

Section V. Application Review Information A. Evaluation Criteria

Note: Additional provisions that apply to this section can be found at [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#).

Only eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in [Section III. Eligibility Information](#) will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth below. Applicants should explicitly address these criteria as part of their application package submittal in the Program Narrative, following the content requirements set forth in [Section IV.C: Content of Application Submission](#). Each application will be rated using a point system. Applications will be evaluated based on a total of **245 points** possible.

To assist EPA reviewers, applicants are strongly encouraged to reference the numbers and titles of the evaluation criteria in their Program Narratives to help identify where the criteria are being addressed.

1. Program Strategy Narrative (175 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it articulates a plan to use grant funds to advance GGRF program objectives described in [Section I.C: GGRF Solar for All Program Objectives](#) by performing the scope of work described in [Section I.E: Scope of Work](#). The application should refer to these program objectives in the below application components.

1. Impact Assessment (20 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent and quality to which it explains the program's intended impact on addressing current market barriers to low-income solar deployment and sets achievable outcome metrics for the program based on those barriers. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Maximizes the impact of the program relative to the amount of funding requested by setting reasonable and ambitious targets for program output and outcome metrics, specifically the number of households projected to benefit from the solar program (both as an absolute number of households and award funding requested per household); the megawatts of solar capacity deployed over time (both as an absolute number of megawatts of solar deployed and dollars of award funding requested per megawatts of solar); megawatt hours of storage capacity deployed over time (both as an absolute number of megawatt hours of storage deployed and dollars of award funding requested per megawatt hours of storage); short tons of annual CO₂ emissions avoided over time (both as an absolute number of tons of CO₂ avoided and dollars of award funding requested per tons of CO₂ avoided); and the absolute

annual of household savings realized over time (both as an absolute number of dollars saved and dollars of award funding requested per dollars of household savings). **(10 points)**

- Justifies how the proposed outcome metrics are reasonably achievable considering historical data (either past deployment of low-income distributed solar and storage in the geography the applicant is applying to serve or based on deployment in geographies with similar conditions); an assessment of the market barriers (e.g., power market barriers, financial barriers, non-financial barriers) in the geography the program will operate in; a summary of how the program will address these barriers (you may reference other sections of the Program Narrative); and, if relevant, a description of the overall structure of how Solar for All will augment an existing low-income solar program. An application from an applicant without an existing low-income solar program will be evaluated on the extent and quality to which they describe the overall structure of the program they will develop with Solar for All funds. **(10 points)**

2. Meaningful Benefits Plan (30 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the quality of the program plan to ensure the solar and storage projects receiving financial assistance from the program will deliver meaningful benefits (as defined in [Section I.D: Competition Terminology](#)) to low-income and disadvantaged communities and households. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Details a plan to ensure all households that benefit from the Solar for All program experience minimum household savings of 20% of the average household utility bill in the utility territory. To ensure household savings are maximized, the application will also be evaluated on the extent of the plan to ensure customers receive a minimum household savings of 20%, even if the financial assistance model will require households to incur costs to benefit from the program either directly (e.g., costs to subscribe to the project or to build the project) or indirectly (e.g., costs through increases in taxes or impacts to other financial subsidies such as affordable housing allowances). Additionally, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to deliver equivalent household savings for projects serving households without individual electricity bills (e.g., master-metered, multi-family buildings)— specifically, how the program will ensure households receive a financial or equivalent non-financial benefit of 20% or greater of the average household’s annual electricity expenditure; financial and equivalent non-financial benefit examples are described in recent guidance from [U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development](#). If the household saving figure included in the financial assistance model is an estimate, the application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to refine the estimated amount of savings a program beneficiary will receive from the

program annually, including considering what data is required to better refine the estimate. If further refinement of the household savings figure included in the financial assistance model is not required, the application will be evaluated on the quality of the assumptions and data used to calculate the amount of savings a program beneficiary will receive from the program annually. **(10 points)**

- Justifies how the program strategy for financial assistance and project-deployment technical assistance detailed later in the Program Narrative will increase low-income and disadvantaged households' access to solar through financial assistance and deployment options. Applicants may reference other sections of the Program Narrative to support these assertions. **(5 points)**
- Describes how the program will deliver energy resilience and grid benefits by creating capacity that can deliver electricity to low-income and disadvantaged households and/or critical facilities in low-income and disadvantaged communities in the event of a grid outage. Applicants may reference how the Financial Assistance Strategy for solar and storage achieves this meaningful benefit. **(5 points)** *(Note: this criteria point complements the criteria point on associated storage in the Financial Assistance Strategy. This criteria point asks applicants how projects funded by the program will support resilience as an overarching program goal, whereas the Financial Assistance Strategy asks how applicants will make decisions about when and how to use financial assistance to invest in associated storage.)*
- Commits to maximizing household and community ownership models and includes a plan to support low-income and disadvantaged households and communities building equity in projects. If community ownership is not being proposed, applicants will be evaluated on the quality to which they justify why the program will be unable to facilitate community ownership models. **(5 points)**
- States a plan for investing in jobs and businesses in low-income and disadvantaged communities through program operations. The application will be evaluated on the extent to which it details a plan to invest in minority- and women-owned businesses as well as historically underutilized business zones (as defined by the U.S. Small Business Administration's "[HUBZone](#)" program). Additionally, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the program's commitment to job quality and expanding opportunities for workers from underserved communities in the use of grant funds for solar projects. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the program's plans, policies, procedures, and concrete goals to work with labor unions, developers, contractors, and other partners that are committed to "high road" labor practices, including providing family-sustaining benefits, predictable work schedules, retirement contributions, safe working conditions, the free and fair choice to join a union, providing supportive services for those who need them, and other characteristics of a good job as discussed in [Appendix E: Equitable](#)

Workforce Development and Job Quality. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to use Registered Apprenticeship labor on projects to grow the skilled workforce and promote job quality. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the program's commitment to workers' free and fair choice to collectively bargain and join a union, such as requiring participating contractors to commit to remaining neutral in union organizing and operations and encouraging the use of Project Labor Agreements when appropriate. The application will be evaluated on the extent the plan is supported by letters of support from quality partners (e.g., labor unions, employers, industry associations, worker centers) in Attachment I of the application. **(5 points)** *(Note: this criteria point complements the criteria point on workforce development strategies in the Project-Deployment Technical Assistance strategy. This criteria point asks applicants how projects funded by the program will support jobs and businesses in low income and disadvantaged communities, whereas the Project-Deployment Technical Assistance strategy asks how applicants will invest in workforce development services as part of the technical assistance services the program provides. The strategy for supporting jobs and businesses in low income and disadvantaged communities may include hiring workers trained by the workforce development services explained in the Project-Deployment Technical Strategy).*

3. Distributed Solar Market Strategy (30 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent to which it identifies and addresses barriers to low-income and disadvantaged community residential distributed solar deployment in relevant power market structures. The application will be evaluated on the extent to which the plans described below are supported with statements of support from governors' offices, public utility commissions, and other energy market stakeholders in the geography the applicant is applying to serve, as included in Attachment J of the application. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Describes the net metering policies, including net metering caps, in the program's geography and how supportive those policies are to residential distributed solar deployment. If net metering policies are a barrier to residential distributed solar deployment, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to address this barrier. If net metering policies are supportive of residential distributed solar deployment, the application will be evaluated on the extent to which it justifies why net metering is not a barrier and proposes a plan to maximize and leverage these policies. **(6 points)**
- Describes the third-party ownership policies in the geography and how supportive those policies are to residential distributed solar deployment and delivering meaningful benefits—specifically community ownership benefits—to low-income and disadvantaged

communities and households. If third-party ownership policies are a barrier to communities deploying and benefiting from distributed residential solar, the application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to address these barriers. If third-party ownership policies are not a barrier to deployment, the application will be evaluated on the extent to which it justifies why this is not a barrier and proposes a plan to maximize and leverage these policies. **(5 points)**

- Describes barriers to distributed solar deployment from interconnection processes (e.g., excessive fees, limited transparency in processes and timelines) in the geography and describes a reasonable plan to address these barriers. If this barrier is not applicable to the geography, the application will be evaluated on the extent to which it justifies why this is not a barrier and proposes a plan to maximize and leverage these policies. **(5 points)**
- Describes the plan to maximize and leverage relevant enabling renewable portfolio standard (RPS) mandates in the geography the program will operate to support distributed solar deployment. If the geography does not have a RPS, the application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to address this barrier. **(5 points)**
- Describes the geography's enabling regulatory frameworks that support community solar deployment, specifically, whether the geography has adequate deployment caps and/or carveouts to support the Solar for All deployment targets stated in Section 1.1 Impact Assessment; allows for consolidated billing; and values power generation from community solar at or close to retail rates and/or represents a healthy net metering market. If the geography does not have adequate regulatory frameworks for community solar, the application will be evaluated on the extent to which it describes a reasonable plan to address this barrier. If enabling community solar policies are not relevant for the application because the proposed program will only deploy residential rooftop solar, the application should state that this is not applicable. *If not applicable, the application will receive a neutral score for this criterion.* **(4 points)**
- Describes a plan to ensure the program will maximize deployment breadth and diversity across the geography, despite jurisdictional differences between different utility territories and/or regulatory jurisdictions in the geography the application proposes to serve. If none exist, the application will be evaluated on how well it demonstrates that there are no major regulatory differences across jurisdictions that will impact distributed solar deployment. **(5 points)**

4. Financial Assistance Strategy (30 points total): Each application will be evaluated on whether the proposed financial assistance model is efficient, leverages other funds to the greatest extent possible, and maximizes solar deployment. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Details a reasonable financial assistance strategy that includes defining the type and size of the subsidy and/or other financial assistance strategy for all the technologies the program will fund (i.e., residential rooftop solar, residential-serving community solar, and/or associated storage). The financial assistance model will be evaluated on the quality of the plan to maximize the number of households benefitting from the program relative to the amount of award funds. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the program's proposed targets for deployment of residential rooftop solar and residential-serving community solar and the justification that these targets are appropriate given the characteristics and needs of the communities (e.g., building stock, cost of electricity, homeownership ratios) the program will serve. **(10 points)**
- Ensures that the Solar for All financial assistance strategy proposed in the application complements, and does not duplicate, existing sources of capital and financial assistance; is designed to ensure program longevity and market transformation beyond the program period detailed in this application; plans to leverage innovative financing structures such as renewable energy credits, tax credits, debt financing, leases, power purchase agreements, other third-party ownership options, revolving loan programs, green bonds, guarantees, or other financing products; and includes a strategy to engage with other capital providers to maximize deployment including supporting other public (including the National Clean Investment Fund and the Clean Communities Investment Accelerator) and private sources of capital. **(10 points)**
- Details reasonable criteria for when the program will provide financial assistance for associated storage and enabling upgrades that maximizes residential distributed solar capacity deployment, households served by the program, and meaningful benefits. In regard to the associated storage plan, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it details prudent criteria for deciding which projects receive financial assistance for storage and includes reasonable deployment targets for residential storage. In regard to the enabling upgrades plan, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent to which it presents a prudent strategy for using financial assistance for enabling upgrades (which the applicant may define for the program) to address barriers that reduce the deployment of residential and residential-serving community solar, such as roof upgrades; energy efficiency; behind-the-meter electrical upgrades; and distribution and transmission infrastructure investment that must be borne by the project (i.e., is not rate-based or part of planned capital improvement by a utility). The application will be evaluated on the plan to ensure financial assistance for enabling upgrades are spent judiciously, ensuring that no more than 20% of total financial assistance distributed for the lifetime of the program is used for enabling upgrades. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the plan to ensure the program does not use

these funds on costs that could be supported by other sources of capital including other assistance programs at the federal, state, and local level, as well as a plan to refer customers to DOE's [Weatherization Assistance Program](#) (WAP), or other local, state, and federal programs for energy efficiency financial assistance. **(5 points)**

- Considers the long-term impacts of program financial assistance. The application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to integrate housing affordability considerations into the program operations, including but not limited to policies that maintain affordability of existing housing stock, anti-displacement policies, and policies that prevent rapid cost increases for low-income and disadvantaged households and communities. Additionally, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to supporting operations, maintenance, and recycling of the assets funded under the program for the lifetime of the assets (i.e., approximately 20 years), including ensuring maximum energy output of the assets and conducting audits of assets to ensure operations and maintenance is performed. **(5 points)**

5. Project-Deployment Technical Assistance Strategy (20 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the plan to address the market barriers defined in Section 1.1: Impact Assessment of the Program Narrative with project-deployment technical assistance. This project-deployment technical assistance includes services defined in [Section I.D: Competition Terminology](#). Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Details a robust plan to invest in the skilled workforce needed to deploy solar, including expanding participation from workers in low-income and disadvantaged communities in the solar industry. The application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to train and place workers in high-quality, long-term careers through high road, worker-centered workforce training models, including one or more Registered Apprenticeship programs, pre-apprenticeship (apprenticeship readiness) programs affiliated with Registered Apprenticeship programs, Labor-Management Training Partnerships or other union-affiliated training programs, and training programs in partnership with local community colleges or Minority Serving Institutions. The application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to recruit and retain participants from low-income and disadvantaged communities, including how those participants will be supported with wrap-around supportive services (e.g., childcare, transportation), case management, and on-the-job support and mentorship. The application will be evaluated on the extent the plan is supported by letters of support from quality partners (e.g., State workforce board and/or State department of labor, community

colleges, labor unions, community-based organizations) in Attachment K of the application. **(10 points)**

- Describes a robust plan to provide solar developers and communities with technical assistance to address interconnection challenges, including detailing what interconnection challenges can and cannot be addressed by the program; explaining a plan for how the program will provide support to stakeholders to address these challenges (e.g., using DOE's [i2X Technical Assistance](#) program); and describing a plan to partner with utilities and create efficiencies for program deployment. **(5 points)**
- Describes a robust plan to ensure projects funded under the program are efficiently deployed and resilient by providing solar developers and communities with technical assistance for project siting, land-use, permitting, building codes, inspection, and quality control. To ensure projects are efficiently sited and permitted, the applicant will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to provide technical assistance to stakeholders on engaging with utilities on project siting; leveraging community benefits agreements; considering land use planning and zoning requirements that impact siting strategy; incorporating climate hazards (e.g., flood zones, wildfire risks) into siting strategy; committing to protecting critical pollinator habitats, greenspace, wetlands, and productive farmland; adopting agrivoltaics in siting strategy if relevant; using remediated brownfields for project siting; managing permitting processes and challenges; and adopting existing technical assistance tools such as DOE/NREL's [SolarAPP+](#), [SolSmart](#) and/or similar technical assistance programs or strategies. To ensure projects are efficiently and soundly built, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to provide technical assistance to solar stakeholders on meeting the most current, broadly accepted consensus-based building codes and standards; ensuring projects are resilient to any relevant physical climate hazards; and incorporating robust post-construction inspection and quality control processes. **(5 points)**

6. Equitable Access and Meaningful Involvement Plan (30 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to ensure the program maximizes access to the program for low-income and disadvantaged communities. The application will be evaluated on the extent to which the plans described below are supported with statements of support from community-based organization, labor partners, and other potential program partners in Attachment L of the application. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Commits to maximizing the breadth and diversity of communities served in the geography while prioritizing serving the most disadvantaged and low-income households in the

communities the program is designed to serve. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to ensure the program serves all types of communities and households, including rural, suburban, and urban communities; traditional energy communities; communities with limited English proficiency; as well as households who do not own their property, including owners of manufactured homes on leased sites, and households who do not have space for residential rooftop solar. If the application is for award option #1 and there are American Indian and Alaska Native communities in the state or territory the program will operate in, the application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to serve these communities. If the program will not serve one or more of these types of communities, the application will be evaluated on the quality of the rationale for why. **(10 points)**

- Details a robust plan for participatory governance—formalized structures for communities to be involved in the design and decision-making of the program. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to develop meaningful partnerships with community-based organizations that reflect the communities the program intends to benefit and are designed to reach the most disadvantaged or historically marginalized communities. If the application is serving American Indian and Alaska Native Communities, the application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to meaningfully involve American Indian and Alaska Native Communities in program planning and operations. **(10 points)**
- Plans to meaningfully engage with Solar for All stakeholders including education, outreach, and community engagement. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the plan to collaborate with trusted community-based organizations and ensure the program effectively engages with all communities, such as communities with limited English proficiency by creating culturally appropriate materials and via diverse channels (e.g., online, in-person, paper messaging). **(5 points)**
- Explains a robust strategy for customer acquisition and management for the program. The strategy for customer acquisition will be evaluated on the extent to which it plans to use partnerships with community-based organizations to acquire customers and plans to coordinate with existing need-based federal, state, Tribal, or utility assistance programs (e.g., [WAP](#), [SNAP](#), [TANF](#), [Lifeline](#), [LIHEAP](#)) to leverage complementary resources and acquire customers. To reduce risk from fraud and waste, the application will be evaluated on the extent and quality to which the program plans to perform robust income verification above and beyond attestation—such as categorical eligibility; the forthcoming DOE and HHS [Community Solar Subscription Tool](#); or a similar tool/strategy, while minimizing burdens on households. Categorical eligibility consists of obtaining proof of household participation in a needs-based Federal, State, Tribal, or utility assistance program with income limits at or below the qualifying income level for the program. **(5 points)**

7. Program Planning Timeline and Workplan Narrative (15 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to implement the program described in the Program Narrative Sections 1.2 through 1.6 to achieve the impact targets defined in Section 1.1. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of both the narrative as described below as well as the supporting Program Planning Timeline and Workplan in Attachment D (as described in *Section IV.B: Application Materials*). EPA has included an optional template Program Planning Timeline and Workplan in Excel on epa.gov/GGRF. Applicants may use this template as Attachment D. Applicants will not be penalized for not using this template. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Plans on refining the program plan as detailed in an implementation timeline narrative with clear and reasonable milestones for developing the Solar for All program, ensuring the program completes the program planning stage and begins deploying financial assistance to solar projects within one year of the award and expends all funds within five years of the award. The application will be evaluated on the extent to which the implementation timeline narrative includes reasonable steps for planning and implementing the Meaningful Benefits Plan (Section 1.2), Distributed Solar Market Strategy (Section 1.3), the Financial Assistance Strategy (Section 1.4), the Project- Deployment Technical Assistance Strategy (Section 1.5), and the Equitable Access and Meaningful Involvement Plan (Section 1.6). The application will be evaluated on the quality and extent of the plan to dedicate program planning capacity to incorporate forthcoming EPA guidance on how and when to apply Build America, Buy America and Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements to Solar for All program operations. See *Section VI.B: Administrative and National Policy Requirements* for more information about these requirements. **(5 points)**
- Coordinates with relevant stakeholders and partners including local and/or state governments, utilities, community-based organizations, state-level assistance programs, labor organizations, and other stakeholders referenced in Sections 1.2 through 1.6, as evidenced by including coordination milestones and steps in the planning phase of the workplan. **(5 points)**
- Commits to adopting residential rooftop and residential-serving community solar best practices by planning to leverage existing technical assistance tools and resources for program planning. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to refine elements of the program plan in the application, which may need to be improved or further detailed with analysis, data, or support from solar industry experts and tools. If no assistance is needed for program planning, the application will be evaluated on the quality of the justification for why the program does not need technical assistance for program planning. **(5 points)**

Applicants should attach the Program Planning Timeline and Workplan as Attachment D to their application so it will not count against the 40-page Program Narrative limit. However, the Program Planning Timeline and Workplan Narrative should be included in the body of the 40-page Program Narrative and provide clear, explanatory detail about how the program will be implemented efficiently and effectively to achieve the program objectives and impact targets detailed in 1.1 Impact Assessment of the Program Narrative.

2. Program Administration Narrative (50 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent to which it will deploy and manage funds efficiently, responsibly, and transparently.

1. Budget Narrative (15 points total): Each application will be evaluated based on the quality of the description of the budget included in SF-424A as well as the extent and quality of the itemized Budget Table in Attachment E of the application. EPA has provided an optional detailed Budget Table template in Excel available for download on epa.gov/GGRF. Applicants that do not use this template will not be penalized. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Demonstrates the procedures and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner and explains how the program costs are cost-effective, allowable, and reasonable to accomplish the proposed program plan. An application for award option #1 or #3 will be evaluated on the extent to which it will use 75% or more of requested funds (both direct costs and the indirect costs charged to direct costs attributable to financial assistance activities) on financial assistance for projects; an application to award option #2, will be evaluated on the extent to which it will use 65% or more of requested funds (both direct costs and the indirect costs charged to direct costs attributable to financial assistance activities) on financial assistance for projects. **(10 points)**
- Demonstrates that the budget is efficient in the detailed Budget Table, which breaks up costs in the proper budget category for each activity for which the application is requesting funding, in Attachment E of the application. **(5 points)**

Applicants should attach the itemized Budget Table as Attachment E to their application so it will not count against the 40-page Program Narrative limit. However, the Budget Narrative should be included in the body of the 40-page Program Narrative and provide clear, explanatory detail about the itemized costs in the attached Budget Table. Both the Budget Table and Budget Narrative should be specific and clear.

2. Fiscal Stewardship (20 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the quality of program controls to manage taxpayer dollars ethically and efficiently as well as the policies and

controls for program oversight. Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Commits to reducing waste, fraud, and abuse by including plans and policies for program oversight, including confidential reporting (e.g., whistleblower protections) and managing conflicts of interest. The application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to comply with requirements in 2 CFR § 200.303 and 2 CFR § 200.332(b) and (d) if the applicant intends to provide subawards to eligible subrecipients. **(10 points)**
- Invests in consumer protection, including a plan explaining how program partners and entities that directly interact, transact, or contract with consumers as part of the program, such as through the sales and marketing of solar products or services, and consumer purchasing, leasing and financing (including Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing), will comply with applicable consumer protection laws, including the consumer protection laws in the jurisdiction(s) the program will serve, in addition to federal consumer protection and consumer financial laws, such as laws prohibiting unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices (e.g., the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. § 45), Consumer Financial Protection Act (12 U.S.C. § 5536), Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S. Code § 1692e), and Regulation Z (12 CFR § 1026) which requires the disclosure of terms and cost of consumer credit and offers substantive protections to people who use consumer credit). The application will also be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to screen entities that will directly interact, transact, or contract with consumers in the program and ensure consumers are not charged illegal upfront or cancellation fees; experience transparent and verifiable subscription payment, where applicable, and billing processes; and have accessibility if they have limited English proficiency, in compliance with [Executive Order 13166 \(Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency\)](#). The application will also be evaluated based on the extent and quality of the plan to actively combat residential rooftop and residential-serving community solar predatory lending activities, which potentially exist in the geography the applicant proposes to serve. **(7 points)**
- Incorporates guardrails to ensure household savings materialize for program beneficiaries by performing audits or spot-checks of bills. **(3 points)**

3. Reporting Plan (15 points total): Each application will be evaluated on the extent and quality of the plan to execute the anticipated reporting requirement described in [Section VI.C: Program Performance Reporting Requirements](#). Specifically, EPA will evaluate the extent and quality to which the application:

- Invests program capacity in performing program evidence and evaluation activities and details a plan to publish data, evidence, and evaluation reports publicly during the program lifetime. Please see *Section VI.C: Program Performance Reporting Requirements and ORDER 1000.33 03/25/2022 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Policy for Evaluations and Other Evidence-Building Activities* for additional information on evidence and evaluation requirements. **(10 points)**
- Demonstrates an understanding of the award reporting requirements, a plan to execute on the reporting requirements, and the capacity to execute on those reporting requirements. **(5 points)**

3. Programmatic Capabilities and Environmental Results Past Performance (20 points total):

Each applicant will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed program plan considering their past performance. Applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed program considering their:

- Past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to *Section IV.C: Content of Application Submission*, Section 3 Programmatic Capabilities and Environmental Results Past Performance of this NOFO (the applicant will have addressed this information in Attachment F of their application). Demonstrates past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to *Section IV.C: Content of Application Submission*, Section 3 Programmatic Capabilities and Environmental Results Past Performance of the NOFO. **(6 points)**
- History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to *Section IV.C: Content of Application Submission*, Section 3 Programmatic Capabilities and Environmental Results Past Performance of this NOFO, (the applicant will have addressed this information in Attachment F, of their application) including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and, if such progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately reported why not. **(6 points)**
- Organizational experience and a plan for timely and successfully achieving the objective of the proposed program. **(4 points)**
- Staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed program. **(4 points)**

Note: In evaluating applicants under the first two factors, EPA will consider the information provided in the application and may also consider relevant information from other sources,

including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the application and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response, you may receive a score of 0.