

## 2012 AMR Survey Questionnaire Results

### 1. All Respondents

#### 1.1. What is your affiliation?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Government agency directly sponsoring the program under review	10	4.4%
National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher whose project is under review	54	24.1%
Non-government institution that received funding from the program(s) under review	49	21.8%
Non-government institution that does not receive funding from the program(s) under review	37	16.5%
Government agency with interest in the work	13	5.8%
National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher not being reviewed	33	14.7%
Other	25	11.1%
No Response	3	1.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### “Other” Responses

- Contractor at government agency sponsoring program under review
- Community college adjunct professor
- Private sector business that has received other government funding
- Consultant
- Private company
- Non-profit
- Reviewer from Germany
- Non-U.S. government organization
- Consultant
- State government whose project was under review
- Commercial business
- Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE)
- Reviewer
- American Association for the Advancement of Science Policy Fellow working with Fuel Cells Technologies Program
- Foreign institution
- Industry
- Hydrogen technology consultant
- International Partnership for Hydrogen and Fuel Cells in the Economy member
- European Commission
- Federal peer reviewer
- Fuel cell and hydrogen consultant for Germany; [www.efceco.com](http://www.efceco.com)
- University of South Carolina
- Private company
- Consulting group
- Renewable energy developer

1.2. Purpose and scope of the Annual Merit Review (AMR) were well defined by the Joint Plenary Session (answer only if you attended the Joint Plenary on Monday).

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
4	0	15	54	46
3%	0%	13%	45%	39%

20 Comment(s)

- The purpose and scope of the Annual Merit Review (AMR) was well explained during the Joint Plenary Session.
- The purpose was very well promoted and built on the success of previous years.
- The purpose was not clearly described.
- The quality of the overview presentations made by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) staff varied.
- The purpose, to review DOE Vehicle Technologies Program and Hydrogen and Cells Program research, was defined appropriately.
- The Joint Plenary Session is very important to all of the attendees because it explains the purpose and scope of the DOE Hydrogen and Fuel Cells and Vehicle Technologies Programs (the Programs).
- The Joint Plenary Session was very useful since it is impossible to attend all of the parallel sessions (and thus the overviews at the beginning of each). This session provided an opportunity to obtain the full scope of the DOE Programs.
- The concept (that this was a review rather than a conference) was not very well defined in the plenary session (not that it had to be).
- The presentations were well done, but perhaps forced. The motive of “getting value for the money” was clearly emphasized.
- The first presentation was somewhat hypothetical with a high-level focus and no direct connection to the two DOE Programs.
- The quality of the plenary speakers’ presentations was high; however, the print on the lunch session slides was very difficult to read. The reviewer requested copies of the plenary speakers’ slides.
- The main objectives of the Programs and the link to the individual projects could have been presented more clearly.
- The plenary presentation was OK.
- The plenary session described the Programs and highlights, but little was said about the review process.
- The presentations could have been more big picture, high level, and inspirational, rather than detailed. The details were covered in the sub-program overviews in the afternoon.
- The review process is not very effective—there was not enough detail provided and the rating scale is too broad.
- The overviews were good, but it is difficult to absorb so much information in such a short time.
- The plenary talks are in general very uninspiring. The presentations could at least be delivered with some enthusiasm, even if feigned. The vision and the new achievements are far more interesting than the budget. While the budget is obviously important, it does not belong in a plenary talk to technical people.
- Present slides that are easier to digest—less bits and pieces and more clear statements and information; this applies to many presentations throughout the meeting. Prescribe a leaner and clearer template for the slides.
- Increase the focus on the objectives and criteria for the reviews. No one explained how DOE would use the reviews. Too much focus was on PeerNet and not enough on what DOE wanted from the reviewers.
- The Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program talk was outstanding. The keynote speaker’s was OK. Possible future speakers could include: Nate Lewis (California Institute of Technology), Dan Nocera (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Pete Diamandis (author, *Abundance: the Future is Better than You Think*), or Elon Musk (CEO, Tesla Motors). It should be noted that Diamandis and Musk need to be educated on hydrogen.

- 1.3. The two plenary sessions after the Joint Plenary Session were helpful to understanding the direction of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells and Vehicle Technologies Programs (answer only if you attended either the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells or Vehicle Technologies plenary sessions on Monday).

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
3	1	13	63	43
2%	1%	11%	51%	35%

11 Comment(s)

- The Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program Plenary Session was outstanding.
- The Vehicle Technologies Program Plenary Session was helpful.
- The long-term perspective of both Programs would be interesting.
- There was a lot of repetition between the joint plenary and the individual plenary sessions.
- This session seemed to be a summary of progress of various projects; it did not seem to convey any sort of overall Program direction.
- Other than some indications about progress toward specific goals, there was no overall mention about the direction of the Programs.
- Separate plenary sessions allowed for more detail on the individual sub-programs, helping to provide additional context for the research to be reviewed.
- Generally, the sessions were helpful, but the sound quality in the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program session was poor. The slides that are prepared for these presentations are great documentation for the vastness of this research, but they can be overwhelming to even those familiar with the Program. More emphasis should be placed on simpler slides with key takeaway messages.
- The relationship/correlation between the different activities within each program was very clearly laid out through the series of talks during this session.
- The following sessions need to be longer: thermoelectric material application and waste heat recovery system application. There was too much information on the slides.
- It is unclear whether the DOE Fuel Cell Technologies Program is phasing out, going up, or remaining flat in the years to come.

- 1.4. Sub-program overviews were helpful to understanding the research objectives. (Answer only if you attended one or more sub-program overviews.)

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
7	2	12	88	70
4%	1%	7%	49%	39%

15 Comment(s)

- The details were good and, mostly, presented very well.
- The sub-program overviews/presentations needed to be longer.
- The overviews were quick summaries of the projects; they did not provide insight into the overall sub-program direction.
- The overviews provided additional details for each sub-program and its motivations, which was helpful information.
- Because the sub-programs are so well integrated, there was some duplication between the upper level and the sub-program.

- The overviews are helpful because the reviewers can understand more recent progress and discuss with the presenter about the research fields. Peer reviewers will give their judgements for the projects.
- The main objectives of the sub-programs and the link to the individual projects could be presented more clearly.
- The sub-program managers spent very little time discussing progress between the previous year and the current year, even though DOE AMR reviewers were asked to use this as a criterion for evaluation.
- Poor sound quality got in the way. Some reference to the Hydrogen Safety Panel should have been included in the sub-program overview.
- The Lightweight Materials overview provided great information on future trends.
- These overviews provided more detailed information about the sub-programs, which would be difficult to ascertain without those briefs.
- Sometimes the manager tried to present too much material. If the presenter talks too fast, the audience cannot keep up.
- Some of these presentations often included busy and complex slides from which it was difficult to extract and assimilate the necessary and useful information.
- Good overview, although there was too much focus on the money and not enough on the mission.
- The individual sub-program managers say similar things, but the actions/directions of their sub-programs often do not reflect what they say.

1.5. What was your role in the AMR? Check the most appropriate response. If you are both a presenter and a reviewer and want to comment as both, complete the evaluation twice, once as each.

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter	97	43.3%
Presenter of a project	72	32.1%
Peer Reviewer	54	24.1%
No Response	1	<1%
<b>Total</b>	224	100%

## 2. Responses from “Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter”

2.1. The quality, breadth, and depth of the following were sufficient to contribute to a comprehensive review:

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Presentations	0	1	7	57	26
	0%	1%	8%	63%	29%
Question and answer periods	0	4	14	50	24
	0%	4%	15%	54%	26%
Answers provided to programmatic questions	0	2	22	48	18
	0%	2%	24%	53%	20%
Answers provided to technical questions	0	1	12	54	25
	0%	1%	13%	59%	27%

7 Comment(s)

- This attendee did not hear any programmatic questions.
- More time was needed for questions and answers (Q&A).
- Many of the presenters did not leave time for questions. Interesting discussions had to be cut off because of time constraints.

- It is difficult to provide a comprehensive review with so many projects in only a few days; but, overall, it is a very good review of the DOE Programs. For a more detailed review, perhaps based on feedback from a preliminary review like this, there may need to be more detailed site reviews.
- In many presentations, either more presentation time was needed to better cover the material, or more time for questions should have been provided.
- The format was good and provided adequate time for the presenters to describe their work in good detail and for Q&A periods.
- It would be nice to have more time to interact and ask questions of presenters.

## 2.2. Enough time was allocated for presentations.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	5	6	59	21
1%	5%	7%	64%	23%

9 Comment(s)

- Enough time was allocated; however, some presenters are not skilled public speakers.
- Forty-five minutes would be better.
- Five more minutes for Q&A would have been useful, even if it meant shortening the presentations.
- It might be nice to have time for one more technical slide.
- DOE needs to do something to the presenters that go over the time limit year after year. The moderator should have the ability to “disconnect” the presentation somehow. It is unclear how it is possible to fairly judge those who work within the rules when others do not abide by them and are unfairly allowed to present more information.
- The technical details provided by the presenters varied significantly. Some went into every detail, whereas others presented a cursory overview. Consistency might improve the review process.
- There is never enough time, but this attendee does not see an alternative.
- Some used the time well for program specifics; some used it well for technical specifics of the project. The attendee was looking for the project detail information.
- Large projects (i.e., multi-million dollars, multi-year) are hard-pressed to provide a comprehensive review of information in 20 minutes, resulting in presentations with too many slides crammed with too much data/information as presenters try to justify the work. Presenters should be required to focus. The attendee suggests having a sliding scale for presentation length depending on project size, duration (just starting versus four or five years old), funding, etc.

## 2.3. The questions asked by reviewers were sufficiently rigorous and detailed.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	9	31	41	12
0%	10%	33%	44%	13%

11 Comment(s)

- The quality of the questions depended on the person.
- The quality of the questions varied quite a bit from sub-program to sub-program.
- The reviewers were not very engaged; they had few questions.
- One of the reviewers was reviewing a program that he owns.
- The questions could be slightly tougher.
- The review process could be more thorough.

- It is hard to expect reviewers to have enough presence of mind on the projects when the review interval is one year. This is too long for an independent reviewer to get up to speed on a short notice.
- The questions were fairly routine and mostly addressed “unlabeled” information; questions, for example, asked the presenter about specific test conditions represented on the graph. Thoughtful, in-depth questions were rarely asked. When they were, the presenters side stepped them as much as possible.
- In some presentations and Q&A sessions, company presenters were overly secretive and did not disclose sufficient information to make it interesting.
- The reviewers did not ask questions in many of the presentations. The few that were asked were sufficiently rigorous.
- Reviewer questions, which were usually excellent, were many times outside the scope of the project being presented.

2.4. The frequency (once per year) of this formal review process for this Program is:

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
About right	85	37.9%
Too frequent	1	<1%
Not frequent enough	4	1.7%
No opinion	3	1.3%
No Response	131	58.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>100%</b>

6 Comment(s)

- Two or three reviews per year are optimal.
- More oral presentations would be preferred. The poster session started late after a very full day. The presenters were busy and it was difficult to have a meaningful discussion there; however, it was good for networking.
- One year is the correct time period. More than once is a waste of taxpayers’ money because there will not be a lot of progress. Two years seems too long.
- The review should be twice a year, with more emphasis on actual progress. Some of the poster sessions would have been better as presentations.
- For a formal review, one year is about right. But more frequent meetings, perhaps quarterly, to show results would be useful.
- Given the nature of the technical work (research and development), yearly formal review is appropriate to enable sufficient time for significant progress on each project.

2.5. Logistics, facilities, and amenities were satisfactory.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	3	6	35	49
0%	3%	6%	38%	53%

20 Comment(s)

- The location was nice.
- There was no plug for a laptop.
- A fee should be charged to cover the excellent food and coffee services.
- The facilities were uncomfortably crowded during breaks.
- A less expensive hotel would be good.
- The location near a Washington Metro stop was a big plus.
- The space outside the presentation rooms could be larger. It got crowded very quickly.

- Walking between buildings made it impossible to attend all the desired presentations.
- The meeting rooms were comfortable and the organization of the meeting was excellent.
- Find sponsorship for better food/drinks, rather than having a cash bar.
- This meeting had too many people; the gathering was too big. There is no benefit in mixing storage and fuel cells together in one meeting. Also, Washington, D.C., is too expensive.
- Easier access to wireless in the review rooms without paying additional hotel charges would be desirable.
- Wireless connection in the conference room is requested.
- The respondent appreciated the discounted rate at hotels. It would be nice to have a discounted airfare as well. A roundtrip from Detroit to D.C. was \$900, even three weeks in advance, forcing the respondent to fly to Baltimore Washington International and spend over an hour getting to the hotel.
- Reviewers who have to attend reviews that are only in one hotel should be allowed to register and park in that hotel without having to go to the main hotel first. The Wardman Park location is superior and preferred over Crystal City.
- Logistics, facilities, and amenities were excellent. Providing table space for attendees to place their laptops/notebooks while taking notes would be more convenient. This may not be possible for the first day of overviews because of high attendance.
- There needs to be wireless access in the rooms for everyone, not just reviewers.
- Ideally, the venue would be large enough to have all the presentations at one location. At times, the reviewer had to hurry to move from one hotel to the other to see presentations.
- One elevator was not working and the other two seemed to be synchronized, so two were doing the work of one. The Internet connection in the rooms was poor.
- The Marriott was an excellent facility for the review. The staff was excellent, the food was great, and the accommodations were adequate.

## 2.6. The visual quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to see all of the presentations I attended.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	5	8	47	32
0%	5%	9%	51%	35%

13 Comment(s)

- Visual consistency and set up between each room was excellent.
- Some rooms are too big compared with the screen size.
- Some rooms were overcrowded, which only illustrates a lot of interest.
- Many presentations used graphs and plots with a font that was too small to see in the larger rooms.
- Many presenters had tiny font sizes that could not be read—even from the front few rows.
- Some of the screen information displayed was a little blurry and was hard to view.
- Some presenters use fonts that are too small and illegible figures, making it difficult to follow. Obviously this depends on the presenter.
- The audio/visual facilities and the technicians provided by the hotel were good. Some presenters had too much data per slide, resulting in small fonts.
- There needs to be a visual standard for all presentations. Some had a very small font that could not be seen in the back. Also, the color choices were poor on some presentations, causing confusion.
- Guidelines regarding minimum font size and the amount of information allowed on a slide would help. If the table or graph is not readable, the presenter should summarize the data differently to communicate the message.
- The bottom third of the screen is typically masked by the people in the front. It seems so easy to raise the screen (and perhaps use larger screens).
- Very small chairs led to crowding in some rooms; it was impossible to see around the people sitting in front to see the projected slides. This often led to a significant blockage of the view.

- The podium in some rooms was so close to the screen that the presenter could not read the slide. The mixing of the presentation formats (Adobe/pdf and Powerpoint/ppt) did not work well. Speakers would go up to the computer and try to access their slides and mess things up. After a while, the audio/visual person had to come up to the computer to bring up the next presentation. Another room had no pdf/ppt scheme—just a folder with all the presentations listed sequentially—that worked perfectly every time.

2.7. The audio quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to hear all the presentations I attended.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	7	8	46	31
1%	8%	9%	49%	33%

12 Comment(s)

- The audio quality was mostly adequate.
- There was poor audio quality in some of the rooms.
- The reviewer found it difficult to hear sometimes.
- Lunch sessions were very difficult to hear over the diners.
- Some presenters needed better microphone training. The available sound equipment was excellent.
- Audio quality was poor in some rooms. It was too loud and had feedback at times; at other times it was too quiet.
- The salons at the Marriott have terrible acoustics. The sounds were so distorted in Salon 3 that they were barely recognizable.
- There were several issues in Salon IV with audio. Because there was not a speaker in the back of the room, it made it difficult to hear.
- Only one microphone was available for Q&A, which wasted precious time and could not cover two parties during discussions.
- The audio equipment in the smaller sessions was poor. The sessions that were earlier or later were disturbed by the people outside.
- The attendee spent time in Salon III at the Gateway and suggested that the audio/visual crew put speakers on both sides of the audience. They were only located on the right side and made it hard to hear on the left side of the room.
- The audio/visual technician was sometimes a little late turning up the volume of a microphone; but after that, the volume was fine. There was too much noise in the snack area during the sessions. From the back of the room, it was difficult to hear the speaker because of all the noise outside the doors.

2.8. The meeting hotel accommodations (sleeping rooms) were satisfactory.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	1	21	39	22
1%	1%	25%	46%	26%

4 Comment(s)

- The meeting hotel accommodations were too expensive. (3 responses)
- While D.C. is known to be pricey, better accommodations were expected.



### 2.9. The information about the Review and the hotel accommodations sent to me prior to the Review was adequate.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	0	6	46	40
0%	0%	7%	50%	43%

1 Comment(s)

- The price is high and the number of rooms is limited.

### 2.10. What was the most useful part of the review process?

60 Response(s)

- The technical presentations were the most useful part of the review. (12 responses)
- The Q&A sessions were the most useful part of the review process. (5 responses)
- Interfacing/networking with other professionals was the most useful part of the review. (6 responses)
- The poster sessions and conversations during poster session times were the most useful parts of the review process. (3 responses)
- The CD containing all the presentations and posters, which was provided on Monday, was extremely useful as the presentations could be studied. (2 responses)
- The plenary sessions during the first day and the poster sessions were the most useful parts of the review.
- The electrochemical storage sessions and the good networking opportunity were both useful parts of the review. The AMR provides the opportunity to organize separate discussions/meetings around the presentations taking advantage of the presence of scientists otherwise hard to gather in one room.
- The most useful part was the Mitigation of Vehicle Fast Charge Grid Impacts with Renewables and Energy Storage.
- The overviews of the programs on the recent accomplishments, future challenges, and funding opportunities were most useful and the principal investigators' (PIs') presentations were very impressive.
- The most useful part of the process was the way the topics were grouped in sequence.
- The presentations and the reviewers' feedback are the most useful parts of the review process.
- Getting overviews of multiple sub-program areas were the most useful parts of the review process.
- The most useful part of the review was learning about the state-of-the-art research.
- The presentations and Q&A were good, especially when followed by breaks where follow-up questions and networking could be undertaken.
- The presentations and the discussions during the coffee breaks were the most useful parts of the review.
- The cost studies and the overview for alternative powertrains were the most useful parts of the review.
- Learning about the level and readiness of the new technologies sponsored by DOE was the most useful part of the review process.
- Meeting people in person, networking, and listening to presentations on similar topics were the most useful parts of the review.
- The AMR gave an excellent perspective of what was being done at the national level. Also, it provided opportunities for people to network with 30-minute breaks and poster sessions.
- The AMR provides an opportunity to review and discuss the progress of key programs.
- The most useful part of the process was learning about the progress of the development of technology.
- The most useful parts of the process were learning the project details and interacting with other related projects. Networking was also very important.
- The information obtained was the most useful part of the process.
- The AMR provided updates on all of DOE's programs in these areas in a single week and enabled reviewers to directly interact with both the DOE Program Managers and the performers.

- The respondent attended as a means to become more familiar with the various programs and found the experience very useful.
- The presentations and the discussions and meeting the people performing the best research worldwide in the topic were the most useful parts of the process.
- Overall, progress on the projects plus technical details and interacting with everyone were the most useful parts of the process.
- The first day gave a comprehensive overview of the work achieved.
- For the purpose of the reviewer's work, the Program and sub-program overviews were very useful.
- The technical presentations were most valuable, enabling the reviewer to catch up with the state-of-the-art of various technologies.
- The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) project reviews, especially on fuel cell forklifts, were the most useful parts of the process.
- Learning about the information available that was pertinent was the most useful part of the process.
- This first-time attendee felt that everything was useful.
- The review meeting (presentations and posters) was very helpful in understanding the research needs of the industry.
- This attendee was able to gain a good understanding of how the Energy Storage Program is managed and executed, and came home with a good understanding of the objectives of the program. It was good to meet those who are working in the program.
- The most useful part of the process was meeting with government researchers and being updated by them on where research is taking place.
- The AMR gave the reviewer the most comprehensive and unbiased overview of research in the lithium battery space, which was highly useful to the reviewer's program.

### 2.11. What could have been done better?

#### 33 Response(s)

- The meeting was excellent. (2 responses)
- Everything was well organized. (2 responses)
- The audio and visual tools could have been better.
- Split the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program from the Vehicle Technologies Program so we can focus on the topic.
- This attendee would prefer getting the talks on a USB drive instead of a CD because most laptops no longer have CD drives.
- Shorten the Plenary session.
- There should be more time for questions from the audience.
- There could have been more time for presentations and questions.
- It would be better if a small summary of each topic is available at the website and in the handout so people can decide beforehand which presentation they will attend. (2 responses)
- There were too many sessions in parallel. The attendee wanted to attend both batteries and fuel cells and could not and suggests having them in separate times.
- There needed to be more access to DOE leadership. With such a high-profile event, a talk by the Secretary of Energy would have been appropriate.
- It was difficult to go back and forth between two different hotels. It would have been easier to have registration set up in both.
- The AMR should be held at a less expensive hotel with an improved sound system. There were relatively few questions, even from the reviewers. In some cases, the reviewers did not have a single question.
- It would have been better to invite more international peer reviewers to attend the meeting.
- Some presenters took too long to present and the time for questions was not enough. The presenters need to practice well in advance and leave more time for questions.
- The lighting was too dark in a certain poster session.

- There should be more discussion/presentations at the plenary about the overall place of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program in the national energy policy.
- The presenters could have given an estimated readiness level to allow for a review of technologies closer to completion.
- Many of the presenters did not give very much background, which made following their talk difficult. Although there is a limited amount of time, a better background/introduction section is encouraged. Often, the “problem statement” and “approach” served this purpose well; however, it was often glossed over.
- This attendee would have preferred to be in a single hotel/building rather than two. The government-rate rooms sold out much too quickly.
- It would have been better to have ice cream bars at every break!
- It would have been better to have a larger facility—spilled coffee is painful.
- This is the best meeting in the field of the upcoming hydrogen-based economy!
- It would have been better to arrange for more time to interact with presenters and DOE staff.
- It would be useful to have the plenary session presentations in the CD provided during the AMR.
- This attendee noticed many of the presentations had no one sitting at the review desks and questioned if these were being reviewed or if the reviewers sat elsewhere.
- Scheduling could have been better by trying to condense the time spent in each sub-program, such as fuel cells, production, etc., by running parallel sessions. Also, moving more projects into the poster sessions would have been better.
- The food at the poster session receptions could be more suitable for a broad audience.
- It would have been better to make the plenary presentations available sooner.
- The refreshment breaks were chaotic and disturbed the technical session rooms for at least 15 minutes into the presentation following the breaks.

2.12. Overall, how satisfied are you with the review process?

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
0	1	4	55	31
0%	1%	4%	60%	34%

3 Comment(s)

- It is a good venue with good facilities and easy to get on the Metro. There was a ton of information and the presenters are very accessible.
- Overall, it is an excellent meeting and the food is great.
- The evaluation methodology being used by the reviewers was unclear and the reviewers had fewer verbal questions and comments than at other reviews.

2.13. Would you recommend this review process to others, and should it be applied to other DOE programs?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
• Yes	91	40.6%
No	2	<1%
No Response	131	58.4%
<b>Total</b>	224	100%

8 Comment(s)

- Yes, if there existed a sufficient critical mass.
- Yes, except make certain that all reviewers do not have a conflict of interest.

- In principle, yes, but the respondent can say nothing about other DOE programs.
- It is very important to monitor the progress of funded research to decide whether to discontinue or to suggest interventions to get the research back on track.
- This attendee has recommended this review process to others.
- This was one of the best merit reviews the respondent has attended.
- This would be very useful for the Sunshot Program.

2.14. Please provide comments and recommendations on the overall review process.

20 Response(s)

- The review was very good. (5 responses)
- The information provided is very useful. (3 responses)
- There were too many interesting presentations simultaneously.
- The meeting was very informative and well organized.
- The meeting was well run by DOE personnel.
- The attendee was satisfied with the overall review process and thanks the organizers for all their hard work!
- The management of the meetings and the catering was perfect.
- This first-time AMR attendee was interested in topics presented during poster sessions and would have liked to see oral presentations on some of them. The crowding in the venue was overwhelming at times, with little room to move to the side for more in-depth, or private conversations.
- The presenters should not go into detail about funding and not use light green as a color for text. It is too faint and therefore unreadable.
- The presenters should be objective and disclose the composition (or some basic description of the composition) of the sample that was shown in the presentation. The attendee understands the proprietary aspect, but felt that some generic description can be provided to understand the reasons for the differences in performance.
- There ought to be some discussion of the previous year’s review and its effect on the project.
- The presenters could have given an estimated readiness level to allow for a review of the technologies that are closer to completion.
- This attendee would recommend the AMR to others seeking an overview of the fields; however, the very public nature of the event diminishes the frank technical exchange of a private review. The presenters should weigh in on this in terms of application to other DOE programs.
- If the review is part of the grant, then the PI should be required to submit their presentations on time or be scored to reflect that they were late. Knowing how taxpayer dollars are being spent and that they are well spent is important. If the PI cannot meet this deadline, the attendee questions what else the PI may be overlooking.

3. Responses from Reviewers

3.1. Information about the program(s)/project(s) under review was provided sufficiently prior to the review session.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	2	1	25	24
2%	4%	2%	47%	45%

12 Comment(s)

- This was very well done.
- It was helpful to have the prior-year presentation to measure the progress.
- The presentations were available in plenty of time to allow the reviewer to read over them and begin thinking about review inputs.
- A week earlier would have been nice.

- One of the reviews was late getting the Fiscal Year 2012 graphics posted. However, that did not cause any difficulty.
- The final information was not received for a couple of projects on the Friday before the AMR.
- Having the presentations ahead of time helped the reviewer to prepare questions for the PIs.
- The information was provided in a timely manner, but the level of detail is totally insufficient to do anything like a thorough review.
- This reviewer got more information for the 2012 review from the 2011 text report. The 2012 presentations do not provide enough detail in general.
- This reviewer felt hounded with administrative emails, but received almost nothing helpful about the review itself.
- Another reviewer got nothing but titles prior to the AMR. Ideally, this would have helped, although it is not clear that reviewers would really have had the time (or inclination) to review them before the meeting.
- It was unclear whether the reviewers needed to consider job creation in the reviews.

### 3.2. Review instructions were provided in a timely manner.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	1	1	20	30
2%	2%	2%	38%	57%

7 Comment(s)

- Timely information was provided by the ORISE team. (2 responses)
- The webinar presentation was a good review.
- It was unclear how the presentation/review procedures worked together, but that may have been just because this was the reviewer's first time as a reviewer/attendee.
- The PeerNet login information was difficult to find in the email.
- The review instructions were only fair. The webinar was OK. It would have been nice to have the technology development manager provide some context about what the reviewers were being asked to do.
- PeerNet worked very well for the reviewer this time. The professionalism and support of the ORISE team and webcast training sessions were very helpful. They do a really good job of handling the mechanics of the review and should be commended. The reviewer may have them point out that some of the projects are at very different stages on their funding timeline and that results have to be weighed against how much time they have spent on a project (some had barely started, for example).

### 3.3. The information provided in the presentations was adequate for a meaningful review of the projects.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	4	11	27	9
2%	8%	21%	52%	17%

23 Comment(s)

- In general, the presenters provided enough information to evaluate the work, given the limitations of proprietary data and time constraints. (4 responses)
- It seems out of proportion to give each project the same amount of time; for example, some projects were given 20 minutes plus 10 minutes for questions, while some projects receive five to ten times more funding and are doing five to ten times more work.
- It is unclear how it is possible to review an \$80 million project thoroughly in half an hour.

- There were some programs that were funded at \$200,000, while others were as large as \$40 million. However, both were allocated the same amount of time, i.e., 20 minutes for presentation plus 10 minutes for Q&A. This resulted in a thorough review of the smaller projects and a cursory one for the larger projects. Some of the activities in the larger projects were mere line items. If the intention of the AMR is to provide a check and a balance, the larger programs should be reviewed for one and a half hours at least.
- For very large programs, the time was inadequate; for small programs, it was sometimes more than adequate. The \$100,000 projects and the \$30 million projects get the same time. Some presenters avoided presenting any real data, making it hard to evaluate their work.
- It is apparent that the presentations generally are just the good news, and there is little mention of things that did not work out well. Many of the presentations were broad, with many players.
- It would be helpful to require clearer presentation of original goals and objectives of the project, to get a clearer understanding of what has not been met and what has changed.
- The standardized structure of the presentation helps with the review process; however, in some cases, diagrams were not properly explained or were difficult to understand.
- Not all of the evaluation criteria were addressed in all the presentations. (2 responses)
- Some of the presentations did provide adequate information, but most did not. It might be better if people spoke directly to the questions the reviewers has to answer. In some cases, people did this, but often they did not. Also, some presenters used up so much time on introductory material that the reviewers did not have time to hear about the important things that would tell them whether a project was good or on track, etc.
- The definition of “barriers” is interpreted differently by DOE, PIs, and reviewers. This reviewer suggests including a standardized definition or delete and replace with “objectives” of the project.
- With the exception of the Mississippi State project, the presentations were adequate.
- Powerpoint forces the presenters to select limited data and results.
- The presentations could have been a bit more specific. The time was too short with Q&A.
- The fuel cell session presentations contained too much information on each slide. It was difficult to determine the actual data and meaningful results. Provide presentation guidance, including font size. Also, few presentations provided error bars/analyses on their graphs.
- Reviewing the industry projects is always challenging, as they are reluctant to reveal sufficient technical detail to properly evaluate their progress towards the project goals.
- A meaningful review requires examining the 2011 presentation and/or report, reviewers’ comments, and the 2012 presentation. Unless you are an expert in the field, the information provided in the presentations is not sufficient.
- Time is simply too short to grasp anything but the highlights. Most things must be taken at face value. The current process is not fair to either the PIs or the reviewers. The previous ATD/BATT review system was far better and allowed time for real discussions. The current process may be more convenient, but it is simply too much at one time to work. It seems to be done mainly for show, ticking off someone’s box.
- The reviewers were given only the most superficial budget information on rather big programs; yet, they were still asked whether the budgets were sufficient or not. The reviewers should learn more about the specifics of how the money was spent or that question should be deleted.

### 3.4. The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized (see below) were clearly defined.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	3	2	2	21	23
	6%	4%	4%	41%	45%
Approach	2	1	2	26	21
	4%	2%	4%	50%	40%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	1	1	1	29	20
	2%	2%	2%	56%	38%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	1	3	10	21	17
	2%	6%	19%	40%	33%
Proposed Future Research	2	2	4	29	15
	4%	4%	8%	56%	29%

#### 14 Comment(s)

- The evaluation criteria were not provided in advance.
- The evaluation criteria were clear and appropriate.
- The evaluation criteria have not changed greatly in the past few years, so most reviewers (including this reviewer) are generally clear on the criteria and the type of answers desired.
- The Relevance criterion is overrated. Either the work is relevant or it is not. If they are not doing work that is relevant, they should not be at the AMR. While the review focuses on prior accomplishments, the real question should be: is the project proposing proper future work? This gets only half the credit and is reduced to one or two bullet summary slides.
- All the projects should by definition be “relevant.” (Those that are not should not be funded.) Programs near termination really do not need to discuss “future work.” Many of the collaborations are more like customer-vendor relationships.
- The problem with the Proposed Future Research criterion is that some presenters see future work as new topics to be addressed after the project is completed; other presenters see it as work to be done from the current status to project completion.
- Relevance to DOE targets is not always easy to assess. It should be addressed in the AMR Plenary session.
- The Approach is extremely important because if the reviewer does not agree with the approach, everything else matters less. It was difficult to evaluate Technical Accomplishments and Progress without requiring the PI to also give a schedule of milestones. For example, spending 50% of the funds does not necessarily equate to meeting 50% of the objectives or 50% progress.
- The Collaboration criterion was explained well, but Technology Transfer was explained to a lesser extent. It was not completely clear how Proposed Future Research was defined.
- The Relevance question is just irrelevant and should be removed from the criteria. It is unclear why the research would get funded if it was not relevant. DOE knows why they funded the work. Regarding the collaboration criterion, some projects need collaboration much more than others. Moreover, collaboration is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Thus, this reviewer would not rank collaboration numerically. Future work should be ranked more highly since past work has already been paid for.
- Relevance and Approach are generally skimmed over by the presenters, as they feel that the Technical Accomplishments are the most important. The weights given to the Relevance and Approach should be significantly lower, since Relevance should be a given (the reviewer questioned if DOE would fund irrelevant projects) and Approach is often sort of obvious (experiments get results). Technology Transfer and Collaboration is not relevant for every project, and should not be presented on the same slide with the Budget (redundant).
- Some of these criteria were skewed for projects that were mainly aimed at educational and outreach missions.
- The criteria were pretty well explained, but it was hard to know how heavily the reviewers should weight collaboration at different levels. Some projects naturally involved collaboration; some did not. Some included

collaboration within the state or with certain types of institutions, but did not go further than that. It was unclear how much reviewers should penalize projects for this.

- Include “sufficient resources” criteria for evaluation in this list. In addition, provide more of an explanation on what resources to evaluate.

3.5. The evaluation criteria were adequately addressed in the presentations.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	1	3	3	30	14
	2%	6%	6%	59%	27%
Approach	1	4	4	28	14
	2%	8%	8%	55%	27%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	0	1	8	22	19
	0%	2%	16%	44%	38%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	1	3	13	24	9
	2%	6%	26%	48%	18%
Proposed Future Research	1	2	7	33	7
	2%	4%	14%	66%	14%

16 Comment(s)

- Each presentation included each of these issues.
- For most presentations this was true; however, not for all. (3 responses)
- Achievements could have been better presented in several presentations.
- There was a lot less focus on collaborations and industry relevance.
- Proposed future research plans were not presented in much depth.
- Some presenters did not directly answer these questions (or at least emphasize their importance) or adequately address these in their presentations.
- In general, presenters addressed the criteria well, with some exceptions—some did not have enough time to devote to explaining all the criteria.
- There is something about the criteria that does not really work, but it is hard to define.
- For Technology Transfer and Collaboration, the presenters often resorted to name dropping to cater to this requirement. It is better to drop this item altogether in the future.
- Some presenters seem to hide the real data to an extent that makes it hard to judge the technical progress. Some presenters list supplier interactions as collaboration, others do not (but must have suppliers) and this is not always clear.
- Collaborations were highlighted and teams were well defined, but the transition aspects of the projects were not so well defined.
- Relevance related to the Recovery Act’s impact on jobs, activity, and growth were generally not addressed adequately in any of the Recovery Act projects reviewed. Proposed future research beyond the project was not addressed either.
- There was not enough information presented on Technology Transfer and Collaboration. Proposed Future Research was fine, but not relevant to the reviewer’s projects, which are ending.
- There was not enough information on Proposed Future Research. Also, there was not enough on what was learned versus results (due to lack of time). The slides on Collaboration were just a listing of who they are “teaming with,” which does not say much—anyone can have a list of associates (like friends in Facebook). A few PIs posted a one liner by each saying what the partner actually contributed, which was far more useful in evaluating collaborations.



3.6. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program(s).

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	3	2	5	25	15
	6%	4%	10%	50%	30%
Approach	1	2	4	28	15
	2%	4%	8%	56%	30%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	0	1	3	30	16
	0%	2%	6%	60%	32%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	2	1	5	29	13
	4%	2%	10%	58%	26%
Proposed Future Research	2	2	5	28	13
	4%	4%	10%	56%	26%

8 Comment(s)

- The criteria and weightings were OK.
- The criteria have not changed much, and have always been appropriate.
- Relevance should be 25%; Approach should be 40%; Technical Accomplishments and Progress should be 20%; Technology Transfer and Collaboration should be 10%; and Future Research should be 5%.
- They are all so inter-related, that it is hard to figure out the “right” weighting. Also, the levels are such that all projects are rated “very good” (which may be good for Congress), but DOE then cannot sort out any meaningful spread among project merits.
- For Technology Transfer and Collaboration, the presenters often resorted to name dropping to cater to this requirement. It is better to drop this item altogether in the future.
- Increase emphasis on the Technical Accomplishments and reduce weightings on Future Research and Approach.
- Omit Relevance and emphasize Proposed Future Research (“Future Plans”), and deemphasize Collaborations. Likely due to time constraints, there was not enough time devoted to explaining the rationale behind the approach.
- Relevance should be weighted less since it should be assumed that a project is relevant (otherwise it should not have been funded to begin with) and/or the reviewers should evaluate the relevance of a project as part of evaluating some of the other criteria.

3.7. During the AMR, reviewers had adequate access to the Principal Investigators.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	1	7	24	19
2%	2%	13%	46%	37%

6 Comment(s)

- The discussion Q&A time and the breaks were sufficient for the reviewer to speak with the PIs.
- Many of the presentations were made by people other than the PIs. Quite often, the presenters did not have sufficient knowledge about the material that was being presented.
- There were no formal interactions outside the presentations, but there were good networking opportunities.
- It was not clear if the reviewers are allowed to access the PIs, besides at the time of the presentations.
- The reviewers had access, but because of the technical nature of the material, the reviewers needed more time to digest the information and then come back with questions. It is hard to do this in real time with no advanced review of the presentations. The posters allowed for more interaction, but it is hard to read the slides on a poster.

Doing the talk first and then the poster session, like the BATT program did, is the way to go to get a real review with reviewers contributing to discussions and developing ideas.

- These reviews cannot last forever, so the time has to be limited somehow. On the other hand, given how some presenters did, the reviewers did not always have enough time to get all the information needed to do a really good job of evaluating the projects. Perhaps there could be a dedicated, but informal, “networking” time for reviewers and presenters so there can be more discussion and exploration of topics that were not sufficiently covered.

3.8. Information on the location and timing of the projects was adequate and easy to find.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
0	3	1	30	18
0%	6%	2%	58%	35%

7 Comment(s)

- The staff did a commendable job keeping the speakers on schedule.
- The information on the location and timing of the projects was easy to find, but not adequate. It was better when there were fewer projects reviewed at a time and there was much more detail provided.
- This reviewer wanted to be in two rooms at the same time.
- This reviewer had to move between hotels a lot. The elevator was busy all the time, so the reviewer had to use the emergency stairs.
- It would be better if all sessions were located in one hotel.
- The reviewer does not remembering seeing information on the location and timing of the projects, other than what states they were in.
- This reviewer was not sure what this questions means and questioned if this is referring to the time and place of the talks or of the work being reviewed. It was easy to find the talks; very good information provided. As far as the project timing, the standard slide worked well. While some of the PIs did not like the few “standard slides” they had to present, these were actually good to have and really essential to compare projects.

3.9. The number of projects I was expected to review was:

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Too many	2	<1%
Too few	9	4.0%
About right	41	18.3%
No Response	172	76.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>100%</b>

7 Comment(s)

- The reviews were cursory.
- This reviewer only reviewed two projects, which was completely reasonable.
- It was unclear to the reviewer why they had to also review the DOE presenter.
- Overall, there were fewer projects to review this year; but it is not unreasonable to ask a reviewer to review five or six projects.
- All of this reviewer’s 14 projects were bunched in the last one and a half days; this reviewer could have done a few earlier in the week as well.
- This reviewer had a light load of three projects, of which one ended due to a business decision. Attending all week could be hard to justify if there were not so many networking opportunities and opportunities to hear updates about other funded projects.

- This reviewer’s work load (27 reviews) was really too high to do as good a job as they would have liked, especially since the reviewer is not a consultant and is squeezing this into a day job. The reviewer did like that they had a balance of posters and oral presentations and suggests relaxing the conflict of interest criteria to make it much less imposing so more reviewers can participate.

### 3.10. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the question and answer period provided sufficient depth for a meaningful review.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	3	3	30	14
4%	6%	6%	58%	27%

7 Comment(s)

- It is unreasonable to think that the reviewer can really understand how the larger projects accomplished their goals and are set on the right path for future work in 20 minutes. The reviewer would rather review half of the project every other year and give them twice as much time to present and answer questions.
- The fact that universities, national labs, and industries were being reviewed in a one-week-long review session does not lead to a meaningful review. It is better to split these three reviews so that knowledgeable people are assigned as reviewers, and so that there are enough experts in the audience as well.
- For the larger projects, the review felt quite rushed. However, given the large number of projects overall, it is hard to see how much more time could have been given.
- DOE announced that the meeting was not a technical meeting but a review. However, Q&A was almost related to the detailed technical issues, not to the evaluation criteria.
- It would have been nice to have more preparatory materials, at least within the context of the review. The reviewer only had access to the Powerpoint presentations.
- The whole review process is simply far too short and does not give the PIs enough time to explain and justify their work. The previous ATD/BATT reviews were vastly better at getting real evaluations. At the ATD/BATT reviews, the reviewers had genuine discussions and were in a far better position to fairly judge the work and also to offer advice on next steps. The current process is simply too rushed and superficial.
- The process seemed chaotic, especially for this first-time reviewer.

### 3.11. Please provide additional comments.

15 Response(s)

- The review was very well organized.
- This reviewer felt this was the best review process they have ever experienced.
- A very informative and helpful overview of the Programs’ work overall. This was a very good use of time.
- There needs to be more private space for the reviewers. It was too packed.
- A minimum font size needs to be defined.
- It would help if the reviewers also had access to the summary project reports (text should not be more than 5–10 pages).
- The final scoring on the projects seems to have nothing to do with the final funding on each project. The PI should be accountable for poor scoring or performance.
- A good number of the slides were impossible to follow. Even sitting in the front row, the micro text is hard to discern. The most abusive of the presenters tended to put a micro text in one corner, and then continued adding additional boxes. The presenters need clear specifications on the font size. There also should be a clear message on each slide.
- DOE handled the AMR well. It is a model for other scientific, engineering, and technology programs. The one drawback was not having a level playing field for reviewers. The only non-DOE reviewers that paid for their travel expenses are the national laboratories; they should be doing this out of their overhead funds.

- The main problem with the meeting is that it is way too big. There are too many people to talk to and the noise level is almost unbearable at breaks and meals. Also, there are too many talks going on at once that the reviewer wanted to see.
- Many of the presenters would show a team effort and a variety of activities to mask the fact that they were not able to make sufficient progress in their effort. It would help if Relevance and Accomplishments are given higher weight in the review.
- The reviewer felt hounded by administrative details (especially only reviewing two projects) and is questioning getting involved in this review again. There was not enough information about the content provided to the reviewers, and the registration did not make sense. It is ridiculous to ask reviewers to go to two hotels for a meeting.
- The draconian language used in the agreement to view pdf files was plainly ridiculous and totally unacceptable. Furthermore, every presentation has a disclaimer that there is nothing confidential and they are posted on the Internet. It is unclear why any of this should have any confidentiality associated with it.
- This reviewer has reviewed for many years and has found that the AMR has progressively improved. The biggest issue is absorbing the large volume of material presented by DOE at the plenary session, sub-program overviews, and session introductions.
- It is not possible to have a perfect review system, but the reviewer wanted to provide the following feedback. This was the reviewer’s first time doing this, so perhaps it gets easier/smoothier after some practice. Reviewers should not be typing reviews into computers during the presentations since they cannot help but be distracted.

**4. Responses from Presenters**

4.1. The request to provide a presentation for the AMR was provided sufficiently prior to the deadline for submission.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	1	3	26	38
3%	1%	4%	37%	54%

7 Comment(s)

- The presentation was requested too early. It is rather atypical to have presentations ready so far in advance. Also, the presenter would have liked to change a few things on their presentation after they have submitted it, but that did not seem possible.
- Given the early deadline and the flexibility in accepting presentations after the deadline, it all worked out fine.
- There was ample notice and reminders of what was needed and when.
- The request and due date were too early, because by the time the AMR occurred the presentations were two months outdated.
- The presentations were requested a little too early.
- There was more than enough time; however, the presenter questioned why it takes two months to burn these CDs.
- Although the deadline was missed due to internal approvals process, the organizers were flexible enough to accommodate the delay and were supportive through the process.

#### 4.2. Instructions for preparing the presentation were sufficient.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
2	0	0	28	40
3%	0%	0%	40%	57%

4 Comment(s)

- The instructions have evolved over time, and have gotten better. However, the supplied examples could be of higher quality (or be updated).
- They were way too detailed; the key information gets lost when there is too much of it. Most people do not have time to go through a 50-slide template for a 20-slide presentation!
- What we present based on the instructions is completely different than what the reviewers are interested in. The reviewers are there to learn something whether that is your intention or not. They do not want a list of highlights, nor your motivation, nor your impact; they want to know what science is behind the highlights.
- The instructions were very clear and good examples of the relevant scoring areas were provided.

#### 4.3. The audio and visual equipment worked properly and were adequate.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
1	2	3	25	37
1%	3%	4%	37%	54%

5 Comment(s)

- The presenter had video and had to use a lapel mic to share audio.
- Sometimes a message would appear on the screen that covered part of the slide for an entire presentation.
- A remote slide-advance button (handheld) would be a fancy, but welcome, addition. Having laser pointers available (or loaned) has been a nice touch. Kudos for employing the speaker “countdown” clock effectively.
- The slide number was available to the reviewer but not to the presenter. During the Q&A, the presenter had difficulty navigating back and forth to the slides, was automatically kicked to next presentation, and could not get back to presentation slides.
- The equipment was fine, but it was extremely difficult to see the screen (especially from the back of the room), which the presenter noticed last year as well. This is due to a light that is directly above the screen that shines onto the screen. Because it is a canister light, you probably cannot turn off the one above the screen without turning them all off, but maybe you can put a piece of cardboard over the light directly over the screen.

4.4. The evaluation criteria upon which the Review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	1	1	8	38	16
	2%	2%	13%	59%	25%
Approach	1	1	6	38	17
	2%	2%	10%	60%	27%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	2	1	5	35	20
	3%	2%	8%	56%	32%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	3	1	9	35	15
	5%	2%	14%	56%	24%
Proposed Future Research	0	1	7	35	18
	0%	2%	11%	57%	30%

10 Comment(s)

- It depends on how the reviewers interpret the instructions.
- Technology Transfer and Collaboration was not clearly defined.
- The presenter was aware of the criteria from previous year reviews. The reviewer comments were very helpful and constructive.
- The Relevance and Approach sections overlap somewhat, at least as defined by the examples given in the instructions. Tasks, Targets, Barriers, and Milestones can all cross these organizational boundaries; if DOE reviewers are flexible, then the intent is fine as given.
- The presenter is not aware of the criteria used by reviewers in any of these categories. It would be good for presenters to learn about the evaluation criteria as well as reviewers.
- The evaluation criteria were basically clear; however, the respondent is not sure if they were clear to the reviewers last year (based on the reviewer comments that the respondent looked at).
- There is no requirement for actual evidence on the Technical Accomplishments and Progress. Presenters can sell snake-oil in the AMR, i.e., claims that never materialize. Remove “Collaboration” from the evaluation criteria as this is not a requirement for the success of a project.
- There should be one slide for Relevance, zero for Approach, 15 for Accomplishments, zero for Technology Transfer, and one for Future Research. The Collaboration slide is often used to list the people that actually did the work and everyone in the organization is listed.
- Some of the advanced concept/research is important to the overarching strategy, but not directly related to established technical targets.
- Since the presenters have not received the results of the Review yet, it is unclear how they can intelligently comment on whether the criteria were “used appropriately.”

#### 4.5. Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient.

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	1	1	6	42	13
	2%	2%	10%	67%	21%
Approach	1	0	8	38	15
	2%	0%	13%	61%	24%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	1	0	6	41	14
	2%	0%	10%	66%	23%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	4	1	5	36	14
	7%	2%	8%	60%	23%
Proposed Future Research	0	1	7	39	14
	0%	2%	11%	64%	23%

5 Comment(s)

- This presenter mostly relied on the examples for guidance.
- The reviewers often asked questions not specific to the project being reviewed.
- Technology Transfer and Collaboration were not clearly defined.
- This presenter did not understand the questions and asked what is meant by “criteria.”
- Collaboration should mean different research groups, not who in your group did the work.

#### 4.6. The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program(s).

The top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. The bottom percentage is the percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Highly Agree
Relevance	2	1	12	35	11
	3%	2%	20%	57%	18%
Approach	2	1	9	37	11
	3%	2%	15%	62%	18%
Technical Accomplishments and Progress	2	1	8	35	13
	3%	2%	14%	59%	22%
Technology Transfer and Collaboration	4	2	12	34	8
	7%	3%	20%	57%	13%
Proposed Future Research	1	1	10	38	10
	2%	2%	17%	63%	17%

5 Comment(s)

- There needs to be evaluation criteria for the clarity of the presentations. Some were very poor, clearly not vetted, and did not do justice to the project.
- Technology Transfer and Collaboration were not clearly defined.
- The weighting should be as follows: Relevance, 15%; Approach, 5%; Technical Accomplishments and Progress, 75%; Technology Transfer and Collaboration, 5%; Proposed Future Research, 5%.
- Collaborations were overemphasized. In many cases, due to competing interests in technology development, collaborations are contrary to the interest of the developing organization.
- Too much attention was given to non-technical slides.

4.7. Please provide additional comments:

*12 Response(s)*

- The AMR was well organized and ran smoothly.
- Altogether, the AMR is a very worthwhile event.
- The respondent enjoyed hearing about the other projects, their challenges and successes.
- Given the number of participants at the AMR, it is amazing that everything worked out so smoothly. Congratulations to the organizing team.
- The hotel was very expensive. The next AMR could be held 20 miles outside Washington, D.C., where hotels would be much cheaper.
- The presentation material was requested more than two months in advance and updates just prior to the presentation date were not allowed without special permission. With projects that have data, updates should be permitted at least one week prior to the presentation.
- Washington, D.C., is a really expensive place to have this meeting. DOE is ultimately paying the travel and hotel for most participants (largely through projects), so saving the travel for DOE personnel based in D.C. does not save real money. Having the review in an area that needs stimulus (e.g., Flint, MI) would save money, create good press, etc.
- The AMR location is excellent and easy to get to. The hotel was fine and meeting rooms had plenty of attendee space. Also, a 30-minute time slot for oral was sufficient and allowed time for good discussion. The respondent also presented poster sessions and that worked out nicely; they were not as crowded as they sometimes get.
- Right now the AMR slides are submitted almost three months in advance of actual presentation date. The respondent questioned if it is possible to shorten the time between when the presentation slides are due and the AMR meeting; for example, perhaps the slides can be due 30 days before the actual AMR meeting date.
- The respondent is guessing that the easiest time to get a conference room in D.C. are the weeks where people would not want to travel: Mother's Day and Fourth of July, since every other organization would not consider having their employees travel those days. The reviewer suggests holding the AMR on another week.
- This review meeting has become unwieldy. Handling nearly 1,000 people in one hallway for breaks is not productive or refreshing. Perhaps the review should be broken into Energy Systems one week, and Vehicle Systems the next week.
- The benefit of long lead time in preparing briefs is somewhat offset by real-world events that occur between the time the briefing gets "locked down" and the time the presentation is made. The presenter suggests accepting revisions to the Progress section of the presentations a little closer to the presentation date since the research is being evaluated on that progress.