

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONAL PROJECT — NOT A CLIENT REPORT. Unsigned; not independently verifiable at /verify.

SECTION 1 · PROJECT SNAPSHOT

Meridian LDES 40h (sample)

70 MW · 40 h target duration · US · Greenfield site, PJM interconnection queue · renewable shifting

PROJECT

Meridian LDES 40h (sample)

COUNTRY / SITE

US · Greenfield site, PJM interconnection queue

USE CASE

renewable shifting

POWER

70 MW

TARGET DURATION

40 h

RELIABILITY

High availability required to meet firm day-ahead dispatch commitments for a regional grid operator.

External scope note: 10–100 h storage duration. Shorter durations (e.g. 8 h) appear only as comparison scenarios.

SECTION 2 · READINESS AND CONFIDENCE

Two axes, reported independently

READINESS

82 / 100

Ready for next diligence step

0 · NOT-READY BAND 40 · INSUFFICIENT 60 · CONDITIONAL 80 · READY BAND

Weighted composite, eight components. Band map: 80–100 Ready · 60–79 Conditional · 40–59 Insufficient · 0–39 Not ready.

CONFIDENCE

High band

How well the intake supports its claims. Reported separately from readiness, never blended. Score: 83/100. Evidence covers 7 of 8 components. Gaps: Delivery Maturity.

High comparison confidence from the submitted structure; customer facts are not independently verified. Evidence basis: 5 customer declarations, 4 externally-benchmarked comparisons, 0 customer-uploaded files reviewed. 1 project exception declared (1 customer-only) — self-reported origin, not independently verified. 1 benchmark metric could not be evaluated for this project.

PRIMARY SCORED CONSTRAINT

Operational Consistency — 6.8 readiness points lost, the largest single-component loss in this audit.

BENCHMARK FLAGS FOR REVIEW

CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

Review flag; no readiness adjustment in this rubric version.

Declared EUR 46/kWh vs. matched EUR 53/kWh (~13% vs. matched) — PNNL (2024).

Project exception: Vendor budgetary quote reflects a bulk civil-works discount from co-locating with an existing compressed-air-storage cavern. No independent cost audit has been performed against this discount. (customer; customer-declared, residual uncertainty high)

Evidence required: Provide a dated internal calculation with its source inputs, scope boundary, owner, and approval status.

Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)

Scored — counted within the Grid Realism component score above; no separate readiness deduction from this flag.

304 days faster than the typical (p50) benchmark — US-wide capacity-band reference; not ISO/RTO-specific.

HIGHEST RE-EVALUATION CEILING

Operational Consistency — up to +6.8 readiness points on re-evaluation if accepted evidence closes this gap.

Full evidence path in the Path to Ready sub-panel below.

SECTION 2 · SUB-PANEL · COMPONENT WEIGHTING

Contribution = score x weight / 100.

COMPONENT		SCORE	WEIGHT	CONTRIB.
Technology Class Fit		100	20	20.0
Duration Justification		100	15	15.0
Capex Completeness		100	15	15.0
Value Stack Clarity		85	10	8.5
Reliability Case		76	10	7.6
Grid Realism		55	10	5.5
Operational Consistency		32.5	10	3.3
Delivery Maturity		76	10	7.6

Component-weighted base: 82 · Declared CAPEX is below the observed benchmark range (aggressive) — review flag; no readiness adjustment in this rubric version.: 0 — Reported readiness: 82

SECTION 2 · SUB-PANEL · TIMELINE BENCHMARK POSITION

Your declared timeline vs. observed data for comparable projects, evaluated as of 2026-07-22. Affects readiness only where noted; never blended with confidence.

Interconnection → energization	faster than typical — planned 21mo · typical 31mo · stretched 48mo (304 days faster than the typical (p50) benchmark) LBNL (2026), n=453, 2022-01-01-2025-12-31 · exact reference retained in the verification manifest US-wide capacity-band reference; not ISO/RTO-specific. 31–48mo typical–stretched · planned 21mo
Interconnection → COD	within typical range — planned 60mo · typical 56.5mo · stretched 75mo (107 days slower than the typical (p50) benchmark) LBNL (2026), n=354, 2022-01-01-2025-12-31 · exact reference retained in the verification manifest US-wide capacity-band reference; not ISO/RTO-specific. 56.5–75mo typical–stretched · planned 60mo
Procurement → delivery	not evaluated — no procurement anchor date declared yet No comparable benchmark cohort is available for this metric yet.

SECTION 2 · SUB-PANEL · CAPEX BENCHMARK POSITION

Your declared CAPEX vs. observed benchmark data, evaluated as of 2026-07-22. A below-range position is flagged for review; readiness impact, if any, is stated below.

CAPEX (EUR/kWh)	below the observed benchmark range (aggressive) — declared EUR 46/kWh vs. matched EUR 53/kWh (-13% vs. matched) (100 MW / 24 h / 2030) — Review flag; no readiness adjustment in this rubric version. Note: your declared low/base/high CAPEX range crosses this boundary — the position above is not stable across your own stated uncertainty. PNNL (2024) · exact reference retained in the verification manifest · FX/CPI coverage year: 2024 (evaluation year 2026) EUR 41–75/kWh observed range · declared EUR 46/kWh
-----------------	---

SECTION 2 · SUB-PANEL · MAINTAINING READINESS

Current readiness: 82 — already in the Ready band. The priorities below are where additional accepted evidence would most strengthen the assessment.

- 1 Operational Consistency (2 distinct gaps on this component) — would be re-evaluated for up to +6.8 readiness points if accepted evidence closes these gaps.
Evidence to provide: A dispatch/cycling profile reconciled with the declared technical performance parameters — the same figures used consistently across the submission.
- 2 Grid Realism (2 distinct gaps on this component) (optional evidence upgrade) — would be re-evaluated for up to +4.5 readiness points if accepted evidence closes these gaps.
Evidence to provide: Interconnection evidence: queue position or application reference, requested capacity, and a dated basis for the expected energization timeline.
- 3 Reliability Case (optional evidence upgrade) — would be re-evaluated for up to +2.4 readiness points if accepted evidence closes this gap.
Evidence to provide: The basis for the stated reliability requirement and the operating assumptions expected to meet it.

Potential re-evaluation ceiling, subject to accepted evidence. These figures describe the maximum re-evaluation possible under this report's version-pinned dataset, rubric, and template versions if the requested evidence is submitted and accepted in a new, separately priced re-audit (Section 6) — never an automatic or guaranteed change to this report.

SECTION 3

Top assumption failures

01 Operational Consistency (2 distinct effects merged into this finding)

The declared cycling pattern is not clearly consistent with the target duration and stated use case.

6.8 OF 10.0 POINTS AT STAKE IN THIS COMPONENT

evidence: Basis: your submitted project intake — see Evidence manifest, appendix

02 Grid Realism (2 distinct effects merged into this finding)

The interconnection timeline assumption is not clearly supported for the declared geography and capacity.

4.5 OF 10.0 POINTS AT STAKE IN THIS COMPONENT

evidence: Basis: your submitted project intake — see Evidence manifest, appendix

03 Reliability Case

The basis for the stated reliability requirement and the operating assumptions expected to meet it.

2.4 OF 10.0 POINTS AT STAKE IN THIS COMPONENT

evidence: Basis: your submitted project intake — see Evidence manifest, appendix

SECTION 4

Scenario comparison

#	SCENARIO · ORIGIN · READ	READINESS	CONFIDENCE												
1	Customer baseline customer-provided · The customer's own declared configuration — the reference point every comparison below is measured against.	82	High												
2	Duration alternative (28h) benchmark comparison · no change vs baseline — varying target duration hours did not move the readiness score at this assumption set · roughly comparable to baseline under current assumptions CAPEX: re-evaluated · grid/COD timing: reused (not affected by duration or class) Issues vs baseline: 1 resolved — full detail in the Scenario Intelligence appendix. The varied assumption does not affect a scored rule under the current rubric. The alternative remains in the same decision band.	82	High												
3	Alternative class: Hydrogen (electrolyzer + storage + fuel cell) benchmark comparison · readiness delta -7 · appears modestly weaker under current assumptions (Technology Class Fit -27.0, Delivery Maturity -18.0) <table><tr><th>COMPONENT</th><th>BEFORE</th><th>AFTER</th><th>Δ</th></tr><tr><td>Technology Class Fit</td><td>100.0</td><td>73.0</td><td>-27.0</td></tr><tr><td>Delivery Maturity</td><td>76.0</td><td>58.0</td><td>-18.0</td></tr></table> Net component effect -7.2 (rounding +0.2) readiness points · readiness delta -7. CAPEX: re-evaluated · grid/COD timing: reused (not affected by duration or class) Issues vs baseline: 1 introduced — full detail in the Scenario Intelligence appendix.	COMPONENT	BEFORE	AFTER	Δ	Technology Class Fit	100.0	73.0	-27.0	Delivery Maturity	76.0	58.0	-18.0	75	High
COMPONENT	BEFORE	AFTER	Δ												
Technology Class Fit	100.0	73.0	-27.0												
Delivery Maturity	76.0	58.0	-18.0												

SECTION 4 · SUB-PANEL · TECHNOLOGY-CLASS TRADE-OFF

Real, static benchmark attributes for the technology classes compared above. A class-to-class benchmark comparison, not a vendor recommendation.

CLASS	CORE DURATION RANGE	CYCLE LIFE	CALENDAR LIFE
Compressed-air energy storage	8–48 h	—	30 yr
Hydrogen (electrolyzer + storage + fuel cell)	24–200 h	—	20 yr

SECTION 5

Technology-class implication

The declared class (Compressed-air energy storage) has a core viable duration range of 8–48 h. At the customer's target of 40 h, the class sits inside its core range — the technology-class fit assessment scored 100 / 100. Class maturity is early commercial; the pinned benchmark set records a cycle life not available in this benchmark version and a calendar life of 30 years for this class. These values also feed the operational-pattern and delivery-maturity assessments in Section 2. The declared use case (renewable shifting) matches the class's allowed use-case set (renewable shifting, multi day shift). Comparisons in Section 4 evaluate CLASSES against the same intake — not vendors, not brands, not specific products.

Benchmark set version: v-public-sample-1784726865998. Compares classes, not vendors.

SECTION 6

Required next inputs

Input needed: Full-equivalent cycles per year

Owner: Technical / operations lead

Unlocks: +3.8 readiness points (Operational use-case consistency, 10% weight)

Re-audit path: once the inputs above are available, a re-audit re-evaluates the affected components against the same version-pinned methodology. A re-audit is a new audit at the current published price; a confirmed DurationX defect follows the no-charge correction remedy.

SECTION 7

Investment-committee memo

1 · DECISION UNDER CONSIDERATION

Approval to proceed to the next diligence step

2 · CURRENT READINESS POSITION

Readiness 82/100 (Ready for next diligence step) · Confidence High (83/100)

Readiness is 82/100 (Ready for next diligence step); confidence is High (83/100). This reading already sits in the Ready band; no next-band threshold distance applies. Readiness scores how strong the current assumption set is against the rubric; confidence scores how complete and defensible the evidence behind it is. The two are kept separate because a well-argued but thinly evidenced project, and a well-evidenced but structurally weak one, can score differently on each.

3 · CONDITIONS BEFORE DEEPER DILIGENCE

Full-equivalent cycles per year — owner: Technical / operations lead · up to 3.8 readiness points

Evidence: A full-equivalent-cycles-per-year figure consistent with the declared use case. · Acceptance: A dispatch/cycling profile reconciled with the declared technical performance parameters — the same figures used consistently across the submission.

Re-evaluation of the operational-use-case-consistency component.

4 · PRINCIPAL UNCERTAINTIES

Operational Consistency

A dispatch/cycling profile reconciled with the declared technical performance parameters — the same figures used consistently across the submission.

Grid Realism

Interconnection evidence: queue position or application reference, requested capacity, and a dated basis for the expected energization timeline.

Reliability Case

The basis for the stated reliability requirement and the operating assumptions expected to meet it.

CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

Review flag; no readiness adjustment in this rubric version.

Declared EUR 46/kWh vs. matched EUR 53/kWh (~13% vs. matched) — PNNL (2024).

Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)

Scored — counted within the Grid Realism component score above; no separate readiness deduction from this flag.

304 days faster than the typical (p50) benchmark — US-wide capacity-band reference; not ISO/RTO-specific.

5 · PROJECT EXCEPTIONS

CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

aggressive against PNNL 2024 at 100 MW × 24 h.

Vendor budgetary quote reflects a bulk civil-works discount from co-locating with an existing compressed-air-storage cavern. No independent cost audit has been performed against this discount. — origin: customer, customer-declared, residual uncertainty high.

Next evidence required: Provide a dated internal calculation with its source inputs, scope boundary, owner, and approval status.

6 · ACTION, EVIDENCE, AND TIMING SEQUENCE

Owner: Customer to assign

Acceptance test: All items in "Conditions before next gate" (Section 3) are provided with the stated sourcing, the audit is re-run, and the resulting readiness score and confidence band are re-verified before the next diligence step.

Review timing: Before the next diligence gate

7 · COMMITTEE QUESTION

Does the committee approve proceeding to the next diligence step on the basis of this reading?

8 · SCOPE BOUNDARY

This audit does not select, rank, or recommend a vendor.

This audit does not offer a bankability opinion.

This audit does not conclude whether this project's returns will meet a target IRR or other financial threshold.

This audit does not recommend whether to invest in, fund, or acquire this project — that decision belongs to the customer and its advisers, informed by this reading of assumption readiness.

A "Ready" or "Conditionally ready" readiness state reflects assumption completeness, not independent verification that the underlying assumptions are correct.

This memo reflects report_version as delivered; a subsequent correction may reach different conclusions and supersedes this one.

SECTION 8

Disclaimer and provenance

This report is a first-pass CAPEX assumption readiness audit. It is not financial advice, engineering design, procurement advice, legal advice, tax advice, due diligence, or a guarantee of project performance or returns. DurationX does not sell storage systems, rank vendors, broker procurement, or receive supplier commissions. DurationX audits the assumptions behind long-duration energy storage decisions before CAPEX. See the appendix for the full scope-and-limitations statement.

Numeric scoring is deterministic and version-pinned; no AI is involved in that calculation. Narrative explanations are produced under a version-pinned AI process — the model, prompt, and template versions are recorded on every report — and are reviewed by a person before release.

APPENDIX

Sources

Public benchmark documents behind the timeline benchmark position (Section 2) and the technology-class comparison (Section 5). Not one of the 8 numbered sections; not counted against the 5-page summary limit.

PNNL ESGC v2024

2024-09 · US

<https://www.pnnl.gov/esgc-cost-performance>

LBNL Queued Up interconnection queue data

2026 · US

<https://emp.lbl.gov/queues>

Full scope and limitations

DurationX provides a vendor-independent, human-quality-controlled assessment of the readiness of assumptions submitted for a long-duration energy-storage decision. The assessment is tied to the project, location, inputs, benchmark dataset, methodology, rubric, and report versions identified in the report and to information available on the stated evaluation date. DurationX does not independently verify every customer-provided fact and does not provide engineering design or sign-off, fire or electrical safety certification, interconnection approval, permitting advice, vendor selection or procurement advice, legal or tax advice, investment advice, a valuation, a bankability opinion, or project due diligence. Scores and labels are not probabilities of success and do not guarantee cost, schedule, performance, availability, revenue, returns, financing, regulatory approval, or any other outcome. Public and licensed benchmark information may be incomplete, delayed, model-based, geography-specific, or subject to source restrictions and revision. Missing or non-comparable data are reported as not evaluable and must not be interpreted as favourable or unfavourable evidence. Decisions remain the responsibility of the customer and its qualified advisers.

AI-assisted narrative process: see Section 8 for the disclosure.

APPENDIX

Verification

This is an illustrative sample — it is not linked to a real delivered report, carries no Ed25519 signature, and cannot be checked at durationx.com/verify. A real DurationX report is signed and independently verifiable there; see the methodology page for how that works.

report_id sample-0001 (fixed placeholder, not a real identifier)
dataset v-public-sample-1784726865998 · rubric r2 · template tp-committee-memo-1 · prompt pr-v5 · model claude-sonnet-5
Internal benchmark dataset version · Readiness & confidence methodology v2 · Report template v3 · Narrative process v5

APPENDIX

Evidence manifest

Evidence behind each material finding above (spec 02 §6.5.3): type, source, verification status, and whether it was used in scoring or only in narrative text. The reference codes below are internal pointers for independent verification, not customer-facing labels.

Operational Consistency

Customer declaration — Declared cycling/dispatch pattern

Customer-declared · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.7.b, sub_check:3.7.a

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Operational Consistency"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.7.b, sub_check:3.7.a

Grid Realism

Customer declaration — Declared interconnection status and expected energization date

Customer-declared · Used in scoring · 2027-06-01

sub_check:3.6.b, sub_check:3.6.a

External benchmark — LBNL interconnection queue benchmark (2026)

Externally sourced · Used in scoring · 2026

LBNL · 2026 · US

<https://emp.lbl.gov/queues>

evidence:timeline_metric:request_to_ia

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Grid Realism"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.6.b, sub_check:3.6.a

Reliability Case

Customer declaration — Declared reliability requirement and operating assumptions

Customer-declared · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.5.b

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Reliability Case"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.5.b

Delivery Maturity

Customer declaration — Declared procurement route and expected commissioning date

Customer-declared · Used in scoring · 2030-09-01

sub_check:3.8.a, sub_check:3.8.c

External benchmark — LBNL interconnection queue benchmark (2026)

Externally sourced · Used in scoring · 2026

LBNL · 2026 · US

<https://emp.lbl.gov/queues>

evidence:timeline_metric:request_to_cod

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Delivery Maturity"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.8.a, sub_check:3.8.c

Value Stack Clarity

Customer declaration — Declared value-stream breakdown

Customer-declared · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.4.a

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Value Stack Clarity"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

sub_check:3.4.a

CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

External benchmark — PNNL matched CAPEX benchmark point (2024)

Externally sourced · Not used in scoring or narrative · 2024

PNNL · 2024 · US

<https://www.pnnl.gov/esgc-cost-performance>

evidence:capex_position

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)"

Not independently verified · Not used in scoring or narrative

issue:benchmark_flag:capex_position

Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)

External benchmark — LBNL interconnection queue benchmark (2026)

Externally sourced · Used in scoring · 2026

LBNL · 2026 · US

<https://emp.lbl.gov/queues>

evidence:timeline_metric:request_to_ia

Deterministic calculation — Rubric evaluation behind "Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)"

Not independently verified · Used in scoring

issue:benchmark_flag:request_to_ia

APPENDIX

Scenario Intelligence detail

Full component-level and issue-level detail behind Section 4's scenario comparison (spec 02 §7.2): every real component score before/after, the exact readiness-delta reconciliation, confidence basis, benchmark re-evaluation notes, and issue transitions for each comparison scenario.

Duration alternative (28h)

Changed vs baseline: target duration hours 40 → 28

Carried from baseline: Technology class, CAPEX low, CAPEX base, CAPEX high, Use case, Reliability requirement, Grid/interconnection status

COMPONENT	WEIGHT	BEFORE	AFTER	Δ
Technology Class Fit	20	100.0	100.0	0.0
Duration Justification	15	100.0	100.0	0.0
Capex Completeness	15	100.0	100.0	0.0
Value Stack Clarity	10	85.0	85.0	0.0
Reliability Case	10	76.0	76.0	0.0
Grid Realism	10	55.0	55.0	0.0
Operational Consistency	10	32.5	32.5	0.0
Delivery Maturity	10	76.0	76.0	0.0

Component-weighted effect +0.00 + rounding +0.00 = base readiness delta +0; benchmark-flag adjustment +0 → total readiness delta +0.

Confidence: 83 (High) → 83 (High) — Unchanged — this scenario does not vary any structured field or dataset-sourcing input the confidence model reads.

CAPEX benchmark position was re-evaluated for this scenario's own duty point: within observed central band.

Interconnection-to-energization benchmark evidence is reused unchanged from your baseline — it is not affected by duration or technology class.

Interconnection-to-COD benchmark evidence is reused unchanged from your baseline — it is not affected by duration or technology class.

Procurement-timeline evidence is reused unchanged (this scenario does not vary technology class).

Resolved — CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

Unchanged — Value Stack Clarity (1.5 → 1.5 points at stake)

Unchanged — Reliability Case (2.4 → 2.4 points at stake)

Unchanged — Grid Realism (4.5 → 4.5 points at stake)

Unchanged — Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)

Unchanged — Operational Consistency (6.8 → 6.8 points at stake)

Unchanged — Delivery Maturity (2.4 → 2.4 points at stake)

The varied assumption does not affect a scored rule under the current rubric. The alternative remains in the same decision band.

A customer-declared benchmark exception recorded against your baseline is not automatically re-applied to this scenario — re-confirm applicability if the same benchmark flag appears here.

Cross-assumption reconciliation findings are evaluated against your declared baseline only; they are not re-evaluated per scenario.

Alternative class: Hydrogen (electrolyzer + storage + fuel cell)

Changed vs baseline: class key caes → hydrogen

Carried from baseline: Target duration, CAPEX low, CAPEX base, CAPEX high, Use case, Reliability requirement, Grid/interconnection status

COMPONENT	WEIGHT	BEFORE	AFTER	Δ
Technology Class Fit	20	100.0	73.0	-27.0
Duration Justification	15	100.0	100.0	0.0
Capex Completeness	15	100.0	100.0	0.0
Value Stack Clarity	10	85.0	85.0	0.0
Reliability Case	10	76.0	76.0	0.0
Grid Realism	10	55.0	55.0	0.0
Operational Consistency	10	32.5	32.5	0.0
Delivery Maturity	10	76.0	58.0	-18.0

Component-weighted effect -7.20 + rounding +0.20 = base readiness delta -7; benchmark-flag adjustment +0 → total readiness delta -7.

Confidence: 83 (High) → 83 (High) — Unchanged — this scenario does not vary any structured field or dataset-sourcing input the confidence model reads.

CAPEX benchmark position was re-evaluated for this scenario's own duty point: aggressive.

Interconnection-to-energization benchmark evidence is reused unchanged from your baseline — it is not affected by duration or technology class.

Interconnection-to-COD benchmark evidence is reused unchanged from your baseline — it is not affected by duration or technology class.

Procurement-timeline evidence was re-evaluated for this scenario's own technology class.

Introduced — Technology Class Fit (— → 5.4 points at stake)

Unchanged — CAPEX benchmark position (aggressive)

Unchanged — Value Stack Clarity (1.5 → 1.5 points at stake)

Unchanged — Reliability Case (2.4 → 2.4 points at stake)

Unchanged — Grid Realism (4.5 → 4.5 points at stake)

Unchanged — Interconnection-to-energization benchmark position (aggressive)

Unchanged — Operational Consistency (6.8 → 6.8 points at stake)

Unchanged — Delivery Maturity (2.4 → 4.2 points at stake)

A customer-declared benchmark exception recorded against your baseline is not automatically re-applied to this scenario — re-confirm applicability if the same benchmark flag appears here.

Cross-assumption reconciliation findings are evaluated against your declared baseline only; they are not re-evaluated per scenario.

APPENDIX

Path to Ready — evidence detail

Potential re-evaluation ceiling, subject to accepted evidence. These figures describe the maximum re-evaluation possible under this report's version-pinned dataset, rubric, and template versions if the requested evidence is submitted and accepted in a new, separately priced re-audit (Section 6) — never an automatic or guaranteed change to this report.

Operational Consistency

Required — a mandatory intake field at this readiness level.

Why it matters: Leaving this unresolved keeps 6.8 readiness points at risk here and leaves the assumption open to challenge at the next diligence step.

Minimum acceptance criteria: A dispatch/cycling profile reconciled with the declared technical performance parameters — the same figures used consistently across the submission.

Evidence origin expected: Customer-declared, consistent with this audit's minimum intake requirement. A named external source (vendor, EPC, grid operator, or independent calculation) further strengthens confidence where the acceptance criteria above call for one.

Accepted evidence here may move readiness; this component's confidence coverage is already sufficient.

Grid Realism

Optional — an evidence-strengthening opportunity, not a missing required field.

Why it matters: Leaving this unresolved keeps 4.5 readiness points at risk here and leaves the assumption open to challenge at the next diligence step.

Minimum acceptance criteria: Interconnection evidence: queue position or application reference, requested capacity, and a dated basis for the expected energization timeline.

Evidence origin expected: Customer-declared, consistent with this audit's minimum intake requirement. A named external source (vendor, EPC, grid operator, or independent calculation) further strengthens confidence where the acceptance criteria above call for one.

Accepted evidence here may move readiness; this component's confidence coverage is already sufficient.

Reliability Case

Optional — an evidence-strengthening opportunity, not a missing required field.

Why it matters: Leaving this unresolved keeps 2.4 readiness points at risk here and leaves the assumption open to challenge at the next diligence step.

Minimum acceptance criteria: The basis for the stated reliability requirement and the operating assumptions expected to meet it.

Evidence origin expected: Customer-declared, consistent with this audit's minimum intake requirement. A named external source (vendor, EPC, grid operator, or independent calculation) further strengthens confidence where the acceptance criteria above call for one.

Accepted evidence here may move readiness; this component's confidence coverage is already sufficient.