Criteria for team projects evaluation

I. STAGE 1: CORRESPONDENCE (Evaluation of project and abstracts)

The goal of the stage: To determine the range of projects allowed for the full-time stage, based on the assessment of technical viability, relevance to the forum topic and the depth of idea development.

Maximum amount of points for an absentee stage: 25

No	Criteria	Description	Rating scale (1-5)
1	**Relevance and country-specific**	How important is the problem solved by the project for countries in Africa and / or Russia? Are the climatic, resource, infrastructural, and social characteristics of the region taken into account?	**1–** the topic is not relevant **2–** the topic is mentioned, but not disclosed in relation to the region **3–** the topic is relevant in general, but without reference to the specifics of the continent / region **4**-the problem is relevant, the specifics of the region are taken into account superficially **5**-the project solves an acute problem that is in demand in Russia/Question
2	**Innovativeness and novelty**	Does the project contain new engineering / technical solutions, or is it an adaptation of existing technologies?	**1**-a well-known solution, complete lack of novelty **2**-compilation of known solutions without significant processing **3**-improvement of existing analogues (modernization) **4**-an original combination of known technologies **5**- fundamentally new approach or technology
3.1	***for technical projects*** **Scientific and technical elaboration**	Quality of the methodology description, availability of calculations, diagrams, specifications, justification for the choice of materials/technologies.	**1**- only general words, no technical details **2**-the technical part is fragmentary, no calculations are available **3**- there is a description of the principle of operation, partial calculations **4**-there are all the necessary calculations and diagrams, but there is no justification for the choice **5**-depth analysis, full engineering justification
3.2.	***for social/ humanitarian projects***	The quality of the description of the research methodology, the logic of constructing evidence, the depth of	**1**-there is no methodology, the conclusions are not justified **2**-the methodology is described superficially, the sources are not

No	Criteria	Description	Rating scale (1-5)
	The quality of development and validity of the decision	analysis of sources, the validity of conclusions and suggestions.	relevant **3**-there is a description of the methods, but the logic of evidence is weak, the conclusions are partially justified **4**-clear methodology, good source base, but insufficient argumentation **5**-impeccable logic, deep study, conclusions are fully justified and supported by data
4	**Contribution into sustainable development**	How does the project correspond with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)? Does it solve problems, social or economic problems without compromising the future?	**1**-does not comply with the principles of sustainable development **2–** compliance is declared, but not confirmed by calculations **3**-indirectly contributes to one of the aspects of sustainability **4**-the project is aimed at solving a specific problem of sustainable development **5–** the project is directly aimed at solving economic, technical or social problems
5	**Quality of abstracts and text**	Clarity of presentation, logical structure, visibility (graphics, drawings), compliance with the design requirements.	**1**-the text is chaotic, there is no understanding of the essence **2**-the structure is broken, there are no conclusions, there are errors **3**-there is a structure, but it is difficult to read, there are errors **4**-good language, all sections are in place, there are minor flaws **5**-perfect language, professional graphics, clear conclusions

II. STAGE 2: In-person participation (Project defense)

The goal of the stage is to assess the depth of development and realism of the project implementation, the team's ability to communicate and the implementation potential.

Maximum amount of points for a full-time stage: 25

No	Criteria	Description	Rating scale (1-5)
1	**Presentation quality and visualization**	How well does the presentation reflect the essence of the work? Are graphs easy to read; are there any prototypes/layouts (photos/videos), diagrams?	**1**-solid text, no illustrations, graphs or diagrams **2**-there are illustrations, but they are not related to the project text **3**- there are illustrations, but they are overloaded **4**-good design, clear diagrams, but there

No	Criteria	Description	Rating scale (1-5)
			is no demonstration of the layout **5**-perfect balance of text and visual, demonstration of the layout / model
2	**Convincing defense and communication**	The team's ability to clearly and concisely convey the essence of the project, engage the audience and the expert jury.	**1**-the speaker does not know the material, reads from a sheet **2-** reading from a sheet, uncertainty, exceeding the time limit **3**-the material is presented, but uncertainly or monotonously **4**-good contact with the audience, clear speech **5**-lively, energetic presentation, professional terminology, teamwork
3	**Answers to questions**	Depth of the topic understanding, the ability to reasonably defend one's point of view, reaction to criticism.	**1**-the team is unable to answer questions or does not answer in substance **2-** answers only to elementary questions, confusion in terms **3**-confident answers to general questions, but difficulties in delving into details or highly specialized aspects **4**-confident answers to most questions, but lack of depth **5**-clear, reasoned answers, demonstration of expert level
4	**Practical feasibility and business potential**	Is it possible to implement in Africa/Russia "here and now" or in the near future? Is there an estimate of the implementation cost and availability of materials?	**1**-a fantastic project that cannot be implemented in the current conditions **2**-feasibility is very doubtful, there is no project economy **3–** we will implement it with significant investments/complex logistics **4**-we will implement it in the medium term, there is an understanding of the market **5**-a startup ready for implementation, cheap, simple technology
5	**Consideration of the implementation context and resistance to external factors**	Has the impact of the external environment (natural, infrastructural, social) on the project implementation been assessed? Are possible limitations (resource, personnel, and logistics) taken into account and are there mechanisms for adapting the technology to different	**1**-The project is presented without taking into account real condition, can be exist only in the “ideal” model **2**-External conditions are mentioned, but their impact to the project is not analyzed and technically not taken into account **3**-Partial consideration of individual factors (for example, energy supply), but a comprehensive analysis of the environmental impact has not been conducted **4 -** Key external risks analysis was

No	Criteria	Description	Rating scale (1-5)
		conditions?	provided, technical or organizational solutions are proposed for most of them **5**. The project was initially developed taking into account the variability of conditions: flexible architecture, scalability, the ability to adapt to local resources and human resources

FINAL RESULT

The total score from two stages determine the winners. **Maximum: 50 points.**