

Shell Gamechanger Powered By NREL (GCxN) Application Rubric

			SCORING RANGE			
	Subject	Prompt	1	2	3	4
Viability and potential energy impact (50%)	Energy Impact (20%) Sections A & B	<i>What potential does this technology have to impact the future of energy?</i>	Little or no indication that the technology can provide an impact to the energy industry in the future.	Potential for contributing to future energy industry goals, but performance estimates are preliminary and the use cases are unclear.	Future energy industry benefits are clear, but applicability may not be truly widespread.	Technology can substantially improve the future of energy and its ecosystem.
	Technical Development (15%) Sections B & G	<i>How well is the technology understood? Is it based on solid fundamental principles? Has it been validated?</i>	Technology does not have a sound fundamental basis and has not been validated.	Technology appears to have fundamental basis. Validation has been attempted, results unclear.	Technology fully validated. Full scale production in place.	Sound technology validation. Pilot manufacturing in place. Clear path to full scale production.
	Potential project success (technical) (15%) Sections A, B, F, G	<i>What is the likelihood for short-term, technical success?</i>	Project cost, time scale, or technical barriers will prevent a short term success	High risk project (e.g., pass/fail) that has little room for error to demonstrate technical success	High chance for a technical advancement	High chance for a technical advancement that will move the product to the next TRL
Match for laboratory assistance (25%)	Technical expertise and/or facilities (10%) Sections B, D, F	<i>Does the proposal match laboratory expertise in: system integration, SMEs, facilities, experimental design, benefit mapping, delivery assurance, and/or deployment paths?</i>	No alignment with lab expertise	The proposal shows a connection to lab technical services but will require ramp-up time or new equipment for success	The proposal shows a match for lab technical services	The proposal shows a match for lab technical services and will allow for alignment with and development in with DOE's key focus area
	Proposing company partnership (5%) Section G	<i>Does the proposal express a shared effort or demonstrate a high level of company support in the work plan?</i>	No, the company does not appear to have a strong commitment to project success	The proposal suggested resources and partnerships that will be helpful to the success of the project	Yes, a commitment to project success is demonstrated in the proposal	Yes, a commitment to project success and potential for long term partnership are clearly demonstrated in the proposal
	External partners (5%) Section G	<i>Does the technology and proposal align with DOE or lab's existing partnership networks?</i>	No alignment with lab partnership network	Yes, lab has partners that align with the proposal but the technology might not be of direct interest	Yes, lab sees a general connection to partnerships and the technology	Yes, lab has active partners that align with the proposal and would be interested in the technology/proposal
	Alignment with Call (5%) Section B	<i>Does the technology align with the call's requirements?</i>	No, the technology is not related to call.	Yes, the technology is related to the call.	Yes, the technology perfectly aligns with call.	Yes, the technology perfectly aligns with the call and could be applied to Shell's future ventures.
Match with GCxN goals (20%)	Novelty (5%) Section A, B, G	<i>Does the proposal describe an idea fundamentally different and unproven?</i>	No, the idea is not novel.	The idea has the potential to pivot to a novel idea, and would need an assisted change in work plan	The idea is essentially novel, but the details would need reworking for differentiation	The idea is novel; fundamentally different from current technologies and remains unproven
	Project affordability and success rate (5%) Sections A, B, C, E, G	<i>How quickly and affordably can the concept be proven?</i>	Project cost, time scale, or technical barriers will prevent a short term success	High risk and/or high cost project (e.g., pass/fail) that has little room for error to demonstrate market success	High chance for technology advancement in the short term with reasonable cost	High chance for advancement in short term that increases product visibility and recognition
	Relevance to Shell (5%) Section G	<i>How relevant is the proposal to Shell and Shell's ultimate goals?</i>	Proposal does not demonstrate relevance to Shell.	Proposal shows peripheral alignment with Shell's ultimate goals.	Proposal incorporates Shell's goals and is relevant to Shell.	Proposal internalizes Shell's goals and addresses precisely how it will accomplish and further these goals.
	Project Value (5%) Section C, E, G	<i>What is the likelihood the idea creates substantial new value (assuming it works)?</i>	Very low likelihood this idea would create substantial new value if it worked.	Somewhat likely; however any substantial new value indicated would not occur without GCxN participation.	Likely that this idea will create substantial new value.	Very likely that this idea would create substantial new value
Other score (5%)	Open Score (5%)	<i>Provide a score for topics not identified in rubric that you feel are important to the success of GCxN or NREL's contribution. The average score will be used if no score is provided.</i>	Extreme dissatisfaction with elements of the proposal	Dissatisfaction with elements of the proposal	Satisfaction with most elements of the proposal	High satisfaction with all elements of the proposal