

Opportunity	MII Company Formation					
Application Title	xxx					
Submission #	###					
		Criteria				
Scored Section	Section Weight	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent	
A. Technology Description and Status, Intellectual Property	1	The problem is vaguely described or not identified. No understanding of the affected parties, the scale of the problem, or decision-making processes. The significance of the solution is unclear, with no explanation of customer benefits. The unit of value is not defined. The technology is poorly described, with minimal detail on its function or developmental status. No supporting data or evidence is provided, and uniqueness is not addressed. No discussion of intellectual property is present, with no strategies for portfolio development or landscape analysis included.	The problem is identified but lacks depth. Some information on affected parties and decision-making processes is provided, but the scale and common need are not well articulated. The overall significance of the solution is partially explained, but the focus on customer benefits is weak. The unit of value is vaguely mentioned. The technology is described but lacks clarity on its functionality or developmental status. Some data may be included but lacks strong evidence. Uniqueness is addressed but insufficiently detailed. Intellectual property is mentioned but lacks detail. Strategies for strengthening the portfolio are minimally discussed, and landscape analysis is basic or absent.	The problem is clearly articulated, identifying who is affected, the size of the problem, and its commonality. Some insight into decision-making processes and evaluation of alternatives is provided. The significance of solving the problem is well explained, with a clear focus on customer benefits. The unit of value is defined and relevant. The technology is well described, including its function and developmental status. Strong supporting evidence is provided, including relevant studies and data. The uniqueness of the technology relative to existing solutions is adequately discussed, including indications and use cases. Intellectual property is clearly outlined, with strategies for strengthening the portfolio. A reasonable landscape analysis of the IP is included, identifying competitive aspects.	The problem is compellingly defined, detailing the affected parties, the scale, and its identification as a common need. Insight into decision-making processes, alternative solutions, and evaluation methods is comprehensive. The overall significance of the solution is thoroughly explained, with a strong emphasis on customer benefits. The unit of value is clearly defined and impactful. The technology is comprehensively described, including its functionality and advanced developmental status. Strong data and evidence are presented, demonstrating reliability. The technology's uniqueness is clearly articulated, with specific indications and use cases detailed. Intellectual property is extensively discussed, with well-defined strategies for enhancing the portfolio. A thorough "deep-to-complete" landscape analysis is provided, highlighting competitive advantages and gaps.	Comments
B. Market Analysis and Competition	1	Vague or absent description of value proposition; no clear market segmentation or opportunity size. Market trends are not discussed. Market size is not provided or poorly estimated, with no breakdown of TAM, SAM, or SOM. Little to no detail on the target customer, their priorities, or how the Technology addresses their needs. No competitors or alternatives identified, and competitive advantages are not discussed. No SWOT or competitive analysis matrix provided.	The value proposition is present but lacks depth; some market segmentation is provided, but the opportunity size is unclear. Market trends are briefly mentioned. Market size is estimated but lacks detail on TAM, SAM, or SOM. Bottom-up analysis is vague or missing. Some description of the target customer and stakeholders, but their priorities and value considerations are not clearly defined. Competitors are identified, but competitive advantages are vaguely outlined. A basic competitive analysis matrix or SWOT is provided but lacks depth.	Clear value proposition aligned with a defined target market; market segmentation and opportunity are well described. Market trends support commercial viability. A reasonable estimate of TAM, SAM, and SOM is provided, supported by a bottom-up model based on customer segments. A detailed description of the target customer and stakeholders, including their economic priorities, and why they would value the solution. Competitors and alternatives are well identified, with a solid competitive analysis matrix or SWOT showing some clear advantages of the Technology.	Comprehensive value proposition fully aligned with the target market opportunity. Detailed market segmentation and market trends clearly support the Technology's potential. Well-researched and precise estimates of TAM, SAM, and SOM with a detailed bottom-up model based on customer segments and market conditions. A thorough, data-backed description of the target customer and stakeholders, with clear understanding of their priorities and strong justification for why the Technology meets their needs. Extensive competitive analysis with a detailed matrix or SWOT showing significant advantages over competitors. Clear articulation of how the Technology disrupts or enhances the status quo, with compelling improvements demonstrated.	
C. Commercialization Pathway, Go-to-Market Strategy, and Risk Assessment	2	No clear validation of commercial potential. Business model is either absent or vague, with no detailed value propositions or pro-forma. Timeline, milestones, and regulatory path are missing or insufficiently detailed. No funding sources mentioned. Minimal or no plan to capture market opportunity, raise awareness, or execute the business model. No mention of potential commercial partners or marketing strategies. Lacks discussion of key risks or barriers; no strategies to address these risks are presented.	Some validation of commercial potential is indicated. Business model and value propositions are discussed but lack specificity. Basic timeline and milestones are outlined, with limited regulatory and cost details. Few or general funding sources are identified. Some plan for market entry, but approach to raising awareness and delivering product is vague. Limited engagement with commercial partners; marketing strategy lacks depth. Identifies some technical or commercial risks but lacks specific strategies for addressing them. Key hurdles are vaguely outlined.	Clear validation of commercial potential and a structured business model with specific, operational-level value propositions. A well-defined timeline with milestones and associated costs, as well as a clear regulatory path, are provided. Identifies credible external funding sources. Detailed plan to capture market opportunity, with a defined marketing strategy (e.g., B2C, B2B, B2G) and sales approach. Some engagement with commercial partners and a clear timeline for partnership involvement. Identifies significant technical and commercial risks with practical strategies to mitigate them. Provides a reasonable approach to addressing potential hurdles.	Comprehensive validation of commercial potential, with a detailed business model delivering specific, valuable features to the target customer. A robust timeline with specific milestones, credible cost estimates, and a clear regulatory path is included. Clearly leverages a range of funding sources. Comprehensive strategy to execute the business model, including a well-defined target marketing strategy and detailed awareness-raising plan. Initial contact with commercial partners or investors that demonstrate compelling interest levels, with substantiated potential to continue supporting the company beyond the project period. Thorough analysis of technical and commercial risks, with well-developed strategies to address each risk. Identifies specific hurdles and detailed contingency plans to ensure progress.	
D. Project Milestones, and Detailed Budget/Justification	2	Lacks a clear timeline or detailed milestones. No indication of mid-term milestones or progress benchmarks. No evidence of commercial significance or proof-of-concept data collection. Budget is incomplete or lacks detail. Cost justification is unclear, and no adjustments protocol is provided.	Basic timeline and milestones are provided, but the connection to commercial relevance is weak. Few milestones are quantifiable or lack mid-term clarity. Minimal proof-of-concept data collection is mentioned. Budget is outlined but lacks itemization. Justification for some costs is provided, though limited. Some detail on adjustment protocol, but unclear.	Clear timeline and quantifiable milestones with a reasonable scope. Includes mid-term milestones and data collection to support commercial value. Each milestone has some evidence supporting commercial significance. Detailed, itemized budget with clear cost justification. Includes a clear protocol for adjustments with approval requirements.	Comprehensive, quantifiable milestones with a well-defined timeline, mid-term targets, and commercial relevance. Specific proof-of-concept data collection supports commercial potential. A Gantt chart or similar visual tool effectively illustrates the project timeline. Thorough, itemized budget with strong justification for each expense.	
E. Executive Summary & Team	1	Missing key elements, or sections are incomplete. Lacks clarity and does not engage the reviewer's interest. Problem and solution are unclear, with minimal or no market size, opportunity, or competitive landscape description. Little to no information on why the company is uniquely positioned, and evidence of customer interest is missing. Lacks product development and go-to-market strategy details. No clear description of team or relevant experience; gaps in essential personnel are not addressed. No prior funding sources listed, or financial projections are missing or vague.	Provides most elements but lacks depth or conciseness; only moderately engaging. Identifies the problem but lacks details on market size, opportunity, or competition. Gives some company background but lacks specificity on competitive advantages and customer value. Mentions product development and go-to-market strategies but lacks detail on costs, pricing, or sales strategy. Lists team members but provides limited information on expertise; team gaps are vaguely addressed. Mentions prior funding but lacks detail. Financial projections are general, with minimal ask details.	Provides a clear and engaging summary with most key elements well-covered. Defines the problem, target market, and competition with a reasonable level of detail. Clearly explains why the company can address the problem, with evidence of customer interest. Provides some unique qualities and competitive advantages. Describes product development and go-to-market strategies with moderate clarity, including cost and sales approach. Describes relevant team members with key experience and qualifications. Mentions plans to address team gaps if needed. Lists previous funding sources and provides a basic financial projection with a funding ask and timeline.	Comprehensive, concise, and highly engaging summary that covers all elements and piques strong interest. Clearly defines the problem, solution, and significant market opportunity with a detailed competitive landscape. Articulates the company's unique positioning and value proposition, supported by strong evidence of customer interest and competitive advantage. Provides a robust description of product development, pricing, and a clear go-to-market strategy, with specific cost and sales projections. Presents an experienced, qualified team with expertise directly supporting commercial success. Shows clear plans for future hires, if needed. Lists all prior funding, including sources and use, along with detailed, realistic financial projections and a well-defined funding ask and timeline.	