










Evaluation Framework

EMURGO x UNDP Blockchain Accelerator

Version: May 2025

Contents

 Evaluation Framework	1
Contents	1
 Purpose	2
 Key Metrics	2
Metric	3
Description	3
Strong	3
Acceptable	3
Needs Improvement	3
 Blockchain Integration Rate	3
% of teams that implement working blockchain components (VCs, smart contracts, tokens, wallet flows)	3
90–100%	3
70–89%	3
< 70%	3
 Curriculum Completion	3
Modules completed and assignments submitted	3
All 6 modules, on time	3
4–5 modules, minor delays	3
< 4 modules or weak submissions	3
 Mentor & Stakeholder Feedback	3
Ratings from mentors & reviewers	3
4.5–5.0 (out of 5)	3
3.5–4.4	3
< 3.5	3
 Documentation Quality	3
README, architecture, metadata/VC schema	3
Complete, professional repo	3
Mostly complete, needs cleanup	3
Missing files or unclear logic	3
 Working Demo	3
Testnet MVP demonstrating SDG use case	3

Fully functional, clean UX.....	3
Partially working, needs polish.....	3
Broken or incomplete demo.....	3
 SDG Relevance.....	3
Alignment with real SDG need.....	3
Clear link + stakeholder validation.....	3
General alignment.....	3
Unclear or weak SDG foc.....	3
 Evaluation Scoring Criteria.....	4
 Evaluation Thresholds.....	4
Score Range.....	4
Status.....	4
Notes.....	4
45–50.....	4
 Outstanding / Pilot Ready.....	4
High technical quality, strong SDG alignment, mentor-endorsed.....	4
38–44.....	4
 Ready for Pilot Consideration.....	4
Meets quality bar; may need polish before scale.....	4
30–37.....	4
 Promising, but Not Yet Ready.....	4
Good direction, but missing depth or quality in areas.....	4
< 30.....	5
 Needs Significant Rework.....	5
Lacks feasibility or SDG clarity; major revisions needed.....	5
 Score Template (Example).....	5
 Evaluation Phases.....	5
 Evaluation Methods.....	5
 Deliverables to be Evaluated.....	6



Purpose




This Evaluation Framework ensures transparent, consistent, and objective assessment of all teams participating in the EMURGO x UNDP Blockchain Accelerator. It is used to:


- Track technical and impact progress across the accelerator lifecycle.
- Provide feedback to teams for improvement and scaling.

- Identify standout projects ready for post-program support (e.g., pilots, grants, investment).
- Align technical execution with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Key Metrics






Metric	Description	Strong	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	How It's Measured (Data Sources & Methods)
 Blockchain Integration Rate	% of teams that implement working blockchain components (VCs, smart contracts, tokens, wallet flows)	90–100%	70–89%	< 70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Codebase inspection via GitHub - Confirmed contract addresses - Screenshots or video walkthroughs of on-chain activity - Lucid or MeshJS usage where applicable
 Curriculum Completion	Modules completed and assignments submitted	All 6 modules, on time	4–5 modules, minor delays	< 4 modules or weak submissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal LMS tracking - Google Forms or Notion logs of submitted exercises - Timestamped milestone reports from teams

 Mentor & Stakeholder Feedback	Ratings from mentors & challenge owner reviewers	4.5–5.0	3.5–4.4	< 3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weekly mentor scorecards - UNDP/local partner feedback forms - Optional interviews logged in summary sheets
 Documentation Quality	Code and architecture documentation, metadata/VC schemas	Complete, professional repo	Mostly complete	Missing or unclear logic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GitHub repo review checklist - Schema validation (e.g., JSON schema linting) - Reviewer notes and flags
 Working Demo	Testnet MVP demonstrating SDG use case	Fully functional	Partially working	Broken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Live demo + testnet walkthrough - Deployed frontend link - GitHub release tag or README instructions

 SDG Relevance	Project's alignment with real-world SDG need	Clear and validated	General alignment	Weak or unclear focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk research on the problem - Challenge statement fit - UNDP/local NGO validation interview - Impact potential score by evaluators
---	--	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--

Evaluation Scoring Criteria

Each project is scored across **5 equally weighted categories**, each worth 10 points.

Category	Description	Weight	Data Sources
 Technical Feasibility	Smart contracts, VCs, token logic, frontend/backend interactions	20%	GitHub repo, testnet logs, mentor validation
 SDG Alignment	Clear link to at least one SDG, stakeholder input, impact clarity	20%	Stakeholder interview, documentation, deck
 Scalability & Readiness	Project readiness for pilot/scale, modularity, clarity	20%	Code architecture, UI/UX, stakeholder interest
 Documentation & Architecture	Repo quality, schema clarity, onboarding ease	20%	Reviewer checklist on GitHub, readme.md
 Engagement & Collaboration	Responsiveness, feedback loops, attendance, teamwork	20%	Mentor scorecards, participation logs, Slack/email history

Evaluation Thresholds

Score Range	Status	Notes
45–50	🌟 Outstanding / Pilot Ready	High technical quality, clear SDG story, tested demo
38–44	✅ Ready for Pilot Consideration	MVP functioning, needs some polish
30–37	⚠️ Promising, but Not Yet Ready	Gaps in tech or impact clarity
< 30	❌ Needs Significant Rework	Major missing components or unclear value



Score Template (Example)

Category	Score (1–10)	Evaluator Notes
Technical Feasibility	9	Working PoC with real contracts and frontend
SDG Alignment	8	Clear PES model with measurable outcomes
Scalability	6	Reusable but UX still basic
Documentation	9	Very clean repo with deployment instructions
Engagement	10	Active mentors, multiple iterations

Total Score: 42 / 50

Status: ✅ Ready for Pilot Consideration



Evaluation Phases

Phase	Timing	Purpose
Midpoint Review	Week 3	Track curriculum progress and unblock teams
Demo Day	Week 6	Real-time PoC review and scoring

Post-Accelerator Impact Report	1–3 months after	Document deployment, user feedback, partner traction
--------------------------------	------------------	--

Evaluation Methods (Expanded)

1. Mentor Scorecards

- Weekly rating form (1–10) per category
- Includes qualitative notes and friction points
- Used to track momentum and progress over time

2. Live Demo Day Judging

- 5-min presentation, 5-min Q&A
- Judges from EMURGO, UNDP, external partners
- Scoring rubric covers tech, relevance, usability

3. GitHub Repository Review

- Manual inspection using predefined checklist:
 - `README.md`
 - `architecture.md`
 - `vc-schema.json`
 - Testnet contracts + UI
- Linting tools and code quality score optional

4. Stakeholder Interviews / Surveys

- Local NGOs, challenge owners, validators
- Assess SDG fit and practical relevance

- Optional but adds bonus score or validation flag

5. Survey Tools for User Testing (Optional)

- Teams may conduct surveys via Google Forms, Typeform
- Data may support user feedback and engagement metrics
- Highlighted in final impact reports



Evaluation Analysis Process

After all data is collected, the evaluation process follows these steps:

1. Metric-by-Metric Scoring

- Each metric is scored using predefined benchmarks
- Raw data comes from repo inspection, mentor feedback, and live judging
- LMS data used to cross-check module completion

2. Reviewer Calibration

- At least 2 reviewers score each project independently
- Scores are compared, and any major variance (>2 points) is reconciled via discussion

3. Qualitative Context Added

- Reviewer notes, stakeholder quotes, and demo impressions are compiled
- This helps identify if a lower-scoring team still deserves consideration due to local impact or difficulty level

4. Pilot Readiness Tagging

- Final status is assigned using score thresholds
- Bonus tags include:

- 🏆 *Top Demo*
- 🌱 *Promising Early-Stage*
- 💡 *Innovative Tech*

5. **Post-Evaluation Reporting**

- Each team receives a scorecard with feedback and pilot readiness status
- Selected teams may be referred to partners for follow-on support