

DOE/USDA 2005 Feedstock Stage Gate Review

Project Evaluation Form

Session: 2 3 4 5

Reviewer Name: _____

Title of Project: _____

Presenter Name: _____

Proposed Stage Placement (Circle One): A B 2 3 4 NA

Reviewer Recommended Stage (Circle One): A B 2 3 4 NA

Comments on Stage Placement: _____

Using the following criteria, rate the work presented in the context of the program objectives and provide **specific, concise** comments to support your evaluation. -- Write/print **clearly** please. --

1. **Relevance** to overall objectives.

Stage Gate Criteria 1) Strategic Fit and 2) Customers/Markets.

The degree to which 1) the project supports the goals and objectives of the DOE Multi-Year Technical Plan or USDA Program Plan, and 2) the market potential is attractive and customers are identified for project outputs.

4-Outstanding. The project is critical to and fully supports plan objectives		Specific Comments:
3-Good. Most aspects of the project align with the plan objectives.		
2-Fair. The project partially supports the plan objectives.		
1.-Poor. The project provides little support to the plan objectives.		

2. **Approach** to performing the R&D.

Stage Gate Criteria 3) Technical Feasibility and 4) Competitive Advantage

The degree to which technical barriers are addressed, the project is well-designed, technically feasible, and integrated with other research. Also, it is clear why the approach is better than alternatives.

4-Outstanding. The project is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers to development of biomass feedstock technologies. Difficult for the approach to be improved significantly.		Specific Comments:
3-Good. The approach is generally well thought out and effective but could be improved in a few areas. Most aspects of the project will contribute to progress in overcoming the barriers.		
2-Fair. Some aspects of the project may lead to progress in overcoming some barriers, but the approach has significant weaknesses.		
1.-Poor. The approach is not responsive to project objectives and unlikely to make significant contributions to overcoming the barriers.		

3. **Technical Accomplishments and Progress**

Toward overall project and DOE or USDA goals – the degree to which research progress is measured against performance indicators and to which the project elicits improved performance (effectiveness, efficiency, cost, and benefits).

<p>4-Outstanding. The project has made excellent progress toward objectives and overcoming one or more key technical barriers. Progress to date suggests that the barrier(s) will be overcome.</p>		<p>Specific Comments:</p>
<p>3-Good. The project has shown significant progress toward against its objectives and to overcoming one or more technical barriers.</p>		
<p>2-Fair. The project has shown modest progress in overcoming barriers, and the rate of progress has been slow.</p>		
<p>1.-Poor. The project has demonstrated little or no progress towards its objectives or any barriers.</p>		

4. **Success Factors and Showstoppers**

Stage Gate Criteria 5) Legal/Regulatory Compliance and 6) Critical Success Factors and Showstoppers

The degree to which the project has identified and addressed the most critical technical or business factors impacting or impeding achievement of the project goals. Factors include legal or regulatory issues that may be barriers to commercialization.

<p>4-Outstanding. All critical success factors and showstoppers are identified and reasonable strategies developed to overcome showstoppers.</p>		<p>Specific Comments:</p>
<p>3-Good. Most critical success factors and showstoppers are identified and possible strategies developed to overcome showstoppers.</p>		
<p>2-Fair. Some critical success factors and showstoppers are identified. Strategies to overcome showstoppers are very high level or not developed.</p>		
<p>1.-Poor. Little to no identification of critical success factors or showstoppers. Little to no recognition of relative importance or prioritization of activities.</p>		

5. **Proposed Future Research** approach and relevance.

Stage Gate Criteria 7: Plan to Proceed

The degree to which the project has effectively planned its future, considered contingencies, understands resource or schedule requirements, built in optional paths or off ramps, etc.

<p>4-Outstanding. The future work plan clearly builds on past progress and is sharply focused on one or more key technical barriers in a timely manner.</p>		<p>Specific Comments:</p>
<p>3-Good. Future work plans build on past progress and generally address removing or diminishing barriers in a reasonable period.</p>		
<p>2-Fair. The future work plan may lead to improvements, but should be better focused on removing/diminishing key barriers in a reasonable timeframe.</p>		
<p>1.-Poor. Future work plans have little relevance or benefit toward eliminating barriers or advancing the program.</p>		

Additional Comments:

Strengths

Weaknesses

Technology Transfer/Collaborations - the degree to which the project interacts, interfaces, or coordinates with other institutions and projects, providing additional benefits to the Program.

Recommendations for Additions/Deletions to Project Scope