

BAG 6.0: Last Mile Project Scoring Rubric

The following are the review criteria the review team will use to score each BAG 6.0 application. Each application will be given a score out of one hundred (100) points and be rated based on the following criteria:

- Application Quality – 21 points
- Technical Evaluation – 30 points
- Financial Evaluation – 9 points
- Applicant Interview – 10 points
- Impact – 30 points

The point distribution across categories is listed below:

Application Quality Review

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
Project Summary and Priorities 5.25 Points Possible	Highly detailed summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program. References to how the project will enable work, education, health monitoring, economic development support, or other sector-based involvement are provided in detail for all five areas. Details how project will provide unserved areas with affordable and scalable broadband services.	Detailed summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program. References to how the project will enable work, education, health monitoring, economic development support, or other sector-based involvement are provided, but missing details in at least one of the five areas. Details how project will provide unserved areas with affordable and scalable broadband services but missing details in at least one or more of the three areas.	General summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program. References to how the project will enable work, education, health monitoring, economic development support, or other sector-based involvement are provided but without substantial detail in any of the above areas. Generally describes how the project will provide unserved areas with affordable and scalable broadband services but without substantial detail in any of the three areas.	Summary of the project provided, unclear that project will meet goals of program. References to how the project will enable work, education, health monitoring, economic development support, or other sector-based involvement are provided but with little detail. Limited details on how the project will provide unserved areas with affordable and scalable broadband services.	Little to no information provided in the project summary or project priorities.
	(5.25 to 3.5 Points)	(3.5 to 2.5 Points)	(2.5 to 1.25 Points)	(1.25 to 0.25 Points)	(0 Points)

Application Quality Review Continued

<p>Project Plan with Achievable Timeline and Detailed Milestones</p> <p>2.5 Points Possible</p>	<p>Application includes detailed preconstruction planning and/or engineering; permitting, leasing, licensing; construction; equipment installation; project implementation and a clear marketing outreach plan that includes providing detailed sub-tasks for each of the five categories (subordinate sub-task, start/end date or duration). Project plan shows end date of project and that it will finish before end of program period.</p> <p>(2.5 to 2.25 Points)</p>	<p>Application provides information (start/end date or task duration) on all the following categories in the project plan: preconstruction planning and/or engineering; permitting, leasing, licensing; construction; equipment installation; project implementation and a clear marketing outreach plan. Provides detailed sub-tasks (task, start and end date or duration) in at least two, but less than five categories. Project plan shows end date of project and that it will finish before end of program period.</p> <p>(2.0 to 1.75 Points)</p>	<p>Application provides information (start/end date or task duration) on all the following categories in the project plan: preconstruction planning and/or engineering; permitting, leasing, licensing; construction; equipment installation; project implementation and a clear marketing outreach plan. Does not include detailed sub-tasks for each category. Project plan shows end date of project and that it will finish before end of program period.</p> <p>(1.5 to 1.0 Points)</p>	<p>Application provides information (start/end date or task duration) on at least two, but less than five, of the following categories in the project plan: preconstruction planning and/or engineering; permitting, leasing, licensing; construction; equipment installation; project implementation and a clear marketing outreach plan. Project plan may or may not show end date of project, or if it will finish before end of program period.</p> <p>(0.75 to 0.25 Points)</p>	<p>Little or no plan for construction and implementation.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---

Application Quality Review Continued

<p>Letters of Support</p> <p>2.5 Points Possible</p> <p>(Section 1 = 1.5 Points, Section 2 = 1.0 Points)</p>	<p>Section 1 Letter signed by sponsor plus all of the following items included in the letter: 1) Letter dated and organization logo at the top of letter; 2) Describes the nature of the support: Engagement could mean sponsoring, endorsing, providing funding or resources, cooperating to facilitate project approval, implementation or adoption of the service; 3) Letter clearly states the problem to be solved and how applicant is addressing broadband needs within the community.</p> <p>(1.5 Points)</p> <p>Section 2: Number of letters meeting criteria: One letter (0.25 Points) Two letters (0.5 Points) Three letters (0.75 Points) Four or more letters (1.0 Points).</p>	<p>Section 1 Letter signed by sponsor plus two of the following items included in the letter: 1) Letter dated and organization logo at the top of letter; 2) Describes the nature of the support: Engagement could mean sponsoring, endorsing, providing funding or resources, cooperating to facilitate project approval, implementation or adoption of the service; 3) Letter clearly states the problem to be solved and how applicant is addressing broadband needs within the community.</p> <p>(1.25 to 1.0 Points)</p> <p>Section 2: Number of letters meeting criteria: One letter (0.25 Points) Two letters (0.5 Points) Three letters (0.75 Points) Four or more letters (1.0 Points).</p>	<p>Section 1 Letter signed by sponsor plus one of the following items included in the letter: 1) Letter dated and organization logo at the top of letter; 2) Describes the nature of the support: Engagement could mean sponsoring, endorsing, providing funding or resources, cooperating to facilitate project approval, implementation or adoption of the service; 3) Letter clearly states the problem to be solved and how applicant is addressing broadband needs within the community.</p> <p>(0.75 to 0.5 Points)</p> <p>Section 2: Number of letters meeting criteria: One letter (0.25 Points) Two letters (0.5 Points) Three letters (0.75 Points) Four or more letters (1.0 Points).</p>	<p>Section 1 Letter not signed by sponsor plus one of the following items included in the letter: 1) Letter dated and organization logo at the top of letter; 2) Describes the nature of the support: Engagement could mean sponsoring, endorsing, providing funding or resources, cooperating to facilitate project approval, implementation or adoption of the service; 3) Letter clearly states the problem to be solved and how applicant is addressing broadband needs within the community.</p> <p>(0.25 Points)</p> <p>Section 2: Number of letters meeting criteria: One letter (0.25 Points) Two letters (0.5 Points) Three letters (0.75 Points) Four or more letters (1.0 Points).</p>	<p>No Community Partner Letters of Support Provided.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>
---	--	--	--	---	--

Application Quality Review Continued

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points Description
Narrative describes who is to be served 2 Points Possible	Did the applicant provide a breakdown of locations served (Households, businesses, Community Anchor Institution) (Y/N)
What percentage of counties in the proposed project is targeted to reach the economically disadvantaged? 2 Points Possible	≤ 20% - .25 points <20% and ≤ 40% - 0.25 to 0.75 points < 40% and ≤ 60% - 0.75 to 1.25 points <60% and ≤ 80% - 1.25 to 1.75 points < 80% and ≤ 100% - 1.75 to 2.0 points
Adoption and Digital Opportunity Efforts 1.25 Points Possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The organization outlined its digital literacy training, marketing campaigns, and outreach efforts, including in-person and virtual town hall meetings and surveys - 0.5 pts - It confirmed participation in Lifeline or similar federal subsidy program and shared viable digital opportunity plans – 0.25 pts - It identifies key stakeholders (municipalities, chambers of commerce, economic development organizations, educational institutions, healthcare, libraries, public safety, and other CAIs) describing each party’s commitment/project role – 0.25 pts - The organization also detailed activities to increase adoption awareness and provided supporting documentation on partnerships with school districts and colleges to promote programs that enhance digital opportunity – 0.25 pts
Service Speed Offers, associated price points, relevant offer information and Affordability 2.25 Points Possible	Provided service speeds and associated price points (at least 3 offers) - 0.5 pts per offer provided (up to 1.5 points awarded). Provided installation, equipment and non-recurring charges – 0.25 pts each (up to .75 points awarded)
Service Speed Offers 2.25 Points Possible	Are ALL speeds symmetric services? (Y/N)
Applicant Historical Performance 1 Point Possible	Previous projects completed on time and on budget or to updated KOBD terms – 1.0 pts Provided documentation of completing projects on time and on budget but no experience in Kansas – 0.75 pts Previous projects completed but not within KOBD or other customer terms - 0.5 pts Projects deemed incomplete, company under audit or investigation or pending litigation or unfavorable litigation outcome from previous project - 0 pts
Total Possible Points for Application Quality Review – 21	

Technical Review

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
<p>Technical Project Summary</p> <p>3 Points Possible</p>	<p>Provides a strong and detailed technical narrative on why this area was chosen and is unlikely to be served without grant funding. Includes an explanation of terrain, population density, or other factors contributing to cost across all items (terrain, population density and other factors).</p> <p>Provides service-level options, including speed and latency offered with additional details to provide insight into how the speed and latency values will be supported.</p> <p>(3.0 to 2.5 Points)</p>	<p>Provides a detailed technical narrative on why this area was chosen and is unlikely to be served without grant funding. Includes a detailed explanation of terrain, population density, or other factors contributing to cost in generalities in one or two of the three items listed: terrain, population density, other factors.</p> <p>Provides service-level options, including speed and latency offered with additional details to provide insight into how the speed and latency values will be supported.</p> <p>(2.5 to 2.0 Points)</p>	<p>Provides a general technical narrative on why this area was chosen and is unlikely to be served without grant funding succinctly. Includes an explanation of terrain, population density, or other factors contributing to cost in generalities.</p> <p>Provides service-level options, including speed and latency offered.</p> <p>(2.0 to 1.25 Points)</p>	<p>Provides a limited technical narrative on why this area was chosen (very little or no cost information, number of locations passed and density of locations) and is unlikely to be served without grant funding. Includes an Explanation of terrain, population density, or other factors contributing to cost (is limited to providing less than three.)</p> <p>When addressing Service-level options, including speed and latency offered, only mentions one of the two items (either speed or latency, but not both).</p> <p>(1.25 to 0.25 Points)</p>	<p>No technical project summary provided.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>

Technical Review Continued

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
Scalability 3 Points Possible	<p>There is substantial evidence to demonstrate the solution proposed is scalable and a future-proof investment in the area proposed to be served (fiber cable infrastructure proposed + middle mile). Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment (using XGS PON or NG-PON electronics in initial deployment) with middle mile able to support the 10G/10G solution.</p> <p>(3.0 to 2.75 Points)</p>	<p>There is strong evidence to demonstrate the solution proposed is scalable and a future-proofed investment in the area proposed to be served (fiber cable infrastructure proposed). Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment (using XGS PON or NG-PON electronics in initial deployment).</p> <p>(2.50 to 2.00 Points)</p>	<p>There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate the solution proposed is scalable and a future-proof investment in the area proposed to be served (fiber cable infrastructure proposed). Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment.</p> <p>(1.75 to 1.00 Points)</p>	<p>There is limited evidence to demonstrate the solution proposed is scalable and a future-proof investment in the area proposed to be served (fiber not used in deployment). Potentially capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment but no disclosure of electronics to support 10G / 10G service.</p> <p>(0.75 to 0.25 Points)</p>	<p>Little to no evidence to demonstrate the ability to scale to 10G / 10G within the project.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>

Technical Review Continued

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
BSL List Submitted to Specifications 5 Points Possible	Provided all data in the following template columns on a per Location ID basis: provider_id brand_name location_id technology max_advertised_downlo ad_speed max_advertised_upload_ speed low_latency business_residential_co de (5.0 to 4.25 Points)	Provided all data in the following template columns on a per Location ID basis: provider id location ID technology max_advertised_downlo ad_speed max_advertised_upload_ speed Plus either low latency or business_residential code (4.0 to 3.25 Points)	Provided all data in the following template columns on a per Location ID basis: provider_id location id technology max_advertised_downlo ad_speed max_advertised_upload_ speed (3.0 to 2.25 Points)	Missing BSL IDs or included BSLs that are served by qualified broadband speeds with fiber or coax services. Provided data in two or less of the following template columns: provider_id brand_name location_id technology max_advertised_downlo ad_speed max_advertised_upload_ speed low_latency business_residential_co de (2.0 to 0.25 Points)	No list submitted. (0 Points)

Technical Review Continued

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points Description
Project Maps 3 Points Possible	The organization uploaded a KMZ map in a ZIP file - 0.25 pts Details the routes for all new plant funding - 0.25 pts Identifies existing infrastructure supporting the proposed build out - 0.50 pts Marked end-point connections, including households, businesses, and anchor institutions, while specifying the type of access (fiber, coax, etc.). - 0.50 pts One map designated as private / proprietary - 0.5 pts One map designated as public - 0.5 pts Adhered to location color coding rules - 0.25 pts Properly shaded the proposed service area - 0.25 pts
Downstream 4 Points Possible	Improvement and Service Speed Plan. See chart below.
Upstream 4 Points Possible	Improvement and Service Speed Plan. See chart below.
Service partners: Role is clearly defined and letters of commitment are provided 2 Point Possible	Letter dated and organization's logo at the top of the letter head. Identifies partner relationship - 0.25 points Stated the role of the organization – 0.5 pts Approving person's signature included - 0.25 points If indicated that service partners are not needed to complete project – 1.0 points
Physical Infrastructure & Network Architecture Plan 6 Points Possible	Section 1: (select one option) - Fiber only (2 points) - Fiber with wireless (1.5 points) - HFC only (1 point) - HFC with wireless (1 point) - Fixed Wireless only (1 point) - Satellite (0.5 points) Section 2: - Network plan provided a comprehensive plan with end point equipment (1 point) - Documented path from end point to entrance including equipment terminating signal (1 point) - Documented path and associated key equipment from network entrance point to carrier's point of presence (1 point) - Provide the details to understand equipment being used and how data traverse the network from end user to internet cloud (1 point)
Total Points Possible for Technical Review – 30	

Downstream/Upstream Scoring

Downstream Improvement Points									
Current Downstream Speed >>>	<10M	10M to 25M	25M to 100M	100M to 200M	200M to 500M	500M - 1G	1G - 5G	5G - 10G	
"To Be Offered" Speeds	100M	2.67	2.40	2.13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	200M	2.93	2.67	2.40	1.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	500M	3.20	2.93	2.67	1.87	0.53	N/A	N/A	N/A
	940M / 1G	3.47	3.20	2.93	2.13	0.80	N/A	N/A	N/A
	1G - 5G	3.73	3.47	3.20	2.40	1.07	0.20	N/A	N/A
	5G - 10G	4.00	3.73	3.47	2.67	1.33	0.53	0.27	N/A

Upstream Improvement Points											
Current Upstream Speed >>>	<1M	1 to 5M	5 to 10M	10 to 20M	20 to 50M	50 to 100M	100M to 200M	200M to 500M	500M to 1G	1G+	
"To Be Offered" Speeds	20M	2.13	1.87	1.60	1.33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	50M	2.40	2.13	1.87	1.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	100M	2.67	2.40	2.13	1.87	1.60	0.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	200M	2.93	2.67	2.40	2.13	1.87	1.07	0.27	N/A	N/A	N/A
	500M	3.20	2.93	2.67	2.40	2.13	1.33	0.53	0.27	N/A	N/A
	940M / 1G	3.47	3.20	2.93	2.67	2.40	1.60	0.80	0.53	0.27	N/A
	1G - 5G	3.73	3.47	3.20	2.93	2.67	1.87	1.07	0.80	0.53	N/A
	5G - 10G	4.00	3.73	3.47	3.20	2.93	2.13	1.33	1.07	0.80	N/A

Financial Review

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
Budget Narrative and Bill of Materials Financial Review 1.75 Points Possible	<p>Applicant used the Budget Template and BOM Template. Budget reflects allowable costs consistent with the program scope. Budget and Bill of Materials only reflect allowable costs, no unallowable costs are included in either the Budget or Bill of Materials. Highly detailed Budget Narrative and Bill of Materials that justify the total project budget using the provided templates.</p> <p>(1.75 to 1.5 Points)</p>	<p>Applicant used the Budget Template and BOM Template. Budget reflects allowable costs consistent with the program scope. Budget or Bill of Materials can reflect minor, immaterial unallowable costs, but not in both items. Detailed Budget Narrative and Bill of Materials that justify the total project budget using the provided templates. Budget Template and BOM template total costs are the same.</p> <p>(1.25 to 1.0 Points)</p>	<p>Applicant used the Budget Template and BOM Template. Budget reflects allowable costs consistent with the program scope. Budget and Bill of Materials can reflect minor, immaterial unallowable costs. Provides a general description of the Budget Narrative and Bill of Materials that justifies the total project budget using the provided templates. Budget Template and BOM template total costs are the same.</p> <p>(0.75 to 0.5 Points)</p>	<p>Applicant used the Budget Template and BOM Template. Budget reflects some material unallowable costs inconsistent with the program scope. Budget Narrative and / or Bill of Materials partially filled out and lacking required details such as category descriptions, quantities, unit costs, line-item descriptions. Budget Template and BOM template total costs are not the same.</p> <p>(0.25 Points)</p>	<p>No Budget Narrative, Budget or Bill of Materials provided.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>

Financial Review Continued

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points Description
Bill of Materials Review 2.75 Points Possible	Project documentation includes: - Manufacturer & model numbers for all equipment – 0.75 pt - Individual device costs and a summary of each line item - 0.25 pts - Identifies design and engineering costs - 0.25 pts - Expenses for fiber, HFC, wireless or satellite head-end equipment - 0.25 pts - Construction costs - 0.25 pts - Outside plant infrastructure, backhaul cable and permitting expenses - 0.25 pts - Subscriber equipment costs for fiber, fixed wireless, or mobile wireless are detailed - 0.25 pts - Labor costs - 0.25 pts - The Bill of Materials aligns with project goals, ensuring clear identification of subcomponents and associated costs without unnecessary or vague groupings - 0.25 pts
Applicant Match 1.25 Points Possible	Additional match >10% of total project cost: 1.25 points Additional match between 8% to 9.99% of total project cost: 1.0 points Additional match between 5% to 7.99% of total project cost: 0.75 points Additional match between 3% to 4.99% of total project cost: 0.5 points Additional match between 1% and 2.99% of total project cost: 0.25 points No additional match provided on top of required amount or additional match is less than 1% of total project cost: 0 points
Co-Investment 1.25 Points Possible	10% or greater of total project cost: 1.25 points Greater than or equal to 8% and less than 10% of total project cost: 1.15 points Greater than or equal to 6% and less than 8% of total project cost: 1.0 points Greater than or equal to 4% and less than 6% of total project cost: 0.75 point Greater than or equal to 2% and less than 4% of total project cost: 0.5 point Greater than 0% and less than 2% of total project cost: 0.25 point
Bank Verification Letter 1 Point Possible	- Bank verification letter states applicant has sufficient funds for the project – 1.0 pts. - If bank verification was not provided, applicant provided other acceptable proof demonstrating sufficient funds as noted below –1.0 pts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Companies (Public or Private) providing a bond rating from Moody’s, Standard and Poor’s, or Fitch of Investment Grade at the time an application is submitted. - Does not provide a bank verification letter or other acceptable proof demonstrating sufficient funds - 0 pts.
Income Statement - Financial Validation 1 Point Possible	Income statement for last two years – 1.0 pts Income statement for one of the two years – 0.5 pts No Income statement – 0 pts
Total Points Possible for Financial Review – 9	

Applicant Interview Rubric

Evaluation criteria- 10 points possible	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
Overall Quality of the Application 2 Points Possible	Exceptionally clear, thorough, and well-structured; strongly aligned with program goals; compelling evidence; anticipates challenges with strong solutions. (2.0 – 1.6)	Strong, complete, and well-organized; most aspects detailed and aligned with goals; only minor gaps. (1.5 – 1.1)	Adequate; addresses required elements but may lack depth, polish, or clear goal connections. (1.0 – 0.6)	Incomplete, vague, or poorly structured; significant gaps in clarity, detail, or alignment. (0.5)	Insufficient information to evaluate quality. (0)
Overall Quality of the Interview and Answers to KOBD/Executive Committee Questions 2 Points Possible	Highly articulate, data-driven, and persuasive; deep knowledge; anticipates questions; confident, evidence-based answers. (2.0 – 1.6)	Clear, accurate, and thoughtful; minor areas lack detail but overall strong and responsive. (1.5 – 1.1)	Generally adequate; uneven in clarity, depth, or alignment with application. (1.0 – 0.6)	Vague, inconsistent, or limited understanding of proposal/program requirements. (0.5)	Fails to provide meaningful answers or show understanding. (0)
Community Partners Presence & Support during Interview 1.5 Points Possible	Multiple partners actively present; strong buy-in; articulate clear support; broad, diverse, and meaningful engagement. (1.5 – 1.1)	At least one partner present; provides substantive, well-aligned support; genuine and collaborative engagement. (1.0 – 0.6)	Minimal presence or general support but confirms involvement. (0.5)	Limited presence: support appears tokenized, unclear, or loosely connected. (0)	No partners present or no meaningful evidence of support. (0)
Overall Benefits of the Application on the Community in Comparison to the Overall Cost 4.5 Points Possible	Transformative community benefits that far outweigh cost; clear, measurable impacts with strong evidence. (4.5 – 4.0)	Significant, realistic, well-documented benefits; favorable return on investment; only minor gaps. (3.5 – 3.0)	Plausible and aligned with cost; analysis limited or impacts less compelling. (2.5 – 2.0)	Weakly articulated benefits; difficult to measure; not proportional to cost. (1.5 – 1.0)	No demonstration of benefits or justification relative to cost. (0.5 – 0)
Total Points Possible for Applicant Review – 10					

Impact

Question	Maximum Points Available	Description
Impact – Number of Locations Enabled	30	Impact scores will be based on the number of locations to be enabled by the project. Final scores will be assigned by ranking the projects highest to lowest by number of locations passed. The highest number of locations connected will receive thirty (30) points, the lowest zero (0), and the remainder will be stacked ranked and receive a score based on the number of applicants.