Commercialization RFTS Evaluation Criteria

1. How well does the applicant describe the required elements (i.e. how the technology works, what challenges it resolves, who the stakeholders/end users are, and the unique value proposition of the technology)? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
All elements in summary are clearly described and understandable for a general audience	Most elements in summary are clearly described and understandable for a general audience	Most elements in summary are not described and understandable for a general audience	Summary of the request, rationale, and/or outcomes are incomprehensible

2. Has the applicant adequately described the need for this support and how it will benefit the business and/or project? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
All potential benefits and described need are clear and succinct.	Most potential benefits and the described need are clear and succinct.	Most potential benefits are unclear and/or illogical, and the need for this support is unclear.	Potential benefits are incomprehensible, and no discussion of need is incorporated.

3. How well will the project objectives, impact, and metrics identified for TEAMER support help improve the sustainability of the business and/or project? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
All defined objectives, impacts, and metrics will clearly improve the sustainability of the business and/or project	Most defined objectives, impacts, and metrics will clearly improve the sustainability of the business and/or project	Some of the defined objectives, impacts, and metrics will improve the sustainability of the business and/or project	Defined objectives, impacts, and metrics are unclear and will not support the sustainability of the business and/or project.

4. Is the facility(ies) selected for this project suitable to achieve the project? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
Facility selection is clear and likely to achieve the project	Facility selection is mostly clear	Facility selection is arbitrary and unlikely to achieve project	Facility selection has serious flaws

Commercialization RFTS Evaluation Criteria

5. Is the proposed project a logical next step for the business and/or project? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
The proposal is clearly likely to meaningfully support the advancement of the project and/or business, leaving no doubt that the requested support is the next logical step.	The proposal is mostly clear and likely to meaningfully support the advancement of the project and/or business, leaving little doubt that the requested support is the next logical step.	The proposal is mostly unclear and is unlikely to meaningfully support the advancement of the project and/or business, causing minor doubt that the requested support is the next logical step.	The proposal has significant flaws, causing major doubt that the requested support is the next logical step.

6. Are the assistance objectives and potential benefit clear and aligned?Are the assistance objectives and potential benefit clear and aligned? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
Objectives and benefit are clear, valuable sector-wide, and aligned.	Project objectives and benefits to the applicant are clear but not aligned.	Project objectives and benefits to the applicant are unclear.	Project objectives and benefits to the applicant are unclear and conflicting.

7. Is the stakeholder engagement plan and/or past work described likely to meaningfully integrate critical feedback into the business and/or project design? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
Materials and benefits are clearly described and likely to meaningfully incorporate feedback	Materials and benefits are mostly clear and likely to meaningfully incorporate feedback	Materials and benefits are mostly unclear and unlikely to meaningfully incorporate feedback	Materials and benefits have significant flaws.

Commercialization RFTS Evaluation Criteria

8. Is the timing for the project reasonable, well-integrated between project partners, with few or no timeline constraints impacting project implementation? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
Project timing is reasonable, well-integrated, and has few to no constraints.	Project timing is reasonable, somewhat integrated, with minor constraints.	Project timing is unreasonable, integration is limited and has major constraints	Project timing is not possible within the proposed period.

9. Are the facility and applicant roles clearly identified and appropriate for the project? (11.1%)

Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor
All roles are clearly defined and likely to contribute to a collaborative partnership.	Project roles are mostly defined, and minor work will need to be done to create a collaborative partnership.	Project roles are mostly undefined and major work will need to be done to create a collaborative partnership.	Project roles are either not mentioned or unrelated to project goals.