

# UMHackathon 2025 Judging Criteria

## Domain 3: Economic Empowerment through AI (by Grab)

### Preliminary Round

#### 1. Innovation and Originality (20%)

- **Poor (0-4 points):** The solution lacks originality and is derivative, or too similar to existing solutions.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The solution is a direct copy of an existing solution with no new ideas or features.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The solution is derivative, with some small improvements, but it relies heavily on existing solutions.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The solution shows some originality, but the idea is not unique and could be considered an improvement on common approaches.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The solution introduces a few novel ideas, but they are still heavily influenced by existing solutions.
- **Fair (4-8 points):** The solution has some innovative aspects but relies on common approaches. Key features are underdeveloped.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The solution shows some creative ideas, but key features are underdeveloped and are not fully explored.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The solution has innovative aspects, but it still relies on common approaches and lacks significant differentiation.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The solution introduces new features but relies on familiar concepts and lacks originality in its core approach.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The solution is somewhat original but still uses many common strategies or concepts. The innovative elements are underdeveloped.
- **Good (8-12 points):** The solution is creative and original, offering a fresh perspective on the problem, though not entirely groundbreaking.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The solution introduces fresh ideas and original features, but the approach is not yet groundbreaking.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The solution offers a creative perspective on the problem, presenting new features or approaches that set it apart from standard solutions.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The solution is original, with fresh ideas and a new way of tackling the problem, though it may not be a radical shift from existing solutions.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The solution provides a unique approach, with fresh ideas that introduce new perspectives on the problem, though not entirely revolutionary.
- **Very Good (12-16 points):** The solution is highly innovative, presenting unique features and a fresh approach that sets it apart from typical solutions.

- **12.1-13.0 points:** The solution presents unique features and a fresh approach, clearly distinguishing it from common solutions.
- **13.1-14.0 points:** The solution is highly original, demonstrating innovative features and a unique perspective that sets it apart from existing methods.
- **14.1-15.0 points:** The solution demonstrates exceptional innovation, presenting distinct and unique features that disrupt conventional approaches.
- **15.1-16.0 points:** The solution is highly innovative, offering unique features and a fresh approach that clearly sets it apart from standard solutions.
- **Excellent (16-20 points):** The solution is exceptionally original, presenting a breakthrough idea or feature that radically changes how the problem can be solved.
  - **16.1-17.0 points:** The solution introduces exceptionally original ideas and a breakthrough feature that offers a completely new way of solving the problem.
  - **17.1-18.0 points:** The solution is groundbreaking, with innovative features that radically alter the approach to the problem.
  - **18.1-19.0 points:** The solution represents a major breakthrough, offering revolutionary ideas that radically change how the problem is addressed.
  - **19.1-20.0 points:** The solution offers a transformative idea or feature that fundamentally changes the approach to the problem.

## 2. Technical Execution and Feasibility (20%)

- **Poor (0-4 points):** Prototype does not meet basic functionality requirements or fails to demonstrate key features.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The prototype does not meet basic functionality and fails to demonstrate key features.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The prototype lacks essential features and does not work as intended.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The prototype works with limited functionality but fails to meet critical requirements.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The prototype demonstrates some core features but lacks key functionalities or does not work correctly.
- **Fair (4-8 points):** The prototype works but with some issues, and may lack certain key functionalities.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The prototype works somewhat but is missing key functionalities or has significant bugs.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The prototype is functional but lacks some key features or has major usability issues.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The prototype is mostly functional, demonstrating core features, but still requires substantial improvement.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The prototype is functional but lacks certain key features and needs significant improvement for full usability.
- **Good (8-12 points):** The prototype functions well and demonstrates the core features, but it may not be fully optimised or refined.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The prototype functions well and demonstrates most core features, though some refinements are needed.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The prototype demonstrates core features effectively, though there is room for optimisation or refinement.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The prototype is mostly refined, demonstrating core functionality but may still require minor adjustments.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The prototype works well, demonstrating core features with minimal issues, though it may still require optimisation for performance.
- **Very Good (12-16 points):** The prototype is robust, efficiently demonstrating the core functionality and addressing the problem effectively.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The prototype is robust, demonstrating core functionality efficiently with minor issues.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The prototype is efficient, demonstrating core functionality and addressing the problem effectively with optimised performance.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The prototype is well-executed, demonstrating the core features with high efficiency and addressing the problem effectively.
  - **15.1-16.0 points:** The prototype demonstrates robust functionality, addressing the problem effectively with an optimised and polished design.
- **Excellent (16-20 points):** The prototype is well-executed, polished, and operates flawlessly, with an optimised design that is scalable and practical.

- **16.1-17.0 points:** The prototype is well-executed with an optimised design, operating flawlessly and scalable for practical use.
- **17.1-18.0 points:** The prototype is polished, demonstrating flawless operation with optimised design, and ready for real-world deployment.
- **18.1-19.0 points:** The prototype is exceptionally well-executed, demonstrating scalable, practical solutions with flawless operation.
- **19.1-20.0 points:** The prototype operates flawlessly, with an optimised, scalable design ready for large-scale real-world applications.

### 3. Impact and Usefulness (20%)

- **Poor (0-4 points):** The solution does not solve a real problem, or its practical value and impact are unclear.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The solution does not address a real problem or has no clear practical value.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The solution may address a problem but lacks clarity on its real-world application or impact.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The solution addresses a problem, but its practical value or impact is unclear or insignificant.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The solution addresses a real problem, but its impact or value is vague or not fully developed.
- **Fair (4-8 points):** The solution addresses a relevant problem but lacks clear real-world application or broad impact.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The solution addresses a relevant problem, but its real-world application or impact remains unclear.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The solution has potential value but lacks evidence of broad impact or real-world use.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The solution addresses a relevant problem, but real-world application is not fully realised or lacks clarity.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The solution has value and addresses a relevant problem, but its impact is still unclear or limited.
- **Good (8-12 points):** The solution solves a defined problem with practical value, and its potential impact is evident.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The solution solves a defined problem with practical value and some evidence of its real-world impact.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The solution addresses a clear problem and has practical value, demonstrating its potential impact.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The solution has a clear real-world impact and solves a relevant problem with practical value.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The solution has a measurable impact, solving a defined problem with clear practical value.
- **Very Good (12-16 points):** The solution effectively addresses a significant problem with measurable, real-world impact.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The solution is highly impactful, addressing a significant real-world problem with measurable results.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The solution solves an important problem with measurable real-world impact.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The solution addresses a critical issue with clear real-world impact, providing significant benefits.
  - **15.1-16.0 points:** The solution addresses a significant problem with measurable impact and provides real-world benefits.
- **Excellent (16-20 points):** The solution is transformative, solving an important problem with wide-reaching, tangible benefits.

- **16.1-17.0 points:** The solution is transformative, solving an important problem with wide-reaching benefits.
- **17.1-18.0 points:** The solution is revolutionary, solving a significant problem with substantial real-world impact.
- **18.1-19.0 points:** The solution is exceptional, providing wide-reaching tangible benefits and solving a critical problem in a transformative way.
- **19.1-20.0 points:** The solution provides transformative benefits, solving a critical problem in an impactful and innovative way.

#### 4. Presentation and Communication (20%)

- **Poor (0-4 points):** The presentation is unclear, disorganised, and difficult to follow. The problem and solution are not adequately communicated.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The presentation is unclear and disorganised, failing to communicate the problem or solution effectively.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The presentation has major clarity issues and disjointed flow, making it hard to follow the problem and solution.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The presentation lacks structure, with some key details missing. It's hard to follow or understand the core message.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The presentation is confusing and disorganised and fails to convey the key points effectively.
- **Fair (4-8 points):** The presentation has some clarity but lacks structure and key details, making it somewhat difficult to follow.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The presentation has basic clarity but lacks structure or key details, making it difficult to follow.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The presentation has some structure, but the clarity and flow need improvement. It is somewhat difficult to follow.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The presentation communicates the main points but is still not fully organised. Some sections need more clarity or details.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The presentation is clear but lacks full structure or refinement, leading to gaps in understanding.
- **Good (8-12 points):** The presentation is clear and well-structured, though some areas could be refined for better flow or more details.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The presentation is clear and well-structured, though a few areas need refinement or further clarification.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The presentation is organised, clear, and flows logically, but some sections could use more details or better conciseness.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The presentation is well-structured and clear, with good flow. However, some sections could benefit from greater refinement.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The presentation is clear and well-structured, effectively conveying the solution.
- **Very Good (12-16 points):** The presentation is highly organised, with a clear, concise, and engaging narrative that effectively communicates the problem, solution, and impact.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The presentation is highly organised, clear, and communicates the message engagingly.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The presentation is well-organised, concise, and engaging, communicating the problem and solution effectively.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The presentation is clear, organised, and compelling, engaging the audience while effectively conveying the problem and solution.
  - **15.1-16.0 points:** The presentation is highly engaging, clear, and persuasive, delivering a strong message that resonates with the audience.

- **Excellent (16-20 points):** The presentation is compelling and persuasive and seamlessly communicates the idea with clarity and engagement, making the solution easy to understand and inspiring confidence.
  - **16.1-17.0 points:** The presentation is dynamic, engaging, and persuasive, clearly conveying the idea with confidence.
  - **17.1-18.0 points:** The presentation is compelling, engaging, and seamless, presenting the solution with clarity and confidence.
  - **18.1-19.0 points:** The presentation is exceptionally clear and persuasive, inspiring confidence and resonating with the audience.
  - **19.1-20.0 points:** The presentation is exceptionally compelling, clear, and highly engaging, leaving a strong, confident impression on the audience.



## 5. Team Collaboration and Problem-Solving Process (20%)

- **Poor (0-4 points):** The team demonstrates poor collaboration with significant issues in task division and problem-solving.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The team lacks collaboration, with significant issues in task division and solving the problem.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The team faces major collaboration issues and poor coordination, resulting in ineffective problem-solving.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The team has some collaboration, but there are key problems in task division and problem-solving.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The team demonstrates poor collaboration with unclear roles and ineffective problem-solving.
- **Fair (4-8 points):** The team collaborated moderately well but faced challenges in communication and task division.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The team showed moderate collaboration, with communication challenges or unclear task division.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The team faced some challenges in task division or communication but worked together to solve the problem.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The team demonstrated moderate collaboration, with some issues in task division or coordination.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The team displayed adequate collaboration but struggled with coordination and task division.
- **Good (8-12 points):** The team demonstrated good collaboration, effectively dividing tasks and working together, though minor coordination issues may have occurred.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The team demonstrated good collaboration and division of tasks, but minor coordination issues were present.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The team worked effectively together, with clear roles and division of tasks, though minor coordination issues occurred.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The team displayed good collaboration and clear communication, efficiently solving the problem with minor coordination challenges.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The team demonstrated strong collaboration, with well-defined roles and good communication throughout the problem-solving process.
- **Very Good (12-16 points):** The team worked cohesively with strong communication and efficient problem-solving. Roles were clearly defined, and collaboration was smooth.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The team worked cohesively, communicating well and solving the problem efficiently.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The team demonstrated strong communication and collaborative efforts, addressing the problem effectively.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The team worked seamlessly, with clear roles and strong communication, solving the problem with efficiency.

- **15.1-16.0 points:** The team demonstrated exceptional collaboration with efficient problem-solving, clear roles, and strong communication.
- **Excellent (16-20 points):** The team demonstrated exceptional collaboration with seamless communication, a well-defined workflow, and efficient problem-solving.
  - **16.1-17.0 points:** The team demonstrated exceptional collaboration with clear roles and seamless communication.
  - **17.1-18.0 points:** The team worked together exceptionally well, solving the problem with efficient communication and task division.
  - **18.1-19.0 points:** The team demonstrated outstanding collaboration, working together seamlessly and solving the problem efficiently.
  - **19.1-20.0 points:** The team worked exceptionally well, demonstrating strong communication, efficient task division, and effective problem-solving throughout.

# Final Round

## 1. Technical Implementation and Architecture (30%)

- **Architecture and Design**

- **Poor (0-3 points):** The solution lacks a clear technical architecture, and there is no consideration for scalability or resource optimisation. The design is not aligned with real-world applications.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** No discernible architecture. The solution is not organised with no clear technical design.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** Minimal architecture with basic structure. Lacks integration and scalability. The design is overly simplistic.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** Basic architecture exists but lacks depth. Scalability and performance considerations are not fully explored.
- **Fair (3-6 points):** The architecture is defined but lacks depth or scalability. Some components may not be integrated well, or there may be challenges in scaling the solution.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The architecture is outlined, but scalability is not well-considered, or the components may not be fully integrated.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The architecture is defined and functional, though scalability or optimisation may need more work.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** Solid architecture with clear consideration for scalability. Some areas need further optimisation for real-world application.
- **Good (6-9 points):** The architecture is well-defined, with consideration for scalability and integration. Some improvements are needed for full optimisation.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** Well-defined architecture, some consideration for scalability, but integration challenges remain.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** Scalable architecture with well-implemented integration; optimisation could be enhanced for performance.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** Highly scalable architecture with excellent integration and performance considerations, though minor tweaks are needed.
- **Very Good (9-12 points):** The architecture is robust, scalable, and integrates well with modern tools and technologies. There is a clear consideration for performance, scalability, and future growth.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The architecture is fully scalable, integrates with existing tools and technologies, and addresses performance and future growth. Some minor performance refinements could improve its readiness for large-scale deployment.

- **10.1-11.0 points:** The solution is highly optimised and can scale effectively. It demonstrates good integration with core systems and technologies and addresses scalability with high attention to future-proofing.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** Exceptional architecture that is robust, scalable, and efficient. Integration with multiple systems is seamless, and the solution is prepared for handling future challenges and scaling to meet growth demands.
- **Excellent (12-15 points):** The architecture is highly optimised, scalable, and future-proof. Demonstrates the use of cutting-edge technologies with seamless integration across multiple systems, ensuring both performance and scalability.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The architecture is top-tier, integrating seamlessly across various systems with minimal performance issues. It shows clear future-proofing and scalability, built to handle industry-level demands.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** Exceptional architecture that employs cutting-edge technologies. It demonstrates not only scalability and integration but also robust performance management and high adaptability to future developments.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The architecture is industry-leading, built for seamless, large-scale deployment. It integrates flawlessly with multiple systems and demonstrates exceptional performance optimisation. The solution is highly future-proof, optimised for rapid scaling, and prepared for long-term usage in real-world systems.

- **Integration and Real-World Deployment**

- **Poor (0-3 points):** The solution is not suitable for integration into existing systems or for real-world deployment. The prototype is incomplete and lacks functionality.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The prototype is incomplete or non-functional. No components are integrated, and there is no pathway for real-world deployment.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The prototype demonstrates basic functionality, but it is not deployable or integrated with existing systems. Key features are missing, or there are major performance issues.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The prototype is partially deployable but lacks integration with critical systems. Major issues with functionality or performance prevent it from being applicable for real-world deployment.

- **Fair (3-6 points):** The prototype demonstrates basic functionality but may have integration challenges or is not optimised for real-world use.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The prototype is partially functional with basic integration. However, significant challenges exist in ensuring the solution works effectively in real-world environments due to the lack of optimisation and effective integration issues.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The solution demonstrates functional features, but its integration with external systems is problematic or incomplete. The solution is not fully optimised for real-world use and may require substantial modifications.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The solution is mostly functional and can integrate with some systems. It may still face issues in real-world scenarios as it lacks full scalability or optimisation for large-scale deployment.
- **Good (6-9 points):** The prototype is deployable with minimal changes and can integrate into existing systems, though additional optimisation may be needed.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The prototype is deployable in small-scale real-world scenarios with minimal integration required. Performance and scalability considerations may still require further refinement to handle larger, more complex environments.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The solution is functional, with basic integration into real-world systems. Optimisation for performance is still required to address scalability or fine-tune its deployment for higher loads.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The solution is well-integrated into existing systems and works well for deployment in real-world environments. Minor tweaks or further optimisation may be needed for large-scale deployment or complex scenarios.
- **Very Good (9-12 points):** The solution is well-suited for deployment and integration, with clear pathways for scaling and implementing it in real-world scenarios.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The solution is fully deployable and integrates well with other systems. The prototype has clear pathways to scale and can handle real-world use effectively with some minor optimisations.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The solution is well-optimised for real-world deployment, with clear integration pathways and scalable architecture. It's ready for early-stage deployment with minimal changes.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The solution is fully scalable and demonstrates excellent integration with real-world systems.

The deployment is ready for a large-scale environment, with performance and scalability clearly addressed.

- **Excellent (12-15 points):** The solution is fully deployable and integrates seamlessly into existing systems. It is highly optimised for real-world environments and shows significant potential for large-scale adoption.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The solution is fully deployable, seamlessly integrating into existing systems. It demonstrates advanced optimisation for large-scale environments and has the capacity to handle significant user traffic or data loads.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The solution is industry-ready, optimised for real-world environments, and with perfect integration. It offers high scalability, meets the needs of real-world scenarios, and requires minimal adaptation for large-scale deployment.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The solution is exceptional, fully integrated, and optimised for seamless, large-scale deployment. It demonstrates cutting-edge performance, scalability, and integration capabilities, making it ready for immediate adoption in complex, real-world systems.

## 2. Prototype Quality and Functionality (30%)

- **User Interface and User Experience**

- **Poor (0-3 points):** The user interface is poorly designed, unintuitive, and hard to navigate. The user experience is negatively impacted by design flaws.
  - **0.0-1.0 points:** The interface is non-functional or completely confusing. The navigation is unintuitive, and key functionalities are missing or broken. The user experience is completely hindered by poor design choices.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The interface is incomplete and non-intuitive. Critical features are difficult to locate or use. Design flaws make the application frustrating or inefficient.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The interface is functional but unpolished and hard to navigate. Users struggle to complete tasks, and key components are either poorly placed or unintuitive, leading to a negative user experience.
- **Fair (4-6 points):** The user interface is functional but lacks refinement. Some elements are not intuitive, and the user experience could be improved.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The interface is functional, but key features may be hard to find or lack logical organisation. Some users may struggle with certain aspects of navigation or understandability.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The user interface is mostly intuitive, but some design choices are confusing or not user-friendly. Minor elements are out of place, or the flow of interactions may need improvement for a smoother experience.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The user interface is mostly intuitive but could benefit from more refinements. Some aspects, such as button placement or color schemes, could be more logically organised or visually appealing to improve the overall user experience.
- **Good (6-9 points):** The user interface is user-friendly and intuitive, but some small improvements in design or functionality could enhance the user experience.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The user interface is functional and intuitive, making it relatively easy to navigate. However, the interface could benefit from a few improvements in visual appeal, consistency, or optimisation to make the experience even smoother.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The user interface is clean and well-organised, with clear functionality. Some minor issues, such as color

contrast or placement of certain buttons, could be addressed to improve the flow and ease of use.

- **8.1-9.0 points:** The user interface is smooth, intuitive, and user-friendly. It is mostly polished, though a few small refinements could make the experience more seamless and enjoyable to use.
- **Very Good (9-12 points):** The interface is polished, intuitive, and user-friendly. The design is clean, with an optimal user experience for the target audience.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The interface is visually appealing and highly intuitive. The design is clean, and users can easily navigate through the application. Minor adjustments could improve its functionality or overall polish for a better user experience.
  - **10.1-11.0 points:** The user interface is well-polished with intuitive interactions and elegant design. The design is well-suited to the target audience, ensuring high usability. Some minor usability improvements could still be made.
  - **11.1-12.0 points:** The interface is well-designed, highly intuitive, and easy to use. The experience is seamless, with clear visual cues and optimised navigation. It effectively meets the needs of the target audience.
- **Excellent (12-15 points):** The interface is elegant, intuitive, and highly optimised. It provides a seamless and delightful user experience, demonstrating a deep understanding of user needs and behaviour.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The interface is exceptionally elegant and highly intuitive. The design is optimised to provide a seamless experience, making it delightful for users. The user interface responds fluidly to user actions with minimal friction.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The user interface is industry-level, offering seamless interaction and an enjoyable experience. It anticipates user needs and has strong visual appeal. It's polished, with little to no friction in navigation or interactions.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The user interface is flawless, industry-leading, and exceptionally intuitive. It demonstrates a deep understanding of user needs and behaviours. The interface is perfectly optimised, providing a delightful user experience and anticipating every need, making it ready for widespread adoption.

- **Scalability and Real-World Application**

- **Poor (0-3 points):** The solution lacks scalability and is not suitable for real-world application. It would not be viable in large-scale environments.



- **0.0-1.0 points:** The solution is not scalable and not deployable in real-world environments. The design or architecture cannot handle large volumes of users, data, or systems.
  - **1.1-2.0 points:** The solution has some basic functionality but lacks fundamental scalability considerations. It would require a complete redesign to be used in real-world scenarios.
  - **2.1-3.0 points:** The prototype lacks scalability or is incomplete for large-scale deployment. It may have some components working, but major design flaws prevent it from being deployed in a real-world environment.
- **Fair (3-6 points):** The solution shows some potential for scalability but is not fully optimised for large-scale deployment.
  - **3.1-4.0 points:** The solution demonstrates basic scalability but is not optimised for real-world environments. It could handle small-scale use, but major challenges exist when scaling to larger systems or user bases.
  - **4.1-5.0 points:** The solution works in small environments, but scalability concerns exist for real-world applications. Some parts of the system may not be optimised to handle higher volumes or complex integrations.
  - **5.1-6.0 points:** The prototype shows potential scalability but needs significant optimisation and refinement to handle large-scale deployment in complex systems or real-world use cases.
- **Good (6-9 points):** The prototype is scalable and could be applied in real-world scenarios with some refinement for larger-scale use.
  - **6.1-7.0 points:** The solution is scalable and functional, but some elements require further optimisation for large-scale use. It may work in smaller or controlled environments, but improvements are needed for broader application.
  - **7.1-8.0 points:** The prototype demonstrates solid scalability for real-world application. Some minor adjustments or optimisations are needed to support higher user volumes or integrate into complex systems.
  - **8.1-9.0 points:** The solution is scalable and works well in real-world environments with minimal adjustments. It demonstrates a clear path toward larger-scale use with some minor refinements needed.
- **Very Good (10-12 points):** The solution is highly scalable, and the prototype demonstrates a clear path toward real-world application and widespread deployment.
  - **9.1-10.0 points:** The solution is highly scalable, can be applied in real-world scenarios, and is almost ready for widespread deployment. Only minor optimisations are needed to fully integrate into large-scale systems.

- **10.1-11.0 points:** The prototype is well-suited for large-scale deployment with clear strategies for scaling and real-world application. Optimisation may still be necessary, but the path forward is clear and practical.
- **11.1-12.0 points:** The solution is ready for deployment in large-scale systems. It demonstrates high scalability and shows how it can be implemented effectively in real-world applications across various industries.
- **Excellent (12-15 points):** The solution is built with scalability and real-world applications in mind. It demonstrates potential for deployment at scale and integration into large systems, with robust support for growth.
  - **12.1-13.0 points:** The solution is industry-ready, with scalable architecture and real-world application. It integrates seamlessly with existing systems and has robust support for future growth and large-scale deployment.
  - **13.1-14.0 points:** The solution is highly optimised for both scalability and real-world deployment. It handles large-scale traffic and integrates into complex systems. The solution is ready for immediate adoption in the industry.
  - **14.1-15.0 points:** The solution is exceptional, demonstrating seamless integration and unmatched scalability. It is optimised for large-scale, real-world application and is future-proofed for rapid growth, making it ready for global deployment.

### 3. Code Quality, Documentation, and Maintainability (20%)

- **Code Quality and Modularity**

- **Poor (0-2 points):** The code is unstructured, inefficient, and difficult to maintain. There is minimal modularity, making future updates or changes challenging.
  - **0.0-0.5 points:** The code is completely unstructured, difficult to follow, and lacks basic modularity. Significant refactoring is needed, and future updates would be very challenging.
  - **0.6-1.0 points:** The code is inefficient and lacks modularity. It's hard to maintain, and critical design flaws would require major restructuring for scalability.
  - **1.1-1.5 points:** The code has some basic structure but is inefficient and lacks modularity. Future changes or scaling would require significant work.
  - **1.6-2.0 points:** The code is functional, but it is not optimised and lacks sufficient modularity for easy maintenance. The overall design needs major improvements for future growth.
- **Fair (2-4 points):** The code is somewhat modular but contains inefficiencies or redundancies. It is difficult to maintain without significant refactoring.
  - **2.1-2.5 points:** The code has basic modularity, but several parts lack optimisation and include redundant sections, making it difficult to maintain.
  - **2.6-3.0 points:** The solution has some modular components but lacks efficiency or performance optimisation. Minor inefficiencies make the code harder to scale.
  - **3.1-3.5 points:** The code is somewhat structured but still needs substantial refactoring due to redundancies or performance bottlenecks.
  - **3.6-4.0 points:** The code is functional, but there are modular issues, inefficiencies, or organisational flaws that need to be fixed for future scalability.
- **Good (4-6 points):** The code is clean, well-structured, and modular. It follows basic coding best practices but could be optimised further for better performance and readability.
  - **4.1-4.5 points:** The code follows basic best practices and is well-structured and modular, but there is room for performance optimisation.
  - **4.6-5.0 points:** The code is functional and modular, but some areas could be better optimised for scalability and efficiency.

- **5.1-5.5 points:** The code is clean and well-organised with clear modularity, following most coding best practices, though there may be minor inefficiencies.
  - **5.6-6.0 points:** The code is well-structured, with good modularity and follows basic best practices. Some minor improvements could be made to optimise performance or readability.
- **Very Good (6-8 points):** The code is highly modular, efficient, and follows best practices. It is clean and easy to read, ensuring long-term maintainability.
  - **6.1-6.5 points:** The code is highly modular and follows best practices for efficiency. The structure is clear, but there may be minor performance optimisations needed.
  - **6.6-7.0 points:** The code is well-optimised, modular, and clean. There are a few inefficiencies, and the solution is ready for future improvements with minimal changes.
  - **7.1-7.5 points:** The code is highly modular, clean, and well-optimised. The structure follows best practices and is easy to maintain, though minor optimisation tweaks could enhance performance.
  - **7.6-8.0 points:** The code is efficient and modular, following best practices. It is well-organised, maintainable, and optimised for future scaling with minor refinements possible.
- **Excellent (8-10 points):** The code is elegant, highly optimised, and extremely modular. It follows advanced best practices for performance, scalability, and maintainability, ensuring future extensibility and easy updates.
  - **8.1-8.5 points:** The code is highly elegant and optimised. It follows advanced best practices for performance and scalability, but there may be small areas for improvement.
  - **8.6-9.0 points:** The code is exceptionally modular and optimised for performance, adhering to advanced best practices for both scalability and maintainability.
  - **9.1-9.5 points:** The code demonstrates industry-level performance and is extremely modular. It is perfectly optimised for scalability and future growth.
  - **9.6-10.0 points:** The code is exceptional in its elegance and optimisation. It follows cutting-edge practices for performance, scalability, and maintainability, ensuring future extensibility and easy updates.

- **Documentation and Explanation of Code**

- **Poor (0-2 points):** The code is poorly documented, with minimal or no comments. There is no clear explanation of the logic or the design choices.
  - **0.0-0.5 points:** The code has no documentation or comments. There is no explanation of the logic or design, making the code difficult to understand or maintain.
  - **0.6-1.0 points:** The code includes minimal documentation, with little comments or no explanations. It is unclear how the code works or why certain design choices were made.
  - **1.1-1.5 points:** The code is poorly documented, with insufficient comments. Key sections of the code are unclear, making it difficult for others to follow or maintain the code.
  - **1.6-2.0 points:** Some basic comments exist, but they are not detailed or specific enough to explain the logic or design decisions, making the code hard to follow.
- **Fair (2-4 points):** Some documentation is provided, but it is incomplete or lacks sufficient detail. Key sections of the code are not commented on or explained.
  - **2.1-2.5 points:** The code contains basic comments but lacks sufficient detail or explanation for key sections. There is a lack of clarity in the logic and design decisions.
  - **2.6-3.0 points:** Some parts of the code are commented, but important sections, such as some core functions and code logic, are missing explanations, making the code harder to follow.
  - **3.1-3.5 points:** The documentation includes some explanations, but critical sections of the code are not commented on or are only briefly described.
  - **3.6-4.0 points:** Some documentation is provided, but it is incomplete or lacks depth. Many important sections are either unexplained or under-explained.
- **Good (4-6 points):** The code is adequately documented with clear comments and explanations. The repository includes basic documentation for setup and use.
  - **4.1-4.5 points:** The code is well-commented in most places, providing explanations for the key sections, though some areas could benefit from more detail or clarification.
  - **4.6-5.0 points:** The code is adequately documented, with clear comments explaining the logic of most sections. The README file includes basic instructions for setup and usage but may not be comprehensive.
  - **5.1-5.5 points:** The code contains clear and detailed comments on key sections. The README includes basic setup and usage instructions, though further explanation of more advanced features might be helpful.

- **5.6-6.0 points:** The code is well-documented, with clear comments for most functions and logic. The README provides sufficient setup and usage instructions but could benefit from further examples or explanations of complex features.
- **Very Good (6-8 points):** The code is well-documented, with clear comments explaining key sections of the code. The README file is comprehensive and provides full instructions for installation, usage, and further development.
  - **6.1-6.5 points:** The code is well-documented, with detailed comments explaining key sections and the overall structure. The README includes comprehensive installation and usage instructions but could benefit from more detailed explanations or examples.
  - **6.6-7.0 points:** The documentation is extensive, with clear explanations for the logic behind key sections. The README is detailed, providing instructions for installation, usage, and some troubleshooting.
  - **7.1-7.5 points:** The code is well-commented, with clear explanations for all functions and major design decisions. The README is comprehensive, detailing installation, usage, and further development.
  - **7.6-8.0 points:** The code is thoroughly documented with clear explanations for every important section. The README is detailed, covering all necessary instructions for setup, usage, and contributing.
- **Excellent (8-10 points):** The code is extensively documented with thorough, clear comments explaining every function, variable, and design decision. The README is exemplary, including detailed instructions, examples, and troubleshooting tips.
  - **8.1-8.5 points:** The code is extensively documented, with clear, detailed comments explaining every function and design decision. The README includes detailed instructions for setup, usage, and contributing, with real-world examples.
  - **8.6-9.0 points:** The code is exceptionally documented with thorough explanations for every part of the code. The README is exemplary, providing clear examples, setup instructions, and troubleshooting tips.
  - **9.1-9.5 points:** The documentation is exceptional, with clear and thorough comments for every function, variable, and design choice. The README is comprehensive, with examples and troubleshooting instructions.
  - **9.6-10.0 points:** The code is perfectly documented with comprehensive, clear comments for all aspects of the code. The

README is industry-level, with complete instructions, advanced examples, and troubleshooting guides.

## 4. Presentation and Pitching (20%)

### ● Clarity and Structure

- **Poor (0-2 points):** The presentation lacks clarity, is disorganised, and fails to communicate key points. It is hard to follow and misses critical information.
  - **0.0-0.5 points:** The presentation is disorganised and unclear, making it difficult to understand the solution. Key points are missing or not communicated effectively.
  - **0.6-1.0 points:** The presentation communicates some ideas but is disjointed and lacks clear structure. The message is unclear, and several key points are missing.
  - **1.1-1.5 points:** The presentation has a basic structure but lacks coherence or flow. The key ideas are communicated, but the overall narrative is weak, and some important information is missing.
  - **1.6-2.0 points:** The presentation is hard to follow, with poor transitions between points. Critical information is missing or poorly explained.
- **Fair (2-4 points):** The presentation communicates basic ideas but is somewhat disorganised, with areas lacking detail or clarity.
  - **2.1-2.5 points:** The presentation is somewhat structured, but some sections are unclear or lack detail. The key points are communicated, but the overall structure could be improved.
  - **2.6-3.0 points:** The presentation communicates basic ideas, but some sections could benefit from better organisation or more detailed explanations. It's mostly clear, but the flow of ideas is not smooth.
  - **3.1-3.5 points:** The presentation is generally clear, but the organisation could be improved. Some key points need further refinement to ensure they're effectively communicated.
  - **3.6-4.0 points:** The presentation conveys the main ideas clearly, but some sections may lack detail or could be better organised for a more seamless narrative.
- **Good (4-6 points):** The presentation is clear, well-structured, and communicates the main points effectively. Some areas could be more concise or refined.
  - **4.1-4.5 points:** The presentation is organised, clear, and communicates the main points well. However, some sections could be more concise or refined to improve clarity.
  - **4.6-5.0 points:** The presentation is well-structured, clearly communicating the problem, solution, and impact. Some minor improvements could make it more concise and impactful.



- **5.1-5.5 points:** The presentation is clear and concise, effectively communicating the main ideas. The overall structure is strong, but some areas could be further refined for clarity or engagement.
- **5.6-6.0 points:** The presentation is well-organised, effectively communicating the core message with clarity. It may benefit from minor tweaks to enhance engagement or refine the flow of information.
- **Very Good (6-8 points):** The presentation is engaging and well-structured, effectively communicating the problem, solution, and impact.
  - **6.1-6.5 points:** The presentation is engaging and well-structured, with clear communication of the problem, solution, and impact. It flows logically but could be enhanced with more compelling transitions.
  - **6.6-7.0 points:** The presentation is very clear, well-structured, and engaging. The narrative is compelling and well-paced, though minor adjustments could make it more impactful.
  - **7.1-7.5 points:** The presentation is clear, well-structured, and engaging. It clearly communicates the problem, solution, and impact in a compelling way.
  - **7.6-8.0 points:** The presentation is dynamic and engaging, with a strong narrative that effectively communicates the problem, solution, and impact. It's well-structured and persuasive.
- **Excellent (8-10 points):** The presentation is compelling and dynamic and seamlessly communicates the story. It is easy to follow, and the solution is presented in a persuasive, impactful way.
  - **8.1-8.5 points:** The presentation is compelling and dynamic, and clearly communicates the story. It's easy to follow and effectively persuades the audience of the value of the solution.
  - **8.6-9.0 points:** The presentation is highly dynamic, seamlessly communicating the solution with impact. The problem and solution are conveyed persuasively, and the narrative is smooth and compelling.
  - **9.1-9.5 points:** The presentation is exceptional—engaging, dynamic, and clear. It persuasively communicates the story, making the solution compelling and easy to understand.
  - **9.6-10.0 points:** The presentation is flawless, compelling, and dynamic, with a clear and impactful narrative that engages the audience and effectively communicates the solution and its value.

- **Visual Appeal and Engagement**

- **Poor (0-2 points):** The slides are cluttered, poorly designed, and fail to engage the audience.
  - **0.0-0.5 points:** The slides are disorganised, cluttered, and difficult to read. They fail to engage the audience or support the narrative.
  - **0.6-1.0 points:** The slides are poorly designed, with overcrowded content or inconsistent visuals, making them difficult to follow and lacking engagement.
  - **1.1-1.5 points:** The slides are functional, but the design is unappealing and does not support the presentation well. They do not engage or captivate the audience.
  - **1.6-2.0 points:** The slides are basic and functional but lack a polished design. They may fail to support the message or engage the audience effectively.
- **Fair (2-4 points):** The slides are functional but not particularly engaging. They could benefit from a cleaner design and more engaging visuals.
  - **2.1-2.5 points:** The slides are functional but lack creativity. They are difficult to read or poorly formatted, making it hard for the audience to follow.
  - **2.6-3.0 points:** The slides are clean, but the design is unappealing or lacks visual engagement. They support the narrative, but they fail to engage the audience fully.
  - **3.1-3.5 points:** The slides are functional, with basic design elements that support the presentation. However, they could be more visually appealing to improve audience engagement.
  - **3.6-4.0 points:** The slides are adequate, but the design is basic or lacks impact. They could benefit from simplification or more engaging visuals.
- **Good (4-6 points):** The slides are well-designed and visually appealing, enhancing the presentation. They engage the audience and support the narrative.
  - **4.1-4.5 points:** The slides are visually appealing, with a clean design that supports the presentation. Some slides could benefit from more engaging visuals to enhance the narrative.
  - **4.6-5.0 points:** The slides are well-designed, clean, and visually engaging, but they could be further optimised to strengthen the narrative or increase impact.
  - **5.1-5.5 points:** The slides are well-designed and engaging, with a professional layout that complements the narrative, though some slides could be simplified or refined for clarity.
  - **5.6-6.0 points:** The slides are polished and visually striking, effectively supporting the message and engaging the audience throughout the presentation.

- **Very Good (6-8 points):** The slides are polished, professional, and visually striking, supporting the pitch with clarity and engagement.
  - **6.1-6.5 points:** The slides are well-designed, polished, and visually striking. They effectively engage the audience and support the narrative with clarity and impact.
  - **6.6-7.0 points:** The slides are professional and dynamic, with visuals that enhance the storytelling. They are visually striking and complement the message very well.
  - **7.1-7.5 points:** The slides are visually stunning and well-integrated into the presentation. They enhance the story and are highly engaging.
  - **7.6-8.0 points:** The slides are exceptionally polished and visually captivating, supporting the narrative with clarity and providing an impactful experience for the audience.
- **Excellent (8-10 points):** The slides are exceptional, visually stunning, and creatively designed. They captivate the audience and reinforce the message in a compelling way.
  - **8.1-8.5 points:** The slides are exceptional, visually stunning, creative, and perfectly aligned with the message. They captivate the audience and reinforce the solution in a compelling way.
  - **8.6-9.0 points:** The slides are flawlessly designed, highly engaging, and creative. They are exceptionally impactful, complementing and reinforcing the pitch's main points.
  - **9.1-9.5 points:** The slides are industry-level, exceptionally creative, and perfectly aligned with the presentation. They are highly engaging and support the narrative with maximum impact.
  - **9.6-10.0 points:** The slides are exceptionally creative, flawlessly designed, and impactful, captivating the audience and reinforcing the message in a dynamic and compelling way.