**TEAM NAME: JUDGE: DATE:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Category | Description  | Comments | Score |  | Category | Description  | Comments  | Score |
| **Key Deliverables (60%)** | **CO2 calculations** **(20%)** | Rigorous and complete calculations; well-documented references; explicit treatment of uncertainty |  | **/4** | **Written/Oral** **Communication****(35%)** | **Presentation quality****(15%)** | Presentation was well organized and talking points were well shared among team members; displayed mastery of subject matter across team members. |  | **/4** |
| **Financial calculations** **(10%)** | Financials calculations are rigorous, reflect careful data collection and documentation, and cover Net Present Value (NPV), Return on Investment (ROI) and Payback Period, if applicable. |  | **/4** | **Presentation content****(15%)** | Presentation clearly communicates the key deliverables, is attractive, and follows guidelines. Presentation contains a balance of informative images, graphs, and descriptive text. |  | **/4** |
| **Co-benefits** **(10%)** | Co-benefits of project are adequately researched and clearly articulated. |  | **/4** | **Creativity/Innovation****(5%)**  | The project team showed creativity in project choice, methodology, and/or presentation |  | **/4** |
| **Interpretation and Organization of Data****(10%)**  | Data clearly supports project recommendations. Data is clear and easy to understand. Able to follow where and how the date was collected. |  | **/4** | **Professionalism****(5%)** | **Communication****(5%)** | Highly professional and timely communication with CRC instructors and staff. |  | **/4** |
| **Implementation/Host Deliverables****(10%)**  | Evidence of strong internal ownership and acceptance. Content is easily accessible for company partner |  | **/4** |  |

**NOTES:**