

Rubric Table for PDF1

Prototype development

Criteria	Description	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Marks
Customer & Need Identification (10%)	Identifies potential customers and their specific needs or problems to be solved.	Unclear or not identified	Limited understanding	Basic identification	Clear identification	Highly specific and detailed	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Customer Value Proposition (5%)	Demonstrates the product's value (faster, better, cost-efficient) and relevance to customers.	No value proposition	Weak relevance	General value proposition	Strong value with examples	Excellent, quantified value	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Technology Development Plan (15%)	Methodology of the project implementation (based on current TRL level to target TRL)	No plan provided	Basic plan	General milestones	Clear plan with timeline	Detailed, achievable roadmap	Poor (0% - 3%) Fair (4% - 6%) Good (7% - 9%) Excellent (10% - 12%) Outstanding (13% - 15%)
Market analysis and competition (10%)	Shows evidence of market size, trends, and demand for the product/prototype.	No market data	Limited relevance	General market analysis	Strong analysis with data	Comprehensive and validated demand	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Competitive Advantage (5%)	Highlights competitive strengths and differentiation from existing solutions.	No comparison provided	Weak differentiation	General comparison	Strong competitive edge	Excellent and sustainable advantage	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Roadmap for sustainability of product (10%)	Details plans for product improvements, scalability, or technological advancements.	No plan provided	Limited improvement plan	Basic technology plan	Clear roadmap with details	Excellent roadmap and milestones	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)

Commercialization Plan / Business Plan(10 %)	Outlines clear commercialization steps, including market entry, partnerships, and benefits to the university.	No plan provided	Unclear or weak strategy	General commercialization plan	Strong plan with clear benefits	Comprehensive plan with significant benefits to the university	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Business Model Canvas (BMC) (10%)	Provides clear BMC elements: customer segments, value propositions, channels, revenue streams, and key activities.	No BMC provided	Limited or unclear BMC	Basic BMC with missing elements	Clear BMC with key elements	Comprehensive BMC with well-defined components and market alignment	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Financial Justification & Budgeting (UTM Guidelines) (5%)	Ensures compliance with UTM financial policies, including proper allocation across budget categories (VOT codes).	Does not follow UTM financial policies. Budget is incorrect, with missing or wrong VOT codes. No justification given.	Partially follows UTM policies. Some mistakes in budget and VOT codes. Justification is unclear.	Mostly follows UTM policies. Minor errors in budget and VOT codes. Justification is provided but needs improvement.	Follow UTM policies well. Budget and VOT codes are mostly correct. Justification is clear.	Fully follows UTM policies. Budget is well-structured, VOT codes are correct, and justification is strong.	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Risk & Mitigation (5%)	Identifies key risks (technical, financial, market) and proposes strategies to mitigate them.	No risks identified	Limited risks addressed	General risks identified	Strong risk management	Comprehensive mitigation plan	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Team Capability (5%)	Evaluates the team's ability, skills, and experience to deliver the project or commercialization.	No team identified	Weak team capability	Basic team capability	Strong team with skills	Highly experienced and capable team	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Impact and contribution of the	Measures how the project benefits	No clear socio-econo	Limited impact with weak	Some positive impact with	Clear socio-economi	High socio-economi	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%)

project to socio-economic (10%)	society and the economy. Projects should help industries grow, create jobs, improve communities, or solve important problems. Impact can be seen through better productivity, quality of life, or sustainability.	mic impact. No evidence of contribution to society or the economy.	connections to socio-economic benefits. Minimal contribution to society or industry.	moderate socio-economic benefits. Contribution is present but not significant.	c impact with strong benefits. The project contributes well to society and industry.	c impact with significant benefits. Strong contribution to improving society, industry, or the economy.	Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
--	---	--	--	--	--	---	---

Rubric Table for PDF 2

Target: Pre-commercialisation

Focus on technology ready to enter market

Criteria	Description	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Marks
Market readiness level (20%)	Market readiness involves validating the idea, refining for early adopters, and improving for wider market adoption based on feedback.	No clear value proposition, no prototype, no market engagement.	Basic idea with minimal validation and weak prototype.	Defined value proposition, early prototype, and some market testing.	Strong prototype, tested with early adopters, and refined for scaling.	Fully market-ready with clear demand and solid adoption strategy.	Poor (0 - 4%) Fair (5% - 8%) Good (9% - 12%) Excellent (13% - 16%) Outstanding (17% - 20%)
Technology Development Plan (10%)	Methodology of the project implementation (based on current TRL level to target TRL)	No plan provided	Basic plan	General milestones	Clear plan with timeline	Detailed, achievable roadmap	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Market analysis & Competitive strategy(10%)	Shows evidence of market size, trends, and demand for the product/prototype.	No market data	Limited relevance	General market analysis	Strong analysis with data	Comprehensive and validated demand	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Roadmap sustainability of product (5%)	Details plans for product improvements, scalability, or technological advancements.	No plan provided	Limited improvement plan	Basic technology plan	Clear roadmap with details	Excellent roadmap and milestones	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Commercialization Plan / Business Plan(10 %)	Outlines clear commercialization steps, including	No plan provided	Unclear or weak strategy	General commercialization plan	Strong plan with clear benefits	Comprehensive plan with significant	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%)

	market entry, partnerships, and benefits to the university.					benefits to the university	Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Business Model Canvas (BMC) (10%)	Provides clear BMC elements: customer segments, value propositions, channels, revenue streams, and key activities.	No BMC provided	Limited or unclear BMC	Basic BMC with missing elements	Clear BMC with key elements	Comprehensive BMC with well-defined components and market alignment	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Financial Plan (10%)	Provides detailed cost breakdown, funding needs, and revenue projections.	No financial plan	Budget unclear	Basic financial data	Clear and reasonable plan	Detailed, accurate projections	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)
Financial Justification & Budgeting (UTM Guidelines) (5%)	Ensures compliance with UTM financial policies, including proper allocation across budget categories (VOT codes).	Budgeting is not aligned with UTM financial policies. Incorrect or missing VOT codes. Financial justification is weak or absent. Major misallocation of funds.	Some alignment with UTM financial policies, but with significant errors in VOT codes or category allocation. Justification is minimal or unclear. Budgeting	Generally follows UTM financial policies, but minor errors exist in VOT codes or allocation. Justification is provided but lacks depth. Some budget categories are not well-explained.	Largely adheres to UTM financial policies, with correct VOT codes and logical budget allocation. Justification is clear and reasonable, with minor areas for improvement.	Fully meets UTM financial policies with accurate VOT codes and appropriate budget allocation. Financial justification is well-structured, detailed, and strongly supports budget decisions.	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)

			lacks coherence.				
Risk & Mitigation (5%)	Identifies key risks (technical, financial, market) and proposes strategies to mitigate them.	No risks identified	Limited risks addressed	General risks identified	Strong risk management	Comprehensive mitigation plan	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Team Capability (5%)	Evaluates the team's ability, skills, and experience to deliver the project or commercialization.	No team identified	Weak team capability	Basic team capability	Strong team with skills	Highly experienced and capable team	Poor (0% - 1%) Fair (2%) Good (3%) Excellent (4%) Outstanding (5%)
Impact and contribution of the project to socio-economic (10%)	The project contributes to socio-economic development. The impact assessment considers both direct and indirect benefits, and has the potential for long-term sustainability.	The project has little to no contribution to socio-economic development. No clear benefits identified. No evidence of addressing societal or economic needs.	The project has minimal contribution to socio-economic development. Benefits are vaguely stated and not well-supported by evidence. Limited relevance to societal or economic needs.	The project has some positive socio-economic impact. Contributions are somewhat clear but lack strong justification or measurable outcomes. Some alignment with societal and economic needs.	The project demonstrates clear socio-economic contributions with well-defined benefits. Evidence supports its potential impact on society and the economy. Aligns well with socio-economic needs.	The project makes a strong, measurable contribution to socio-economic development. Clearly defined and well-supported benefits. Potential for long-term sustainability and scalability. Strong alignment with societal and economic priorities.	Poor (0 - 2%) Fair (3% - 4%) Good (5% - 6%) Excellent (7% - 8%) Outstanding (9% - 10%)