SpellBound Coders Cup

General Information

Name

SpellBound Coders Cup

What?

This is a one-day hackathon along with an ideation phase where individuals or teams come together to ideate, prototype, and build innovative products from scratch. Participants can choose to work solo or collaborate with teammates (1-3), leveraging their diverse skills to solve real-world problems, explore creative solutions, and showcase their technical prowess. The event encourages rapid development, out-of-the-box thinking, and a spirit of friendly competition, culminating in a final presentation to a panel of judges.

When?

Ideation phase 10th November till 23rd November. Hackathon date: 4th December

Why?

To hire best talent out of it for our company.

Phases

1. Online Ideation Phase
2. Hackathon Day

Timeline

Overall Timeline

1. **Registration Start (Ideation Submission Start):** 10th November
2. **Start Reviewing Ideas (internal by copoint members):** 11th November
3. **Registration Last Date:** 26th November
4. **Announcing shortlisted 20 Ideas:** 28th November
5. **Hackathon Day**: 4th December

Online Ideation Submission Timeline

1. **Registration Start (Ideation Submission Start):** 10th November

2. **Start Reviewing Ideas (internal by copoint members):** 11th November
3. **Registration Last Date:** 26th November
4. **Announcing shortlisted 20 Ideas:** 28th November

Hackathon Day Timeline

Copoint Members reaching office	8:00am sharp
Keynote	9:30am – 10:00am
Hackathon Start	10:00am sharp
Lunch	01:00pm – 2:00pm
Mentoring (6 members on 20 teams) - total **1 hour 30 minutes**	½ hour to each team
Hackathon End	05:00pm
Judging	5:00pm – 8:00pm
Result Announcement	8:30pm

Online Ideation Phase

What?

The **Online Ideation Phase** is the first and foundational stage of the *SpellBound Coders Cup* hackathon.

Team Formation & Registration

- Participants can register either **solo** or in **teams of up to 3 members**.
- Registration opens on **10th November** and closes on **26th November**.
- A maximum of **50 ideas** will be accepted during this phase to ensure quality and manageability.
- The **20 selected teams** will be invited to participate in the **Hackathon Day** on **4th December**, where they will build and present a working prototype of their idea.

Submission Requirements

Once registered, each team is required to submit the following:

1. **Presentation Deck (3 slides max – problem + solution +BMC)**
    a. A well-structured slide deck that outlines the problem statement, the proposed solution, the approach to solving it, and any relevant technical or design considerations.
    b. This should clearly communicate the innovation, feasibility, and impact of the idea.
2. **Video Explanation**
    a. A short video (hosted on a platform like YouTube or Drive) where the team explains their idea in their own words.
    b. This helps reviewers understand the thought process, team dynamics, and clarity of the concept.

Members & their roles

Each member will be responsible for reviewing an equal portion of the 50 submitted ideas using the designated judging mechanism. Based on the evaluations, the top 20 teams will be shortlisted and forwarded to Deepak Pahuja for final comments and feedback.

Members who will be contributing for the judging:

1. Abhishek
2. Arpit
3. Azim
4. Hansika
5. Samid
6. Subin
7. Soumyadeep

The 50 teams will be distributed in a manner such that each team will be reviewed by two team members.

Team No.	Judge 1	Judge 2
1	Abhishek	Arpit
2	Abhishek	Azim
3	Abhishek	Hansika
4	Abhishek	Samid
5	Abhishek	Subin
6	Abhishek	Soumyadeep
7	Arpit	Azim
8	Arpit	Hansika
9	Arpit	Samid
10	Arpit	Subin
11	Arpit	Soumyadeep
12	Azim	Hansika
13	Azim	Samid
14	Azim	Subin
15	Azim	Soumyadeep
16	Hansika	Samid
17	Hansika	Subin
18	Hansika	Soumyadeep
19	Samid	Subin
20	Samid	Soumyadeep
21	Subin	Abhishek
22	Subin	Arpit
23	Subin	Azim

24	Subin	Hansika
25	Soumyadeep	Abhishek
26	Soumyadeep	Arpit
27	Soumyadeep	Azim
28	Soumyadeep	Hansika
29	Abhishek	Samid
30	Arpit	Subin
31	Azim	Soumyadeep
32	Hansika	Abhishek
33	Samid	Arpit
34	Subin	Azim
35	Soumyadeep	Hansika
36	Abhishek	Samid
37	Arpit	Subin
38	Azim	Soumyadeep
39	Hansika	Abhishek
40	Samid	Arpit
41	Subin	Azim
42	Soumyadeep	Hansika
43	Abhishek	Subin
44	Arpit	Azim
45	Hansika	Samid
46	Subin	Soumyadeep
47	Abhishek	Arpit
48	Azim	Hansika
49	Samid	Subin
50	Soumyadeep	Abhishek

Creatives

Excel file: Creatives excel file

Hackathon announcement

1. Devfolio creatives
2. LinkedIn creatives
3. Instagram creatives
4. Hackathon website(optional)

Online Ideation Phase

1. Weekly reminders – for submit their ideas

Judging

Overall

The hackathon will consist of two primary phases:
1. Online Ideation Phase (30% of total score)
2. On-Ground (Hackathon Day) Development Phase (70% of total score)

Each team's final score will be calculated out of 100 points, distributed across the stages as outlined below.

Ideation:

Maximum points: 30 points

Process:
- 50 teams will submit a presentation (3 slides – problem + solution + BMC) and a video (at most 3-4 minutes).
- Top 20 teams will be selected for the on-ground hackathon.

- Judges (total 7 judges; each idea will have 2 judges) will apply marks in this excel file: Judging Sheet

1.1 Evaluation Criteria

These four parameters will be of total 40 marks, which will be normalized to 30 marks.

Parameter	Description	Max Score
Problem Understanding	Clarity and depth in defining the problem statement.	10
Innovation & Creativity	Novelty and originality of the proposed solution.	10
Feasibility & Execution Plan	How realistic and executable the proposed idea is.	10
Market & Impact Potential	Strength of BMC and potential for real-world adoption.	10

For each parameter, there are certain indicators which we have to look at. If it is there, we will award 1 mark for each of the indicators.

1.1.1 Problem Understanding (10 marks)

Evaluation Indicator	Evidence Expected	Example	Marks
Problem is clearly and concisely stated	One-line summary	"We aim to reduce medical appointment no-shows."	1
Target users or stakeholders identified	Mentions who faces it	"Low-income diabetic patients in urban areas."	1
Explains why the problem matters	Social or business relevance	"Missed appointments lead to 25% revenue loss for clinics."	1
Root causes analyzed	"Why" or "How" behind the issue	"Complex booking systems and lack of reminders cause drop-offs."	1
Uses supporting data or research	Cited statistic or source	"Surveyed 50 clinics—avg. 15% daily no-shows."	1
Identifies current gaps	Mentions what's missing	"Existing apps only work in English; ours will support regional languages."	1
Defines measurable scope	Context like region, scale, or demographic	"Affects ~1.2M diabetic patients annually in South India."	1
Aligns with hackathon theme	Fits sustainability, AI, health, etc.	"Contributes to SDG 3: Good Health & Well-being."	1
Shows original framing	Unique interpretation or angle	"Instead of just food donation, we tackle storage loss in transit."	1
Validated with user or field feedback	Quotes, interviews, or early testing	"Interviewed 10 shop owners—8 cited lack of affordable POS."	1

1.1.2 Innovation & Creativity (10 marks)

Evaluation Indicator	Detailed Description (What Judge Should Look For)	Example (From PPT / Video)	Marks
Novelty of Concept	The idea introduces something genuinely new — not a direct copy of an existing solution. Even if inspired by existing tools, the concept should offer an innovative twist or unique application.	> "Instead of a generic ride-sharing app, our platform matches users by *shared commute habits* and *verified workplace routes* to improve safety."	1
Creative Approach to Solving the Problem	The team's approach stands out in *how* they tackle the issue — either through unusual	> "We use gamification to make financial literacy engaging for rural youth."	1

	methods, cross-domain thinking, or clever use of available tools.		
Innovative Use of Technology / Medium	The project leverages technology (AI, IoT, blockchain, etc.) in a fresh or unexpected way — not just buzzword use, but meaningful integration.	> "Using computer vision to detect early crop disease through farmers' basic smartphone cameras."	1
Differentiation from Existing Solutions	The team clearly explains *how* their idea is better or different — performance, affordability, accessibility, or design innovation.	> "Current waste apps only focus on pickup; ours connects waste sellers directly to local recyclers with instant pricing."	1
Original Perspective or Reframing of Problem	The problem is viewed from a unique angle or target group that others often overlook. Creativity in *framing* counts as much as creativity in *solution*.	> "Instead of tracking students' attendance, our tool helps teachers identify emotional disengagement through speech tone."	1
Creative Application of Common Tools or Data	Use readily available resources (APIs, datasets, or hardware) in new ways to deliver extra value.	> "We repurpose open Google Maps APIs to predict waterlogging risk during heavy rains."	1
Integration of Multiple Disciplines or Ideas	The team creatively blends concepts from different fields (e.g., AI + psychology, IoT + education).	> "Combining sentiment analysis with smart badges to track workplace morale anonymously."	1
Feasibility of Innovation	Innovation is not just theoretical — the proposed creative element is realistically achievable with current tools, data, or resources.	> "We built a low-cost prototype using open-source hardware instead of proposing expensive new devices."	1
Potential to Inspire or Disrupt	The idea has the potential to redefine current practices or inspire new products or policies, even at an early stage.	> "Our model could enable farmers to lease drones collaboratively, creating shared rural drone fleets."	1
Wow Factor — "Why Didn't I Think of That?"	The idea makes judges genuinely pause — elegant simplicity, lateral thinking, or creative leap that clearly improves the user's experience or system efficiency.	> "An AI model that converts sign language into text *in real time* for video calls — bridging inclusion directly."	1

1.1.3 Feasibility & Execution (10 marks)

Evaluation Indicator	Detailed Description (What Judge Should Look For)	Example (From PPT / Video)	Marks
Clear Execution Roadmap	The team outlines a logical, step-by-step plan of how they will go from idea → prototype → final solution. Includes basic milestones or phases.	> "Phase 1: Data collection → Phase 2: Model training → Phase 3: User testing and deployment."	1
Defined Technical Approach	Mentions specific technologies, platforms, or tools they plan to use (e.g., React, TensorFlow, Node.js, Arduino). Shows technical awareness.	> "We'll build the frontend in React, backend in Flask, and integrate with Firebase for authentication."	1
Clarity of Roles and Team Capabilities	Team members' skills match the requirements of the idea — e.g., one handles ML, another UI, another business model.	> "Our team includes a data scientist, UI/UX designer, and backend developer — covering all core needs."	1
Resource Awareness	Identifies the infrastructure, data, or materials required, and whether they are accessible or affordable.	> "We'll use publicly available WHO datasets and open-source APIs to build our MVP."	1
Timeline Realism	Proposed milestones fit within a hackathon or short-term project duration (1–3 months	> "We can deliver a functional PoC within 24 hours using existing frameworks."	1

	max). Avoids overpromising.		
Risk Identification & Mitigation	Acknowledges possible risks (technical, data, operational) and suggests how they'll handle them. Shows maturity in planning.	> "If live deployment fails, we'll demo with local JSON mock data to ensure functionality."	1
Scalability Consideration	Mentions how the solution can grow or scale beyond initial prototype (e.g., cloud hosting, modular design, multi-user support).	> "Our microservice architecture allows scaling from 100 to 10,000 users without code changes."	1
Operational Feasibility	Explains practical aspects like maintenance, usability, cost efficiency, and operational sustainability.	> "We plan to host the MVP on free-tier services to minimize recurring costs."	1
Clarity on Success Metrics	Defines what success looks like (KPIs or measurable outcomes). Helps judges see whether the plan is goal-oriented.	> "Target: reduce hospital appointment no-shows by 25% within six months."	1
Demonstrated Readiness or Early Progress	Evidence of groundwork — prototype sketches, GitHub repo, flow diagrams, or mockups.	> "We've already built the data schema and a working login prototype."	1

1.1.4 Market & Impact Potential(10 marks)

Evaluation Indicator	Detailed Description (What Judge Should Look For)	Example (From PPT / Video)	Marks
Clearly Defined Target Market or User Segment	The team identifies who their product is for — end users,	> "Our solution targets small neighborhood pharmacies	1

	customers, or beneficiaries. Clarity on audience shows they understand the demand side.	managing fewer than 500 prescriptions monthly."	
Evidence of Market Need / Demand Validation	Shows data or proof that the problem exists at scale — through surveys, research, or references to credible sources.	> "A 2024 report shows 65% of local stores lack real-time inventory systems."	1
Market Size or Potential Reach Identified	Mentions size of opportunity (e.g., market value, number of users, or regional potential). Even basic quantification shows business understanding.	> "India's telehealth market is projected to reach $5B by 2026; our solution targets rural clinics (20% of that share)."	1
Realistic Business or Sustainability Model	Explains how the solution will sustain — through revenue, partnerships, or continued support. Doesn't need detailed financials, just realistic logic.	> "Freemium model for students; universities can pay for analytics dashboard access."	1
Differentiation in the Market	Shows awareness of competitors or existing solutions, and clearly defines what makes theirs stand out (price, usability, access, innovation).	> "Unlike current platforms, ours works offline and supports local languages."	1
Scalability of the Solution	Indicates how the idea can grow — more users, new markets, or features — with limited friction.	> "Our backend is designed to handle data from 1 city to 100 with minimal changes."	1
Potential for Social, Environmental, or Economic Impact	Quantifies or clearly describes the positive change — who benefits, and how significantly.	> "Can reduce food waste by 25% and feed 1,000 additional people monthly through redistribution."	1
User Adoption or Accessibility Considerations	Shows awareness of user barriers (cost, tech literacy, geography) and	> "We designed the UI for low-literacy users with voice prompts in regional languages."	1

	addresses how they'll ensure adoption.		
Long-Term Vision / Sustainability	Indicates thought beyond the hackathon — what happens if this scales or is deployed widely.	> "In 2 years, we plan to onboard NGOs and municipalities for continuous waste tracking."	1
Realistic Impact Measurement Metrics	Defines clear, measurable outcomes (KPIs) that track success — social, financial, or usage metrics.	> "We'll measure success by tracking the % of waste diverted from landfills via our app."	1

Hackathon Day Phase

Members

- Keynote
    - Deepak/Justin/Dipesh
- Mentors
    - Subin (team 1-3)
    - Soumyadeep (team 4-6)
    - Arpit (team 7-9)
    - Azim (team 10-12)
    - Samid (team 13-16)
    - Abhishek (team 17-20)
- Demo & Presentation Panel
    - Deepak
    - Neeraj
    - Dipesh
    - Justin
- Technical judges
    - Subin (team 1-10)
    - Soumyadeep (team 1-10)
    - Samid (team 1-10 standby)
    - Abhishek (team 11-20)
    - Azim (team 11-20)
    - Arpit (team 11-20 standby)

Creatives

1. Banners: 2
2. Standees: 2
3. Handouts of all the selected topics (multiple copies) pdf + printouts
4. Passes - @Samid Zafar

Judging

Maximum: 70 points

Overview:
- The 20 shortlisted teams will be assigned new project ideas (different from their submissions).
- The ideas will be sourced from Hackathond day ideas.
- Teams will have to build a working Proof of Concept (PoC) and submit it on GitHub.
- Optional: Teams can deploy their projects online for additional points.

- Judging Sheet: Judging Sheet

2.1 Evaluation Components

Category	Weightage
Agent-OS Technical Score	20 pts
Git History & Contribution	10 pts
Deployment Score	10 pts
Documentation & Demo Video	5 pts
Mentor Conversation Score	10 pts
Final Panel Presentation & Live Demo	15 pts

2.1.1 Agent OS Technical Score

Criterion (1 mark each)	Judge / System Should Check	Marks
Code executes end-to-end without crashing	Runs cleanly using provided setup or command	1
Core functionality produces expected output	Solves stated problem accurately	1
All required files and dependencies present	`requirements.txt`, `package.json`, or `environment.yml` complete	1
Project structure organized logically	Separate folders for src, data, docs, etc.	1
No missing or broken imports	Code compiles or interprets successfully	1
Handles invalid or edge inputs gracefully	No runtime failure on bad input	1
Includes basic error logging or messages	Exceptions handled clearly	1
Code follows efficient logic	No redundant loops or unnecessary calls	1
Functions / classes used modularly	Core logic not written as one giant script	1
Variable & function names meaningful	Improves readability (no temp1, xyz, etc.)	1
Comments explain key logic	Sufficient inline documentation	1
Integration between components works	Frontend ↔ backend ↔ DB/API connect smoothly	1

Deployment or build instructions provided	Clear README / setup steps present	1
Code runs on clean environment	Fresh clone + install = working build	1
Output/UI matches described features	Demo aligns with documentation or pitch	1
Prompts / AI interactions structured well	Modular `.md` or `.json` prompt files used	1
Secure coding practices followed	No hardcoded keys, sanitized inputs	1
Passes lint / formatting check	PEP8 / ESLint or equivalent compliance	1
Documentation adequate	Explains setup, usage, and architecture	1
System ready for demo / deployment	Runs smoothly live or locally	1

2.1.2 Git History & Contribution

Criterion (1 mark each)	Judge / System Should Check	Marks
Repository initialized and actively used	Team worked in Git (not local zip uploads)	1
Consistent commits throughout hackathon period	Not all code pushed at the end; commits spread over time	1
Multiple contributors committed	At least 2+ team members with commits	1
Balanced contribution across team	No single member with >80% commits (unless solo dev)	1
Meaningful commit messages	Clear, descriptive commits (e.g., "added auth API" not "update 1")	1
Incremental commits showing progress	Logical commit flow — setup → features → fixes → final	1
Code changes align with project roadmap	Commits reflect evolution of stated solution	1
Proper use of branches / merges	Used branches for features or testing before merging to main	1
No unnecessary	`.gitignore` used effectively (no large cache, .env, node_modules)	1

binary or junk files committed		
Final working build available in main/master	Final version clearly merged and ready to run from repo	1

2.1.3 Deployment Score

Criterion (1 mark each)	Judge / System Should Check	Marks
Working live deployment link provided	Accessible web/app link or running instance shared	1
Application runs without major downtime/errors	Loads successfully, core features functional	1
Deployment matches latest GitHub version	Live app reflects same codebase as final repo	1
Clear deployment documentation present	Includes setup/deploy steps in README or docs	1
Environment variables & secrets handled safely	Uses `.env` or config files, not hardcoded credentials	1
Responsive / accessible interface (if applicable)	UI adapts to device or browser correctly	1
Stable backend or API connection	Backend endpoints respond reliably without 500 errors	1
Performance acceptable under normal use	App runs smoothly, no major lag or memory issues	1
Supports demo without technical intervention	Judges can open or use without manual setup	1
Backup or fallback demo plan ready	If live link fails, a local deployment, container, or video demo is available	1

2.1.4 Documentation & Demo Video

Criterion (1 mark each)	Judge / System Should Check	Marks
Complete README / Documentation Provided	README includes project overview, setup steps, and usage instructions.	1
Architecture or System Flow Diagram Present	Visual or textual explanation of how components interact (frontend, backend, database, etc.).	1
Code & Repo Documentation Clear	Inline comments or docstrings explain key logic; dependencies and file structure are understandable.	1
Demo Video Shows Working Prototype	2–4 min walkthrough showing major features, UI, or outputs — video accessible and functional.	1
Demo Video Quality & Clarity	Audio/subtitles understandable, steady visuals, and clear narration or labeling of features.	1

2.1.5 Mentor Conversation

Criterion (1 mark each)	Mentor / Judge Should Check	Marks
Active Participation in Mentor Sessions	Team attends on time, engages meaningfully, asks questions, and takes initiative.	1
Clarity in Explaining Progress & Challenges	Team communicates what they've built so far and where they're facing issues.	1
Receptiveness to Feedback	Team listens carefully, takes notes, and shows openness — not defensive or dismissive.	1
Implementation of Mentor Feedback	Evidence that team applied or attempted suggestions during hackathon hours.	1
Collaborative Team Behavior	All members interact; balanced communication instead of one dominant speaker.	1
Positive Problem-Solving Attitude	Team handles setbacks constructively, shows persistence, and focuses on solutions.	1
Adaptability to Change	Team pivots or refines approach effectively after mentor input or new challenge.	1
Technical Curiosity & Learning Orientation	Asks meaningful questions, shows eagerness to understand and improve technically.	1
Professional & Respectful Interaction	Communicates courteously, values mentor time, maintains positive tone.	1
Visible Growth Between Sessions	Noticeable improvement in clarity, confidence, or project progress from first to last check-in.	1

2.1.6 Final Presentation & Live Demo

Criteria	Parameters(1 mark each)	Judge / System Should Check	Marks
Content & Clarity (5 Marks)	Presentation starts and ends within time limit	Concise, structured delivery within allocated time	1
	Problem statement clearly defined	Judges instantly understand what the team is solving	1
	Explains the proposed solution logically	Clear explanation of how the system works	1

	Demonstrates linkage between problem and result	Shows how the solution solves the defined issue	1
	Highlights innovation and differentiator	Points out what makes this solution unique	1
Technical Depth & Demonstration (5 Marks)	Live working demo shown successfully	Real PoC demonstrated during judging	1
	Explains technical implementation clearly	Describes core architecture, tech stack, or data flow	1
	Showcases user journey or use case	Demonstrates how an end user interacts with the solution	1
	Shares performance results or outcome metrics	Shows accuracy, impact, or any measurable outcome	1
	Addresses feasibility or scalability	Discusses deployment, future users, or growth plan	1
Delivery & Team Dynamics (5 Marks)	Team coordination during presentation	All members participate effectively and communicate well	1
	Confidence and clarity during delivery	Calm, professional, and engaging communication	1
	Handles Q&A effectively	Answers are relevant, confident, and accurate	1
	Mentions limitations and next steps	Acknowledges improvement areas with future vision	1
	Overall presentation flow and engagement	Smooth storytelling and professional conclusion	1

Prizes

Prizes will be awarded for the top two positions as follows:

1. **First Prize**: Rs. 25,000
2. **Second Prize**: Rs. 15,000