

APPLICATION RATING FORM

Reviewer's Identification Number: (no name please)

Date:

Principal Investigator(s):

Proposal Number:

Application Title:

Section A. Summary of Ratings:

Please complete the questions below and then fill in this summary.

Statement	Circled Number	Weighting Factor	Subrating
1. Objectives	_____ X	9	= _____
2. Achievability	_____ X	9	= _____
3. Methodology	_____ X	7	= _____
4. Contribution	_____ X	7	= _____
5. Awareness	_____ X	5	= _____
6. Background	_____ X	5	= _____
7. Project Management	_____ X	2	= _____
8. Equipment Purchase	_____ X	2	= _____
9. Facilities	_____ X	2	= _____
10. Budget	_____ X	2	= _____
		Total: 50	_____
			250 points possible

Note: While points are necessary to establish an overall rating, comments on the various criteria are critical to truly understanding the value of a proposed project. **Please elaborate in the comment sections to the maximum extent possible.**

Overall Recommendation: If > 170 _____ Fund
130 -170 _____ Funding May Be Considered
If < 130 _____ Do Not Fund

Please note that the applicant will be given the opportunity to provide clarification to your comments and those reviewers giving a recommendation of "do not fund" will be asked to review the applicant's clarification and determine if it changes their rating.

Section B. Ratings and Comments:

Please circle your response to each statement and transfer the number circled to the column entitled "Circled Number" on the first page of this form. Also, please comment on each criteria.

1. The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with North Dakota Industrial Commission/Renewable Energy Council goals are: 1 – very unclear; 2 – unclear; 3 – clear; 4 – very clear; or 5 – exceptionally clear.

Please comment:

2. With the approach suggested and time and budget available, the objectives are: 1 – not achievable; 2 – possibly achievable; 3 – likely achievable; 4 – most likely achievable; or 5 – certainly achievable.

Please comment:

3. The quality of the methodology displayed in the proposal is: 1 – well below average; 2 – below average; 3 – average; 4 – above average; or 5 – well above average.

Please comment:

4. The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address North Dakota Industrial Commission/Renewable Energy Council goals will likely be: 1 – extremely small; 2 – small; 3 – significant; 4 – very significant; or 5 – extremely significant.

Please comment:

5. The principal investigator's awareness of current research activity and published literature as evidenced by literature referenced and its interpretation and by the reference to unpublished research related to the proposal is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.

Please comment:

6. The background of the investigator(s) as related to the proposed work is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.

Please comment:

7. The project management plan, including a well-defined milestone chart, schedule, financial plan, and plan for communications among the investigators and subcontractors, if any, is: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – very good; or 5 – exceptionally good.

Please comment:

8. The proposed purchase of equipment is: 1 – extremely poorly justified; 2 – poorly justified; 3 – justified; 4 – well justified; or 5 – extremely well justified. (Circle 5 if no equipment is to be purchased.)

Please comment:

9. The facilities and equipment available and to be purchased for the proposed research are: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – notably good; or 5 – exceptionally good.

Please comment:

10. The proposed budget “value”¹ relative to the outlined work and the financial commitment from other sources² is of: 1 – very low value; 2 – low value; 3 – average value; 4 – high value; or 5 – very high value. (See below)

Please comment:

¹ “Value” – The value of the projected work and technical outcome for the budgeted amount of the project, based on your estimate of what the work might cost in research settings with which you are familiar. Additionally, the Legislature provided \$1.5 million for this biennium. Please keep this in mind when considering the relative value.

²Financial commitment from other sources – A minimum of 50% of the total project must come from other sources to meet the program guidelines. Higher priority is to be given if the application has private industry investment equal to or at least 50% or more of total cost.

Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to fund.

General comments: