

Following teams are shortlisted for Stage 3

Grand Total = 1/3 of Stage 1 (Total) + 2/3 Stage 2 (Total)

| S.No | University/College/Institute Name | Stage 1 (Total) | TASK 1 Scores (35) | Remark 1 | TASK 2 Scores (30) | Remark 2 | TASK 3 Scores (35) | Remark 3 | Stage 2 (Total) | Grand Total (Stage 1 + Stage 2) | OVERALL REMARKS |
|------|---|-----------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | TOTAL | | TOTAL | | TOTAL | | | | |
| 1 | A.C.Patil College of Engineering | 92.0 | 34 | l(c)- range not shown. Neat Video. | 30 | Good Mechanism.Try not to touch the arena. | 35 | | 99 | 97 | |
| 2 | Ajay Kumar Garg Engineering College | 82.5 | 32 | TR touching boundary , No range description | 30 | | 31 | Orthogonal projection rule , range description not shown | 93 | 90 | |
| 3 | BRAC's Vishwakarma Institute of Technology, Pune - 411037 (Team Leader : Amogh Amonkar) | 90.0 | 34 | Distance shown without any scale | 23 | TB touching boundary and TB is not in contact with robot while placing | 33 | hitting conversion post | 90 | 90 | |
| 4 | College of Engineering Pune | 98.0 | 34 | Task 1.A: Movement hit the boundary | 25 | Task 2.C: Rule 19.B ball touching the boundaries of try spots | 32 | Task 3.C: Kicking representation not well enough; Measurement not shown for all kicking zones | 91 | 93 | |
| 5 | Fr. C. Rodrigues Institute of Technology, Vashi | 99.0 | 33 | PR touching ground while picking | 25 | Touching boundary | 35 | | 93 | 95 | |
| 6 | Government College of Engineering and Research, Avasari (Khurd), Pune | 94.0 | 35 | | 25 | Task 3.C: Rule 19.B violated hit the boundary and bounced | 30 | Task 3.B: Rule 20.C violated, contact surface of robot stops after hitting | 90 | 91 | |
| 7 | Government College of Engineering, Aurangabad | 100.0 | 35 | They are collecting the ball instead of picking | 30 | Using slope and a cloth to ensure rule 19 b | 29 | 3b- rule 20 (a) Usage of curve surface. 3(c) - Kick 01,02 not shown, measurement | 94 | 96 | |
| 8 | Gujarat Technological University | 82.0 | 33 | Range description not given | 29 | Boundary touch not clear (consider) | 33 | Conversion post height not shown | 95 | 91 | |
| 9 | Indian Institute of Technology , Roorkee | 97.0 | 35 | | 30 | | 34 | Range description without scale | 99 | 98 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|----|----------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|----|--|
| 10 | K. J. Somaiya Institute of Engineering and Information Technology | 100.0 | 35 | | 25 | Task 3.C: Rule 19.B violated hit the boundary and bounced | 35 | | 95 | 97 | |
| 11 | K.J Somaiya College Of Engineering | 100.0 | 35 | | 29 | Task 2.C: Rule19.A and 19. B violated touched boundaries and bounced | 33 | Task 3.C: Range not indicated | 97 | 98 | |
| 12 | L. D. College Of Engineering | 94.0 | 35 | | 30 | | 32 | Kick 01 not shown completely, measurement(2) | 97 | 96 | Try Mechanism using slope |
| 13 | Marathwada Mitra Mandal's College of Engineering, Pune-52. | 91.0 | 35 | | 30 | | 28 | Task 3.B: Rule 20.C not followed post kicking the ball Task 3.D: | 93 | 92 | |
| 14 | MIT-World Peace University | 97.0 | 35 | | 29 | Task 2.B: Obstacle avoidance not satisfactory, no good maneuver shown | 35 | | 99 | 98 | |
| 15 | MKSSS's Cummins College of Engineering for Women, Pune | 100.0 | 34 | 3 (c)- No Range Description | 29 | 2(b)- Obstacle avoidance not shown | 33 | 3(c)- Range not shown | 96 | 97 | |
| 16 | Muffakham Jah College of Engineering and Technology (MJCET) | 98.0 | 33 | Range description not shown | 26 | Difficult to evaluate from video | 33 | Range description not shown | 92 | 94 | |
| 17 | Mukesh Patel School Of Technology Management & Engineering, Mumbai | 84.0 | 33 | PR touching ground while picking | 27 | TB touching boundary | 33 | Kicking not clear from video | 93 | 90 | |
| 18 | Pimpri Chinchwad College of Engineering, Pune | 100.0 | 35 | | 24 | Task 2.B: Obstacle avoidance not satisfactory Task 2.C: Rule 19.a (used cable tie) | 35 | | 94 | 96 | |
| 19 | Sardar Patel College of Engineering | 99.0 | 35 | | 30 | | 25 | Task 3.B: 20.A has orthogonal projection;20.C rule not followed contact surface comes to reduce speed to zero Task 3.C - Range not clearly shown | 90 | 93 | Very good try mechanism one the few where ball did not bounce or hit the wall Great video description |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|------|----|---|----|---|----|--|----|----|---|
| 20 | St Francis Institute of Technology | 98.5 | 35 | | 23 | Obstacle avoidance not shown, half movement shown | 27 | Velocity of hitting surface becomes zero, Range description not shown | 85 | 90 | |
| 21 | Vadodara Institute of Engineering | 95.5 | 35 | | 28 | 2(c)- Ball is rolling instead of placing. | 33 | 3(c)- kick from different zones not shown | 96 | 96 | Video divided into parts. Complete competition video shown. |
| 22 | Zakir Husain College of Engineering and Technology, Aligarh Muslim University | 93.5 | 33 | Task 1.C: Range description not well enough | 25 | Task 2.C: Rule 19.A violation | 32 | Task 3.C: Kick 01 not show completely; measurement unclear for two zones | 90 | 91 | |

Following teams are not shortlisted for Stage 3

| S.No | University/College/Institute Name | Stage 1 Mark | TASK 1 Scores (35) | TASK 1 Remarks | TASK 2 Scores (30) | TASK 2 Remarks | TASK 3 Scores (35) | TASK 3 Remarks | Stage 2 TOTAL | Grand Total (Stage 1 + Stage 2) | OVERALL REMARKS |
|------|--|--------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | TOTAL | | TOTAL | | TOTAL | | | | |
| 1 | Fr. Conceicao Rodrigues College of Engineering Bandra | 93.5 | 21 | Movement not shown, passing range not shown, receive mechanism not accurate | 21 | Obstacle not shown, TB placing zone | 13 | No conversion post, kicking not clear, movement not shown, Range description not shown | 55 | 68 | |
| 2 | Government College of Engineering, Amravati | 100.0 | 0 | The video is not as per guidelines. Only pass mechanism was shown. | 0 | Video was not as per guidelines. | 5 | Video not as per guidelines. Only mechanism and conversion post shown. | 5 | 36 | |
| 3 | Gujarat Technological University (Team Leader: Naresh Prajapati) | 84.0 | 35 | | 0 | Task 2.C: Ball not being picked for the try mechanism, ball is dragged | 34 | Task 3.C: Range not clearly visible | 69 | 74 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|----|---|
| 4 | IIT Patna | 99.0 | 0 | 1(a)- only movement of robot platform shown, no mechanism on it. Video not according to Task 1 guidelines. Complete try and pass robot not shown. Pass and Recieve not shown. Only individual mechanism shown. | 0 | A mobile robot was shown. No mechanism, no obstacle avoidance. Did not follow guidelines. | 0 | A video of kicking mechanism was found. Robot not visible. | 0 | 33 | |
| 5 | IITD | 90.0 | 0 | Task 1.A: No try bot Task 1.B: Manual picking Task 1.C: No range indicated Task 1.D: No proper receiving mechanism Task 1.E: Passing and receiving not in bot | 0 | Same video as video for task 1 | 2 | Task 3.A: No movement shown Task 3.B: kicking mechanism not on the bot Task 3.C: No range shown 1c Task 3.D: No conversion post indicated | 2 | 31 | |
| 6 | Institute of Technology, Nirma University | 95.0 | 35 | | 25 | Task 2.C: Rule19.A and 19. B violated, boundary touched and ball bounced | 20 | Task 3.B: Rule 20.C not followed, post kicking the ball contact surface stopped Task 3.C: Only one kicking zone shown; Range not shown properly | 80 | 85 | |
| 7 | KIET group of Institutions, Ghaziabad | 92.0 | 27 | 1(a)- movement of try robot missing. 1(e)- try robot not shown. No range | 5 | 2(a)-Try robot movement not shown. 2(b) no obstacle avoidance. 2(c)- only try mechanism shown. | 16 | Violation of Rule 20 (a), not according to guidelines. | 48 | 62 | Good Simulation. Maybe hardware development got hampered due to COVID |
| 8 | L.J. Institute of Engineering and Technology | 82.0 | 29 | 3(c)- Extremely Slow picking mechanism. We can also reduce one more mark | 23 | 3(c)- Violation of Rule 19 a, 19 b | 30 | 3(c)- Violation of 20 c. | 82 | 82 | Narrow Wooden Hitting Surface |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|----|---|----|--|----|---|----|----|-------------------------------|
| 9 | National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Surathkal, Mangalore. | 94.5 | 3 | No TR, No Picking, no movement. | 4 | No try mechanism | 4 | hitting conversion post, no range description, orthogonal projection rule avoided, no movement | 11 | 39 | |
| 10 | P.E.S's Modern College of Engineering, Pune | 100.0 | 35 | | 25 | Task 2.C: Rule19.A and 19. B violated, boundary touched and ball bounced | 16 | Task 3.B: Wrong ball orientation while being thrown Task 3.C: Distance not indicated well Task 3.D: Conversion post crossing not good | 76 | 84 | |
| 11 | Pune Institute of Computer Technology | 92.0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 31 | NO VIDEO FOUND |
| 12 | SRMIST, KTR, Chennai | 91.0 | 20 | Task 1.B: Ball picking not shown Task 1.C: Range not shown; passing mechanism is manual Task 1.E: No movement while passing and receiving | 5 | Task 2.A: Used hand to manavure the robot Task 2.B: No obstacle shown Task 2.C: no try mechanism | 8 | Task 3.B: Mechanisms not placed on the bot Task 3.C: No kicking range displayed Task 3.D: No conversion post shown | 33 | 52 | |
| 13 | SRMIST, KTR, Chennai | 0.0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | DUPLICATE ENTRY (SRMIST) |
| 14 | St Francis Institute of Technology | 0.0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | DUPLICATE ENTRY (St. Francis) |
| 15 | Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai Campus | 95.5 | 5 | Task 1.B: No picking shown Task 1.C: No passing Task 1.D: No receiving demonstration Task 1.E: No proper passing and receiving shown | 10 | Task 2.C: Rule 19.B violation dragging the ball and touching boundary | 32 | Task 3.C: Only one kicking zone shown; range not clear | 47 | 63 | |