

**Basic Energy Sciences (BES) Response to the Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee  
Committee of Visitors (COV) Review of the BES Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences Division  
August 11, 2008**

	<b>COV General Recommendation/Finding</b>	<b>BES Response</b>
<b>Recommendation #1</b>	<p><b>Information Management</b> The COV recommends, in the strongest terms, the rigorous collection of data on all aspects of proposal solicitation, review, funding recommendation, proposed action, and all metrics associated with progress that can assist in the evaluation of the impact of funded work. Such information should include new investigators to DOE/program, publications, patents, presentations, awards, commercialization successes, new collaborations, annual reports/abstracts from contractors meeting, personnel on project, technical highlights (“nuggets”), information on PI (institution, demographics) number of years funded, and funding profile. Information systems should also be used to collect a distinct set of information on reviewers: institution, BES funded/non-funded, frequency of use, demographics, etc.</p>	<p>BES concurs with this recommendation, which has been forwarded to the Deputy Director for Programs in the Office of Science (SC) for centralized actions for all SC programs. BES has been and will continue to work with SC Resource Management on the development and implementation of information technology resources that will address this recommendation.</p>
<b>Major Finding #4</b>	<p><b>Onsite Reviews of DOE Laboratory Programs</b> Although understanding the review process is relatively straightforward for individual PIs, the COV found more ambiguities about the criteria used by reviewers in evaluation of national laboratory programs. For example, on-site reviews are an important part of the evaluation of ongoing programs at the laboratories, but are more likely to overemphasize past accomplishments. We encourage the CSGB program to direct members of on-site review panels to strive for a better balance between “forward looking” proposed science and track record in their evaluations.</p>	<p>BES concurs with this finding. The BES guidelines for peer review of DOE laboratory programs is clear in requesting research proposals that are prospective in nature, emphasizing the appropriate balance between recent progress and proposed research. BES will continue to monitor the on-site reviews of DOE lab programs to ensure that the information presented maintains a proper balance between past accomplishments and prospective directions, and to direct the on-site review panels to keep a proper balance in their evaluations.</p>