

## Evaluation Criteria for VT Panels (ACE, EDT, ES, FT, LM, PM, VAN, and VSS)

*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 technical 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.

### Comments on Approach to performing the work:

**2. Technical Accomplishments and Progress** toward overall project and DOE goals – the degree to which progress has been made, measured against performance indicators and demonstrated progress towards DOE goals. (Weight = 40%)

**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.

### Comments on Technical Accomplishments and Progress:

**3. Collaboration and Coordination with other institutions** (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.

## Comments on Collaboration and Coordination with other institutions:

4. **Proposed Future Research** – the degree to which the project has effectively planned its future work in a logical manner by incorporating appropriate decision points, considering barriers to the realization of the proposed technology and, when sensible, mitigating risk by providing alternate development pathways. Note: if the 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.

## Comments on Proposed Future Research:

5. **Relevance** Does this project support the overall DOE objectives of petroleum displacement? (Weight = 20%)

◇ Yes

◇ No

## Why or why not?

6. **Resources** How sufficient are the resources for the project to achieve the stated milestones in a timely fashion?

Select one:

◇ Excessive

◇ Sufficient

◇ Insufficient

## Comments on Resources: