

BAG 6.0: Middle 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 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 4 Points Possible	Highly detailed summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program. Details how the project will provide areas with high speed and scalable middle mile services through demonstrating cost structure changes and pricing changes. (4.0 – 3.25 Points)	Detailed summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program but missing details in one of the two areas (platform cost reduction or pricing reduction). Details how the project will provide areas with high speed and scalable middle mile services. (3.0 to 2.25 Points)	General summary of the project and clear that project will meet goals of program. Generally, describes how the project will meet program goals but without substantial detail in any of the items (speeds, pricing, cost structure, technology used, etc.) (2.0 to 1.25 Points)	Summary of the project provided, unclear that project will meet goals of program. Limited details on how the project will meet program goals. (1.0 to 0.25 Points)	Little to no information provided in the project summary or project priorities. (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 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 plan (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 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 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 number of carriers to be served 3 Points Possible	Did the applicant provide the number of other carriers potentially interested in purchasing middle mile services from this infrastructure when completed? (Y/N)
What percentage of counties in the proposed project is targeted to reach the economically disadvantaged? 3 Points Possible	≤ 20% - .25 points <20% and ≤ 40% - 0.5 to 0.75 points < 40% and ≤ 60% - 1.0 to 1.50 points <60% and ≤ 80% - 1.75 to 2.25 points < 80% and ≤ 100% - 2.5 to 3.0 points
Service Speed Offers, associated price points, relevant offer information and Affordability 5 Points Possible	Provided service speeds and associated price points (at least 3 offers) – 1 point awarded per offer provided (up to 3 points awarded). Provided pricing for the following (up to 2.0 total points awarded): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port charges – 0.5 points • Mileage – 0.25 points • Transport bandwidth 0.5 points • Equipment – 0.25 points • Set Up Fees – 0.25 points • Other – 0.25 points
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>6 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, latency, and scalability will be supported.</p> <p>(6.0 to 5.0 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, latency, and scalability will be supported.</p> <p>(4.75 to 4.00 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. Minimal to no mention of scalability.</p> <p>(3.75 to 3.0 Points)</p>	<p>Provides a limited technical narrative on why this area was chosen (very little or no cost information and density of locations) and why this area 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) and no mention of scalability.</p> <p>(2.0 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 5 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). Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment.</p> <p>(5.0 to 4.0 Points)</p>	<p>There is strong evidence to demonstrate the solution proposed is scalable and a future-proof investment in the area proposed to be served. Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment</p> <p>(3.75 to 3.0 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. Capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment.</p> <p>(2.75 to 2.0 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. Potentially capable of achieving 10G / 10G or higher speeds with initial deployment but no disclosure of electronics to support 10G / 10G service.</p> <p>(1.75 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

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points Description
Project Maps 3 Points Possible	The organization uploaded a KMZ map in a ZIP file - 0.25 pts Provides details of 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 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 5 Points Possible	Improvement and Service Speed Plan. See chart below.
Upstream 5 Points Possible	Improvement and Service Speed Plan. See chart below
Service partners: Role is clearly defined and letters of commitment are provided 1 Point Possible	Letter dated and organization's logo at the top of the letter head. Identifies partner relationship - 0.25 points States the role of the organization - 0.5 pts Approving person's signature. - 0.25 points If indicated that service partners are not needed to complete project – 1.0 points
Physical Infrastructure & Network Architecture Plan 5 Points Possible	Section 1: (select one option) - Fiber only (3.0 points) - Any other technology (0.0 points) Section 2: (award points for each item) - Network plan provides a comprehensive plan with end point equipment (0.5 points) - Documented path from end point to entrance including equipment terminating signal (0.5 points) - Documented path and associated key equipment from network entrance point to carries point of (0.5 points) - Provides the detail to understand equipment being used and how data traverse the network from end user to internet cloud (0.50 points)
Total Points Possible for Technical Review – 30	

Symmetrical Downstream/Upstream Middle Mile Scoring

Middle Mile Downstream and Upstream 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	1G - 5G	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.50	1.25	N/A	N/A
	5G - 10G	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.50	N/A
	10G - 50G	3.50	3.25	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.75
	50G - 100G	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.25	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.25
	100G - 400G	4.50	4.25	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.25	3.00	2.75
	400G+	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.25

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 or 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 justifies 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 justifies 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 and equipment - 0.50 pts - Construction costs - 0.25 pts - Backhaul cable and permitting expenses - 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: .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	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 Interview – 10					

Impact

Question	Maximum Points Available	Description
Impact – Transport Pricing, Percent Price Improvement	30	Impact scores will be based on the transport price improvements to be enabled by the project. Final scores will be assigned by ranking the projects highest to lowest by percentage price improvements. The highest percentage improvement will receive thirty (30) points, the lowest percentage price improvement will receive zero (0) points, and the remainder will be stacked ranked and receive a score based on the applicant's percentage price improvements.