

# HDTX Industry Day JPEO CBRN v0-1 Evaluation Criteria Defined



		DEFINITION
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<i>weight 5%</i>	Write a clear, concise description of what problem your innovation address and how you (aim to) solve that problem.
<b>COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE</b>	<b>GAP ANALYSIS</b>	Define the gap between today's status quo and what your solution aims to deliver. How "painful" is today's status quo for your (potential) customers relative to what you offer? Is this a need they are ready to spend money to address?
	<b>SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES</b>	Prove your prospective customers will choose you given limited resources and myriad choices. Have you accounted for indirect substitute products as well as direct competitors?
	<b>DEGREE OF INNOVATION</b>	Prove that your solution is truly innovative. How big a departure from existing technical and/or operational approaches is your solution?
	<b>DATA QUALITY, COMPETITIVE</b>	Use data to substantiate your claims of competitive superiority. You're pitching to some of the Army's top technologists. They live and breathe data! Show us quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources.
<i>weight 15%</i>		
<b>POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</b>	<b>OPERATIONAL IMPACT</b>	This Dimension is for the Army judges to figure out. It is their job – not yours! – to connect the dots and determine how your innovation can impact the Army. At the scale of a single Army end-user, how would their jobs or lives will be significantly improved if this solution were adopted? What is the impact of this solution for a soldier/Army civilian vs. today's solutions?
	<b>SCALE OF IMPACT</b>	This Dimension is for the Army judges to figure out. It is their job – not yours! – to connect the dots and determine how your innovation can impact the Army. If you have direct knowledge of your potential within DoD, please _briefly_ make your case. Otherwise, don't spend your valuable time on this one)
<i>weight 25%</i>		
<b>CLINICAL RISK</b>	<b>SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY</b>	Is the science behind the solution sound? Convince readers who don't have deep expertise in your field that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and engineering principles.
	<b>ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES</b>	Point to the foundational technologies that you rely on to deliver your solution. Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk? Using proven (and ideally Army-fielded) underlying technologies and techniques helps to lower technical risk.
	<b>RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS</b>	Prove that you understand the technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution. What are your top areas of risk, why, and what is your plan to mitigate those risks?
	<b>DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL</b>	Use data to substantiate your claims that your technical risk mitigation plans are credible. You're pitching to some of the Army's top technologists. They live and breathe data! Show us quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources.
<i>weight 35%</i>		
<b>COMMERCIAL RISK</b>	<b>COMPETITIVE EDGE</b>	Why will you win? A small company needs to have a Competitive Edge in the marketplace: Something you do better than anyone else. This might be intellectual property, unmatched relevant expertise, a novel business model, channel partners, network effects, etc.
	<b>TEAM QUALIFICATIONS</b>	Do you have the key people and core capabilities you need? The Qualifications include not only the ability to perform the research and development but also to successfully commercialize the results.
	<b>COMMERCIALIZATION POTENTIAL</b>	Is there a commercial market for this solution that the DoD can build upon? Dual use technologies tend to advance at a faster pace, which can be helpful. If your solution is dual use, please explain. Give the judges a clear sense of your past success and future potential in commercial applications.
<i>weight 15%</i>		
<b>SUBMISSION QUALITY</b>	<i>weight 5%</i>	Prove you write clearly. Prove you argue convincingly.

# HDTX Industry Day JPEO CBRN v0-1 Evaluation Criteria



		UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	SATISFACTORY	SUPERIOR	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<i>weight 5%</i>	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 the target problem and solution.	
	<b>COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE</b>	<b>GAP ANALYSIS</b>	Current solutions deliver satisfactory outcomes.	Current solutions deliver mostly satisfactory outcomes.	Current solutions deliver mostly unsatisfactory outcomes.	Current solutions deliver completely unsatisfactory outcomes.
		<b>SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES</b>	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.
		<b>DEGREE OF INNOVATION</b>	No departure from existing technological or operational approaches.	Slight departure from existing technological or operational approaches.	Significant departure from existing technological or operational approaches.	Radical departure from existing technological or operational approaches.
	<i>weight 15%</i>	<b>DATA QUALITY, COMPETITIVE</b>	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.
<b>POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</b>		<b>OPERATIONAL IMPACT</b>	If successful, no improvement vs. existing technological approaches.	If successful, slight improvement vs. existing technological approaches.	If successful, significant improvement vs. existing technological approaches.	If successful, radical improvement vs. existing technological approaches.
	<i>weight 25%</i>	<b>SCALE OF IMPACT</b>	A fully deployed, mature solution could impact only niche use cases.	A fully deployed, mature solution could impact a DOD organization.	A fully deployed, mature solution could impact several DOD organizations.	A fully deployed, mature solution could have impact across the entire DOD.
<b>CLINICAL RISK</b>		<b>SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY</b>	No scientific basis for presented approach.	Incomplete scientific basis for presented approach.	Credible scientific basis for presented approach.	Convincing scientific basis for presented approach.
		<b>ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES</b>	Requires nonexistent or unavailable technology.	Requires emerging, cutting edge technology.	Requires proven technologies.	Requires Army-fielded technologies.
		<b>RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS</b>	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.
	<i>weight 35%</i>	<b>DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL</b>	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.
<b>COMMERCIAL RISK</b>		<b>COMPETITIVE EDGE</b>	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.
		<b>TEAM QUALIFICATIONS</b>	Seriously flawed. Team requires new talent.	Capable of limited progress. Team recognizes gaps in personnel, but presents no plan to address needs.	Capable of significant progress. Team presents specific plan to address personnel needs.	Highly capable. Team with excellent composition. No near-term personnel gaps.
	<i>weight 15%</i>	<b>COMMERCIALIZATION POTENTIAL</b>	Gov't-only technology.	Marginal commercial adoption or potential.	Some commercial adoption or potential.	Impressive commercial adoption or potential.
<b>SUBMISSION QUALITY</b>	<i>weight 5%</i>	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.	