

# TECHNICAL REVIEWERS' RATING SUMMARY

R024-C

## Growing the Bioscience Industry in North Dakota

Bioscience Association of ND (BioND)

Principal Investigator: Bruce Gjovig

Request for \$60,000; Total Project Costs \$120,000

<u>Rating Category</u>	<u>Weighting Factor</u>	<u>1C</u>	<u>2C</u>	<u>Average Weighted Score</u>
1. Objectives	9	4	4	36.00
2. Achievability	9	4	4	36.00
3. Methodology	7	5	4	31.50
4. Contribution	7	4	3	24.50
5. Awareness	5	4	3	17.50
6. Background	5	5	3	20.00
7. Project Management	2	4	3	7.00
8. Equipment Purchase	2	4	5	9.00
9. Facilities	2	4	3	7.00
10. Budget	2	4	4	8.00
<b>Average Weighted Score</b>		212	181	<b>196.50</b>
<b>Maximum Weighted Score</b>				<b>250.00</b>

### OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

FUND	x	x
FUNDING MAY BE CONSIDERED		
DO NOT FUND		

R024-C  
Growing the Bioscience Industry in North Dakota  
Submitted by Bioscience Association of ND (BioND)  
Principal Investigator: Bruce Gjovig  
Request for \$60,000; Total Project Costs \$120,000

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Excellent.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 4)

Without an organization like Bio ND the goals of The North Dakota Industrial Commission's Renewable Energy Council cannot be even considered to have any change of being met.

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Timeline is feasible.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 4)

A focused effort amongst stakeholders in the biomass/biomaterial industry should yield relatively easily achievable results due to the down turn in commodity prices for common field crops. Grower groups, in particular, will welcome the opportunity to develop new markets.

- 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 1C (Rating: 5)

This will change with time-be flexible.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 4)

Well thought out strategy with logical succession of events.

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Focus on 1-2 items only – heat or liquid.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 3)

Success in meeting these goals can only be speculated upon at this time. Support of Bio ND is an important first step in realizing these goals. However, committees, conferences and membership should not be regarded as a final measure of success.

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Excellent CV is key for all data accumulation.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 3)

Without seeing the actual qualifications and track record of the individual in question I am neutral on this one. Bio ND needs to provide more information on this, other than casual self-authored references.

- 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 1C (Rating: 5)

Excellent.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 3)

Appears to be a good match, but again as above in 5

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

None.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 3)

No comment provided.

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Fisher is great ally!

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 5)

No comment provided.

- 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Crawl first.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 3)

No comment provided.

- 10. The proposed budget “value”<sup>1</sup> 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 1C (Rating: 4)

Be flexible.

Reviewer 2C (Rating: 4)

This opportunity has the ability to start out on a very positive note for the ED. Salary, office facilities / meeting rooms and volunteer staff are the basic ingredients of an initiative such as this.

<sup>1</sup> “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.

<sup>2</sup>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.

**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 1C (Fund)**

Wish your endeavors well! \$50/barrel of oil will be a short term blimp, but this needs to be done. We have been where you're at for 8 years now-lots of trials and tribulations and a learning curve straight up!

**Reviewer 2C (Fund)**

I would support funding this initiative as it represents the starting point for an organization that the state of ND needs to achieve its goals.

I do not see any apparent flaws in the request for funding,

However, success and deliverables past the first 18 month cycle will be the key test. Continuation of the momentum past 18 months will be an important aspect of providing a return on the initial investment by the state. Organizations with long lists of members and frequent meetings should not be regarded as a high value success barometer.