Rating scale

0: Does not meet the criteria - No evidence of the criterion being demonstrated or information is inaccurate or unsupported.

1: Almost meets the criteria - Some evidence of the criterion being demonstrated, but there are clear weaknesses or concerns about the information presented.

2: Meets the criteria -The criterion is clearly demonstrated and reasonably evidenced.

3: Exceeds the criteria -The criterion is demonstrated and evidenced beyond the requirements or expectations.

PROBLEM & SOLUTION	***0***	***1***	***2***	***3***
Outlined a clear problem that affects a significant number of people.	No problem identified or very unclear.	Problem identified but lacks clarity or significance.	Problem is clearly defined and affects a significant number of people.	Problem is clearly defined, affects a significant number of people, and is compellingly presented.
Outlined a solution that solves this problem and clearly explained how it works	No solution presented or very unclear.	Solution presented but not entirely clear how it addresses this problem or how it works. Lacks clarity and detail.	Solution is clear, connected it to the problem, and explained how it works.	Solution is clear, detailed, connected to the problem and is compellingly presented. Clear indication of how it works.
CUSTOMER & MARKET	***0***	***1***	***2***	***3***
Clear description of who the target customer is and what their needs are. Described the size of the market.	No target customer or needs described. No market sizing evidenced.	Target customer and needs described, but market size is vague or unsupported.	Target customer and needs are clearly described. Market size is stated with at least one figure and a reasonable explanation of how it was reached.	Target customer and needs are clearly described. Market size is thorough, with clear calculations or credible sources, and distinguishes the total market from the realistic target segment.
Clear description of how the idea is innovative (outlined how their solution is unique and better than existing alternatives)	No innovation demonstrated. No mention of existing alternatives and/or competitors.	Some innovation demonstrated but lacks clarity or detail. Mention of existing alternatives and/or competitors but no comparison/ analysis.	Innovation is clearly demonstrated. Existing alternatives / competitors outlined with some comparison/ analysis.	Innovation is clearly demonstrated and compellingly presented. Clear outline of existing alternatives/ competitors with a detailed comparison/ analysis.
FINANCIAL VIABILITY	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**
Demonstrated a plan to generate income and grow the business	No income generation strategy presented.	Income strategy presented but lacks detail or is unrealistic.	Financial plan or income generation strategy is clear and reasonable.	Financial plan or income generation strategy is clear, detailed, and compellingly presented. Clear plan for financial growth.

TEAM	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**
Described the expertise of their team in this area and identified any gaps (provided some indication of how they will fill these gaps)	No description of the team. Not clear how strengths connect to the idea. No mention of gaps in expertise.	Basic description of team and strengths but lacks detail on how this connects to the idea. Mention of gaps in expertise but no indication of how these will be addressed.	Team description and strengths are clearly identified and are connected to the idea. Mention of gaps in expertise with some indication of how these will be addressed.	Team description and strengths are clearly identified and are strongly correlated to the idea. Mention of gaps in expertise with a clear plan of how these will be addressed.
TRACTION	0	1	2	3
Shown evidence of work done to date. Evidence that there is demand from real customers, beyond desk-based research.	No evidence of traction demonstrated.	Limited evidence of traction, e.g. a few informal conversations, or mostly desk-based research. Lacks detail and unclear whether it shows real customer demand.	Traction is clearly described and reasonably evidenced beyond desk-based research, e.g. a number of customer interviews or a survey with relevant respondents. Demand from customers is apparent.	Traction is strong for this stage and well evidenced, e.g. a good number of customer interviews or survey responses with clear findings, plus signs of commitment such as sign-ups, a waitlist, letters of intent or a prototype tested with users. Findings are clearly linked to the idea and show how they shaped it.
FUNDING	0	1	2	3
Demonstrated what they will use this competition funding for (costs are realistic and the funding would have a significant impact on further validating the idea)	No clear explanation of how the competition funding will be used, or costs are unrealistic and the funding would have little to no impact on validating the idea.	Use of funding is described, but costs are partly unrealistic or unclear, or the likely impact on validating the idea is limited.	Use of competition funding is clear and costs are realistic. The funding will have a clear impact on the business.	Use of funding is clear, and costs are realistic and detailed. The funding will have a major impact on the business, and this is compellingly presented.