The Project Narrative must respond to each sub-criterion below.

**Technical Merit**

1. The proposed project provides a clear and concise description of the technological, scientific knowledge advancement, and/or innovation that will overcome barriers to achieving the State’s statutory energy goals.
2. Describes at what scale the technology has been successfully demonstrated, including size or capacity, number of previous installations, location and duration, results, etc.
3. Describes how the proposed project fits the definition of cutting-edge emerging technology that is at a minimum TRL of 8 and how it meets the goals described in Section II.B.
4. Provides information described in Section II.B.1.i.

**Technical Approach**

1. The application describes the technique, approach, and methods to be used in performing the work described in the Scope of Work, including demonstrated ability to successfully implement the proposed project.
2. The Scope of Work identifies goals, objectives, and deliverables, details the work to be performed, and aligns with the information presented in Project Narrative.
3. The application identifies and discusses factors critical for success, in addition to risks, barriers, and limitations. Provides a plan to address them. Factors critical for success include:
	* Risks, barriers, and other limitations, including those related to demonstration site loss and commitment, technology readiness for demonstration, status of existing electrical infrastructure, environmental permitting, CEQA, technology operation and manufacturing scheduling, technology maintenance and support during and after the grant term, and how these will be mitigated to successfully complete the project within the grant term. Discuss any outstanding permitting issues (e.g., local air districts), local community issues, or equipment performance tests to be completed prior to equipment installation at the facility(ies) and how and when these matters will be resolved.
	* How the facility(ies) plans to overcome potential issues with equipment supply chain, installer availability, cost changes, and other impacts.
4. Provides a clear and plausible measurement and verification plan that describes how GHG emission reductions, energy savings, grid support, and other benefits specified in the application will be determined and measured as described in Section II.B.3.
5. Provides information documenting progress towards achieving compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by addressing the areas in Section I.I and Section III.C.6.
6. Describes the technology transfer plan to assess and advance the commercial viability of the technology, including how the proposed project will drive scalability and application of the technology across industrial sectors in California, identifying market segments and including size and penetration or deployment rates, with underlying assumptions.

**Impacts and Benefits**

1. Provides justifiable and reasonable quantitative estimates of potential benefits:
	* Annual GHG emission reductions at the industrial facility(ies).
	* Annual electricity reductions (kWh), energy cost reductions, peak load reduction and/or shifting (kW or kWh), infrastructure resiliency, and infrastructure reliability at the industrial facility(ies). Explain whether there is sufficient electrical capacity to complete the project at the designated site or indicate if it will be expanded.
	* Other potential benefits for California including additional air emission reductions (e.g. NOx), water savings, additional cost savings (thermal and Btus), and increased safety, water reduction/reuse.
2. States the timeframe, assumptions with sources, and calculations for the estimated benefits, and explains their reasonableness. Includes baseline or “business as usual” over timeframe.
3. Provides cost-benefit analysis comparing CEC funds requested relative to estimated GHG emission reductions and/or load shedding/shifting (e.g., CEC dollars requested/metric ton of GHG emissions reduced).
4. Identifies the expected financial performance (e.g. payback period, ROI) of the demonstration at scale.
5. Identifies the specific programs that the technology intends to leverage *(e.g. feed-in tariffs, IOU rebates, demand response, storage procurement) and extent to which technology meets program requirements.*

**Team Qualifications, Capabilities and Resources**

Evaluations of ongoing or previous projects including project performance by applicant and team members will be used in scoring for this criterion. This can include contacting references.

1. Identifies credentials of prime and any subcontractor key personnel, including the project manager and principal investigator *(include this information in Project Team Form Attachment).*
2. Demonstrates that the project team *including Community Based Organizations* has appropriate qualifications, experience, financial stability and capability to complete the project.
3. Explains the team structure and how various tasks will be managed and coordinated.

*Include an organization chart similar to the one below*

 **Figure X: Organization Chart**

1. Describes the facilities, infrastructure, and resources available that directly support the project.
2. Describes the team’s history of successfully completing projects in the past 10 years including subsequent emerging technology deployments and commercialization.

**Budget and Cost Effectiveness**

1. Budget forms are complete for the applicant and all subrecipients, as instructed in Budget Attachment.

*Provide a budget by tasks, such as:*

**Table X: Task Budget**

| **Task (by major task)** | **Energy Commission Funds** | **Match Share** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task 1: General Project Tasks |       |       |       |
| Task 2: |       |       |       |
| Task [TBD-1]: Evaluation of Project Benefits |       |       |       |
| Task [TBD-2]: Technology/ Knowledge Transfer Activities \* |       |       |       |

\* **Requires 5% of total CEC funds**

1. Justifies the reasonableness of the requested funds relative to the project goals, objectives, and tasks.
2. Justifies the reasonableness of direct and indirect costs, including equipment and material costs, direct labor, fringe benefits, and subrecipients/vendors cost related to installation, engineering and design, M&V, and community engagement and that these costs are consistent with Section I.D.
3. Justify the reasonableness of costs covered by match funding and that these costs are consistent with Section I.D. and Section I.K.

**Priority Populations and Community Engagement**

1. Describe how the applicant will provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits and address important community needs, including:
	* 1. Detailed plan for direct community engagement and proposed benefits. Proposed benefits must be identified following the steps required in Section II.B.5.
		2. Letters from CBOs demonstrating that the project has broad community support as described in Section II.B.5.
		3. Clear outline of planned approach provided as a Technical Task in the Scope of Work, including checkpoints for accountability to communities throughout the agreement period.
2. Provides the rest of the information described in Section II.B

**Funds Spent in California**

This project proposes to spend $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of Energy Commission funds in California.

**Electric Grid Benefits**

To receive additional points, the proposed project must reduce overall electric usage (kWh) during facility’s utility rate peak periods. These reductions can result from implementing energy efficiency, load management, or electric generation projects. If multiple facilities are bundled under one application, an analysis must be provided for each individual facility. Additionally, explain whether these reductions result from energy efficiency or load flexibility projects. Preference points will be awarded based on the table below using the facility with the highest percentage reduction:

$$\frac{\left[Electrical Energy \left(\frac{kWh}{yr}\right)Reduced + Electrical Energy\left(\frac{kWh}{yr}\right)Generated\right]}{Total Facility Energy Usage \left(\frac{kWh}{yr}\right)}×100$$

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Facility Electrical Usage Reduction Percentage During Facility’s Utility Rate Peak Periods | Percentage of Possible Points (15) |
| ≥15% | 100% |
| ≥10% to <15% | 80% |
| ≥5% to <10% | 60% |
| ≥1% to <5% | 40% |