

Exhibit D
AI Innovation Challenge Administration Grant Program
Administrator Application Scoring Matrix

If all eligibility requirements for applicants are met, AI Innovation Challenge execution proposals will be evaluated by NJEDA staff according to the scoring criteria outlined.

General Proposal Criteria	Scoring
I. Sector Focus: <i>Applicant’s demonstrated expertise in technical and non-technical capabilities in Artificial Intelligence (Maximum: 10 points)</i>	
<p>Does the Applicant demonstrate expertise in Artificial Intelligence (AI) through a combination of technical and non-technical resources and activities, ensuring a well-rounded capability to meet the AI Challenge’s objectives? (Maximum available points: 10)</p> <p>Technical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AI-focused Challenges or Competitive Events: prior experience in designing, managing, or executing challenges, hackathons, or competitive events specifically focused on AI innovation. • Collaboration with Academic Institutions on AI Initiatives or Research: track record of partnerships with academic institutions to advance AI research, develop AI-related educational programs, or collaborate on AI-focused innovation. • Development, Programming, and Management of AI Tools: direct expertise in creating, programming, implementing, incubating, or managing AI solutions, with a focus on generative AI and handling structured/unstructured datasets. • Experience in Real-World Applications of AI: proven track record of implementing AI in practical, industry-relevant scenarios, including but not limited to healthcare, climate, finance, or education. <p>Non-technical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in AI: portfolio of SMEs recognized as experts in the AI field, with demonstrated knowledge 	<p>0-4 points – Applicant demonstrates expertise in 2 or fewer technical and non-technical capabilities with minimal evidence to support this.</p> <p>5-8 points – Applicant demonstrates expertise in 3 to 5 technical and non-technical capabilities (with at least 1 technical), and provides evidence to support this.</p> <p>9-10 points – Applicant demonstrates expertise in 6 or more technical and non-technical capabilities (with at least 2 technical). Evidence is highly detailed, supported by specific examples (e.g., project portfolios, successful initiatives, events or partnerships).</p>

<p>and experience in areas such as generative AI development, programming, or implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff expertise in AI: evidence of relevant expertise among the Applicant’s senior leadership or staff, which may include prior roles or projects outside their current entity (e.g., in academia, industry, or startups) • Industry Partnerships in AI: track record of partnerships with AI-focused companies to secure in-kind support (e.g., APIs, cloud credits). • Outreach and Community Engagement in AI: demonstrated ability to build and sustain AI-focused communities or networks, ensuring diverse and broad participation. <p><i>(Note: experience in utilization of generative AI tools is insufficient)</i></p>	
---	--

II. AI Challenge Structure and Programming: *Applicant’s demonstrated ability to develop and execute the AI Challenge (Maximum: 45 points)*

<p>Does the proposal provide a comprehensive plan for the AI Challenge’s programming with the following components?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • format (virtual/in-person/hybrid) of the Initial Competitive Event, Virtual Showcase, and Demo Day Event, with any in-person components hosted in New Jersey • planned activities • participant journey • an accessible and user-friendly website to host virtual components of the AI Challenge • communication method to respond to participants’ inquiries <p>Does it demonstrate how these elements will maximize participant engagement and achievement of the AI Challenge’s scope?</p> <p>(Maximum available points: 10 + 5 bonus points*)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Programming details are unclear or generic, and not well-justified in terms of ensuring engagement and achievement of the AI Challenge’s objectives</p> <p>5-8 points – Programming is adequately detailed, with a clear outline of some components, supported by rationale for participant engagement and alignment with the AI Challenge’s objectives</p> <p>9-10 points – Programming is highly detailed with a clear outline of all components. The plan demonstrates how the programming aligns with the AI Challenge’s objectives, fosters engagement, and includes measurable outcomes to assess impact, which may include well-documented strategies for achieving results.</p> <p>*5 bonus points – for applicants that demonstrate prior experience in organizing Demo Day/Showcase or similar events to present winning Companies at the end of competitive events</p>
---	---

<p>Does the proposal outline a comprehensive strategy to engage the applicant’s network of partners and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) during the AI Challenge to offer strategic support/mentorship to AI Challenge winners (e.g. mentorship program, advisory board, office hours etc.)? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Engagement plan lacks specificity and provides minimal details on how SMEs and partners will support the AI Challenge winners.</p> <p>5-8 points – Engagement plan is adequately detailed, with clear roles for SMEs and partners and a reasonable structure for their involvement.</p> <p>9-10 points – Engagement plan is highly detailed and well-structured, with clearly defined roles and contributions expected from SMEs and partners. The proposal demonstrates a strong alignment with the AI Challenge’s objectives, includes diverse expertise across relevant domains, and provides clear mechanisms for winners’ access and support. Metrics for evaluating the impact of SMEs and partners’ engagement are included.</p>
<p>Does the proposal demonstrate a clear and actionable plan to provide in-kind services to AI Challenge participants, such as cloud infrastructure, APIs, or relevant software tools to enable effective project development and testing? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Minimal details or evidence regarding the applicant’s ability to provide in-kind services, with limited relevance to participant needs or no clear plan for accessibility and utilization.</p> <p>5-8 points – Evidence of adequate range of in-kind services with reasonable relevance to participant needs. Some details are provided on accessibility and utilization.</p> <p>9-10 points – Highly detailed and comprehensive plan for in-kind services provided, offering a wide range of relevant tools (e.g., cloud infrastructure, APIs, software) tailored to participant needs. Accessibility, customization, and scalability are well-defined, with strong partnerships and technical support mechanisms included.</p>
<p>Does the proposal demonstrate the Administrator's ability to conduct effective outreach and marketing to attract qualified participants for the AI Challenge, ensuring strong alignment with the AI Challenge’s objectives? (Maximum available points: 5)</p>	<p>0-1 points – Outreach and marketing strategies are vague and lack clear methods for reaching AI Challenge participants.</p> <p>2-3 points – Outreach and marketing strategies are adequately detailed, with some evidence of methods to attract a qualified participant pool. Includes basic mechanisms for tracking the effectiveness of marketing efforts.</p> <p>4-5 points – Outreach and marketing strategies are highly detailed and aligned with the AI Challenge’s objectives. The proposal demonstrates a strong focus on attracting a qualified participant pool and may include details such as communication channels, and evidence of previously successful outreach</p>

	<p>campaigns. Clear metrics for evaluating the success of outreach efforts are included.</p>
<p>Does the proposal provide a clear and effective plan for offering legal and Intellectual Property (IP) support to AI Challenge participants, ensuring they understand their rights and obligations when developing and sharing their software projects? (Maximum available points: 5)</p>	<p>0-1 points – Legal and IP support is minimally addressed, with little evidence of relevance to participant needs or mechanisms for accessibility.</p> <p>2-3 points – Compelling plan for legal and IP support, with adequate detail about the scope, relevance, and accessibility of services.</p> <p>4-5 points – Detailed and well-structured plan for legal and IP support, offering accessible resources (e.g., consultations, workshops) provided by qualified experts or reputable organizations.</p>
<p>III. Selection and Management of Sub-Grants: <i>Applicant’s demonstrated ability to select and manage sub-grant awards for AI Challenge winners (Maximum: 25 points)</i></p>	
<p>Does the proposal include a comprehensive scoring matrix for evaluating and selecting the AI Challenge winners, ensuring alignment with the AI Challenge’s objectives, viability of software prototype, and include NJEDA’s requirements for sub-grant awardees? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Scoring matrix lacks sufficient detail to ensure alignment with the AI Challenge objectives, NJEDA’s requirements for sub-grant awardees and prototype viability.</p> <p>5-8 points – Scoring matrix is adequately detailed, with some metrics to ensure alignment with AI Challenge objectives, NJEDA’s requirements for sub-grant awardees and prototype viability.</p> <p>9-10 points – Scoring matrix is highly detailed, with well-defined metrics to ensure alignment with the AI Challenge’s objectives, full integration of NJEDA’s requirements for sub-grant awardees, and prototype viability including functionality, scalability, and implementation feasibility is ensured.</p>
<p>Does the proposal include a proposed panel of diverse, qualified, and relevant judges, including AI-domain specific experts and SMEs aligned with the AI Challenge’s scope, to ensure fair and effective evaluation of AI Challenge winners? (Maximum available points: 5)</p>	<p>0-1 points – Proposed judges for the panel possess insufficient or irrelevant expertise related to the AI Challenge’s scope.</p> <p>2-3 points – Panel includes some relevant AI-domain specific experts and SMEs but lacks diversity and a comprehensive engagement plan.</p> <p>4-5 points – Panel includes a diverse mix of qualified AI-domain specific experts and SMEs, and aligns strongly with the AI Challenge’s scope, with defined mechanisms to ensure fairness, impartiality, and active engagement.</p>

<p>Does the Administrator demonstrate a clear, detailed, and effective plan for managing sub-grant awards, tracking the AI Challenge winners' progress against milestones, ensuring compliance with reporting requirements, conducting post-Demo Day check-ins, and maintaining transparency through a public project dashboard? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points –Plan lacks sufficient or key details for sub-grant management and reporting</p> <p>5-8 points – Plan is adequately detailed, and includes some details for sub-grant management and reporting</p> <p>9-10 points – Plan is highly detailed and comprehensive, with clear processes for managing sub-grants, tracking progress, and reporting deliverables to NJEDA. It includes robust plans for regular post-Demo Day check-ins and maintaining a well-structured public dashboard to ensure transparency and accountability.</p>
---	--

IV. Project Execution: *Applicant's demonstrated ability to execute the AI Challenge on time and on budget (Maximum: 20 points)*

<p>Does the proposal convincingly demonstrate readiness and ability to fully execute the AI Challenge within a maximum of 4 months, as demonstrated by such items as detailed timelines, Gantt chart, and clear milestones? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Proposal lacks sufficient detail, with incomplete timelines, milestones, or Gantt charts, and minimal evidence of readiness to meet the 4-month execution window</p> <p>5-8 points – Proposal demonstrates moderate readiness with a basic timeline, milestones, and Gantt chart, but the execution plan lacks depth or complete structure to ensure success within 4 months</p> <p>9-10 – Proposal is highly detailed and well-structured, with a comprehensive timeline, clear milestones, and Gantt chart, demonstrating strong readiness and a clear path to complete the AI Challenge within 4 months. Proposal also includes evidence of Applicant's ability to execute prior projects within similar timelines.</p>
--	---

<p>Does the proposal convincingly demonstrate the financial viability of the Administrator's plan to execute the AI Challenge, including outlining all costs and mitigation for cost overruns? (Maximum available points: 10)</p>	<p>0-4 points – Financial plan is vague or incomplete, lacking a detailed cost breakdown and offering minimal or no evidence of mitigation strategies for cost overruns</p> <p>5-8 points – Financial plan includes an adequate cost breakdown with some evidence of financial viability and basic but underdeveloped strategies for mitigating cost overruns</p> <p>9-10 – Financial plan is highly detailed and comprehensive, with a clear cost breakdown and robust, well-thought-out mitigation strategies for managing cost overruns, demonstrating strong financial planning</p>
---	--

Scoring Summary

Maximum Possible Points	100
Minimum Required Points with Demo Day Experience Bonus	85
Minimum Required Points for all other Applicants	80