

TECHNICAL REVIEWER

APPLICATION RATING FORM

Reviewer's Identification Number: (no name please)

Date:

Principal Investigator(s):

Proposal Number:

Application Title:

Section A. Mandatory Requirements:

		Yes	No
Diversification Delivery:			
Project enhances the production of clean sustainable energy, to make the State a world leader in the production of clean sustainable energy, and/or to diversify and grow the State's economy.			
Commercialization or Development/Expansion:			
Concept will lead to the large-scale development and commercialization of projects, processes, activities, and technologies that reduce environmental impacts and/or increase sustainability of energy production and delivery.			
In State Requirement:			
The funds distributed from the financial assistance are to be applied to support in-state activities and must have other sources of financial support.			

Section B. Summary of Ratings:

Please complete the questions below and then fill in this summary.

	Statement	Checked	Number	X	Weighting Factor	=	Subrating
1.	Objectives			x	3	=	
2.	Impact			x	9	=	
3.	Methodology			x	9	=	
4.	Facilities			x	3	=	
5.	Budget			x	9	=	
6.	Partnerships			x	9	=	
7.	Awareness			x	3	=	
8.	Contribution			x	6	=	
9.	Project Management			x	6	=	
10.	Background			x	6	=	
	Total						/315

Note: While points are necessary to establish an overall rating, comments on the various criteria are critical to truly understanding the technical feasibility of a proposed project. **Please elaborate in the comment sections to the maximum extent possible.**

Overall Technically Sound: If > 214 _____ Good
200 - 213 _____ Fair
If < 164 _____ Questionable

Section B. Ratings and Comments:

Please indicate your response to each statement by placing an “x” in the box above the number and transfer the number selected to the column entitled “Checked Number” on the first page of this form. **Please comment on each criterion.**

- The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with Clean Sustainable Clean Energy Authority goals of projects, processes, activities, and technologies that reduce environmental impacts and increase sustainability of energy production and delivery are:

1 - Very Unclear	2 - Unclear	3 - Clear	4 - Very Clear	5 - Exceptionally Clear

Please comment:

- The objectives will make a difference in the near term to the state’s economy:

1 – No Impact	2 – Small Impact	3 - Likely Impact	4 - Most Likely Impact	5 - Significant Impact

Please comment:

- The quality and clarity of the methodology in the proposal is:

1 - Well Below Average	2 - Below Average	3 - Average	4 - Above Average	5 - Well Above Average

Please comment:

4. The facilities and equipment available and to be purchased for the proposed pilot or commercialization strategy is:

1 – Very Inadequate	2 - Inadequate	3 - Adequate	4 – Notably Good	5 – Exceptionally Good

Please comment:

5. The proposed budget is comprehensive and sufficient relative to the outlined work and the timetable:

1 – Not Sufficient	2 – Possibly Sufficient	3 – Likely Sufficient	4 – Most Likely Sufficient	5 – Certainly Sufficient

Please comment:

6. The appropriate strategic partnerships are in place for short and long term plans to be successful:

1 - Very Limited	2 - Limited	3 - Adequate	4 - Better Than Average	5 – Exceptional

Please comment:

7. The likelihood that the project approach (time & budget) will achieve its technical and market goals is:

1 – Not Achievable	2 – Possibly Achievable	3 – Likely Achievable	4 – Most Likely Achievable	5 – Certainly Achievable

Please comment:

8. The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address Clean Sustainable Energy Authority goals of impacting technology used in North Dakota’s energy industries will likely be:

1 - Extremely Small	2 - Small	3 - Significant	4 – Very Significant	5 – Extremely Significant

Please comment:

9. The project management plan, including budgeting projections, partner connections and well-defined milestone chart is:

1 - Very Inadequate	2 - Inadequate	3 - Adequate	4 - Notably Good	5 – Exceptionally Good

Please comment:

10. The background and experience of the project principals with regards to technical qualifications and competence is:

1 – Very Limited	2 – Limited	3 – Adequate	4 – Better Than Average	5 – Exceptional

Please comment:

Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to the project is technically sound.

General comments:

BND CREDIT SUMMARY

Market Analysis

Financial Summary

Historical Financial Summary

Strong	
Adequate	
Weak	
Not Applicable	

Proposed Debt Service Coverage (if applicable)

Collateral Valuation

Loan to Value Summary (if applicable)

Overall Economic Feasibility	
Yes	
No	

Proposed Accommodations/Covenants

***This will be a confidential document.*

Clean Sustainable Energy Authority Tech Committee Scoring Form

1. The degree to which the project reduces environmental impacts and increases sustainability of energy production and delivery.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

2. The timeliness of the project.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

3. The impact on natural resource industries and value to the State.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

4. The level of funding previously supplied by the State.

Significant	0	1	2	3	4	5	Limited

5. The level of matching funds, with higher priority given to those projects with private industry investment.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

6. The short-term and long-term benefits to the State, including the diversification and growth of the State's economy.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

7. The likelihood that the project will achieve its technical and market goals.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

8. The scientific soundness and innovation of any proposed technology.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

9. The financial feasibility of the proposed project.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

10. The technical qualifications and expertise of the applicant, key personnel, and the sponsors.

Limited	0	1	2	3	4	5	Significant

Not Feasible	
Feasible with Conditions	
Feasible	

*This is a public document.

Name of Application	Application Number
---------------------	-----------------------

Submitted by:
 Project Duration:
 Total Project Costs:
 Request for:

Summary of Project

Technical Review Results

Overall Technically Sound (X/315)		
Good		
Fair		
Questionable		

BND Economic Feasibility Recommendation

Overall Economic Feasibility	
Yes	
Yes, with conditions	
No	

Tech Committee Recommendations

	Feasible (X/50)	Feasible with Conditions (X/50)	Not Feasible (X/50)	Absent (X)
Charles Gorecki				
Dave Glatt				
Lynn Helms				
Justin Kringstad				
James Leiman				
Rachel Retterath				
Todd Steinwand				
John Weeda				

***This is an open record.

Name of Application	Application Number
---------------------	--------------------

Submitted by:
 Project Duration:
 Total Project Costs:
 Request for:

Summary of Project

Technical Review Results

Overall Technically Sound (X/315)		
Good		
Fair		
Questionable		

BND Economic Feasibility Recommendation

Overall Economic Feasibility	
Yes	
Yes, with conditions	
No	

Tech Committee Recommendation

	Feasible (X/50)	Feasible with Conditions (X/50)	Not Feasible (X/50)	Absent (X)
Charles Gorecki				
Dave Glatt				
Lynn Helms				
Justin Kringstad				
James Leiman				
Rachel Retterath				
Todd Steinwand				
John Weeda				

CSEA Recommendation

	Fund	Do Not Fund
Lt. Governor Sanford		
Jim Arthaud		
Joel Brown		
Al Christianson		
Christopher Friez		
Terry Goerger		
Robert (Mac) McLennan		
Kathy Neset		

***This is an open record.