



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

Application Content and Evaluation Criteria/Process

Reginald Tyler

Golden Field Office

Office of Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and Infrastructure Technologies



Application Content

- Separate Applications for Each Major Topic
- Title Should Identify the Topic Area
- Application – SF 424
- Budget File – SF 424A
- Project Summary – 1 page, non-proprietary



Project Narrative

- Provide clear description of the technical concept and how you plan to accomplish the work.
- Include a description of the relevance of and justification for your proposal.
- Must include a Preliminary Safety Plan.
- Must limit length to fifteen pages.



Participants, Facilities, Equipment

- Describe roles of participants.
- Describe relevant facilities.
- Describe existing and needed equipment.
- Limit length to five pages.



Statement of Objectives, Work Plan and Schedule

- Identify Tasks, Milestones, Decision Points.
- Should include at least one go/no-go decision point including decision criteria.
- Include brief schedule.
- Limit length to eight pages.



Application Evaluation Criteria

Application should adequately address each evaluation criteria:

- Technical Concept – 40%
- Work Plan/Statement of Objectives – 30%
- Qualifications and Facilities – 30%



Criterion 1: Technical Concept (40%)

- Perceived value of the project in advancing the state of the art of fuel cell technologies for automotive and stationary applications. Note: automotive applications will be given higher weight than stationary applications
- 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 fuel cell system components
- Perceived likelihood of overall technical success



Criterion 2:

Work Plan/Statement of Objectives (30%)

- The adequacy, clarity, and completeness of the work plan and Statement of Objectives
- 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 the 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 (30%)

- The adequacy of the education, professional training, technical/business related skills, and work experience of the Principal Investigator and other key personnel
- The 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 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.
- All applications will 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 compiled.
- Merit Review Committee (MRC) meets and develops consensus scores, strengths, and weaknesses.
- MRC establishes selection range and recommends applications for selection.



Evaluation Process (Continued)

- MRC Chairperson's Report prepared.
- Selections made factoring in Program Policy Factors and available funding.
- Program Policy Factors
 - Past Performance
 - Team Diversity
 - Technology Diversity
 - Topic Diversity
 - Cost Share Above the Minimum



Tentative Schedule

- Issue Solicitation on IIPS – 8/12/2005
- Applications Due – 11/15/2005
- Announcement of Awards – April 2006
- Awards made – Sep 2006 - Dec 2006