Rubrics for Minor Project Evaluation

Category 1: Institute-Oriented Software & Information Systems Projects

Domains Covered: Software Engineering, Web Technologies, Information Systems, Databases, UI/UX

Category Description: Projects developed to solve internal institutional problems such as academic management, administration, learning platforms, student services, dashboards, and campus automation.

Rubric #1: (Synopsis) 10 Marks

		Excellent(2.5) Good(2)	Average(1.5) Acceptable(1)	Unacceptable(0)
A	**Identify Problem Domain**: **Identification of an institution-level academic or administrative problem requiring a software or information system solution (**problem may address societal needs such as healthcare, education, environment, governance, disaster management, or infrastructure**)**	Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the project
B	**Requirement analysis and Feasibility of the proposed work: Feasibility within institutional constraints, data privacy, accessibility, and usability (**may additionally consider affordability, environmental impact, and long-term sustainability**)**	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are moderately properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are not properly analysed
C	**Objectives of the proposed work: Automation, efficiency improvement, service quality, and transparency (**may reflect improvement in quality of life, efficiency, safety, inclusiveness, or environmental protection**)**	All objectives of the project work are well defined	Some objectives of the project work are well defined	Objectives of the project work are either not identified or not well defined

D	**Methodology of the proposed work: ERP-style workflows, modular system design, ethical software use (**may demonstrate responsible and ethical use of technology for sustainable development**)**	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are moderately specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not properly specified

Rubric #2: (Mid Term) 20 Marks

		Excellent(4) Good(3)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1)**	**Unacceptable(0)**
A	**Incorporated Modifications: Feedback-based improvements to enhance institutional usability (**may strengthen societal impact, efficiency, sustainability, or usability of the solution**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes
B	**Design Methodology: Modular architecture and scalable institutional systems (**may focus on scalable, inclusive, and resource-efficient solutions supporting sustainable innovation**)**	• Division of problem into modules • Selection of good computing frame work • Appropriate design methodology properly defined	• Partial division of problem into modules • Inappropriate selection of computing frame work • Design methodology not properly defined	Modular approach not adopted and design methodology not defined
C	**Planning of project work and team structure: Academic calendar-aligned planning and responsibility distribution (**may include tasks related to impact assessment, ethical considerations, or deployment feasibility**)**	• Time frame properly specified and being followed • Appropriate distribution of project work	• Time frame properly specified but not being followed • Un-even distribution of project work	• Time frame not properly specified and being followed • In-appropriate distribution of project work

D	**<u>Conceptual and Technical Demonstration:</u> Clear explanation of software logic, databases, and UI/UX (**may highlight contribution of computing solutions to social good or environmental responsibility**)**	• Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification • Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Complete explanation with some relevant literature • Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate • Poor understanding of the technical requirements of the project
E	**<u>Demonstration and Presentation:</u> Effective demonstration of institutional workflows (**may briefly explain broader societal or sustainability relevance of the project**)**	• Objectives achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are appropriate and well delivered • Proper eye contact with audience and clear voice with good spoken language	• Objectives not achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are not appropriate • Eye contact with few people and clear voice with good spoken language	• No objectives achieved • Contents of presentations are not appropriate and not well delivered • Poor delivery of presentation

Rubric #3: (Final Evaluation) 12 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Incorporated Modifications:</u> Final refinements improving performance and security (**may enhance sustainability impact or real-world applicability**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes

B	**<u>Project Demonstration:</u> Fully functional institutional system with integrated modules (**may show outcomes relevant to societal challenges such as safety, accessibility, or efficiency**)**	Module wise demonstration Proper working integrated modules	Module wise demonstration but not proper working of integrated modules	Modules and their integration is not working properly
C	**<u>Presentation:</u> Clear articulation of institutional benefits (**may articulate how the project contributes to societal or environmental improvement**)**	Proper eye contact with audience Clear voice with good spoken language Good concept knowledge	Eye contact with few people less clarity with spoken language partial concept knowledge	No eye contact No concept clearance Voice not audible
D	**<u>Result Evaluation:</u> Measured gains in efficiency, automation, or service delivery (**may be interpreted in terms of social, environmental, or economic benefit**)**	Results are relevant to the expected output of the proposed system	Results are relevant to some extent to the expected output of the proposed system	Unable to provide expected output of the proposed system

Rubric #4: (Final Evaluation) 18 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Formatting:</u> Compliance with institute-prescribed report format (**may optionally include a short section on sustainability or societal relevance**)**	According to specified format	Formatting not done properly	No formatting instructions

B	**<u>Conceptual Demonstration:</u> Information system concepts linked to institutional context (**may be justified in relation to sustainability challenges or national priorities**)**	Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification	Complete explanation with some relevant literature	Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate
C	**<u>Technical Demonstration:</u> Explanation of software stack, database design, and deployment (**may support efficiency, reliability, security, and responsible technology use**)**	Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Poor knowledge understanding of the technical requirements of the project
D	**<u>Representations of results:</u> Dashboards and reports showing institutional performance gains (**may include indicators related to efficiency improvement or resource optimization**)**	Results are present in very efficient manner using charts and bars	Tools is used but not in an efficient manner	No result analysis tool is used
E	**<u>Conclusion and Discussion:</u> Institutional usefulness, scalability, and future expansion (**may briefly state contribution to social good or sustainable development**)**	Importance and purpose of the project is completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of the project is not completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of project is not completed
F	**<u>References and Citations:</u> Relevant software engineering literature and standards (**may include government reports, sustainability studies, or UN documentation**)**	References and citations are completely appropriate and related to the project	References and citations are not completely related to the project	References and citations are not appropriate not even related to the project

Rubrics for Minor Project Evaluation

Category 2: Research-Oriented Intelligent Systems & Data Analytics Projects

Domains Covered: Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Data Science, Image Processing, Computer Vision

Category Description: Projects based on research papers, experimental studies, algorithmic innovation, or comparative analysis.

Rubric #1: (Synopsis) 10 Marks

		Excellent(2.5) Good(2)	Average(1.5) Acceptable(1)	Unacceptable(0)
A	**Identify Problem Domain**: **Clearly articulated research problem and identified research gap (**problem may address societal needs such as healthcare, education, environment, governance, disaster management, or infrastructure**)**	Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the project
B	**Requirement analysis and Feasibility of the proposed work:** **Dataset availability, tools, computational feasibility, reproducibility (**may additionally consider affordability, environmental impact, and long-term sustainability**)**	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are moderately properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are not properly analysed
C	**Objectives of the proposed work: Research-driven objectives aligned with hypothesis or experimentation (**may reflect improvement in quality of life, efficiency, safety, inclusiveness, or environmental protection**)**	All objectives of the project work are well defined	Some objectives of the project work are well defined	Objectives of the project work are either not identified or not well defined

D	**Methodology of the proposed work: Algorithms, models, pipelines, validation strategy (**may demonstrate responsible and ethical use of technology for sustainable development**)**	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are moderately specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not properly specified

Rubric #2: (Mid Term) 20 Marks

		Excellent(4) Good(3)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1)**	**Unacceptable(0)**
A	**Incorporated Modifications: Refinement of models and experiments based on review feedback (**may strengthen societal impact, efficiency, sustainability, or usability of the solution**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes
B	**Design Methodology: Model architecture, feature engineering, evaluation metrics (**may focus on scalable, inclusive, and resource-efficient solutions supporting sustainable innovation**)**	• Division of problem into modules • Selection of good computing frame work • Appropriate design methodology properly defined	• Partial division of problem into modules • Inappropriate selection of computing frame work • Design methodology not properly defined	Modular approach not adopted and design methodology not defined
C	**Planning of project work and team structure: Experiment planning, iterations, result validation (**may include tasks related to impact assessment, ethical considerations, or deployment feasibility**)**	• Time frame properly specified and being followed • Appropriate distribution of project work	• Time frame properly specified but not being followed • Un-even distribution of project work	• Time frame not properly specified and being followed • In-appropriate distribution of project work

D	**<u>Conceptual and Technical Demonstration:</u> Clear explanation of algorithms and experimental design (**may highlight contribution of computing solutions to social good or environmental responsibility**)**	• Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification • Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Complete explanation with some relevant literature • Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate • Poor understanding of the technical requirements of the project
E	**<u>Demonstration and Presentation:</u> Logical presentation of methodology and interim results (**may briefly explain broader societal or sustainability relevance of the project**)**	• Objectives achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are appropriate and well delivered • Proper eye contact with audience and clear voice with good spoken language	• Objectives not achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are not appropriate • Eye contact with few people and clear voice with good spoken language	• No objectives achieved • Contents of presentations are not appropriate and not well delivered • Poor delivery of presentation

Rubric #3: (Final Evaluation) 12 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Incorporated Modifications:</u> Final tuning and validation improvements (**may enhance sustainability impact or real-world applicability**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes

B	**Project Demonstration: Experimental validation and result reproduction (**may show outcomes relevant to societal challenges such as safety, accessibility, or efficiency**)**	Module wise demonstration Proper working integrated modules	Module wise demonstration but not proper working of integrated modules	Modules and their integration is not working properly
C	**Presentation: Clear articulation of findings and comparisons (**may articulate how the project contributes to societal or environmental improvement**)**	Proper eye contact with audience Clear voice with good spoken language Good concept knowledge	Eye contact with few people less clarity with spoken language partial concept knowledge	No eye contact No concept clearance Voice not audible
D	**Result Evaluation: Accuracy, benchmarking, statistical analysis (**may be interpreted in terms of social, environmental, or economic benefit**)**	Results are relevant to the expected output of the proposed system	Results are relevant to some extent to the expected output of the proposed system	Unable to provide expected output of the proposed system

Rubric #4: (Final Evaluation) 18 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**Formatting: Research-paper-style academic formatting (**may optionally include a short section on sustainability or societal relevance**)**	According to specified format	Formatting not done properly	No formatting instructions

B	**Conceptual Demonstration: Strong theoretical grounding (**may be justified in relation to sustainability challenges or national priorities**)**	Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification	Complete explanation with some relevant literature	Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate
C	**Technical Demonstration: Implementation and experimentation details (**may support efficiency, reliability, security, and responsible technology use**)**	Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Poor knowledge understanding of the technical requirements of the project
D	**Representations of results: Tables, graphs, confusion matrices, metrics (**may include indicators related to efficiency improvement or resource optimization**)**	Results are present in very efficient manner using charts and bars	Tools is used but not in an efficient manner	No result analysis tool is used
E	**Conclusion and Discussion: Research contribution, limitations, and future scope (**may briefly state contribution to social good or sustainable development**)**	Importance and purpose of the project is completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of the project is not completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of project is not completed
F	**References and Citations: High-quality journal and conference references (**may include government reports, sustainability studies, or UN documentation**)**	References and citations are completely appropriate and related to the project	References and citations are not completely related to the project	References and citations are not appropriate not even related to the project

Rubrics for Minor Project Evaluation

Category 3: Application-Oriented Interactive & Multimedia Systems Projects

Domains Covered: Web Applications, Mobile Applications, Game Development, Multimedia Systems, UI/UX
Category Description: Projects involving development of end-user applications such as web apps, mobile apps, games, or interactive systems.

Rubric #1: (Synopsis) 10 Marks

		Excellent(2.5) Good(2)	Average(1.5) Acceptable(1)	Unacceptable(0)
A	**Identify Problem Domain**: **User-centric problem or need (**problem may address societal needs such as healthcare, education, environment, governance, disaster management, or infrastructure**)**	Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the project
B	**Requirement analysis and Feasibility of the proposed work:** **Platform suitability, performance, usability (**may additionally consider affordability, environmental impact, and long-term sustainability**)**	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are moderately properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are not properly analysed
C	**Objectives of the proposed work: Feature-driven and experience-oriented objectives (**may reflect improvement in quality of life, efficiency, safety, inclusiveness, or environmental protection**)**	All objectives of the project work are well defined	Some objectives of the project work are well defined	Objectives of the project work are either not identified or not well defined

D	**Methodology of the proposed work: UI/UX flow, application architecture, interaction design (**may demonstrate responsible and ethical use of technology for sustainable development**)**	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are moderately specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not properly specified

Rubric #2: (Mid Term) 20 Marks

		Excellent(4) Good(3)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1)**	**Unacceptable(0)**
A	**Incorporated Modifications: Improvements based on usability and functionality feedback (**may strengthen societal impact, efficiency, sustainability, or usability of the solution**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes
B	**Design Methodology: UI design principles and application architecture (**may focus on scalable, inclusive, and resource-efficient solutions supporting sustainable innovation**)**	• Division of problem into modules • Selection of good computing frame work • Appropriate design methodology properly defined	• Partial division of problem into modules • Inappropriate selection of computing frame work • Design methodology not properly defined	Modular approach not adopted and design methodology not defined
C	**Planning of project work and team structure: Agile or iterative development planning (**may include tasks related to impact assessment, ethical considerations, or deployment feasibility**)**	• Time frame properly specified and being followed • Appropriate distribution of project work	• Time frame properly specified but not being followed • Un-even distribution of project work	• Time frame not properly specified and being followed • In-appropriate distribution of project work

D	**<u>Conceptual and Technical Demonstration:</u> Application logic, UI flows, and interactivity (**may highlight contribution of computing solutions to social good or environmental responsibility**)**	• Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification • Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Complete explanation with some relevant literature • Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate • Poor understanding of the technical requirements of the project
E	**<u>Demonstration and Presentation:</u> Interactive and user-focused demonstration (**may briefly explain broader societal or sustainability relevance of the project**)**	• Objectives achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are appropriate and well delivered • Proper eye contact with audience and clear voice with good spoken language	• Objectives not achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are not appropriate • Eye contact with few people and clear voice with good spoken language	• No objectives achieved • Contents of presentations are not appropriate and not well delivered • Poor delivery of presentation

Rubric #3: (Final Evaluation) 12 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Incorporated Modifications:</u> Final UI/UX and performance refinements (**may enhance sustainability impact or real-world applicability**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes

B	**Project Demonstration: Fully functional and interactive application (**may show outcomes relevant to societal challenges such as safety, accessibility, or efficiency**)**	Module wise demonstration Proper working integrated modules	Module wise demonstration but not proper working of integrated modules	Modules and their integration is not working properly
C	**Presentation: Clear explanation of features and user benefits (**may articulate how the project contributes to societal or environmental improvement**)**	Proper eye contact with audience Clear voice with good spoken language Good concept knowledge	Eye contact with few people less clarity with spoken language partial concept knowledge	No eye contact No concept clearance Voice not audible
D	**Result Evaluation: Usability, feature completeness, responsiveness (**may be interpreted in terms of social, environmental, or economic benefit**)**	Results are relevant to the expected output of the proposed system	Results are relevant to some extent to the expected output of the proposed system	Unable to provide expected output of the proposed system

Rubric #4: (Final Evaluation) 18 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**Formatting: Application project documentation format (**may optionally include a short section on sustainability or societal relevance**)**	According to specified format	Formatting not done properly	No formatting instructions

B	**Conceptual Demonstration: User experience and interaction rationale (**may be justified in relation to sustainability challenges or national priorities**)**	Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification	Complete explanation with some relevant literature	Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate
C	**Technical Demonstration: Technology stack and implementation details (**may support efficiency, reliability, security, and responsible technology use**)**	Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Poor knowledge understanding of the technical requirements of the project
D	**Representations of results: Screenshots, flow diagrams, usage analysis (**may include indicators related to efficiency improvement or resource optimization**)**	Results are present in very efficient manner using charts and bars	Tools is used but not in an efficient manner	No result analysis tool is used
E	**Conclusion and Discussion: Adoption potential and future enhancements (**may briefly state contribution to social good or sustainable development**)**	Importance and purpose of the project is completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of the project is not completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of project is not completed
F	**References and Citations: Relevant frameworks and UI/UX guidelines (**may include government reports, sustainability studies, or UN documentation**)**	References and citations are completely appropriate and related to the project	References and citations are not completely related to the project	References and citations are not appropriate not even related to the project

Rubrics for Minor Project Evaluation

Category 4: Industry-Oriented Secure, Networked & Smart Systems Projects

Domains Covered: Cyber Security, Computer Networks, Cloud Computing, Internet of Things (IoT), Distributed Systems
Category Description: Projects addressing real-world industry problems or developed in collaboration with industry partners.

Rubric #1: (Synopsis) 10 Marks

		Excellent(2.5) Good(2)	Average(1.5) Acceptable(1)	Unacceptable(0)
A	**Identify Problem Domain**: **Industry-relevant problem statement (**problem may address societal needs such as healthcare, education, environment, governance, disaster management, or infrastructure**)**	Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the project
B	**Requirement analysis and Feasibility of the proposed work:** **Cost, scalability, security, and compliance (**may additionally consider affordability, environmental impact, and long-term sustainability**)**	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are moderately properly analysed	Technical, operational and economic aspects of the proposed work are not properly analysed
C	**Objectives of the proposed work: Industry impact and operational improvement (**may reflect improvement in quality of life, efficiency, safety, inclusiveness, or environmental protection**)**	All objectives of the project work are well defined	Some objectives of the project work are well defined	Objectives of the project work are either not identified or not well defined

D	**<u>Methodology of the proposed work</u>: Industry standards, architectures, and protocols (**may demonstrate responsible and ethical use of technology for sustainable development**)**	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are moderately specified	Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not properly specified

Rubric #2: (Mid Term) 20 Marks

		Excellent(4) Good(3)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1)**	**Unacceptable(0)**
A	**<u>Incorporated Modifications:</u> Refinement based on industry feedback (**may strengthen societal impact, efficiency, sustainability, or usability of the solution**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes
B	**<u>Design Methodology:</u> Standard-compliant system architecture (**may focus on scalable, inclusive, and resource-efficient solutions supporting sustainable innovation**)**	• Division of problem into modules • Selection of good computing frame work • Appropriate design methodology properly defined	• Partial division of problem into modules • Inappropriate selection of computing frame work • Design methodology not properly defined	Modular approach not adopted and design methodology not defined
C	**<u>Planning of project work and team structure:</u> Industry-aligned milestones (**may include tasks related to impact assessment, ethical considerations, or deployment feasibility**)**	• Time frame properly specified and being followed • Appropriate distribution of project work	• Time frame properly specified but not being followed • Un-even distribution of project work	• Time frame not properly specified and being followed • In-appropriate distribution of project work

D	**<u>Conceptual and Technical Demonstration:</u>** **Networking, security, or cloud concepts (**may highlight contribution of computing solutions to social good or environmental responsibility**)**	• Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification • Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Complete explanation with some relevant literature • Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	• Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate • Poor understanding of the technical requirements of the project
E	**<u>Demonstration and Presentation:</u> Clear industry workflow and system demonstration (**may briefly explain broader societal or sustainability relevance of the project**)**	• Objectives achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are appropriate and well delivered • Proper eye contact with audience and clear voice with good spoken language	• Objectives not achieved as per time frame • Contents of presentations are not appropriate • Eye contact with few people and clear voice with good spoken language	• No objectives achieved • Contents of presentations are not appropriate and not well delivered • Poor delivery of presentation

Rubric #3: (Final Evaluation) 12 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Incorporated Modifications:</u> Final performance and reliability improvements (**may enhance sustainability impact or real-world applicability**)**	Changes are made as per suggestion	Partial changes	Unable to make changes

B	**<u>Project Demonstration:</u> Robust and production-ready system (**may show outcomes relevant to societal challenges such as safety, accessibility, or efficiency**)**	Module wise demonstration Proper working integrated modules	Module wise demonstration but not proper working of integrated modules	Modules and their integration is not working properly
C	**<u>Presentation:</u> Clear articulation of industrial relevance (**may articulate how the project contributes to societal or environmental improvement**)**	Proper eye contact with audience Clear voice with good spoken language Good concept knowledge	Eye contact with few people less clarity with spoken language partial concept knowledge	No eye contact No concept clearance Voice not audible
D	**<u>Result Evaluation:</u> Measurable performance or impact metrics (**may be interpreted in terms of social, environmental, or economic benefit**)**	Results are relevant to the expected output of the proposed system	Results are relevant to some extent to the expected output of the proposed system	Unable to provide expected output of the proposed system

Rubric #4: (Final Evaluation) 18 Marks

		Excellent(3) Good(2.5)	**Average(2) Acceptable(1.5)**	**Unacceptable(1)**
A	**<u>Formatting:</u> Industry-style technical documentation (**may optionally include a short section on sustainability or societal relevance**)**	According to specified format	Formatting not done properly	No formatting instructions

B	**<u>Conceptual Demonstration:</u> Industry context and problem relevance (**may be justified in relation to sustainability challenges or national priorities**)**	Complete explanation of the key concepts with justification	Complete explanation with some relevant literature	Explanation of the concepts with literature are inaccurate
C	**<u>Technical Demonstration:</u> Security, networking, cloud, or IoT implementation (**may support efficiency, reliability, security, and responsible technology use**)**	Strong understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Minimal understanding of the technical requirements of the project	Poor knowledge understanding of the technical requirements of the project
D	**<u>Representations of results:</u> Logs, benchmarks, analytics (**may include indicators related to efficiency improvement or resource optimization**)**	Results are present in very efficient manner using charts and bars	Tools is used but not in an efficient manner	No result analysis tool is used
E	**<u>Conclusion and Discussion:</u> Real-world applicability and deployment scope (**may briefly state contribution to social good or sustainable development**)**	Importance and purpose of the project is completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of the project is not completed with the conclusions and discussions	Importance and purpose of project is not completed
F	**<u>References and Citations:</u> Industry standards and technical documentation (**may include government reports, sustainability studies, or UN documentation**)**	References and citations are completely appropriate and related to the project	References and citations are not completely related to the project	References and citations are not appropriate not even related to the project