

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

CUC-RFP-25-021 Renewal Energy Phase 1 Evaluation: Qualifying Scoring Worksheet																																												
Please select your Evaluation Committee Member Name from drop down list: Evaluation Committee Member: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	Please enter the date of completion for the evaluation of this proposal: Date of Evaluation Completion: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>																																											
Please provide project identifying information in items A), B) and C). Project Identifying Information																																												
A) Proponent Name: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	B) Proposal Name/Number: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	C) Project Name: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>																																										
A proposal must meet the Minimum Required Phase 1 Score in order to be considered qualified for evaluation during Phase 2. Proposals can be disqualified for failing to meet certain proposal requirements, as noted in the Points Value information. A score of "Disqualify" on any one line item means the proposal is disqualified and is excluded from further consideration. A proposal must meet the Minimum Required Phase 1 Score requirement prior to the Reference Assessment. Therefore, References cannot increase a proposal's score for qualification purposes; they can only decrease the score. Evaluation Committee Members will evaluate proposals and select answers in the blue highlighted boxes. All scores are filled in automatically based on answers selected and all calculations are automatic.																																												
Evaluation Sections and Scoring: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Maximum Points Value:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Basic Proposal Requirements</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Equipment and EPC</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Environmental Attributes, Permits, and Related Issues</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Site Control</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5) Project Management and Experience</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6) Project Financing and Credit Worthiness</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Maximum Possible Phase 1 Score:</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;">100</td> </tr> </table>		Maximum Points Value:	1) Basic Proposal Requirements	24	2) Equipment and EPC	20	3) Environmental Attributes, Permits, and Related Issues	10	4) Site Control	6	5) Project Management and Experience	20	6) Project Financing and Credit Worthiness	20	Maximum Possible Phase 1 Score:	100	Reference Scoring (Decremental Only): <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Reference Assessment:</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Good</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Fair</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Poor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Applicability and relevance of provided references</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quality of project team personnel and proponent's partners</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall satisfaction working with proponent</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Results/outcome of project met expectations</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Reference Assessment:	Good	Fair	Poor	Applicability and relevance of provided references	0	-1	-2		Quality of project team personnel and proponent's partners	0	-1	-2		Overall satisfaction working with proponent	0	-1	-2		Results/outcome of project met expectations	0	-1	-2	
	Maximum Points Value:																																											
1) Basic Proposal Requirements	24																																											
2) Equipment and EPC	20																																											
3) Environmental Attributes, Permits, and Related Issues	10																																											
4) Site Control	6																																											
5) Project Management and Experience	20																																											
6) Project Financing and Credit Worthiness	20																																											
Maximum Possible Phase 1 Score:	100																																											
	Reference Assessment:	Good	Fair	Poor																																								
Applicability and relevance of provided references	0	-1	-2																																									
Quality of project team personnel and proponent's partners	0	-1	-2																																									
Overall satisfaction working with proponent	0	-1	-2																																									
Results/outcome of project met expectations	0	-1	-2																																									
Section 1) Basic Proposal Requirements																																												
Maximum Points Value for Section: 24		Score:																																										
1.1) Has proponent provided the submittal checklist, shareholders & non-collusion affidavits, the equal emp. statement, and the COI declaration?	[Blue Box]	Points Value: Yes = +0 No = Disqualify	Disqualify																																									
1.2) Has proponent adequately completed the Technical Parameters Worksheet?	[Blue Box]	Yes = +5 No = 0	0																																									
1.3) Has proponent adequately completed the Expected Production Worksheet?	[Blue Box]	Yes = +5 No = 0	0																																									
1.4) Does the proposal provide a good overview/understanding of the proposed project(s) and/or integrated solution?	[Blue Box]	Yes = +5 No = 0	0																																									
1.5) Does the proposal provide a good overview/understanding of the benefits of the proposed project to CUC?	[Blue Box]	Yes = +4 No = 0	0																																									
1.6) Does the proposal reflect the work product of a careful and well thought out effort on behalf of proponent?	[Blue Box]	Yes = +5 No = 0	0																																									
Subtotal for Basic Proposal Requirements:			Disqualify																																									

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

Project Identifying Information

A) Proponent Name: _____

B) Proposal Name/Number: _____

C) Project Name: _____

Section 2) Equipment and EPC

Maximum Points Value for Section: 20

Points Value:

Score:

2.1)	Does the proposal meet the required system configuration equal or greater for the Solar PV with BESS and system integration requirements?		Yes = +4	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
2.2)	Has the proposal demonstrated that the technology has reliable commercial operations in a utility environment for at least two years?		Yes = +5	No = 0	0
2.3)	If No to Question 2.2), has the technology been proven technically feasible and does this technology warrant further consideration?		Yes = +0	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
2.4)	Has the proposal illustrated the effectiveness of the technology in island environments?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
2.5)	Has the proposal identified/discussed principal engineering firm and key equipment suppliers/vendors?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
2.6)	Has the proposal described the lead time for delivery of major equipment from vendors to CNMI?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
2.7)	Has the proposal identified similar equipment by same vendor that are in operations, including #, capacity, and generation?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
2.8)	Has the proposal secured major equipment for the project?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
2.9)	Has the proposal identified the long-lead equipment options and described the timing for securing equipment?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
Subtotal for Equipment and EPC:					Disqualify

Section 3) Environmental Attributes, Permits, and Related Issues

Maximum Points Value for Section: 10

Points Value:

Score:

3.1)	Does proposal identify permits, licenses, and environmental assessments that may be required to construct and operate the project?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
3.2)	Has the proposal identified the agencies involved in issuing and approving permits, licenses, and environmental assessments?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
3.3)	Has the proposal prepared a timeline which adequately details what is required to complete the environmental permitting process?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
3.4)	Has the proposal provided an adequate preliminary environmental assessment of the anticipated project site and mitigation plans?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
3.5)	Has the proposal addressed communities' and stakeholders' issues and mitigation plans for those affected?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
3.6)	Has the proposal provided a discussion around community support and endorsement and a communications plan?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
3.7)	Has the proposal discussed the environmental characteristics of the proposed project, including emissions, water & land use?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
3.8)	Has the proposal described any grants, tax credits, incentives or other similar funding sources related to environmental attributes?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
Subtotal for Environmental Attributes, Permits, and Related Issues:					0

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

Project Identifying Information

A) Proponent Name: _____

B) Proposal Name/Number: _____

C) Project Name: _____

Section 4) Site Control	Maximum Points Value for Section:	6	Points Value:	Score:
4.1) Is there a map that includes identification of acreage, interconnection and other infrastructure which includes a site layout plan of the project site with all equipment and facilities?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
4.2) Does the proposal include a discussion of facility safety such as electronic or physical tampering or damage concerns?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
4.3) Has the proposal provided evidence of right to use site by virtue of ownership or land rights? Has it addressed needed entitlements?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
4.4) If No to Question 4.3), has proponent provided any letter of intent to negotiate a lease or purchase of site?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
4.5) Has the proposal provided a timeline when it is anticipated the project will obtain use of the site?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
4.6) Has the proposal discussed zoning, rights-of-way/ easements, and the capability for expansion?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
Subtotal for Site Control:				0

Section 5) Project Management and Experience	Maximum Points Value for Section:	20	Points Value:	Score:
5.1) Is there a clearly presented Project Organization Chart that describes the responsibilities of proponent, partners, and other participants?			Yes = +2 No = 0	0
5.2) For each participant on the Project Organization Chart, did proposal provide background information sufficient to establish experience?			Yes = +5 No = 0	0
5.3) Is there a Personnel Chart which lists the key personnel dedicated to this project?			Yes = +2 No = 0	0
5.4) Did proposal provide biographies of the key personnel sufficient to establish experience and expertise?			Yes = +4 No = 0	0
5.5) Did proposal provide a detailed account of all projects successfully developed or under construction?			Yes = +5 No = 0	0
5.6) Did proposal identify the entities responsible for supporting the project, including lenders, advisors, engineers, counsel, etc.?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
5.7) Did proponent provide three references?			Yes = +1 No = 0	0
Subtotal for Project Management and Experience:				0

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

Project Identifying Information

A) Proponent Name: _____

B) Proposal Name/Number: _____

C) Project Name: _____

Section 6) Project Financing and Credit Worthiness

Maximum Points Value for Section: 20

Points Value:

6.1)	Did proponent describe its organization's structure from a financial and legal perspective, including any partners, subsidiaries, providers of capital, and percentage interest of each?		Yes = +0	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
6.2)	Did proposal describe the equity participants in the project and their respective roles and responsibilities and provide contact information?		Yes = +0	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
6.3)	Is there a written commitment provided from the equity participants?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.4)	Did proposal discuss and provide supporting information on any project financing guarantees?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.5)	Does proposal describe any conditions precedent to project financing other than execution of the contract with CUC?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6)	Does proposal provide a description of the financing plan for the project, including construct. & term financing, for each of the following?				
6.6-a)	a) the project's financial structure		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6-b)	b) expected sources of debt financing		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6-c)	c) estimated capital cost		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6-d)	d) evidence the project is financeable, provided that CUC can secure credit-worthy funding		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6-e)	e) the financing of development costs		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.6-f)	f) the use of grants, tax credits, incentives, or other similar funding sources		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.7)	Does proposal provide the requested documentation illustrating the experience of the project sponsor in securing financing for projects of similar size and technology?		Yes = +3	No = 0	0
6.8)	Did proponent provide copies of the most recent three years of audited financial statements?		Yes = +0	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
6.6-a)	a) Do the audited financial statement indicate stability of net assets?		Yes = +0	No = -5	(5)
6.6-b)	b) Do the audited financial statements indicate a reasonable debt/equity ratio?		Yes = +0	No = -5	(5)
6.6-c)	c) Do the audited financial statement indicate adequate cash flow and working capital?		Yes = +0	No = -5	(5)
6.9)	Did proponent provide credit ratings or discussion around credit ratings?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.10)	Did proponent demonstrate its ability to provide the required security, including its plan for doing so?		Yes = +2	No = 0	0
6.11)	Did proponent provide a discussion of the subject of any current credit issues?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.12)	Did proponent describe the implications of the federal Production Tax Credits or Similar incentives?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.13)	Did proponent address past, current, or anticipated future litigation related to projects owned or managed by them or any of their affiliates?		Yes = +1	No = 0	0
6.14)	Did proponent provide an Outstanding Legal Claims Statement as given in Appendix B?		Yes = +1	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
6.15)	Is proponent free of Outstanding Legal Claims which may seriously impact their credit-worthiness and/or ability to deliver on proposal?		Yes = +1	No = Disqualify	Disqualify
Subtotal for Project Financing and Credit Worthiness:					(15)

Has the proposal been disqualified?	Yes
Total Phase 1 Score (Sections 1-6), Prior to Reference Assessment:	N/A
Does proposal meet minimum required Phase 1 score to be considered as part of the Reference Assessment?	N/A

Appendix B: Evaluation Form

Project Identifying Information

A) Proponent Name:

B) Proposal Name/Number:

C) Project Name:

Section 7) Reference Assessment Scoring

Maximum Points Subtracted for Section: **-8**

Points Value:

If references were not provided, a score of "Poor" will be applied to all Subject Areas.

Subject Area: Applicability and relevance of provided references.

Score's assessment as to whether references were valid, applicable, and could speak to proponent's performance and track record for similar projects.

Good = +0 Fair = -1 Poor = -2

-2

Subject Area: Quality of project team personnel and proponent's partners

References' assessments as to the quality of proponent's direct project personnel and the partner companies involved in the reference projects.

Good = +0 Fair = -1 Poor = -2

-2

Subject Area: Overall satisfaction working with proponent

References' assessments as to their overall satisfaction with proponent's quality of work, management of the project, partnering/teaming ability, cooperation/coordination, and effectiveness.

Good = +0 Fair = -1 Poor = -2

-2

Subject Area: Results/outcome of project met expectations

References' assessments of the overall results of the project, including operational effectiveness and reliability, the project generally meeting expectations, and if the project is considered successful.

Good = +0 Fair = -1 Poor = -2

-2

Subtotal for Reference Assessment: -8

Total Phase 1 Score (Sections 1-6), Prior to Reference Assessment: **N/A**

Score Subtotal for Reference Assessment **N/A**

Total Phase 1 Score (Sections 1-7), After Reference Assessment: **N/A**

Does proposal meet minimum required Phase 1 score to be considered further as part of the Phase 2 evaluation? **N/A**