

Grants for Enhancing MA Grid Resilience & Reliability Subawards Scoresheet

Resilience and Reliability Benefits	Reviewer Comments
Project identifies a meaningful resilience or reliability need and proposes a reasonable solution.	
Applicants have proposed a method to quantify the reliability or resilience benefits of project.	
Applicant demonstrates that the project aligns with the Program Objectives outlined in the Program Narrative.	
If applicable, project benefits align with established community resilience or reliability goals.	
Project will provide resilience to critical facilities and/or ensure continuity of critical services during an outage.	
Project will provide additional benefits beyond resilience, such as job creation.	
Resilience and Reliability Benefits Score (0-50)	
Overall Comments	

0-10 points	Proposal does not address the Resilience and Reliability Benefits and Community Engagement scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
11-20 points	Proposal addresses at least some of the scoring criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws. Proposal is inadequate.
21-30 points	Proposal addresses the scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
31-35 points	Proposal is adequate. There are flaws or areas for improvement, but the Proposal meets basic expectations.
36-40 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.
41 - 45 points	Proposal is very good; identified benefits and community engagement plan does not present any obvious room for improvement.
46-50 points	Excellent; Proposal exceeds expectations outlined in application. The applicant may propose an exceptional solution or creative approach, or provide an otherwise excellent proposal.

Project Management Plan & Budget	Reviewer Comments
Project team possesses sufficient knowledge, experience, and skills to successfully execute the project	
Applicant team demonstrates experience with state or federally funded projects of similar scale.	
Project risks have been identified and reasonable mitigation strategies have been proposed.	
Project has access to appropriate resources including infrastructure and facilities to allow project to move forward.	
Completed Scope of Work table demonstrates a feasible timeline to achieve project goals and is sufficiently detailed.	
If applicable, applicant demonstrates that appropriate project planning, such as a feasibility study, was conducted prior to the application.	
Applicant clearly demonstrates need for funding.	
Applicant has outlined a reasonable plan to engage local project stakeholders, if applicable.	
If applicable, applicant has necessary commitments from project partners and demonstrated community support, as demonstrated by letters of support.	
Budget is reasonable and well-justified.	
Applicant demonstrates that the anticipated benefits of the project (monetizable and non-monetizable) justify the expected project costs	
Project Management Plan Score (0-35)	
Overall Comments	

0-5 points	Proposal does not address the Project Management scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
6-10 points	Proposal addresses at least some of the Project Management scoring criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws. Proposal is inadequate.
11-15 points	Proposal addresses the Project Management Plan scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
16-20 points	Proposal is adequate. There are flaws or areas for improvement, but the Proposal meets basic expectations.
21 - 25 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.
26 - 30 points	Proposal is very good; Project Management Plan does not present any obvious room for improvement
31-35 points	Excellent; proposal exceeds expectations outlined in application. The applicant may propose an exceptional solution or creative approach.

Metrics and Reporting	Reviewer Comments
Applicant chooses appropriate metrics to track resilience and reliability benefits.	
Applicant has identified a reasonable strategy to track metrics and progress toward identified outcomes.	
Applicant demonstrates sufficient capacity to gather metrics and complete project reporting.	
Metrics and Reporting Score (0-15)	
Overall Comments	

0-5 points	Proposal does not address the Metrics and Reporting scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
6-10 points	Proposal addresses the Metrics and Reporting scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
11-15 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.

Additional Selection Criteria (only complete this section if the applicant has identified the project as meeting at least 1 of the bonus criteria)	Reviewer Comments
1. Project incorporates innovative, replicable, and scalable financing approaches and business models that could support development of microgrids beyond the Federal funding available in this solicitation.	
Business model or financing approach is a new approach for the applicant or for the industry, or otherwise demonstrates innovation	
Business model or financing approach could be replicated and scaled following this project without assistance from grant funding	
2. Develops a solution for privately-owned buildings or sites that have a public benefit (e.g., grocery stores, cellular/radio towers, health clinics), and associated proposals that demonstrate public benefits from resilience at the private sites.	
Resilience at the selected site would provide meaningful benefit to the community	
Demonstrated support from all parties, including the local community (if applicable)	
Approach to microgrid offers the potential to serve as a case study and provide learnings for similar types of facilities	
3. Projects that support resilience needs and provide distributed public benefits that may not attract private capital.	
Project provides a valuable resilience solution that serves the public good	
Applicant provides justification explaining why this project would have difficulty attracting funding from the private sector (e.g., the benefits provided by the project would not be easily factored into a cost-benefit analysis)	
Additional Selection Criteria Score (0-20) (Bonus Points)	
Overall Comments	

0 points	The proposal does not propose a project that addresses one of the Additional Selection Criteria
1-5 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws.
6-9 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
10-12 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, and provides a reasonable solution. However, the application has notable areas for improvement.
13 - 15 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides a compelling solution. Response is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the response.
16 - 18 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides a very compelling solution without obvious areas for improvement.
19 - 20 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides an extremely compelling solution. The solution is novel, creative, and presents an exciting new direction for the industry.

Total Score	0
--------------------	----------

Do you recommend this proposal for further review and possible funding?	
--	--