

		DEFINITION
INTRODUCTION	weight 10%	Write a clear, concise description of what your innovation does or will do, and where you are in your evolution. Make clear its intended impact on AFRL. Evaluators should "get it" after reading this.
MISSION PARTNER BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Argue your technology innovation is aligned with HUSTLE 2025-2 cohort's mission priorities, as defined in the solicitation.
	COMPETITION AND SUBSTITUTES	How does your solution stack up with other ways to solve the same problem? How does your solution complement other technologies to solve the larger problem? Account for indirect substitute products, direct competitors and strategic partners.
	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	AFRL's Information Directorate seeks higher-risk, high-impact solutions through HUSTLE not engineering changes or incremental improvements. Use this section to describe your technology's impact and improvement upon the state of the art.
	weight 20% TIME TO FIELD	How long will it take you to get to a fieldable solution into a stable production release with the required IL-4 or higher INFOSEC accreditation in place? Convince skeptical experts that your team will field a very mature prototype during a 36-month or shorter period of performance.
TECHNICAL APPROACH	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	Convince readers that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and/or engineering principles. Ensure that your feasibility argument adequately responds to the requirements of this HUSTLE program.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk?
	READINESS LEVELS	Perform and provide a summary of a self-assessment of Technical Readiness Level (TRL) of your proposed technology. Describe your plans to mature your innovation-readiness from at a minimum of TRL 3 to a maximum of TRL 7. Please refer to this PDF as a reference: <a href="https://www.dau.edu/cop/stm/DAU%20Sponsored%20Documents/FMR-TRL%20map.pdf">https://www.dau.edu/cop/stm/DAU%20Sponsored%20Documents/FMR-TRL%20map.pdf</a>
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Briefly list and describe your core scientific and technical team with an emphasis on their past accomplishments and experiences that would relate to this HUSTLE program.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Describe any technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution. What are your plans to mitigate those risks?
	weight 20% DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Use data to substantiate your claims that your Technical Approach (this section of your proposal) is credible. Provide quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources.
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Why will you win? A small company needs to have a competitive edge in the marketplace: Something your team does very well that's difficult to match. Some examples include: well protected intellectual property, unmatched relevant expertise, a novel business model, or network effects.
	TRACTION	Make the case that your business is building commercial momentum. First, explain the metric(s) your team is using to measure your business's progress. Then, make the case that you are currently demonstrating good "Traction" as your progress accelerates.
	BUSINESS MODEL VALIDATION	Make the case that your business model is working or will work for your business. To what evidence can you point that your strategy to monetize your solution is viable with commercial and/or Government buyers?
	SCALABILITY	Argue your business gets more attractive as it grows. What's required to reach economies of scale (and, if appropriate, economies of scope)?
	weight 30% R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	Argue that your team members have commercialized research and development efforts into products successfully, as evidenced by product revenue. (Product revenue is realized by directly selling a solution to solve a problem vs. selling consulting, services or research activities.)
ACCELERATOR FIT	ACCELERATOR BENEFIT	Make the case that your team would benefit greatly from participating in HUSTLE's 8-week accelerator program.
	CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	Argue you are "getting out of the building" to engage in productive customer-discovery with DoD and non-DoD stakeholders. Describe any customer validation you may have received formally or informally to date on this proposed technology.
	weight 15% ECONOMIC IMPACT	Describe the potential your company has to create jobs and contribute to New York State's economic prosperity?
PROPOSAL QUALITY	weight 5%	Provide a clear, well written, and convincing proposal. Avoid jargon and define technical terms.

## Griffiss HUSTLE Round 1 Evaluation Criteria v1-0



		UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	SATISFACTORY	SUPERIOR
INTRODUCTION		Ineffective introduction. Failed to provide concise innovation proposition.	Adequate introduction. Gradually conveyed innovation's purpose and value. Should be more crisp.	Effective introduction. Systematically conveys innovation's purpose and value.	Exceptional introduction. Immediately conveys innovation's purpose and value.
	weight 10%				
MISSION PARTNER BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Not aligned with HUSTLE 2025-2 cohort's mission priorities.	Somewhat aligned with HUSTLE 2025-2 cohort's mission priorities.	Aligned with HUSTLE 2025-2 cohort's mission priorities.	Perfectly aligned with HUSTLE 2025-2 cohort's mission priorities.
	COMPETITION AND SUBSTITUTES	No evidence of competitive analysis. Undifferentiated product.	Incomplete or too narrow competitive analysis. Weak product differentiation.	Thorough competitive analysis. Strongly differentiated product. Accounted for most substitutes.	Persuasive competitive analysis. Highly differentiated, accounted for all substitutes, provides novel solution.
	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	If successful, no improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, incremental improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, significant improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, radical improvement vs. the state of the art.
	weight 20%				
TECHNICAL APPROACH	TIME TO FIELD	Over 48 months to fielding.	36 to 48 months to fielding.	18 to 36 months to fielding.	18 months or less to fielding.
	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	No scientific basis for presented approach.	Incomplete scientific basis for presented approach.	Credible scientific basis for presented approach.	Convincing scientific basis for presented approach.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Requires nonexistent or unavailable technology.	Requires emerging, cutting edge technology.	Requires proven technologies.	Requires Air Force-fielded technologies.
	READINESS LEVELS	Not between TRL 3 and TRL 7.	Between TRL 3 and TRL 7. Lacks self-assessment.	Between TRL 3 and TRL 7. Adequate self-assessment.	Between TRL 3 and TRL 7. Credible self-assessment.
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Technical people lack qualifications OR have no experience.	Technical people are somewhat qualified and have some experience.	Technical people are highly qualified OR have significant experience.	Technical people are highly qualified AND have significant experience.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Failed to present challenges and risks.	Inadequate risk analysis. Mitigation marginally addressed.	Credible risk analysis. Mitigation effectively addressed.	Highly credible risk analysis. Mitigation convincingly addressed.
	weight 20%				
	DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Poorly supported by data. Little to no data attribution.	Partially supported by data. Some data attribution.	Credibly supported by data. Adequate data attribution.	Persuasively supported by meaningful data. Comprehensive data attribution.

## Griffiss HUSTLE Round 1 Evaluation Criteria v1-0



		UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	SATISFACTORY	SUPERIOR
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Undifferentiated firm. Fails to argue it has an advantage.	Weakly differentiated firm. Some evidence of an advantage.	Strongly differentiated firm. Credibly argues it has durable advantage.	Highly differentiated firm. Convincingly argues it has durable advantage.
	TRACTION	Inappropriate metric(s) OR no evidence of traction.	Appropriate metric(s). Evidence of marginal traction.	Appropriate metric(s). Evidence of adequate traction.	Highly appropriate metric(s). Evidence of impressive traction.
	BUSINESS MODEL VALIDATION	Fails to demonstrate business model is valid.	Draws credible parallels to others' proven models.	Evidence of interested customers utilizing the above-defined model.	Evidence of paying customers utilizing the above-defined model.
	SCALABILITY	Very difficult, perhaps impossible, to scale business as presented.	Incomplete scaling plan. Some areas lack credibility.	Feasible scaling plan. Unproven.	Validated scaling strategy. Successful analogs exist.
weight 30%					
ACCELERATOR FIT	R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	No current or prior product revenue evident.	Product revenue at previous company(ies).	Current product revenue at this company.	Current product revenue at this company sufficient to fuel growth.
	ACCELERATOR BENEFIT	No potential to provide benefit through attending HUSTLE.	Some potential to provide benefit through attending HUSTLE.	Good potential to provide benefit through attending HUSTLE.	Exciting potential to provide benefit through attending HUSTLE.
	CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	No customer interviews completed. No validation.	A handful customer interviews completed. No validation.	Extensive interviews completed. Early validation beginning to inform transition strategy.	Exhaustive interviews completed. Validation informs credible transition strategy.
weight 15%					
PROPOSAL QUALITY	ECONOMIC IMPACT	Minimal contributions to state economic growth. Only a handful of state job-creation.	Modest contributions to state economic growth. Modest state job-creation.	Significant contributions to state economic growth. Moderate state job-creation.	Major contributions to economic growth. Large-scale state job-creation.
	weight 5%	Poorly written. Very difficult to impossible to follow argument. Several spelling or grammar errors.	Moderately written. Sometimes difficult to follow argument. A few spelling / grammar errors.	Effectively written. Convincing, easy to follow argument. No spelling or grammar errors.	Clearly and persuasively written. Compelling arguments. No spelling or grammar errors.