

# Evaluation Criteria: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) 2024 Hydrogen Program Annual Merit Review

## **A. General Project Evaluation Form**

This evaluation form is for use with the following Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies Office review panels/projects: Hydrogen Production Technologies;<sup>1</sup> Hydrogen Infrastructure Technologies (Delivery/Infrastructure/Storage); Fuel Cell Technologies; Systems Development and Integration; and Analysis, Codes and Standards.<sup>2</sup>

*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 project objectives and critical barriers have been clearly identified and are being addressed, the quality and completeness of the safety plan (if applicable), the quality and completeness of the diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) plan or Community Benefits Plan (CBP) (if applicable), and the extent to which the project is well-designed, feasible, and integrated with other relevant efforts. **(Weight = 20%)**

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Difficult to improve significantly; sharply focused on overcoming critical barriers.

**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 barriers.

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

**Comments on Approach to performing the work:**

**2. Accomplishments and Progress** toward overall project and DOE goals—the degree to which progress toward project objectives has been made and measured against well-defined performance indicators, and the degree to which the project has demonstrated progress toward addressing critical barriers to achieving DOE goals while appropriately incorporating safety considerations (if applicable) and implementing the DEIA plan or CBP (if applicable). **(Weight = 35%)**

---

<sup>1</sup> HydroGEN seedling projects use Form B.

<sup>2</sup> Newly awarded projects will be evaluated using the same criteria as this general project form, but with a lower scoring weight on Accomplishments (5%) and a higher weight on Approach (40%) and Proposed Future Work (25%).

- 4.0 - Outstanding.** Outstanding progress toward project objectives is demonstrated through clear and measurable performance indicators; results have led directly to overcoming one or more critical barriers.
- 3.5 - Excellent.** Excellent progress toward project objectives is demonstrated through clear and measurable performance indicators; results suggest that one or more critical barriers will be overcome.
- 3.0 - Good.** Significant progress has been made, but there are weaknesses that need to be addressed to improve the rate of progress or improve the clarity of the project's objectives and performance indicators; contributes to overcoming some barriers.
- 2.5 - Satisfactory.** Moderate progress has been made, but there are weaknesses that need to be addressed to improve the rate of progress or improve the clarity of the project's objectives and performance indicators; contributes to overcoming some barriers.
- 2.0 - Fair.** Modest progress has been made, but there are significant weaknesses that need to be addressed to improve the rate of progress or improve the clarity of the project's objectives and performance indicators; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.
- 1.5 - Poor.** Minimal progress toward project objectives has been made, and performance indicators are poorly defined; unlikely to contribute to overcoming barriers.
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Little to no progress toward project objectives has been made, and performance indicators are poorly defined; unlikely to contribute to overcoming barriers.

**Comments on Accomplishments and Progress toward overall project and DOE goals:**

**3. Collaboration and Coordination with Other Institutions**—the degree to which the project effectively engages and coordinates project partners and interacts with other entities and projects to accelerate project progress and improve the likelihood of the project's success and impact, as well as collaborates with minority serving institutions and minority business enterprises where possible. **(Weight = 10%)**

- 4.0 - Outstanding.** There is close, appropriate collaboration with other institutions; partners are full participants and well-coordinated.
- 3.5 - Excellent.** There is 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 coordination with partners is apparent.
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** No coordination with partners is apparent.

**Comments on Collaboration and Coordination with Other Institutions:**

**4. Potential Impact**—the degree to which the project supports and advances progress toward the project's specific performance targets and the Hydrogen Program goals and objectives, as delineated in the Program and subprogram overview presentations given during the AMR. **(Weight = 20%)**

**4.0 - Outstanding.** The project is strongly aligned with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives and likely to significantly advance progress toward its performance targets.

**3.5 – Excellent.** The project aligns well with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives and has the potential to significantly advance progress toward its performance targets.

**3.0 – Good.** Most project aspects align with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives; the project has the potential to advance progress toward its performance targets.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Project aspects align with some of the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives; the project has some potential to advance progress toward its performance targets.

**2.0 - Fair.** The project partially aligns with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives and has limited potential to advance progress toward its performance targets.

**1.5 - Poor.** The project has limited alignment with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives and little potential to advance progress toward its performance targets.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** The project has little to no alignment with the Hydrogen Program’s goals and objectives and little to no potential to advance progress toward its performance targets.

#### **Comments on Potential Impact:**

**5. Proposed Future Work**—the degree to which the project has logically and effectively planned its next steps by incorporating appropriate decision points, considering barriers to its goals, and, when sensible, mitigating risk by identifying alternate pathways. **Note: if a project has ended, please do not rate it. However, comments on remaining needs for advancing the technology are welcome. (Weight = 15%)**

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Plans clearly build on past progress and are sharply focused on critical barriers to project goals.

**3.5 - Excellent.** Plans build on past progress and contribute to overcoming most barriers.

**3.0 - Good.** Plans generally build on past progress and should contribute to overcoming some barriers.

**2.5 - Satisfactory.** Plans have some weaknesses but should contribute to overcoming some barriers.

**2.0 - Fair.** Plans need better focus on addressing project weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Plans are minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to resolve project weaknesses and contribute to overcoming barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Plans don’t exist or are not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming barriers.

#### **Comments on Proposed Future Work:**

### **SUMMARY OF REVIEWER COMMENTS**

**Project Strengths:**

**Project Weaknesses:**

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