



Center of Excellence for Energy Scholarship: Phase II-Technical Screening Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Weighted Rating				Remarks
	1	2	3	4	
Clear Identification of Energy Related Concept and its negative impact	1	2	3	4	
	The stated problem is not clear or relevant	The stated problem is somewhat clear but needs to expand on relevance	The stated problem is clear but additional details needed for relevance	The stated problem is clear and well defined	
Relative literature review	1	2	3	4	
	The ability to refer to literature is limited or does not exist.	The ability to refer to literature is minor. The applicant seems not to have carried out a proper literature review.	The ability to refer to literature is good. But the applicant did not use up-to-date or relevant sources	The ability to refer to literature is clear. The applicant carried out an extensive scientific and literature review methodology	



	1	2	3	4	
Originality of the proposed solution	1 The proposed idea is common with no feasible solution	2 The proposed idea is commonly known with an already established solution	3 The proposed idea is common with originality in the proposed solution	4 Both the proposed idea and solution are original / innovative	
	1 Not applicable or feasible due to lack of suitable technology	2 Not applicable or feasible due to lack of public/ governmental interest	3 Feasibly applicable but needs scientific validation	4 Valid and has potential for application.	
Feasible Application	1 The proposed idea has no applicable methodology	2 The proposed idea has a vague methodology	3 The proposed idea has an applicable methodology but needs verification	4 The proposed idea has clearly applicable methodology	
	1	2	3	4	
Clear Methodology	1	2	3	4	
	1	2	3	4	



Total	-----/20
--------------	----------



- Recommended as a finalist? Why?

- Not recommended as a finalist? Why?

Comments:

Panel Member Signature: _____

Date: _____