

RMI's GREASE framework supports industrial policy design across several domains				
This table highlights key policy design questions surfaced through RMI's analysis of electro-industrial priorities for states in the US Southeast.				
GREASE element	Market development	Private capital mobilization	Site readiness	Workforce development
Governance	Which public entity coordinates demand-side market design and implementation?	Which institution can deliver capital support repeatedly rather than negotiating every deal from scratch?	Who owns site delivery end to end?	Which entity owns employer engagement, training delivery, and performance tracking?
Regional targeting	Where should state-backed demand signals concentrate first?	How can capital tools reach the places or projects where financing barriers are most acute?	Which sites, regions, or clusters should receive scarce infrastructure dollars first?	Which clusters or communities should workforce funds and partnerships prioritize?
Expansive ambition	Is the tool large and durable enough to change supplier and investor expectations?	Is the capital tool scaled to the financing gap it is meant to solve?	Is the program large and durable enough to build a pipeline of ready sites?	Is the program scaled beyond a pilot so it can support a real project pipeline?
Accountability	What review, reporting, or approval mechanisms show whether market-shaping tools are working?	How will the state know whether public dollars are tied to performance and public return?	How will applicants, agencies, and the public know whether timelines are being met?	Are training dollars tied to completion, placement, retention, job quality, or other outcomes?
Sector strategies	Which sectors, loads, or supply chains is the policy trying to organize?	Does the capital tool fit the sector-specific risk or asset class it is trying to finance?	Is the site program tied to sectors with specific infrastructure and power needs?	Does the workforce tool map to the occupations, equipment, and timing needs of target sectors?
Environmental co-benefits	How will the policy make clean energy, resilience, or public-benefit outcomes part of demand growth?	Can the financing tool support clean deployment or resilience without narrowing its economic-development usefulness too much?	Are clean deployment, resilience, or community benefits built into the site-readiness instrument?	Does workforce policy connect job creation to clean deployment or public-benefit goals?