



U.S. Department of Energy
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Application Content and Evaluation Criteria/Process

Jill Gruber
Golden Field Office
Department of Energy
May 18, 2007

The information presented here is an outline of how the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) may be structured. The final application requirements will be shown in the FOA when it is posted on Grants.gov. The schedule and awards are dependent on future appropriations and may change if future appropriations are lower than expected or in the event of a continuing resolution.



DOE Points of Contact

DOE Golden Field Office:

Jill Gruber, Project Officer

Bob Kingsley, Contract Specialist

Stephanie Carabajal, Contracting Officer

DOE HQ:

Pete Devlin, Technology Development Manager



Preliminary Application Content

- Separate applications for each topic
- Title should identify the topic area
- Application – SF 424
- Project Narrative
 - Cover page (1 page limit)
 - Technical summary (1 page limit)
 - Technical Proposal (5 page limit)
- Pre-design analysis required



Final Application Content

- By invitation only; after Preliminary Applications have been evaluated
- Title should identify the topic area
- Budget File – SF 424 (R&R)
- Project Summary – 1 page limit
- Project Narrative with Appendices
- Certifications and Miscellaneous Information



Project Narrative

- Clear description of the technical concept and how you plan to accomplish the work
- Should include a description of the relevance/justification for your proposal
- Addresses Evaluation Criteria
- 20 Page Limit



Statement of Project Objectives, Work Plan, and Schedule

- Identify Tasks, Milestones, and Decision Points
- Should include at least one Go/No-Go decision point and decision criteria
- Include brief schedule



Participants, Facilities, Equipment

- Describe roles of participants
- Describe relevant facilities
- Describe existing and needed equipment
- Biographical sketches for key personnel
- Included as appendices to Project Narrative



Application Evaluation Criteria

- Application narrative should adequately address each evaluation criteria:
 - Technical Concept – 50%
 - Work Plan/Statement of Project Objectives (SOPO) – 30%
 - Qualifications and Facilities – 20%



Criterion 1: Technical Concept (50%)

- Perceived value of the project in advancing manufacturing technologies for PEM fuel cells or hydrogen storage systems.
- Clarity of understanding by the Applicant of fundamental principles and limitations.
- Degree to which barriers are identified and addressed with viable plans for resolution including consideration of the impact on other system components.
- Perceived likelihood of overall technical success.



Criterion 2: Work Plan/SOPO (30%)

- The adequacy, clarity, and completeness of the work plan and Statement of Project Objectives (SOPO).
- The soundness and likelihood of success of the proposed approach, including the ability to resolve challenges, achieve the goals and objectives, and ensure safety.
- The approach to managing the team and the commitment of team members.
- The adequacy and reasonableness of the work task structure, milestones, and schedule.
- The appropriateness of Go/No-Go decision points and decision criteria.



Criterion 3: Qualifications and Facilities (20%)

- The adequacy of the education, professional training, technical/business related skills, and work experience of the Principal Investigator and other key personnel.
- Capabilities of the Applicant and participants to comprehensively address all aspects of the proposed project.
- The adequacy of the level of participation by project participants.
- The adequacy and reasonableness of the project team.
- The adequacy of the Applicant's proposed facilities, and those of subcontractors.
- The reasonableness of any request for new facilities and/or equipment.



Evaluation Process

- All involved must sign confidentiality and conflict of interest certification
- Applications undergo initial/compliance review
- All applications which pass initial review are evaluated by at least three independent reviewers
- Reviewers provide written strengths and weaknesses and score each evaluation criteria



Evaluation Process

(Continued)

- Scores, strengths and weaknesses are compiled
- Merit Review Committee (MRC) meets and develops consensus scores, strengths, and weaknesses
- MRC establishes selection range and recommended applicants



Evaluation Process

(Continued)

- MRC Chairperson's Report prepared
- Selections made by DOE Selection Official factoring in Program Policy Factors and available funding
- Program Policy Factors:
 - Past Performance
 - Topic Diversity
 - Technological Diversity within Topic Area
 - Best Value
 - Cost Share Above the Minimum Required



Tentative Schedule

- Issue Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) on Grants.gov – July 2007
- Preliminary Applications Due – October 2007
- Final Applications Due – January 2008
- MRC Meeting – February 2008
- Selection Complete – March 2008
- Award Negotiations – April 2008

This is a tentative schedule and is subject to change. The application due dates and expected award timeframe will be shown in the FOA when it is posted on Grants.gov. The schedule and awards are dependent on future appropriations and may change if future appropriations are lower than expected or in the event of a continuing resolution.