

**DOE Hydrogen Program
2011 Annual Merit Review
Project Evaluation Form**

Project Number: Reviewer:

Title of Project: _____

Presenter Name: _____

Provide **specific, concise** comments to support your evaluation.1. **Relevance**

To overall DOE objectives – the degree to which the project supports the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and the goals and objectives in the Multi-Year RD&D Plan. (Weight = 20%)

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. Project is critical to the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and fully supports DOE RD&D objectives.		
3 - Good. Most project aspects align with the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.		
2 - Fair. Project partially supports the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.		
1 - Poor. Project provides little support to the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program and DOE RD&D objectives.		

2. **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%)

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. Sharply focused on critical barriers; difficult to improve approach significantly.		
3 - Good. Generally effective but could be improved; contributes to overcoming some barriers.		
2 - Fair. Has significant weaknesses; may have some impact on overcoming barriers.		
1 - Poor. Not responsive to project objectives; unlikely to contribute to overcoming the barriers.		

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 = 40%)

	score	comments
4 - Outstanding. Excellent progress toward objectives; suggests that barrier(s) will be overcome.		
3 - Good. Significant progress toward objectives and overcoming one or more barriers.		
2 - Fair. Modest progress in overcoming barriers; rate of progress has been slow		
1 - Poor. Little or no demonstrated progress towards objectives or any barriers.		

2011

Appendix D – Project Evaluation Form

4. Collaboration and coordination with other institutions

The degree to which the project interacts with other entities and projects. (Weight = 10%)

	score	comments
<p>4 - Outstanding. Close, appropriate collaboration with other institutions; partners are full participants and well coordinated.</p> <p>3 - Good. Some collaboration exists; partners are fairly well coordinated.</p> <p>2 - Fair. A little collaboration exists; coordination between partners could be significantly improved.</p> <p>1 - Poor. Most work is done at the sponsoring organization with little outside collaboration; little or no apparent coordination with partners.</p>		

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. (Weight = 10%)

	score	comments
<p>4 - Outstanding. Plans clearly build on past progress and are sharply focused on barriers.</p> <p>3 - Good. Plans build on past progress and generally address overcoming barriers.</p> <p>2 - Fair. Plans may lead to improvements, but need better focus on overcoming barriers.</p> <p>1 - Poor. Plans have little relevance toward eliminating barriers or advancing the Program</p>		

Project strengths:

Project weaknesses

Recommendations for additions/deletions to project scope

Project Number:

Reviewer: