improvements and/or petroleum/greenhouse gas reduction but needs better focus on overcoming some barriers and targeting appropriate audiences.

2.0 - Fair. Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers and reducing petroleum consumption/greenhouse gas emissions.

1.5 - Poor. Minimally responsive; unlikely to advance an alternative fuel vehicle market or contribute to petroleum reduction/greenhouse gas efforts.

1.0 - Unsatisfactory. Not responsive to eliminating barriers or providing information that will advance an alternative fuel vehicle market or lead to petroleum/greenhouse gas reductions.

Comments on Market Impact and Sustainability:

Use of Resources Are DOE funds being used wisely? Should DOE fund similar efforts in the future? If not, what would be a better use of DOE resources to achieve alternative fuel vehicle and infrastructure expansion to support the broader goal of petroleum displacement and greenhouse gas reductions?

Yes/Maybe/No, **Comments on Use of Resources:**