

Appendix B: Evaluation Criteria

Scoring Scale

Superior	Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
5	4	3	2	1
All aspects of the criterion are comprehensively addressed. There are significant strengths and no more than a few—easily correctable—weaknesses.	All aspects of the criterion are adequately addressed. There are significant strengths and some weaknesses. The significance of the strengths outweighs most aspects of the weaknesses.	Most aspects of the criterion are adequately addressed. There are strengths and weaknesses. The significance of the strengths slightly outweighs aspects of the weaknesses.	Some aspects of the criterion are not adequately addressed. There are strengths and significant weaknesses. The significance of the weaknesses outweighs most aspects of the strengths.	Most aspects of the criterion are not adequately addressed. There may be strengths, but there are significant weaknesses. The significance of the weaknesses outweighs the strengths.

Evaluation Criteria – Program

Using the following criteria, please evaluate the Office’s programs at a strategy-level, both numerically and with specific, concise comments to support each evaluation.

Score Weighting

Program Evaluation Criteria	
Strategy	50%
Implementation and Progress	50%

1. Strategy

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The program has as a **defined strategy** that is outlined in the Multi-Year Program Plan (MYPP), including clear **vision, mission, and intended outcomes**.
- The program’s strategy reflects an understanding of the **near and long-term challenges** facing industry and other stakeholders.
- The program’s strategy has **considered industry and stakeholder needs** and builds on past work.
- The program’s strategy effectively communicates the rationale for and organization of the priority R&D activity areas.
- The program **leverages appropriate funding mechanisms** (i.e., financial assistance to industry and academia vs. national lab procurement vs. prizes/competitions) to achieve intended outcomes.

2. Implementation and Progress

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The program is **funding the most relevant technologies, tools, and studies** to achieve stated outcomes from the MYPP and drive the greatest impact.
- The program effectively **balances R&D priorities** in line with WPTO's role as a public research and development organization and allocates resources appropriately.
- The program demonstrates good stewardship of taxpayer funds by **transparently communicating** program priorities and resulting investments.
- The program maximizes the impact of WPTO-supported R&D by **effectively disseminating progress** on and results of projects.

3. Qualitative Feedback for WPTO (Not Scored—Required)

Please explain your scores by commenting below using complete sentences. Provide both strengths and weaknesses. What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the program manager? **Note: your feedback in this section will be summarized for inclusion in the final public report.** (Maximum 500 words)

Evaluation Criteria – Activity Areas

Using the following criteria, reviewers are asked to evaluate the program’s initiatives and activity areas, including sub-activities, at a strategy-level, both numerically and with specific, concise comments to support each evaluation.

Score Weighting

Activity Area Evaluation Criteria	
Strategy	60%
Implementation and Progress	60%

1. Strategy

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The activity area has a **defined strategy** that is outlined in the Multi-Year Program Plan (MYPP), including clear **performance goals, objectives, and research priorities**.
- The activity area’s strategy reflects an understanding of the **near and long-term challenges** facing industry and other stakeholders.
- The activity area’s strategy has **considered industry and stakeholder needs** and builds on past work.
- The activity area’s strategy effectively communicates the rationale for and organization of the sub-activity areas and research priorities.
- The activity area **leverages appropriate funding mechanisms** (i.e., financial assistance to industry and academia vs. national lab procurement vs. prizes/competitions) to achieve intended goals and objectives.

Score: 1–5

2. Implementation and Progress

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The activity area has selected **diverse and complementary R&D projects** that are closely tied to the program’s strategic direction.
- The activity area is **funding the most relevant technologies, tools, and studies** to achieve stated goals and objectives from the MYPP.
- The activity area is **likely to meet performance goals and objectives**, as defined in in the MYPP, based on the current portfolio of projects.

Score: 1–5

3. Qualitative Feedback for WPTO (Not Scored—Required)

Please explain your scores by commenting below using complete sentences. Provide both strengths and weaknesses. What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the Activity Area Lead? **Note: your feedback in this section will summarized for inclusion in the final public report.** (Maximum 500 words)

Evaluation Criteria – Projects

Using the following criteria, reviewers are asked to evaluate the project work presented in the context of the program objectives, both numerically and with specific, concise comments to support the evaluation.

Score Weighting

Activity Area Evaluation Criteria	
Project Objectives	25%
End-User Engagement and Dissemination	25%
Performance	50%

1. Project Objectives

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The project objectives contribute to WPTO's mission of enabling research, development, testing and commercialization of new technologies to advance marine energy as well as next-generation hydropower and pumped storage systems for a flexible, reliable grid.
- The project performers have identified a project management plan that includes well-defined milestones—especially critical go/no-go decision points—and adequate methods for addressing potential risks.
- The project's expected outputs (i.e., products or deliverables) are useful and have meaningful and relevant applications.
- Successful completion of the project will yield meaningful short-term outcomes (i.e., the earliest intended effects of outputs on target audiences, resulting from the uptake or usage of products).

Score: 1–5

2. End-User Engagement and Dissemination

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The project has a sound stakeholder and/or end-user engagement strategy; the project team has a solid understanding of who will benefit from this project and a plan for meeting specific stakeholder needs and disseminating project results to target audiences.
- The project performers have engaged or plan to engage specific water power industry or end-users at appropriate points in the project lifecycle (i.e., establishing an advisory group, assessing end-user needs, communicating progress/preliminary results, and/or disseminating final results/tools/data).
- If relevant, the project has a clear technology transfer and/or commercialization plan for all products.

Score: 1–5

3. Performance

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The project has made appropriate progress towards addressing the project objectives and, if applicable, has produced meaningful accomplishments since the beginning of their project or since the 2019 Peer Review.
- The project performers implemented sound research and development methodologies and demonstrated/validated the results needed to meet their project objectives.
- The accomplishments have been achieved on schedule within the planned scope. Where applicable, the project performers have addressed or mitigated challenges to project execution/completion and any delays related to COVID-19, supply chain disruptions, or other challenges beyond the project team's control.
- The scope of future work—specifically key milestones and go/no-go decision points—are appropriate for the completion of the overall objectives of the project.

Score: 1–5

4. Qualitative Feedback for the PI (Not Scored—Required)

Please explain your scores by commenting below. Provide both strengths and weaknesses. Provide any additional notable comments on the project content or direction that you would like. What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the PI of this project? **Note: your feedback in this section will be anonymously shared with the PI and summarized for inclusion in the final public report.** (Maximum 300 words)

5. Qualitative Feedback for WPTO (Not Scored—Optional)

What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the WPTO lead of this project? **Note: your feedback in this section will only be viewed by WPTO and will not be shared with the PI or incorporated into the final public report.** (Maximum 300 words)

Evaluation Criteria – Prizes

Using the following criteria, reviewers are asked to evaluate the prizes presented in the context of the program objectives, both numerically and with specific, concise comments to support the evaluation.

Score Weighting

Activity Area Evaluation Criteria	
Prize Objectives	35%
End-User Engagement and Dissemination	35%
Performance	30%

1. Project Objectives

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The prize objectives contribute to WPTO's mission of enabling research, development, testing, and commercialization of new technologies to advance marine energy as well as next-generation hydropower and pumped storage systems for a flexible, reliable grid.
- The prize team has a sound project management plan that includes well-defined milestones—especially critical go/no-go decision points—and adequate methods for addressing potential risks.
- The prize's expected outputs (i.e., products or deliverables) are useful and have meaningful and relevant applications.
- Successful completion of the prize will yield meaningful short-term outcomes (i.e., the earliest intended effects of outputs on target audiences, resulting from the uptake or usage of products)

Score: 1–5

2. End-User Engagement and Dissemination

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The prize has a sound stakeholder and/or end-user engagement strategy; the project team has a solid understanding of who will benefit from this project and a plan for meeting specific stakeholder needs and disseminating project results to target audiences.
- The prize team engaged specific water power industry stakeholders or end-users at appropriate points in the project lifecycle (i.e., establishing an advisory group, assessing end-user needs, communicating progress/preliminary results, and/or disseminating final results/tools/data).
- If relevant, the prize incentivizes or supports competitors to develop clear technology transfer and/or commercialization plan for all products.

Score: 1–5

3. Performance

Please evaluate the degree to which:

- The prize administrator incentivized and supported competitors to make appropriate progress towards addressing the prize objectives.
- The prize administrator implemented and/or incentivized sound research and development methodologies and demonstrated/validated the results needed to meet the prize objectives.
- The accomplishments have been achieved on schedule within the planned scope. Where applicable, the prize administrator has addressed or mitigated challenges to task execution/completion and any delays related to COVID-19, supply chain disruptions, or other challenges beyond the prize team's and prize competitors' control.

Score: 1–5

4. Qualitative Feedback for the Prize Administrator(s) (Not Scored—Required)

Please explain your scores by commenting below. Provide both strengths and weaknesses. Provide any additional notable comments on the project content or direction that you would like. What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the prize administration team? **Note: your feedback in this section will be anonymously shared with the prize administration team and summarized for inclusion in the final public report.** (Maximum 300 words)

5. Qualitative Feedback for WPTO (Not Scored—Optional)

What, if any, recommendations would you like to convey to the WPTO lead of this project? Note: your feedback in this section will only be viewed by WPTO and will not be shared with the prize administration team or incorporated into the final public report. (Maximum 300 words)