			Score					
Criterion	**Consideration Item**	**Description**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Impact at Scale (35%)	C1	Project Impact: Defined as (per participant impact * anticipated number of program participants)	No Impact	Minimal Impact Less than 10,000 kWh/32.9 MCF or $1,000		Moderate Impact Less than 100,000 kWh/329.0 MCF or $10,000		High Impact More than 1,000,000 kWh/3290.3 MCF or $100,000
	C2	Demand or Energy focus (or both)	Neither	Demand or Energy	Both	N/A	N/A	N/A
	C3	Relative importance of size of 2021 impact	No Impact	10,000 kWh / 32.9 MCF		100,000 kWh / 329.0 MCF		1,000,000 kWh / 3290.3 MCF
	C4	Relative importance of impact beyond 2021	No Impact	10,000 kWh / 32.9 MCF		100,000 kWh / 329.0 MCF		1,000,000 kWh / 3290.3 MCF
	C5	Ability to scale/flexibility to support future technologies/program elements	No	Limited to no opportunity to scale to other technologies.		Moderate ability to scale to other technologies		High potential to scale to other technologies.
Diversity (10%)	C6	What is the realistic positive impact of the idea on a diverse group of stakeholders in the community?	No	Low Level of impact. For example, it supports a small group (less 100 people) and is has limited to no potential to be implemented to support other groups.		Moderate Level of impact. For example it supports a moderate group (less 1,000 people) and has the potential to be implemented to support other groups.		High Level of impact. For example, it supports a large group (10,000 or more) and has the potential to be implemented to support other groups.
	C7	Are the positive impact(s) quantifiable?	No					Yes
Other Benefits (10%)	C8	Does it support carbon emission reduction goals? NOTE: Michigan emission factor of 576 kgCO2e/MWh (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-03/documents/emission-factors_mar_2018_0.pdf)	No	Yes, but likely to result in a GHG reduction of less than 5 tCO2e/yr		Yes, and will likely to result in a GHG reduction of less than 50 tCO2e/yr		Yes, and will likely result in GHG reductions of more than 500 tCO2e/yr
	C9	Support of potential NWA, DER, and other utility ecosystem programs	No	Little to no support (positive impact to 1 other program type)		Moderate Support (positive impact to 2 other programs types)		High Level of support. (positive impact to 3+ other program types)
	C10	Provides other value (reduces acquisition cost for other programs, political/stakeholder value, etc.)	No	Direct reductions in energy cost alone		Moderate reductions in acquisition costs, political/stakeholder value, or other.		Significant reductions in acquisition costs, political/stakeholder value, or other.
	C11	Builds organizational capability/learning	No	Limited to no capibility development or learnings.		Moderate capabilites for development or learnings.		Significant capabilites for development or learnings.
	C12	Leverages other investments (e.g., AMI)	No	Direct investment only		Investment from other programs of less than 25% of program cost.		Investment from other programs of more than 50% of program cost.
	C13	Does it cut across/improve impacts of multiple programs?	No	Direct impact only.		Yes, can impact less than 3 other programs		Can impact more than 5 other programs.
	C14	Locational avoided cost, flexible load shape value	No	Highly localized and limited ability to impact time of use energy use.		Broader regional impact, with potential for load shifting (time of use power load shape impacts).		Broad regional appeal, ability for direct impact on load shifting (time of use power load shifting).
Customer Relationship (15%)	C15	Is it a powerful CR lever?	No	Direct participant impact only, with miniaml measurable impact.		Moderate ability to improve customer relations.		High ability to improve customer relations.
	C16	Does it touch a lot of customers?	No	Small group of customers impacted (Less than 1,000)		Moderate group of customers impacted (Less than 10,000)		Large group of customers impacted (more than 10,000)
	C17	Does it touch important customer segments (e.g., low income)?	No	Limited exposure to important customer segment (less than 500)		Moderate impact to important customer segment (less than 5,000)		High imact to important customer segement (more than 5,000)
	C18	Satisfaction or relationship	No	Low level of satisfaction or relationship		Moderate		High
Cost-Effectiveness (20%)	C19	Administrative and incentive cost to acquire savings/ benefits		Currently not cost-effective		High potential for being cost-effective		Currently cost-effective
Readiness (10%)	C20	Is it an emerging technology? If so, what is its technology readiness level (TRL)?	No	Low TRL (less than 3)		Moderate TRL (Less than 7)		High TRL (9)
	C21	Is it available in market today/tested?	No	Not readily available in the market (demonstration scale only)		Yes, but limited market adoption.		Yes, high level of market adoption, including more than 5 commercial installations.
	C22	Are there available implementers?	No	No, implementers will need to be brought in for the project.		Yes, but limited local or nearby implementers.		Yes, implementers are readily available. (Whole project can be operated with local personnel).
	C23	Is the necessary infrastructure available?	No	No, additional infrastructure will be required.		Moderate levels of additional infrastructure development will be required.		Minimal to no additional infrastructure will be required.
	C24	What is the impact of failure (on cost, on reputation, with stakeholders, etc.)?	No	High cost of failure.		Moderate cost of failure.		Low cost of failure.

Legend:	
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
NWA	Non-Wire Alternatives
DER	Distributed Energy Resource
AMI	Advanced Metering Infrastructure
CR	Customer Relationship
TRL	Technology Rediness Level
MCF	One Thousand Cubic Feet
kW	Killowatt
kWh	Kilowatt Hour