

Category	Criterion	Weight	Clear Description for Judges	0 vs Full Grade Definition
Fixed Attendance	Workshop Attendance	10%	Team attended mandatory workshops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(-2 points for each non-attending team member)</b></li> <li>• <b>Full (10):</b> Full attendance of all team members</li> </ul>
	Panel Attendance	10%	Team attended the official problematic announcement and expert panel session.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(-2 points for each non-attending team member)</b></li> <li>• <b>Full (10):</b> Full attendance of all team members</li> </ul>
Creativity	Innovation & Original Thinking	15%	Measures how original, creative, and thoughtfully designed the solution is. Judges evaluate whether the team built a real cognitive assistant concept rather than a simple chatbot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Generic or basic solution with no originality.</li> <li>• <b>Full (15):</b> Highly innovative concept, unique system design, creative architecture, and strong differentiation from standard chatbot systems.</li> </ul>
Technical & System	Multimodal Ingestion & Processing	10%	Evaluates whether the system automatically handles multiple data types (text, images, audio, documents) and converts them into a structured internal representation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Single modality only OR manual upload only OR no structured memory.</li> <li>• <b>Full (10):</b> Automated ingestion of multiple modalities with coherent structured internal representation.</li> </ul>
	Persistent Memory Architecture	10%	Evaluates whether the system stores and manages knowledge over time and remembers past data across sessions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Stateless chatbot; no long-term memory.</li> <li>• <b>Full (10):</b> Persistent structured memory across time with</li> </ul>

				meaningful organization and retrieval.
	Reasoning, Retrieval & Self-Verification	15%	Assesses how well the system retrieves relevant past information, reasons over it, and verifies its answers before responding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Keyword search only OR shallow retrieval OR confident incorrect answers.</li> <li>• <b>Full (15):</b> Context-aware retrieval, logical reasoning steps, grounded answers referencing stored data, and built-in verification or uncertainty handling.</li> </ul>
	Model Compliance & Constraints	5%	Verifies that the team respects all challenge rules (local open-source model under 4B parameters, no proprietary APIs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Used proprietary APIs OR non-compliant model.</li> <li>• <b>Full (5):</b> Fully compliant setup with transparent use of an approved local open-source model.</li> </ul>
Product & User Experience	Usability & Practical Impact	10%	Evaluates whether the system is intuitive, easy to use, and genuinely helpful in organizing and retrieving personal knowledge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Hard to use OR backend-only system OR no practical value.</li> <li>• <b>Full (10):</b> Clear interface, intuitive interaction, structured summaries, actionable outputs, and strong real-world usefulness.</li> </ul>
Presentation & Pitch	Clarity, Demo & Communication	15%	Assesses how clearly the team define the problem, explains the system, demonstrates it live, and justifies technical decisions professionally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0:</b> Confusing presentation, unstable demo, unclear explanations.</li> <li>• <b>Full (15):</b> Clear structured pitch, strong live demo, confident technical explanation, professional delivery within time.</li> </ul>

