

# Evaluation Criteria: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) 2019 Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program Annual Merit Review

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

This evaluation form is for use with the following Hydrogen and Fuel Cells subprogram review panels/projects: Hydrogen Fuels R&D (Hydrogen Production<sup>1</sup> and Storage); Fuel Cells R&D; Hydrogen Infrastructure R&D; Technology Acceleration R&D (Manufacturing R&D, Technology Validation, and Market Transformation); Safety, Codes and Standards; and Systems Analysis.

*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, and the extent to which the project is well-designed, feasible, and integrated with other relevant efforts. **(Weight = 20%)**

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Sharply focused on overcoming 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. 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. **(Weight = 45%)**

**4.0 - Outstanding.** Outstanding progress toward project objectives is demonstrated through clear and measurable performance indicators; results have directly led 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.

---

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

**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—rate of progress has been slow; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.

**1.5 - Poor.** Minimal progress toward project objectives and poorly defined performance indicators; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.

**1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** Little to no demonstrated progress toward project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the 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. **(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. Relevance/Potential Impact**—the degree to which the project supports and advances progress toward the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program goals and objectives, as delineated in the Multi-Year RD&D plan and/or the Program and subprogram overview presentations from the 2018 AMR. **(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.

**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.** Plans clearly build on past progress and are sharply focused on critical barriers to project goals; difficult to improve significantly.
- 3.5 - Excellent.** Effective; contributes to overcoming most barriers.
- 3.0 - Good.** Plans generally build on past progress and should contribute to overcoming some barriers.
- 2.5 - Satisfactory.** Has some weaknesses; contributes to overcoming some barriers.
- 2.0 - Fair.** Plans may lead to improvements, but need better focus on addressing project weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.
- 1.5 - Poor.** Minimally responsive to project objectives; unlikely to resolve project weaknesses and contribute to overcoming barriers.
- 1.0 - Unsatisfactory.** 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:**