OPEN Category Competition Rule Book

Version: 28 Sept 2020

Challenge Statement

How might a team collaborating remotely be more productive than in a face-to-face meeting?

e.g. How might we translate body language, nuance, and emotion for more feedback to make remote meetings better?

Overview

Participating teams to develop a **prototype** solution to address the challenge statement.

Prototype may include:

- Web Applications
- Mobile Applications
- Devices
- Electronic Equipment
- Software / Hardware Product

Prototype should function at least on a proof of concept level.

Prototype should demonstrate application of data science

Prototype should be presented in a live setting to a panel of judges within 15 mins

Refer to assessment rubric for guidance.

ntucampcode.roboto.sg

Assessment Rubrics for Conceptual Solution Challenge

Scoring Table	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Commercial and Economic Impact	Solution does not have commercial viability Solution has little to no economic benefit for users (both organizations and individuals).	Solution has some potential to be commercially viable Solution has some economic benefit for users (both organizations and individuals)	Solution has strong potential to be commercially viable Solution has some economic benefit for users (both organizations and individuals)	Solution is almost certain to be commercially viable Solution has great economic benefit for users (both organizations and individuals)	Solution is commercially viable. Solution has immense economic benefit for users (both organizations and individuals)
Mental Wellness Impact	Solution has negative effects on the user's mental wellness.	Solution has little to no effects on the user's mental wellness.	Solution has slight positive effects on the user's mental wellness.	Solution has great positive effects on the user's mental wellness.	Solution has immense positive effects on the user's mental wellness.
Originality of Ideas	Solution or the combination of use-case and solution is a direct or very-close replicate of an existing product or solution available in the market.	Solution or the combination of use-case and solution is quite similar to an existing product or solution available in the market.	Solution or the combination of use-case and solution is somewhat similar to an existing product or solution available in the market.	Solution or the combination of use-case and solution is unique and not similar to an existing product or solution available in the market.	Solution or the combination of use-case and solution is unique and not similar to an existing product or solution available in the market. It is also not similar to other participant's solutions
Prototype Fidelity	Prototype is a poor representation of the final product in terms of level of detail and realism.	Prototype is a average representation of the final product in terms of level of detail and realism.	Prototype is an above average representation of the final product in terms of level of detail and realism.	Prototype is an excellent representation of the final product in terms of level of detail and realism.	Prototype is an almost-identical representation of the final product in terms of level of detail and realism.
Prototype Functionality	Prototype is a poor representation of the final product in terms of functionality	Prototype is a average representation of the final product in terms of functionality	Prototype is an above average representation of the final product in terms of level of functionality	Prototype is an excellent representation of the final product in terms of level of functionality	Prototype is an almost-identical representation of the final product in terms of level of functionality

ntucampcode.roboto.sg

Scoring Table	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Prototype Sophistication	Prototype s of a ow techn ca comp ex ty	Prototype s of an average techn ca comp ex ty	Prototype s of an above-average techn ca comp ex ty	Prototype s of a h gh techn ca comp ex ty	Prototype s of an extreme y h gh techn ca comp ex ty
Potential of Future Mass Deployment	So ut on has poor potent a for future mass product on, dep oyment and sca ab ty	So ut on has average potent a for future mass product on, dep oyment and sca ab ty	So ut on has above average potent a for future mass product on, dep oyment and sca ab ty	So ut on has exce ent potent a for future mass product on, dep oyment and sca ab ty	So ut on has exce ent potent a for future mass product on, dep oyment and sca ab ty

Prototype demonstrates th s potent a n some form |
| **Application of Data Science** | Prototype uses no e ements of data sc ence or ana yt cs of any sort. | Prototype uses some e ements of data sc ence or ana yt cs, that has tt e to no mpact n the funct ona ty or other aspects of end outcomes. | Prototype uses e ements of data sc ence or ana yt cs, that has some mpact n the funct ona ty or other aspects of end outcomes. | Prototype s somewhat re ant on data sc ence or ana yt cs, that has ma or mpact n the funct ona ty or other aspects of end outcomes. | Prototype s heav y re ant on data sc ence or ana yt cs, that has ma or mpact n the funct ona ty or other aspects of end outcomes. |
| **Quality of Prepared Pitch** | Presenters gave poor answers when asked on deta s or to c ar fy on any aspect of the so ut on.

Presenters defended the r so ut on poor y when cha enged on the mpact, or g na ty, execut on, feas b ty or any other e ements of the so ut on. | Presenters gave average answers when asked on deta s or to c ar fy on any aspect of the so ut on.

Presenters defended the r so ut on poor y when cha enged on the mpact, or g na ty, execut on, feas b ty or any other e ements of the so ut on. | Presenters gave c ear answers when asked on deta s or to c ar fy on any aspect of the so ut on.

Presenters defended the r so ut on reasonab y when cha enged on the mpact, or g na ty, execut on, feas b ty or any other e ements of the so ut on. | Presenters gave c ear and deta ed answers when asked on deta s or to c ar fy on any aspect of the so ut on.

Presenters defended the r so ut on we when cha enged on the mpact, or g na ty, execut on, feas b ty or any other e ements of the so ut on. | Presenters gave c ear and deta ed answers when asked on deta s or to c ar fy on any aspect of the so ut on, to the po nt that no fo ow-up quest ons were needed.

Presenters defended the r so ut on extreme y we when cha enged on the mpact, or g na ty, execut on, feas b ty or any other e ements of the so ut on, promot ng the quest oner to change the r stand. |

ntucampcode.roboto.sg

Scoring Table	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Quality of Answers during Q&A	Presentat on deck was ncoherent and f ow of presentat on was poor. P tch was not de vered n a conv nc ng manner. No use of any other presentat on a ds; such as v deos, ustrat ons or ke-for- ke demo v deos. Poor t me management (d d not f n sh p tch n g ven t me)	F ow of presentat on was average. P tch was de vered n a somewhat conv nc ng manner. No use of any other presentat on a ds; such as v deos, ustrat ons or ke-for- ke demo v deos. Poor t me management (d d not f n sh p tch n g ven t me)	F ow of presentat on was above average, w th some form of narrat ve or story-te ng e ements. P tch was de vered n a reasonab y conv nc ng manner. Some use of any other presentat on a ds; such as v deos, ustrat ons or ke-for- ke demo v deos. Average t me management (Comp eted p tch n g ven t me)	F ow of presentat on was good, w th some form of narrat ve or story-te ng e ements. P tch was de vered n a conv nc ng manner. Good use of any other presentat on a ds; such as v deos, ustrat ons or ke-for- ke demo v deos. Good t me management (Comp eted p tch n g ven t me or esser)	F ow of presentat on was exce ent, w th some form of narrat ve or story-te ng e ements P tch was de vered n an extreme y conv nc ng manner. Good use of any other presentat on a ds; such as v deos, ustrat ons or ke-for- ke demo v deos. Good t me management (Comp eted p tch n g ven t me or esser)

ntucampcode.roboto.sg