

TECHNICAL REVIEWERS' RATING SUMMARY

R017-A

Renewable Energy Commodity Trading Educational Program

North Dakota State University
Principal Investigator: William W. Wilson
Request for \$234,346; Total Project Costs \$1,000,000

<u>Rating Category</u>	<u>Weighting Factor</u>	<u>Technical Reviewer</u>			<u>Average Weighted Score</u>
		<u>1A</u>	<u>1B</u>	<u>1C</u>	
1. Objectives	9	5			15.00
2. Achievability	9	4			12.00
3. Methodology	7	5			11.67
4. Contribution	7	3			7.00
5. Awareness	5	4			6.67
6. Background	5	4			6.67
7. Project Management	2	4			2.67
8. Equipment Purchase	2	3			2.00
9. Facilities	2	4			2.67
10. Budget	2	2			1.33
Average Weighted Score		203	0	0	67.67
Maximum Weighted Score					250.00

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

FUND

x

FUNDING MAY BE CONSIDERED

DO NOT FUND

R017-A
Renewable Energy Commodity Trading Educational Program
Submitted by North Dakota State University
Principal Investigators: William W. Wilson
Request for \$234,346; Total Project Costs \$468,692

- 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.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 5)

The objectives of this project are very clear and it is obvious where they are trying to drive this.

- 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.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 4)

I believe the approach and time is spot on. It will certainly be nice if the budget is that low, but could see it growing. I think either additional researchers or industry data capture expense (travel, time, related expenses) will need to be included.

- 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.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 5)

Their proposal is addressing a big challenge. I think they are approaching it in a very sound manner and should be successful with the outcome.

- 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.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

I think this addresses a bigger industrial need. I don't see it focused directly at North Dakota, but North Dakota will greatly benefited from it.

- 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.

Reviewer IA (Rating: 4)

Looked good.

- 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.**

Reviewer IA (Rating: 4)

- 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.**

Reviewer IA (Rating: 4)

I think this has been well thought out and shows a clear direction and timetable for accomplishing the work.

- 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.)**

Reviewer IA (Rating: 3)

- 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.**

Reviewer IA (Rating: 4)

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

Reviewer IA (Rating: 2)

It is good to see a low cost budget, but I think it may take a few more dollars than what is budgeted.

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.

10a. Financial 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.

The minimum 50% cash match is demonstrated.

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.

Reviewer 1A (Fund)

I think this is going to be a great asset to North Dakota and the entire renewable energy sector. This program is well thought out and has realistic timelines and objectives. When successful, it will have a very positive impact.