Michigan Mobility Funding Platform

SCORING MATRIX

2026 OFME Real World Deployment & Test Site Grants

Eligibility Section

1. Technology: Leverages Mobility technologies (UAS, sensors, AI analytics, aviation platforms, autonomy, electrification, etc.).
2. Local Benefit: Provides direct economic benefits (jobs, cost savings, efficiency, investment).
3. Match: Includes commitment of matching funds with documentation.
4. Deployment: Includes detailed plan with timeline, location(s), and compliance with regulations.
5. Scalability: Shows potential for replication and long-term sustainability.

Is the applicant eligible based on the criteria listed above?

- Yes
- No

Comments regarding eligibility

Open Comment Field

Proposed Project Section

Questions to consider:

- Is the project description clear and comprehensive, including objectives, scope, and deliverables?

- Are measurable outcomes and benefits well-defined? How are metrics for long-term success defined?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 20

- Low score - Vague or incomplete; lacks clarity on objectives, scope, and deliverables.
- Basic description provided; objectives unclear or missing measurable outcomes.
- Clear description of objectives and scope; benefits partially defined.
- Well-developed description; objectives and benefits explained; measurable outcomes mostly clear.
- High score: Comprehensive, innovative, and well-structured; clear deliverables and measurable outcomes.

Proposed Project Score

Open field for number 0-20

Comments

Open Comment Field

Project Team and Partners Section

Questions to consider:

- What kind of relevant experience does the team have?
- Have they deployed previously and demonstrated success?
- Are the roles and responsibilities of the partners clearly defined? Did each partner provide a letter of commitment or support?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 20

- Low score: Team lacks relevant experience, no confirmed partners.
- Limited experience; partners identified but roles unclear.

- Team has some experience; partners identified but contributions vague.
- Experienced team; roles and responsibilities defined; contributions mostly clear.
- High score: Highly experienced team; confirmed partners with clear roles and financial/in-kind commitments.

Project Team and Partners Score

Open field for number 0-20

Comments

Open Comment Field

Technology and Interoperability Section

Questions to consider:

- What is the maturity level of the proposed technology (conceptual, tested, deployed)? Has the technology been successfully implemented in relevant real-world environments?
- Does the project demonstrate strong innovation and interoperability potential?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 20

- Low score: Technology is still in research or conceptual phase; no real-world application.
- Technology has been researched and prototyped but not deployed; readiness unclear.
- Technology developed and tested in limited settings; success unclear or inconsistent.
- Technology proven in controlled or small-scale deployments; shows measurable success and scalability potential.
- High score: Technology is fully mature, deployed successfully in multiple real-world environments, and demonstrates strong innovation and interoperability.

Technology and Interoperability Score

Open field for number 0-20

Comments

Open Comment Field

Project Cost Section

Questions to consider:

- Is the proposed cost realistic and well-justified?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 5

- Low score: Cost is unrealistic or unjustified (meets or exceeds $400,000)
- Budget lacks sufficient justification; cost estimates are incomplete or unsupported.
- Budget is reasonable but missing some detail or justification for key expenses.
- Budget is realistic and well-supported; minor clarifications needed.
- High score: Budget is comprehensive, clearly justified, and demonstrates strong cost realism and alignment with project goals.

Project Cost Score

Open field for number 0-5

Comments

Open Comment Field

Industry Match Funds and In-Kind Contribution Section

Questions to consider:

- Has the applicant secured matching funds or in-kind contributions?
- Are commitments clearly documented and significant relative to project cost?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 5

- Low score: No match identified.
- Minimal match; commitments unclear.
- Partial match; some documentation provided.
- Significant match; commitments mostly documented.
- High score: Full match secured with clear documentation.

Match Score

Open field for number 0-5

Comments

Open Comment Field

Financial Sustainability Section

Questions to consider:

- Does the application demonstrate realistic financial sustainability of the service or company after the demonstration period?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 10

- Low score: No plan for sustainability beyond demonstration.
- Basic plan exists; lacks detail or commitments.
- Plan exists but lacks metrics or confirmed commitments.
- Detailed plan with some commitments and clear metrics.
- High score: Comprehensive sustainability plan with confirmed commitments and funding sources.

Financial Sustainability Score

Open field for number 0-10

Comments

Open Comment Field

State Goal Alignment Section

Questions to consider:

- How clearly does the project align with Michigan's mobility priorities and the MI Future Mobility Plan 2.0?
- How does the proposal demonstrate a direct contribution to Michigan's leadership in mobility?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 10

- Low score: No alignment with MI Future Mobility Plan 2.0 goals or Michigan priorities.
- Minimal alignment; unclear how project supports state objectives.
- Partial alignment; some contribution to Michigan leadership or public-sector use.
- Strong alignment; project likely to advance Michigan's mobility leadership.
- High score: Direct alignment; project will significantly advance Michigan's Mobility leadership and meets goals of MI Future Mobility Plan 2.0?

State Goal Alignment Score

Open field for number 0-10

Comments

Open Comment Field

Overall Project Quality Section

Questions to consider:

- Is the proposal well-organized, clear, and compelling?
- Does it include strong supporting documentation and evidence?

Scoring guide:
Points Total: 10

- Low score: Poorly organized; lacks clarity and supporting evidence.
- Basic structure; significant gaps in clarity or evidence.
- Adequate structure; some gaps in clarity or evidence.
- Well-organized and clear; minor gaps in supporting documentation.
- High score: Highly polished, clear, and compelling; strong supporting documentation.

Overall Project Quality Score

Open field for number 0-10

Comments

Open Comment Field

Application Comments Section

Do you recommend this application moves to the next round? (company interview and due diligence)

- Yes
- No
- Conditional

Overall Comments

Open Comment Field

Total Score (out of 100)