

Preliminary Round

| A. Creativity & Innovation (25%) | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Criteria | Poor (1-2) | Fair (3-4) | Satisfactory(5-6) | Good (7-8) | Excellent (9-10) |
| Originality of Idea (10%) – The solution demonstrates novel thinking, a unique approach, or innovative use of technology to address the problem in a fresh and impactful way. | The solution shows no originality; ideas are common or copied with no improvement. | Minimal originality; slight variation of existing ideas but lacks uniqueness. | Some creative elements; idea incorporates moderate innovation but still familiar. | Strong originality; introduces fresh concepts or improvements over existing solutions. | Highly innovative; presents a breakthrough idea or a novel approach rarely seen. |
| Design Creativity (10%) – The solution showcases creative, thoughtful, and engaging design elements, including user interface, user experience, and overall visual execution. | Design is plain, unstructured, or lacks creativity. | Some effort in design but limited creativity or poor UI/UX. | Functional design with moderate creativity; UI/UX is acceptable. | Creative and appealing design elements; UI/UX is engaging and thoughtful. | Highly creative, professional, and visually impressive design with excellent UX. |
| Criteria | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Satisfactory(3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Problem-Solution Fit (5%) – The solution creatively addresses a real need or challenge in a way not commonly seen, clearly connecting innovation to practicality. | The solution does not match the actual problem; weak alignment. | Weak connection between solution and the problem; unclear reasoning. | Adequate alignment; solution addresses some aspects of the problem. | Adequate alignment; solution addresses some aspects of the problem. | Exceptional problem–solution alignment; creatively tackles the need in a rare or uncommon way. |

| B. Impactfulness (20%) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Satisfactory (3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Real-world Adoption (5%) - The solution shows strong potential for real-world implementation, with feasible and practical application readiness. | Unrealistic; cannot be used or implemented in real life. | Significant challenges for adoption; limited practicality. | Possible to adopt with some adjustments; moderate practicality. | Highly feasible and practical for real-world use. | Ready or near-ready for deployment; strong real-world implementation potential. |
| Economic & Social Value (5%) - The solution provides measurable economic, social, or community benefits. | No clear value or benefit. | Minimal value; benefits are unclear or limited. | Provides moderate social or economic benefits. | Shows strong potential for measurable social/economic value. | Delivers significant and meaningful benefits to society or economy. |
| Community & User Engagement (5%) - The solution demonstrates meaningful engagement with communities, users, or partners that supports adoption and long-term use. | No consideration of users or community. | Minimal engagement strategies; unclear user focus. | Some user engagement or consideration of community needs. | Strong engagement strategies; clearly considers users and partners. | Highly impactful engagement; strongly aligned with community/user needs and adoption. |
| Long-term Impact & Continuity (5%) - The solution is flexible, scalable, and adaptable to long-term growth and evolving needs. | Not sustainable; cannot scale or last long. | Limited long-term potential; scalability unclear. | Moderate long-term viability. | Good scalability and long-term relevance. | Highly sustainable; the solution is flexible, scalable, and adaptable. |

| C. Pitch & Presentation (15%) | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Criteria | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Satisfactory (3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Vision Clarity (5%) – The presentation visually supports the project narrative through effective layout, graphics, flow, and visual storytelling. | Visuals unclear or distracting; does not support explanation. | Basic visuals; limited support for narrative. | Visuals moderately support the story; acceptable quality. | Strong visuals that clearly communicate the solution. | Exceptional visual storytelling; enhances clarity and engagement. |
| Holistic Evaluation (5%) – The presentation provides a complete and balanced view of the solution's technical, business, and user aspects. | Major gaps; technical/ business/ user aspects missing. | Covers some areas but lacks completeness. | Provides a moderately complete overview. | Well-balanced explanation of all major aspects. | Fully comprehensive and well-structured across all important dimensions. |
| Information Clarity (5%) – The presentation content is clear, concise, and well-structured, making key information easy to follow and understand. | Confusing, unclear, or disorganized information. | Some key points are unclear or poorly structured. | Understandable but could be better organized. | Clear, concise, and well-structured information. | Extremely clear, engaging, and logically organized content that is easy to understand. |

| D. Problem Solving & Relevance (25%) | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Criteria | Poor (1-2) | Fair (3-4) | Satisfactory(5-6) | Good (7-8) | Excellent (9-10) |
| Solution Impact (10%) –The solution effectively addresses the identified problem and delivers meaningful value. | Little or no impact; does not address the problem. | Limited impact; partially addresses the problem. | Moderate impact; solves key aspects. | Strong impact; effectively solves the problem. | Significant and meaningful impact; fully addresses the problem with high value. |
| Audience Fit (10%) – The solution clearly meets the needs of the intended users or industry and is appropriately tailored to them. | No clear user or industry relevance. | Weak alignment with target users. | Moderately relevant to intended users/industry. | Strong relevance and clear user fit. | Perfectly matched to the needs of the target audience/industry. |
| Criteria | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Satisfactory (3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Feasibility (5%) – The solution is realistic and achievable within reasonable resource, timeline, and implementation constraints. | Unrealistic and unachievable. | Very difficult to implement; lacks practicality. | Achievable with some challenges. | Practical and realistic to implement. | Highly feasible with strong execution potential. |

| E. AI Model / Core Technology (15%) | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Criteria | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Satisfactory(3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| Core Features (5%) – The solution's AI model directly addresses the problem statement and performs the intended tasks. | AI features do not address the problem. | Weak alignment; limited ability to solve the task. | AI features moderately address the problem. | AI performs intended tasks correctly. | AI strongly addresses the problem with high reliability and purpose-fit features. |
| Functionality (5%) – The solution operates with all key features functioning correctly and with minimal errors. | Major errors; solution not functioning. | Frequent bugs; limited function reliability. | Most features work; minor errors. | Stable with minimal issues. | Fully functional, smooth, and error-free. |
| Relevance (5%) – The solution uses data and core technology that align appropriately with the problem statement and support building an effective model. | Dataset irrelevant or inappropriate for the problem. | Dataset partially relevant; significant mismatch. | Moderately relevant dataset; acceptable fit. | Relevant and well-matched dataset. | Highly relevant, well-curated dataset supporting strong model performance. |