

Guidance for DOE Office of Science Committee of Visitors Reviews

Issued by the Deputy Director for Science Programs

Version 2 Effective April, 2021

Introduction

This document provides guidelines for scheduling and conducting Office of Science (SC) Committee of Visitors (COV) reviews of programmatic activities, distribution of COV reports, and responses to findings and recommendations. COVs are typically core activities for the SC Federal Advisory Committees (FAC) who are charged with assessing (1) the efficacy and quality of the processes used to solicit, review, recommend, monitor, and document application, proposal, and award actions and (2) the quality of the resulting portfolio. The portfolio of activities reviewed by a COV includes all actions administered for the period under review by the program element under review, including funding at national laboratories, universities, industrial companies, and related activities.

This guidance applies to only SC-3 programs and SC-2 programs that use SC-3 FAC for the implementation of their COV.

The Deputy Director for Science Programs (SC-3) maintains a database of SC-3 FAC COV reports and responses. These are available to the public on the SC web site.

Scheduling and Timing of COV Reviews

Programs that recommend or award funds are to be reviewed by a COV at regular intervals of up to five years. Under special circumstances, longer or shorter intervals may be appropriate. Shorter intervals may be requested by the program, but any deviation beyond the five-year COV interval requires SC-3 (for SC-3 offices) or SC-2 (for SC-2 offices) guidance and approval.

Beyond the SC-3 program offices led by Associate Directors of the Office of Science (hereafter referred to as SC-3 program offices), other offices that award funds (e.g., WDTS, Office of Accelerator R&D, DOE Isotope Program) can be evaluated periodically, as determined by the relevant SC Deputy Director, with the review organized through an SC-3 program office FACs or other SC-2/3 approved mechanisms.

The COV reviews can be scheduled throughout the fiscal year but should be timed for presentation of the report to the FAC at its next scheduled meeting after the COV review. When determining the schedule, staff may take into account dates of prior reviews, new and reorganized programs, significant personnel changes, major budgetary changes, and other circumstances that have affected or are expected to affect the programs.

For SC-3 program offices, the Associate Director will maintain a schedule for COV reviews and keep the FAC Designated Federal Officer (DFO), the FAC chair, and SC-3 informed of the schedule. Following agreement by SC-2 and SC-3, COVs for SC-2 Offices or other activities that

will be conducted by an SC-3 FAC will be coordinated between the Office Director and the DFO/AD of respective FAC.

COV Relationship to the Federal Advisory Committee

The program Federal Advisory Committees operate in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA, Public Law 92-463, October 6, 1972) and all FACA Amendments, Federal Regulations and Executive Orders. A COV is a subcommittee that typically reports to a chartered FAC rather than to the agency. As such, it does not meet the definition of an advisory committee under FACA and is not subject to FACA procedural requirements. COV meetings are not announced in the Federal Register and are not required to be open to the public.

The COV report is presented to the FAC at a scheduled meeting open to the public. The report is reviewed, discussed, modified if necessary, and approved by the FAC. The reviewed program's response to the COV findings and recommendations is presented at a subsequent scheduled meeting of the FAC. See the section below on "COV Reports and Program Responses" for details on the report and response requirements.

COV Membership

The COV chair is selected and appointed by the chair of the FAC in consultation with the relevant SC manager (defined as the head of the program element being reviewed, such as the Associate Director/DFO, a Division Director if a division is being reviewed, or the relevant program lead). The COV chair should be a person that has a broad perspective for the program element being reviewed; has leadership skills and sound judgment; is very organized; has deep and broad experience in the field; has national and international knowledge of the field; is familiar with peer review and critical decision making; and understands strategic portfolio planning.

The COV membership will be established by the COV chair in consultation with the FAC chair and the program element under review as needed. The Committee will have significant scientific and technical expertise, as well as other relevant core competencies across all covered areas, and the topical subject matter expertise coverage should not rely upon one person alone. A good practice is to include 25% or more committee members who do not receive direct research support from the program being reviewed. Some but not all members of a COV may be selected from a previous COV. Any person with an action pending (e.g., application or proposal under review) in the program element under review will not participate as a COV member for that program. A good practice is that 25% of the COV be a member of the affiliated FAC, with at least one FAC member required on the COV. The COV will be balanced and drawn from a broad field of qualified reviewers from academia, DOE national laboratories, other federal agencies, private sector entities, and other appropriate institutions. The FAC chair should also consider other balance factors, including expertise, institution, geographic region, diversity, etc. The COV should constitute an exceptional group of recognized experts with broad experiences in the designated program areas.

Organization of a COV

COVs are standing obligations for the FAC. As such, for the SC-3 Program Offices' regularly scheduled COVs, inclusion of the scope of the assessment in the charge to the FAC is not required; the Associate Director/DFO is responsible to work with the FAC chair to ensure that COV reviews are held according to the established schedule. Special COVs can be established by a charge letter from the Director of the Office of Science (SC-1) to the chair of the FAC delineating the scope of the assessment.

For all COVs, the chair of the FAC provides a charge letter to the COV chair. After receipt of the charge letter, the COV chair may want to meet with the relevant program leadership for an overview of the program and to plan the details of the review.

Program offices provide logistical support to the COV chair, including providing background materials and local arrangements to facilitate the COV review. The program offices may work with a contractor to provide this support to the COV. All arrangements will be in compliance with applicable DOE financial guidance and regulations.

COVs are largely executed using the Portfolio Analysis and Management System (PAMS) COV module. Beyond the application review and award information available in PAMS, specially uploaded files for the COV could include information on university and national laboratory review procedures, additional information on national laboratory reviews not available in PAMS, overview presentations on the portions of the program being reviewed, descriptions of core research activities and/or facilities, the report of the last COV and the program response to the last COV report, a draft agenda for the COV, and other information deemed useful such as links to online resources (e.g., abstract books, proceedings of investigator meetings, and/or workshop reports). The relevant funding opportunity announcements for the time-period under review will also be included, either as PDFs or links.

The COV process can be conducted virtually through appropriate software-based approaches or may include a site visit for the committee to review documents, meet with SC program managers, and draft the COV report. For in-person COV meetings, travel support will be provided for all participating COV members. Honoraria are not provided to any COV members.

In execution of the COV review, the initial session is generally a plenary meeting, with an introduction to the process provided by the COV chair and possibly the FAC chair. The program leadership and additional program managers may also deliver overview presentations in the plenary session. The COV may then form smaller breakout groups (panels) that evaluate specific parts of the program. Program managers may meet (in person or virtually) with the breakout groups to provide subprogram overview presentations and to answer questions.

Program managers and support staff members should be available during the COV for follow-up questions, to provide assistance with PAMS, and to assist in providing any requested documentation. An optional good practice is to include writing time in the agenda for the COV to prepare a draft of the report. At a closing session, the COV chair may provide a briefing covering preliminary findings and recommendations.

Scope of COV Reviews

Each COV review will provide SC with information on the efficacy and quality of the program's processes and the effect of the award process on the portfolio. The COV will consider application, proposal, and award actions completed since the previous COV assessment. For each COV, the chair of the FAC will prepare a written charge to the COV asking for evaluation using the core COV review criteria listed below as well as program-specific criteria of interest to SC and the program being reviewed. The charge will also identify the fiscal years under review and denote the components of the program to be reviewed.

The core COV charge components are:

1. Assess the efficacy and quality of the processes used during the fiscal years under review to:
 - a. solicit, review, recommend, and document application and proposal actions and
 - b. monitor active awards, projects, and programs.
2. Within the boundaries defined by DOE mission and available funding, comment on how the award process has affected:
 - a. the breadth and depth of portfolio elements, and
 - b. the overall scientific and technical quality of the portfolio elements.

Topics to be investigated by the COV can include but are not limited to selection of an adequate number of highly qualified reviewers who are free from bias and/or conflicts of interest; use of SC merit review criteria; adequacy of documentation; characteristics of the award portfolio; usefulness of progress reports on previously funded research; quality of overall technical management of the program; relationships between award decisions, program goals, and the DOE mission; significant impacts and advances that have developed since the previous COV review and are demonstrably linked to DOE investments; and the response of the program to recommendations of the previous COV review.

Information Provided to the Committee

COV members will be given access to documentation for activities completed during the period under review. A summary will be provided that covers the period under review and reflects the portfolio of activities for the program(s) being reviewed. Examples of information and data to be provided to the COV are listed below. Note that "proposal" is used generically to refer to research applications from the grant program and proposals received from national laboratories.

1. Copies of all relevant solicitations including summaries of the outcomes for topical solicitations;
2. Description of merit review process(es);
3. Tabulation of new, renewal, and supplemental proposals received, awarded, and declined;
4. Tabulation of new awards, renewal awards, and terminated awards for the period under review;
5. Summaries that reflect the scope for the topics covered by the program element, impact of the PIs' research, and related quality assessments;

6. Examples of awardee results (e.g., research highlights) reported during the period under review;
7. The most recent COV report and the response to that report.

Using PAMS, the COV can be given access to all actions for the review period or may initially focus on a representative sample of the program portfolio that includes new, renewal, and supplemental proposals, awards, and declinations. For the latter approach, the lists provided of all proposals and actions for the review will allow the COV members select additional files for review. COV members will have access to interim reports in PAMS for grants. Upon request final reports will be available along with interim information for national laboratory awards.

Confidentiality: COV members are required to keep confidential the names and comments of reviewers and information related to awards and declinations. Each COV member signs a conflict of interest and confidentiality statement provided in PAMS. Members of the COV will not review any proposal or action with which they have been determined to have a conflict of interest. COV members will not review any proposal or award from their own institution or any proposal in which they collaborated or participated. COV members will not review any review documentation for proposals that they reviewed. DOE General Counsel will be consulted if any questions about conflicts of interest arise.

Note: For COVs that include documents not available in PAMS, the forms found in Appendix A can be used. These forms were developed in collaboration with DOE General Counsel. Federal employees and DOE national laboratory employees will sign the form labeled, “Federal and Laboratory Member.” All others will sign the form labeled, “Non-Federal and Non-Laboratory Member.”

COV Reports and Program Responses

The COV prepares a report using as guidance the template in Appendix B of this document. Office of Science staff may assist a COV by reviewing the draft report to identify factual errors and to ensure that confidential information is not included. The draft COV report will be sent by the COV chair to the FAC chair prior to the FAC meeting at which the report will be reviewed. The report is presented by the COV chair to the full FAC at a public meeting. (Note: The draft report can only be sent to the FAC chair; it cannot be distributed to other members of the FAC prior to the FAC meeting unless it is made available to the public.)

The COV report:

1. will address the COV charge, describe the method of review, including the number of files it examined and the method for selecting them, and the nature of other information provided by the programs under review;
2. will include any COV findings, comments, or recommendations; and
3. will include in an appendix the charge letter to the FAC (if applicable), the charge letter to the COV, the review agenda, and a list of COV members.

The COV report will include all components of the COV reporting template and may also include additional sections at the discretion of the COV.

The FAC reviews and modifies the report, if needed, prior to acceptance. This review process includes public deliberation at a FAC meeting. Following acceptance, the process is:

- 1) The report is transmitted by the FAC chair to the Director of the Office of Science (SC-1).
- 2) The final report is released publicly on the advisory committee website following any requested briefings for SC-1.
- 3) Courtesy copies of the report are sent to the relevant Associate Director or Office lead and to the Deputy Director for Science Programs (SC-3).

Program Response to the COV Report: Typically within 30 working days of the FAC approval, a response to the report is prepared by the program lead and approved by the relevant Associate Director or Office lead, then transmitted to SC-3 for review/approval. Note that findings and recommendations that require SC-wide response are referred by program leadership (AD or Office leads) to SC-3 for follow-up.

Following approval by SC-3, the response to the COV report is transmitted to the FAC chair and posted on the SC FAC website with the COV report. The posted documents serve as the official report copies.

Responsibilities

The Director of the Office of Science (SC-1) is responsible for:

- issuing a charge letter asking the FAC to perform special COVs beyond those for the core activities that fall under the FAC;
- receiving the COV report from the FAC; and
- advising SC-3 on appropriate management actions needed in response to the report.

The Deputy Director for Science Programs (SC-3) is responsible for:

- coordination with the other SC Deputy Directors regarding special topic COVs;
- issuing overarching guidance to be followed for all COV reviews;
- approving the program response to the COV report; and
- maintaining the archive of COV reports and responses on the SC website.

The Associate Director/DFO or Office lead of the Office of Science for the program element under review is responsible for:

- ensuring that procedures described in this guidance and in FACA regulations are met;
- establishing and supporting the COV in accordance with the provisions of this guidance;
- supporting the chair of the cognizant FAC in defining the goals and issues the COV will address and assisting in the selection of a chair and members of the COV;
- providing a response within approximately 30 working days of acceptance of the report by the FAC, obtaining SC-3 approval for the response, and facilitating website posting;
- ensuring that the response is presented at a FAC meeting;
- ensuring COV review of program components on a five-year cycle;
- maintaining a list of scheduled COV reviews and keeping SC-3 apprised of it; and
- providing PDFs of final reports to SC-3's office for posting on the relevant FAC website.

The Federal Advisory Committee chair is responsible for:

- charging the COV with a letter to the COV chair delineating the scope of the assessment;
- establishing, in consultation with the COV chair and the program, the COV committee;
- ensuring discussion, modification, and consideration of acceptance of the COV draft report at a scheduled meeting of the advisory committee; and
- transmitting the final report to SC-1 with a copy to the Associate Director or Office lead and SC-3.

The COV chair is responsible for:

- setting the dates for the COV review;
- meeting with the program manager(s), either in person or virtually, prior to the review to become familiar with the program structure and to preview issues that may be considered during the review;
- providing, with assistance from SC support staff, background information to the committee at least one month before the review;
- ensuring that COV members are aware of responsibilities to keep confidential information accessed during the COV; and
- ensuring that a draft report is written after the review and submitted to the chair of the FAC for discussion at the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Appendix A

Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statements

This appendix contains two conflict of interest and confidentiality forms:

- (1) Conflict-of-Interest Statement for the Non-Federal and Non-Laboratory Member
- (2) Conflict-of-Interest Statement for the Federal and Laboratory Member

Phrases highlighted in **yellow** should be changed to reflect the particulars of the COV review. These forms were developed in collaboration with the DOE Office of General Counsel. Each COV member should be sent a copy of the relevant form in advance of the review. The attached statement must be signed and returned before a person can participate in a COV review.

Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee

Committee of Visitors

Conflict-of-Interest and Confidentiality Statement for the Non-Federal and Non-Laboratory Member

.....

As a member of a Committee of Visitors (COV), you will have an important responsibility to provide an assessment of various issues related to Basic Energy Sciences (BES) management processes. This assessment will be provided to the Office of Science through the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee (BESAC). You will be asked to provide your views as a representative of the basic energy sciences community.

As a COV member, you are required to recuse yourself from participating in any meeting, study, recommendation, or other Committee activity that could have a direct and predictable effect on the companies, organizations, or agencies with which you are associated or in which you have a financial interest.

Your designation as COV member requires that:

- If you handle proposals or other applications, you must be aware of potential conflict situations. Examples of potentially biasing affiliations or relationships are listed on the back of this form. Should any conflict arise during your term, you must bring the matter to the attention of the Director, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. The Director, Office of Basic Energy Sciences will determine how the matter should be handled and will tell you what further steps, if any, to take.
- If your designation gives you access to information not generally available to the public, you must not use that information for your personal benefit or make it available for the personal benefit of any other individual or organization. This is to be distinguished from the entirely appropriate general benefit of learning more about the Department, learning from other advisory committee/review panel members, or becoming better acquainted with the details of a given discipline.

Please read the examples of possible conflicts of interest on page 2 and complete the attached form on page 3 indicating your acceptance of the conflict of interest guidelines.

Examples of possible conflicts of interest.

1. Affiliation with an applicant institution. A conflict may be present if you have/had:
 - Current employment at the institution as member of the scientific staff, professor, adjunct professor, visiting professor, or similar position.
 - Current employment or are being considered for employment at the institution.
 - Any formal or informal re-employment arrangement with the institution.
 - Current membership on a visiting committee or similar body at the institution.
 - Ownership of the institution's securities or other evidences of debt.
 - Any office, governing board membership, or relevant committee chairpersonship in the institution.
 - Current enrollment as a student.
 - Received and retained an honorarium or award from the institution within the last 12 months.
2. Relationships with an investigator, project director, or other person who has a personal interest in the proposal or other application.
 - Known family or marriage relationship.
 - Business or professional partnership.
 - Employment at the same institution within the last 12 months.
 - Past or present association as thesis advisor or thesis student.
 - Collaboration on a project or on a book, article, report, or paper within the last 4 years.
3. Other affiliations or relationships
 - Interests of the following persons are to be treated as if they were yours: any affiliation or relationship of your spouse, of your minor child, or a relative living in your immediate household or of anyone who is legally your partner that you are aware of and that would be covered by Items 1 or 2 above.
 - Any other relationship, such as close personal friendship, that you think might tend to affect your judgments or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

**NON-FEDERAL, NON-LABORATORY COV MEMBER
ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT**

I have read the list of possible conflicts on the back of this form and understand that I must contact the appropriate DOE official if a conflict exists or arises during my term of service. I also will not divulge any confidential information, including but not limited to information on unfunded applications and proposals, information from reviews, investigator and reviewer identities, and deliberative information, I may become aware of during my term. I further understand that I must sign and return this Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement to **Basic Energy Sciences** before serving as a COV member.

Please complete the shaded areas.

Name:	
Organization:	
Mailing Address:	
Business Phone:	() -
BES Program Element to be assessed:	Add name of program being reviewed
Dates of review:	Enter dates of review
Location of review:	BES/DOE Germantown Office or Virtual or Hotel?
Issues to be assessed:	Considering fiscal years 2021, 2022, and 2023 , the panel will assess the processes used to solicit, review, recommend, and document proposal actions and monitor active projects and programs.
Signature:	
Date:	

Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee

Committee of Visitors

Conflict-of-Interest and Confidentiality Statement for the Federal and Laboratory Member

As a member of a Committee of Visitors (COV), you will have an important responsibility to provide an assessment of various issues related to Basic Energy Sciences (BES) management processes. This assessment will be provided to the Office of Science through the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee (BESAC). You will be asked to provide your views as a representative of the basic energy sciences community.

As a Federal or Laboratory COV member, you are subject to the same standards of conduct applicable to you as a full-time Federal or Laboratory employee. In this regard, section 208(a), title 18, United States Code, prohibits you from personally and substantially participating as a COV member in any particular matter in which to your knowledge you, your spouse, minor child, general partner, organization in which you serve as officer, director, trustee, general partner, or employee, or any organization with whom you are negotiating or have any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest.

Further, please note that section 219(a), title 18, U.S. C., makes it a criminal offense for a “public official” to be or act as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Your designation as COV member requires that:

- If you handle proposals or other applications, you must be aware of potential conflict situations. Examples of potentially biasing affiliations or relationships are listed on page 2. Should any conflict arise during your term, you must bring the matter to the attention of the Director, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. The Director, Office of Basic Energy Sciences will determine how the matter should be handled and will tell you what further steps, if any, to take.
- If your designation gives you access to information not generally available to the public, you must not use that information for your personal benefit or make it available for the personal benefit of any other individual or organization. This is to be distinguished from the entirely appropriate general benefit of learning more about the Department, learning from other advisory committee/review panel members, or becoming better acquainted with the details of a given discipline.

Please read the examples of possible conflicts of interest on page 2 and complete the attached form on page 3 indicating your acceptance of the conflict of interest guidelines.

Examples of possible conflicts of interest.

1. Affiliation with an applicant institution. A conflict may be present if you have/had:
 - Current employment at the institution as member of the scientific staff, professor, adjunct professor, visiting professor, or similar position.
 - Current employment or are being considered for employment at the institution.
 - Any formal or informal re-employment arrangement with the institution.
 - Current membership on a visiting committee or similar body at the institution.
 - Ownership of the institution's securities or other evidences of debt.
 - Any office, governing board membership, or relevant committee chairpersonship in the institution.
 - Current enrollment as a student.
 - Received and retained an honorarium or award from the institution within the last 12 months.

2. Relationships with an investigator, project director, or other person who has a personal interest in the proposal or other application.
 - Known family or marriage relationship.
 - Business or professional partnership.
 - Employment at the same institution within the last 12 months.
 - Past or present association as thesis advisor or thesis student.
 - Collaboration on a project or on a book, article, report, or paper within the last 4 years.

3. Other affiliations or relationships
 - Interests of the following persons are to be treated as if they were yours: any affiliation or relationship of your spouse, of your minor child, or a relative living in your immediate household or of anyone who is legally your partner that you are aware of and that would be covered by Items 1 or 2 above.
 - Any other relationship, such as close personal friendship, that you think might tend to affect your judgments or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

**FEDERAL OR LABORATORY COV MEMBER
ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT**

I have read the list of possible conflicts on the back of this form and understand that I must contact the appropriate DOE official if a conflict exists or arises during my term of service. I also will not divulge any confidential information, including but not limited to information on unfunded applications and proposals, information from reviews, investigator and reviewer identities, and deliberative information, I may become aware of during my term. I further understand that I must sign and return this Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement to **Basic Energy Sciences** before serving as a COV member.

Please complete the shaded areas.

Name:	
Organization:	
Mailing Address:	
Business Phone:	() _____ - _____
BES Program Element to be assessed:	Program name
Dates of review:	Dates of COV
Location of review:	BES/DOE Germantown Office or Virtual or Hotel?
Issues to be assessed:	Considering fiscal years 2021, 2022, and 2023 , the panel will assess the processes used to solicit, review, recommend, and document proposal actions and monitor active projects and programs.
Signature:	
Date:	

Appendix B

COV Report Template

This appendix contains a standard template to be used for each COV report. The **yellow** spaces indicate areas for COV input. Program-specific review criteria may include government performance measures or any other appropriate components. Additional sections may be added at the discretion of the COV.

Report Title

Program Being Reviewed: [REDACTED]

Fiscal Years Being Reviewed: [REDACTED]

Dates of COV: [REDACTED]

COV Chair: [REDACTED]

Date of Approval by the Advisory Committee: [REDACTED]

Charge to the COV:

- I. Assess the efficacy and quality of the processes used during the fiscal years under review to:
 - a. solicit, review, recommend, and document application and proposal actions and
 - b. monitor active awards, projects and programs.
- II. Within the boundaries defined by DOE missions and available funding, comment on how the award process has affected:
 - a. the breadth and depth of portfolio elements, and
 - b. the scientific and technical quality of the portfolio elements

III. [REDACTED]

(For each program element being reviewed, the following sections should be created. The text between these parentheses may be deleted.)

I. Efficacy and Quality of the Program's Processes

Based on the COV's study of application, proposal, and award actions completed within the fiscal years under review, please provide brief findings, recommendations, and comments on the following aspects of the programs' processes and management used to:

Processes to solicit, review, recommend, and document application, proposal, and award actions

Consider, for example:

- Consistency with priorities and criteria stated in the program's solicitations, announcements, and guidelines
- Adequate number of reviewers for balanced review; use of reviewers having appropriate expertise/qualifications; use of a sufficiently broad pool of reviewers; avoidance of conflicts of interest
- Efficiency/time to decision
- Completeness of documentation making recommendations.

Findings: [REDACTED]

Comments: [REDACTED]

Recommendations: [REDACTED]

Processes to monitor active awards, projects and programs

Consider, for example:

- Written progress reports

- Contractors' meetings
- Workshops
- Site visits
- Effective interactions between program managers and PIs

Findings: [redacted]

Comments: [redacted]

Recommendations: [redacted]

II. Effect of the Award Process on Portfolios

Taking into account the DOE, Office of Science, and Division missions, the available funding, and information presented about the portfolio, comment on how the award process has affected:

The breadth and depth of portfolio elements

Consider, for example:

- The overall quality of the science and/or technical activities
- The balance of awards with respect to innovation, risk, and interdisciplinary research
- The evolution of the portfolio with respect to new investigators and new science/technology thrusts
- The relationship of the portfolio to other parts of the Division and the Office of Science
- The relevance of the portfolio with respect to the missions of the program, division, Office of Science, DOE, and other federal agencies
- The appropriateness of award scope, size, and duration

Findings: [redacted]

Comments: [redacted]

Recommendations: [redacted]

The scientific and technical quality of the portfolio elements

Consider, for example:

- The uniqueness, significance, and scientific/technical impact of the portfolio
- The stature of the portfolio's principal investigators in their fields

Findings: [redacted]

Comments: [redacted]

Recommendations: [redacted]

III. Other Review Criteria)

IV. [redacted]

Appendix C

Program Response Template

This appendix contains a standard template to be used for the program's response to the COV. Where appropriate, dates of implementation may be included under "Action Plan." Phrases highlighted in yellow should be changed to reflect the particulars of the COV review.

(FES) Response to the Report of the (FESAC) Committee of Visitors Review of (Theory and Computations Program)

Date of COV:

Date of Response:

Program Point of Contact:

COV Recommendation	Program Response
Program Element 1	
Program Element 2	