Exhibit E

Criteria for Evaluating LDRD Proposals

Technical Merit Criteria

1. **Scientific/Technical Significance:** How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field and across different fields?

2. **Innovativeness/Novelty:** To what extent does the proposed activity explore original, innovative or novel concepts?

3. **Proposer Qualifications:** How well qualified are the proposers to conduct the project? Is there sufficient expertise to address all the technical requirements of the proposed research plan?

4. **Proposal Quality:** How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Are the estimates of time and effort reasonable? Is the requested level of funding, overhead charges, and level of contingency appropriate?

5. **Likelihood of Success:** Can the project be completed within the proposed funding levels and duration?

Strategic Merit Criteria

6. **Mission Relevance:** Is the proposal relevant to the missions of DOE and of the Laboratory?

7. **Initiative Relevance:** Does the proposed activity address the specific objectives and research priorities of the LDRD Annual Call for Proposals?

8. **Strategic Fit:** Does the proposed activity match well with the Laboratory's distinctive capabilities and core competencies?

9. **Enduring Capability:** Will the proposed new capabilities bring enduring benefit to the Laboratory? How likely will the project initiate a new program and funding?

10. **Laboratory Reputation:** If successful, will the project enhance the Laboratory's reputation in the scientific and technical community.

Rating Scale

Number	Descriptive Responses
5	**Excellent, extremely interesting, novel, highest quality, absolutely**
4	**Very good, very interesting, clever, high quality, very likely**
3	**Good, interesting, acceptable, good quality, probably**
2	**Fair, might be interesting, marginal, adequate, possibly**
1	**Poor, not interesting, not acceptable, inadequate, not at all**

WORKSHEET FOR SCORING LDRD PROPOSAL

Proposal Name and/or ID Number	Principal Investigator's Name

Scoring Criteria	Rating (Check One Per Criteria)					Comments/Notes
	1 = Poor	2 = Fair	3 = Good	4 = Very Good	5 = Excellent	
Scientific/Technical Significance						
Innovativeness/Novelty						
Proposer Qualifications						
Proposal Quality						
Likelihood of Success						
Mission Relevance						
Initiative Relevance						
Strategic Fit						
Enduring Capability						
Laboratory Reputation						

Reviewer's Name (Print): _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Date of Review: _____