115114, Moscow,
5 Letnikovskaya St., Bldg. 2, Office 135
Tel.: +7 (495) 990-45-72
E-mail: case-in@fondsmena.ru

REGULATIONS GOVERNING[1] THE FINAL STAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING CHAMPIONSHIP CASE-IN® CIS AND BRICS YOUNG PROFESSIONALS LEAGUE[2]

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. The International Engineering Championship CASE-IN® (hereinafter – Championship) is an international system of engineering case-solving competitions for school students, university students, and young professionals.

1.2. The Championship is conducted within the following Leagues:

- School League (for school students under the age of 18);
- Vocational Education and Training League (for students of vocational education institutions under the age of 20);
- Student League (for students of higher education institutions under the age of 25);
- Young Professionals League (for young professionals from companies and educational institutions under the age of 35);
- Special Leagues (for school students, students of vocational and higher education institutions, and young professionals).

1.3. The overarching theme of the Championship in 2026 is «Technologies of the Future».

1.4. The CIS and BRICS Young Professionals League (hereinafter – League) is a team-based engineering case competition for young professionals representing organizations from the CIS and BRICS member states, including industry companies, company subsidiaries, higher education institutions, and research organizations.

1.5. The purpose of the League is to establish a unified industry platform for young professionals in the fuel and energy sector, the nuclear industry, and related fields. The League aims to facilitate the resolution of pressing industry challenges at the national level, promote cross-sectoral knowledge exchange, support the advancement of participants' innovative projects, and strengthen horizontal professional networks and awareness among young professionals from the CIS and BRICS member states.

1.6. The League is organized by the «Nadezhnaya Smena» Foundation and the International Union of Instrument & ITT Engineers, with the support of the Executive

[1] The Organizing Committee shall not be responsible for participants' familiarization with the Championship Regulations.

[2] The Organizing Committee reserves the right to amend the procedures for the preparation, organization, and holding of the Championship.

Committee of the CIS Electric Power Council, the Federal Agency for the Commonwealth of Independent States Affairs, Compatriots Living Abroad and International Humanitarian Cooperation (Rossotrudnichestvo), the Russian Energy Agency of the Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation, and the Alexander Gorchakov Public Diplomacy Fund.

1.7. The Final Stage of the League is the concluding competition in solving engineering cases among young professionals, held within the framework of the «New Generation» Program of the Federal Agency for the Commonwealth of Independent States Affairs, Compatriots Living Abroad and International Humanitarian Cooperation (Rossotrudnichestvo) (hereinafter referred to as the «New Generation» Program).

1.8. The dates of the Final Stage of the League: May 18–23, 2026.

2. PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING THE FINAL STAGE

2.1. The Final Stage defense of the League is held in person in Moscow and will take place on May 21, 2026, at the venue of the National University of Science and Technology MISIS, located at: 4 Leninsky Prospekt.

2.2. The Final Stage is conducted using the specialized software «CASE-IN Simulator» (hereinafter referred to as the CASE-IN Simulator).

2.3. As part of the Final Stage, participants are required to complete an additional assignment to the case.

2.4. The additional assignment will be provided on April 21, 2026, by 12:00 PM (Moscow time) via the CASE-IN Simulator.

2.5. By May 5, 2026, by 12:00 PM (Moscow time), the team captain must upload the case solution presentation and any accompanying materials (if applicable) in .pdf format, as well as a link to the video introduction, to the CASE-IN Simulator.

2.6. Participants may replace the presentation, accompanying materials, or the video introduction link after the established deadline within 24 hours, until 12:00 PM (Moscow time) of the following day, subject to a penalty point (see Section 8 «Penalty Points»).

2.7. Uploading or replacing presentations after the deadline specified in Clause 2.6 **is not permitted.**

2.8. Two working days prior to the Final Stage, members of the expert commission are granted access to the CASE-IN Simulator to review the teams' solutions.

3. PARTICIPANTS OF THE FINAL STAGE

3.1. One top-ranked team from each country, based on the results of the National Qualifying Stages, is invited to participate in the Final Stage[3].

3.2. Eligible participants of the Final Stage include students of higher education institutions, young professionals from companies in the fuel and energy complex, mining

[3] A quota system applies to each track: if a country submits more teams than others, it may be allocated an additional spot in the Final Stage. In this case, the highest-ranked team among the remaining teams from that country will advance to the Final Stage.

and metals sector, the nuclear industry, and related sectors, as well as employees of higher education institutions.

3.3. Participants must be no older than 40 years of age at the time of the Final Stage of the Championship. In the event of a discrepancy between the age declared during registration and the actual age, the team will be disqualified unilaterally.

3.4. By participating in the Championship, participants confirm that their submitted solution represents the result of the collaborative work of their team and that all documentation has been prepared personally by the team members. The use of artificial intelligence in preparing materials is permitted by the Organizing Committee, provided that teams clearly indicate such usage in the submitted documents (see Clause 4.6).

3.5. All participants must comply with the Memorandum on Compliance with the Championship Regulations and the Declaration on Authorship and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems. Violations of these rules, including improper handling of documentation, may result in the imposition of penalty points and may lead to team disqualification (see Section 8).

3.6. With the approval of the Organizing Committee, a team may make no more than one replacement of a team member from the originally submitted list. To carry out a replacement, teams must: submit an official request to lms@fondsmena.ru, including the following details:

- the name of the participating organization, the Selection Stage venue, the track in which the team is competing, the team name, the full name of the departing participant, and the full name of the new participant;
- ensure that the new participant completes individual registration on the Championship website.

3.7. Team substitutions are not permitted after May 8, 2026.

4. PREPARATION OF TEAMS FOR THE DEFENSE

4.1. For the defense, each team must prepare an oral presentation, a case solution presentation in .pdf format in accordance with the presentation template, and a video introduction.

4.2. The case solution presentation should include:

- **Slide 1 – Title slide:** Include the team name and the logos provided in the presentation template.
- **Slide 2 – Team slide:** List team members and include their photos.[4]
- **Content slides:** Present the case solution in no more than 10 slides.

[4] Participants are required to adhere to the official dress code. The background of photographs must be in a neutral color scheme and must not include any prohibited elements, such as the display of alcohol or tobacco products, weapons, or symbols and paraphernalia of organizations banned within the territory of the Russian Federation.

- **Final slide:** Include team members' names and photos, the logos from the template, and the text «Thank you for your attention».

4.3. The total number of slides in the presentation must not exceed 13.

4.4. The content slides of the presentation within the «Solution» section must include appropriate titles and correspond to their content.

4.5. The logos from the template are **mandatory** on the title and final slides.

4.6. If the team used AI tools in developing the case solution, this should be indicated in the presentation using one of the following statements:

- «Part of the textual description was generated using the AI model [model name] for [purpose]»;
- «Visual materials were created with [AI tool name] based on our source data».

4.7. Failure to comply with the mandatory formatting requirements may result in penalty points for the team (see Section 8).

4.8. The presentation template, fully compliant with all requirements and including additional formatting recommendations, will be provided to participants along with the case via the CASE-IN Simulator software.

4.9. In case of changes to the background of the presentation template, teams must use the logos approved in **the Championship Brand Book** (see «Media Center» section).

4.10. Teams may request a consultation on the case topic from the Organizing Committee by submitting a question using the form «Case Question – CIS League / BRICS League» or «Question to the Organizers» via the provided link. This form is **the only channel** for teams to submit questions.[5]

4.11. Each team may submit **a maximum of 3 questions**. Questions are accepted and processed by the Organizing Committee on business days from Monday to Friday, 10:00 to 19:00 (Moscow time). Question submission closes 2 days before the case solution deadline. Responses will be provided within 2 business days.[6]

4.12. Teams may use any sources of information to complete the additional case assignment. It is recommended to rely on reliable and verified sources. Reliable sources are those that provide a reference to an official source, including official websites of industry companies.

4.13. Teams may prepare supplementary materials for the case solution. To do so, upload **no more than 1 .pdf file**[7] in the designated window of the CASE-IN Simulator together with the case solution.

[5] The submission of questions through alternative platforms, such as the CASE-IN Simulator software, email, or team captain chats, is not permitted and will not be considered. This measure is implemented to ensure the efficient processing of all inquiries and the timely provision of responses.

[6] Organizational questions are not considered case-related inquiries and are not subject to any deadlines for submission to the Organizing Committee.

[7] If a team has more than one attachment file, all files must be consolidated into a single document and converted to PDF format.

4.14. If it is necessary to provide printed supplementary materials to the experts, teams must print and bring these materials **themselves** on the day of the defense. The Organizing Committee is not responsible for whether the experts review the supplementary materials.

4.15. Supplementary materials **may not** be included within the main case solution presentation.

4.16. Along with the case solution, teams must prepare a video introduction, which will be used when the team takes the stage to introduce itself to experts and guests prior to the presentation. A link to the file stored in cloud storage for download must be uploaded together with the case solution to a dedicated section of the CASE-IN Simulator.

4.17. Video introduction requirements:

- recording quality of at least 1080p;
- video resolution: 1920 × 1080 (HD), aspect ratio 16:9;
- file format: *.mp4;
- all team members must appear in the video;
- the content of the video must reflect information about the team, its identity, or name;
- a title frame indicating the team name and participants;
- video duration: no more than 1 minute and no less than 30 seconds;
- video acceleration is not permitted;
- video language: English;
- no informal or inappropriate language, including slang;
- all participants must have a presentable appearance;
- the video must not contain any content (music tracks, website links, images, video materials, etc.) prohibited for distribution in the Russian Federation;
- the video must not include any elements that can be interpreted as promoting violence or racial, ethnic, gender, or religious intolerance.

4.18. As part of the League, a vote will be held for the best video introduction. The team whose video receives the highest number of votes will be declared the winner in this category.

4.19. Voting will be conducted via a dedicated Telegram bot or by written ballot. The voting format will be determined by the Organizing Committee.

4.20. To ensure fair voting, participants are prohibited from voting for their own video introductions.

4.21. Submission of a video introduction is a mandatory requirement for participation in the League. Teams that fail to submit a video introduction within the established deadline will be subject to penalties (see Section 8 «Penalty Points»).

4.22. To ensure high-quality preparation of Final Stage participants for presenting

their solutions, the Organizing Committee will provide a link to a recorded webinar with the case analyst.

4.23. Participants must comply with all requirements for finalists specified in Appendix No. 1.

4.24. Participation in contests held on social media is recommended (for more details, please refer to the Championship website: https://case-in.ru/ru/article/126/).

4.25. Additional participation guidelines are provided in Appendix No. 2.

5. EXPERT COMMISSION

5.1. The Expert Commission of the Final Stage (hereinafter referred to as the EC) is established to evaluate team solutions and determine the winners and prize winners of the Championship.

5.2. The EC is formed by the Organizing Committee, taking into account proposals from representatives of participating countries. The EC may include representatives of government, public, and scientific organizations, as well as employees of leading industry companies that do not participate in the Final Stage of the main season, members of the CASE-IN Hall of Fame, and others. If necessary, the Organizing Committee may invite experienced experts and Championship mentors to join the EC.

5.3. Each country is recommended to delegate no more than two representatives to the EC.

5.4. The recommended number of experts in the EC is at least 7 members.

5.5. The Organizing Committee appoints a Chairperson of the EC. The Chairperson's duties include:

- overall coordination of the EC's activities;
- finalizing and summarizing the results of the teams' presentations;
- signing the final defense protocol;
- deciding on the allocation of prizes in case of disputes (see Section 9.3).

5.6. All experts must comply with the Championship Regulations, these Young Professionals League Regulations, the Memorandum on Compliance with the Championship Regulations, and follow the Code of Professional Ethics.

6. DEFENSE PROCEDURE

6.1. The overall process of the defense procedure is overseen by a Moderator, appointed by the League Organizers, who ensures compliance with the Rules.

6.2. Moderators may be members of the Championship Organizing Committee, members of the Championship Hall of Fame, or members of the Engineering Case Winners Club.

6.3. Team solutions are evaluated by the members of the EC.

6.4. All participants, including the Chairperson of the EC and members of the EC,

must arrive at the Championship venue in advance, prior to the announced start time.

6.5. If the Chairperson of the EC or a member of the EC fails to arrive at the start of the event or is late for the presentation of the first team, the defense shall commence at the scheduled time without their presence. In the absence of the Chairperson of the EC, their duties shall be assumed by the most senior member of the EC.

6.6. Teams present their solutions in the order determined by a draw. The draw is conducted in person at the venue on the day of the Final Stage.

6.7. Each team's presentation **must not exceed 8 minutes**. Exceeding the time limit will result in penalty points (see Section 8).

6.8. After each team's presentation, experts may ask questions to assess the team's knowledge and the depth of their solution. Experts may clarify specific points, verify participants' understanding, and explore additional details as needed.

6.9. Each team will be asked **between 3 and 5 questions** by the EC. At the Chairperson's discretion, one additional question may be asked within the allotted time. The total question-and-answer time per team **must not exceed 5 minutes**.

6.10. Upon completion of the time allocated for the Q&A session with experts, the team is not permitted to respond and/or add to their answers. In case of non-compliance with this provision, penalties may be imposed on the team, up to and including disqualification.

6.11. During the Final Stage, questions from participants and guests are not accepted.

6.12. Upon completion of the defense, the Chairperson must provide teams with general feedback and recommendations regarding their solutions.

6.13. Before the defense, each EC member is assigned 1 to 3 teams. Upon completion of the defense, experts must provide detailed feedback and recommendations to their assigned teams regarding their solutions. When interacting with participants, experts must remain objective and provide professional recommendations regarding the team's solution, presentation, and performance.

6.14. Experts evaluate teams using the CASE-IN Simulator. Following the teams' presentations, experts enter scores in the CASE-IN Simulator. After the defense procedure is completed, experts must ensure that each team has been evaluated against all criteria.

6.15. If an expert fails to evaluate the teams within 15 minutes after the completion of the defense, their scores are automatically excluded from the final calculation for all teams.

6.16. If experts do not have access to the CASE-IN Simulator during the Selection Stage, team solutions are evaluated by assigning scores on special evaluation sheets, with the results subsequently entered into the Simulator by the Selection Stage Moderator.

6.17. When evaluating solutions, the EC follows the official Championship criteria (see Section 7).

7. EVALUATION CRITERIA

7.1. The Expert Commission evaluates participants' solutions on a scale from 0 to 5 points for each criterion, with a scoring increment of 0.5 points per criterion (see Appendix No. 3). Each criterion has an assigned weighting coefficient (indicated in parentheses next to each criterion):

- Technological soundness (0.25);
- Economic efficiency (0.20);
- Innovation potential (0.20);
- Practical relevance (0.20);
- Responses to experts' questions (0.15).

7.2. Case solution evaluation criteria:

- **Technological soundness** – the level of technical maturity and practical feasibility of the proposed solution; its potential for further development and scalability; environmental sustainability and safety; flexibility and adaptability in the context of future technological trends; as well as the justification for selecting this solution.
- **Economic efficiency** – the degree of economic feasibility, financial sustainability, and competitiveness of the proposed solution with a long-term perspective; the adequacy of resources required for its implementation; and the level of potential risks.
- **Innovation potential** – the degree of novelty of the proposed solution; the feasibility of its implementation, innovative growth potential, and prospects for realization; as well as its ability to deliver a significant improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues.
- **Practical relevance** – the level of applied value and practical benefits of implementing the proposed solution in real-world conditions to address specific tasks.
- **Responses to experts' questions** – the degree of completeness, logical coherence, and clarity of the participants' responses; their engagement with both the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution; and their command of relevant and up-to-date engineering terminology.

7.3. The evaluation criteria may be modified and/or supplemented by decision of the Championship Organizing Committee.

8. PENALTY POINTS

8.1. In case of violations of the Regulations and the Rules governing the Final Stage, penalty points shall be imposed on teams by decision of the Organizing Committee, which will affect the final score:

- 0,3 penalty points for late submission of the case solution presentation (including any accompanying materials) or the video introduction, and/or for replacing them after the established deadline;
- 0,3 penalty points for failure to submit a video introduction;

– 0.15 penalty points for the absence of logos on the title and/or final slides of the presentation as provided in the presentation template. The absence of a title and/or final slide in the presentation is considered equivalent to the absence of logos;

– 0.3 penalty points for the use of obscene or offensive language by a team during the defense of its solution, or for inappropriate team photos included in the case solution presentation;

– 0.15 penalty points for exceeding the permitted number of slides in the presentation and/or for including appendices within the presentation;

– 0.2 penalty points for exceeding the presentation time limit, 0.3 penalty points for exceeding the presentation time limit by more than 15 seconds. After 15 seconds, the team's presentation will be interrupted by the Moderator. If the team fails to comply with the Moderator's remarks, it may be disqualified;

– 0.3 penalty points for violating the principles of the Declaration on Authorship and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems, including the provision of false information regarding the use of AI or the concealment of its use. In cases of serious violations, the team may be disqualified (including the creation of plagiarized content identical to existing materials or the copying of ideas developed by other teams);

– 0.3 penalty points if an appeal is submitted and subsequently rejected by the Appeals Committee.[8]

8.2. The penalty points specified in Section 8.1 are cumulative. The total amount of penalty points is deducted from the team's final score.

9. DETERMINATION OF RESULTS AND WINNER

9.1. The results of the Final Stage are determined by a representative of the Organizing Committee.

9.2. A team's final result is determined in accordance with the calculation methodology set out in Appendix No. 4.

9.3. If two or more teams competing for first and second place receive the same total score in the ranking, the final decision on which teams advance to the Final is made by the Chairperson of the EC.

9.4. After the final calculation of scores, the Moderator presents the results protocol to the Chairperson of the EC for review and signature. This procedure does not provide for the revision and/or modification of the final results or of the scores previously assigned by the experts. The Chairperson of the EC is entitled to request a verification of the calculation of results, which is carried out by the Championship Organizing Committee.

[8] When reviewing appeals and reports of violations, the Appeals Committee verifies the accuracy of the information presented and may decide to reject the appeal if the submitted information is found to be unsubstantiated and/or does not affect the final scores. In such cases, a penalty of 0.3 points will be applied to the team's final score, regardless of whether the appeal was submitted individually or on behalf of the entire team.

9.5. As part of the Final Stage, teams placing in the top three within each track are awarded. The team that scores the highest number of points in the track is declared the winner of the League.

9.6. Following the Final Stage, additional winners are determined in the following special nominations: «Breakthrough Solution», «Best Video Introduction», and «Top 6 Best Engineering Case Solutions».

9.7. The official Results Protocol is distributed on the day of the defense after the official award ceremony for prize winners and winners.

9.8. Participants and experts of the Championship are not provided with evaluation sheets, software data exports, recordings of defenses, or any other assessment-related materials that are not included in the Results Protocol.

9.9. Upon completion of the Championship, the Organizing Committee reserves the right to use participants' solution presentations in open sources and to transfer them to third parties.

9.10. A Championship participant has the right to submit a written appeal to the Committee regarding:

- violations of the Regulations and/or Rules of the Championship;
- verification of the correctness of score calculations entered by EC members in the software.

9.11. During the review of an appeal regarding the correctness of the transfer and calculation of scores assigned by experts, the Appeals Commission verifies the proper functioning of the CASE-IN Simulator and the accuracy of the transfer of scores entered by EC members.

9.12. The Commission does not consider appeals related to the content and structure of the engineering case, nor appeals regarding the revision or adjustment of scores assigned by members of the EC.

9.13. When reviewing an appeal, the Committee verifies the accuracy of the information presented and adopts one of the following decisions:

- to reject the appeal, if the information is not confirmed and/or did not affect the final score. In the event of rejection, 0.3 points are deducted from the final score of the appealing team;
- to uphold the appeal, if the information is confirmed and affects the final score, in which case the participants' scores are revised accordingly.

Contact details

Participation inquiries	***Media and information support inquiries***
Project Manager – Alena Lapenkova Tel.: +7 (495) 990-45-72 (доб. 144), +20 (127) 279-60-16 Email: lms@fondsmena.ru	Press Officer – Alena Gins Tel.: +7 (922) 223-37-89 Email: pr@fondsmena.ru

The League's website serves as the official information source for the project – https://case-in.ru/league/59/.

Appendix No. 1 – Requirements for finalists
of the International Engineering Championship CASE-IN®

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINALISTS OF THE LEAGUE OF YOUNG PROFESSIONALS OF THE CIS AND BRICS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING CHAMPIONSHIP CASE-IN®

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. To ensure access to all Championship events, participants must carry their **original passport and badge** (issued during registration) at all times. Possession of the original passport is a mandatory requirement for entry to the Final Stage venue.

1.2. For effective communication during the preparation period and throughout the Final Stage, participants are required to join the captains' chat in the Telegram messenger via the link provided in the Final Stage information letter. Participants must install the Telegram application on their phones in advance.

1.3. Finalists must bring their national flag to the Final Stage venue for use during the official Championship ceremonies (opening / award ceremony).

2. DRESS CODE

2.1. Business attire is mandatory. Participants appearing at the Final Stage defense in inappropriate attire (e.g., T-shirts, hoodies, etc., including casual style) will not be admitted to the defense.

2.2. Elements representing the symbolism of the country or organization represented by the team are permitted as part of the dress code.

2.3. Participants who have taken part in previous seasons of the Championship are encouraged to wear CASE-IN badges as part of their attire (if available).

3. VIDEO INTRODUCTION

3.1. Video requirements are specified in Section 4 «Preparation of Teams for the Defense» (see Clause 4.17).

3.2. The video will be used when participants take the stage to present their case solutions.

3.3. During each defense, a vote will be held for the best video introduction. The team whose video receives the highest number of votes will be declared the winner in this category.

3.4. Submission of a video is a mandatory requirement for participation in the Final Stage. Teams that fail to submit a video within the established deadline will be subject to penalties, up to and including disqualification (see Section 8 «Penalty Points»).

4. CASE-IN MUSEUM

4.1. The Museum of the International Engineering Championship CASE-IN® (hereinafter referred to as the CASE-IN Museum) is a collection of gifts and significant items reflecting the history and development of the Championship. The CASE-IN Museum was established in 2017 to mark the fifth anniversary season.

4.2. The CASE-IN Museum collection is replenished annually with gifts from participants, experts, and guests of the Championship from different seasons. Each gift represents respect, recognition of the Championship's achievements, a symbol of friendship, and a commitment to continued cooperation. As part of the Final Stage of the XIV International Engineering Championship CASE-IN®, an exhibition of items from the CASE-IN Museum will be organized at the venue.

4.3. Each Final Stage participant has the opportunity to congratulate the Organizing Committee and contribute a unique item to the Museum collection. To participate in the exhibition, the item must be submitted at the registration desk on the day of the Final Stage before 10:00 AM (Moscow time).

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHAMPIONSHIP PARTICIPANTS

1. Try not to read from your notes throughout the entire presentation; speak in your own words and maintain eye contact with the audience.
2. Take the stage for the defense with your full team.
3. Distribute speaking roles within the team so that each member has the opportunity to be heard.
4. It is not recommended to repeat verbatim what is written on your slides, as this may hinder the EC's perception of your solution.
5. Avoid arguing with experts without clear justification, and do not raise your voice.
6. Rehearse your presentation before the Final Stage defense to ensure that you stay within the allocated time. To obtain an objective external assessment of your readiness, involve your mentor.
7. We recommend checking your email regularly, as the Organizers often send important information in advance.
8. The appearance of each team member should correspond to the status of an international event.

CASE EVALUATION CRITERIA OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING CHAMPIONSHIP CASE-IN®
CIS AND BRICS YOUNG PROFESSIONALS LEAGUE

Evaluation Criteria / Score	**TECHNOLOGICAL SOUNDNESS** (weight – 0.25)	**ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY** (weight – 0.20)	**INNOVATION POTENTIAL** (weight – 0.20)	**PRACTICAL RELEVANCE** (weight – 0.20)	**RESPONSES TO EXPERTS' QUESTIONS** (weight – 0.15)
5	The solution is at a high level of technical maturity, clearly demonstrates practical feasibility, and includes a clearly defined development and scalability plan. Environmental sustainability and safety fully comply with established standards and requirements. Flexibility and adaptability to future technological trends are evident, and the selection of this solution is comprehensively justified, taking into account both current and prospective capabilities.	The solution demonstrates high economic feasibility, strong financial sustainability, and long-term competitiveness. The resources required for implementation are sufficient, and potential risks have been thoroughly analyzed and effectively mitigated.	The solution demonstrates a high degree of novelty, clear feasibility of implementation, and significant potential for innovative growth. The prospects for realization are substantial and capable of delivering a significant improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues.	The solution demonstrates exceptional applied value and practical benefits when implemented in real-world conditions to address specific tasks. Its implementation would result in a substantial improvement of existing processes or enable fundamentally new capabilities.	The participants' responses are detailed, logically consistent, and clearly articulated, demonstrating a deep understanding of both the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution. Their command of current engineering terminology is flawless. The participants confidently and comprehensively address all questions, showing full engagement with the subject matter.
4,5	The solution demonstrates good technical maturity and a high probability of practical implementation. Clear pathways for development and scalability are identified, and key future technological trends are taken into account. Environmental sustainability and safety are ensured at a sufficiently high level. The justification for selecting the solution is convincing.	The solution is economically feasible, financially sustainable, and competitive in the long term. The resources required for implementation are generally sufficient, and potential risks have been assessed, with mitigation measures proposed.	The solution demonstrates a high degree of novelty and has strong prospects for implementation and innovative growth. Its realization is likely to ensure a noticeable improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues.	The solution demonstrates high applied value and significant practical benefits when implemented in real-world conditions to address specific tasks. Its implementation would lead to a noticeable improvement of existing processes.	The participants' responses are detailed, logically consistent, and clearly articulated, demonstrating a good understanding of the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution. The level of command of engineering terminology is high. The participants answer most questions confidently, demonstrating solid knowledge of the subject.

4	The solution is technically developed and has potential for practical implementation. Development and scalability plans are outlined but may require additional detailing. Environmental sustainability and safety are assessed appropriately, in accordance with existing standards. Some future technological trends are considered, and the justification for selecting the solution is logical.	The solution is economically feasible and shows potential for financial sustainability and competitiveness. The resources required for implementation are largely sufficient, and potential risks have been identified.	The solution demonstrates a certain degree of novelty and shows potential for implementation and innovative growth. The prospects for practical realization are present, and the solution may lead to some improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues.	The solution demonstrates solid applied value and tangible practical benefits when implemented in real-world conditions to address specific tasks. Its implementation may lead to improvements in existing processes.	The participants' responses are generally detailed, logically consistent, and clearly articulated, demonstrating a satisfactory understanding of the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution. The level of command of engineering terminology is sufficient. The participants answer most questions but may experience difficulties with some highly specialized issues.
3,5	The solution is at an early stage of technical development, but shows potential for implementation. Development and scalability plans require significant refinement. Environmental sustainability and safety require additional attention and elaboration to fully meet applicable requirements. Only general future technological trends are considered, and the justification for selecting the solution is not fully presented.	The economic feasibility of the solution requires further substantiation. Long-term financial sustainability and competitiveness are not fully evident. The resources required for implementation may be insufficient, and potential risks have not been fully analyzed.	The novelty of the solution is not clearly expressed, and the opportunities for implementation and innovative growth require further justification. The prospects for realization are not fully evident, and the improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues may be limited.	The applied value of the solution requires further validation. The practical benefits of implementation in real-world conditions to address specific tasks are not fully evident, and process improvements may be limited.	The participants' responses are not always sufficiently detailed, logically consistent, or clearly articulated. The understanding of the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution is superficial. The level of command of engineering terminology is basic. The participants answer only some of the questions and demonstrate gaps in knowledge or uncertainty in their formulations.
3	The solution requires substantial further development to achieve technical maturity and practical feasibility. Development and scalability plans are absent or insufficiently developed. Environmental sustainability and safety raise concerns and require significant optimization. Future technological trends are considered superficially, and the justification for the solution is weak.	The economic feasibility of the solution raises concerns. The financial plan demonstrates low financial sustainability. The project may be exposed to significant financial risks, an excessively long payback period, or low expected profitability, calling its overall viability into question. The	The solution does not demonstrate substantial novelty, and the opportunities for implementation and innovative growth are limited. The prospects for realization are weakly defined, and the solution is unlikely to ensure a significant improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues.	The practical relevance of the solution raises concerns. The benefits of its implementation in real-world conditions to address specific tasks appear minimal.	The participants' responses are often incomplete, illogical, or contain inaccuracies. The understanding of the theoretical and applied aspects of the proposed solution is weak. The level of command of engineering terminology is insufficient. The participants experience significant difficulty answering most questions.

		justification of resource adequacy is weak, with clear gaps or unrealistic assumptions. Risk analysis is insufficient.			
2,5	The solution does not demonstrate sufficient technical development, has a low likelihood of practical implementation, lacks a clear understanding of development and scalability pathways, and does not take future technological trends into account. Environmental sustainability and safety have not been properly assessed or require fundamental improvement. The justification for selecting the solution is absent or incorrect.	The solution demonstrates low economic feasibility. The financial plan is extremely weak. The solution is non-competitive and offers no clear advantages over existing alternatives. The justification of resource provision is unrealistic. Risk analysis is superficial.	The solution is not novel and does not demonstrate prospects for implementation or innovative growth. Its realization is impractical, and no improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues is expected.	The solution demonstrates low applied value. It is either overly abstract, extremely difficult to implement, or its potential benefits are minimal relative to the required costs and efforts. The solution is largely theoretical or would require major technological breakthroughs to be realized.	The participants' responses do not meet the evaluation criteria and demonstrate a lack of understanding of the proposed solution, poor formulation, and inability to use engineering terminology appropriately. The participants are unable to answer the experts' questions.
2	The solution is at a very low level of technical maturity. Practical implementation is unlikely without radical changes. There is no evident potential for development or scalability. Environmental sustainability and safety do not meet minimum requirements. The solution does not meet flexibility and adaptability requirements. The selection of the solution is not justified.	The economic feasibility of the solution is questionable. Long-term financial sustainability and competitiveness are not demonstrated. The resources required for implementation are clearly insufficient, and potential risks have not been taken into account.	Low innovation potential. The solution largely replicates existing approaches, offering only minor improvements. No original ideas are demonstrated. Feasibility is questionable due to the lack of a clear implementation plan or the presence of significant constraints. Scalability is unlikely. Development prospects are extremely limited, and the solution is unable to compete in the market or ensure long-term financial sustainability.	The solution demonstrates very limited applied value. The practical benefits of implementing the proposed solution are minimal.	The participants' responses are very brief, incomplete, and often unrelated to the essence of the questions. Logical coherence is absent or severely compromised. The participants are unable to present their thoughts coherently. The responses contain numerous errors, making comprehension extremely difficult. The participants demonstrate minimal or no understanding of the theoretical foundations and practical applicability of the proposed solution. Engineering terminology is either not used or used incorrectly.

1,5	The solution is at a minimal level of technical maturity. Practical implementation is extremely unlikely. There is a complete absence of development and scalability potential, as well as flexibility and adaptability. Environmental sustainability and safety are problematic and require a complete reassessment. The selection of the solution is not presented or appears arbitrary.	The economic feasibility of the solution is nearly absent. The project is financially unsustainable and cannot be implemented. The solution is non-competitive. There is no realistic justification of resource provision, rendering the project unfeasible. Risks are either completely ignored or their assessment and management demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of economic realities.	Very low innovation potential. The solution almost entirely reproduces existing approaches without any meaningful modifications or improvements. No novelty is presented. Feasibility is extremely low or not demonstrated. The implementation plan is absent or unrealistic. There are no development prospects, and the solution has no market value or growth potential. The solution does not demonstrate any improvement in efficiency compared to existing analogues and may, in some cases, be less efficient than them.	The solution has severely limited applied value. It may be partially applicable, but only with very low efficiency, high cost, or within a very narrow scope that does not represent substantial practical interest.	The participants' responses are incorrect and frequently unrelated to the questions asked. The participants are unable to formulate even basic ideas, demonstrating a complete lack of logical structure. The responses contain numerous errors and are difficult to understand. The participants demonstrate a complete lack of understanding of both the theoretical foundations and practical applicability of the proposed solution. Attempts to use engineering terminology result in serious errors.
1	Technical maturity and practical feasibility are at an extremely low level. No development or scalability potential is evident. Environmental sustainability and safety are ignored or contradict fundamental principles. The solution is not adaptable. The selection of the solution contradicts basic technological principles.	The solution is entirely economically unjustified. The financial plan is absent or fundamentally flawed, demonstrating complete financial insolvency of the project. The solution is non-competitive. There is no understanding of the need for resource provision, or it is entirely ignored. Risks are not only unaccounted for but may be exacerbated by the proposed solution, indicating a complete lack of strategic economic thinking.	No innovation potential. The solution represents a repetition of existing and widely used approaches. There is a complete lack of novelty or originality. Feasibility is not demonstrated. There is no implementation plan, no development prospects, and no potential for commercialization. The solution does not ensure an improvement in efficiency and, in some cases, may be less effective than existing solutions.	The solution effectively lacks practical relevance and consists only of isolated elements that could theoretically be useful. Overall, the solution is non-functional, inefficient, or entirely impractical.	The participants' responses are nearly absent or consist of disconnected words and phrases unrelated to the questions. The participants are unable to formulate a coherent statement. The language used is incorrect to the extent that understanding is impossible. The participants demonstrate a complete lack of knowledge or understanding of the subject matter.

0,5	Technical maturity and practical feasibility are nearly absent. Development and scalability potential is absent. Environmental sustainability and safety are not substantiated. The solution is not adaptable. The justification for selecting the solution is absent.	The solution is economically unprofitable. The financial dimension is either entirely ignored or the presented data are detached from reality and demonstrate a lack of understanding of basic principles of financial planning and analysis. The solution has no market potential. Resource provision is either completely ignored or presented in a highly unrealistic manner, without justification or understanding of real needs and constraints. Risk assessment and risk management are absent.	The solution represents an outdated or ineffective approach that has already been tested and rejected. Implementation is impractical or impossible due to fundamental deficiencies. There are no prospects for realization. The solution is significantly inferior to existing analogues across all key efficiency parameters.	The solution has no applied value. It may be entirely detached from real-world conditions, irrelevant to the stated task, non-functional, or provide no practical benefit.	The participants attempt to respond; however, the responses lack meaning, content, and logical coherence. Due to the absence of coherent answers, linguistic quality cannot be assessed. There is a complete lack of understanding of the proposed solution and of engineering terminology.
0	Technical maturity and practical feasibility are absent. Development and scalability potential is absent. Environmental sustainability and safety are entirely lacking. The solution is not adaptable. The justification for selecting the solution is absent.	The solution does not demonstrate economic feasibility, financial sustainability, or competitiveness. The resources required for implementation are absent, and risks have not been analyzed.	Complete absence of innovation potential. The solution is fully outdated and non-functional. Implementation is impossible.	The solution does not demonstrate practical relevance, has no applied value, and provides no benefit when implemented in real-world conditions.	The participants do not provide substantive answers to the experts' questions.

Appendix No. 4 – Final Score Calculation Based on Team Defense Results

FINAL SCORE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

1. When calculating a team's final score for each criterion, the highest and lowest scores are excluded if the EC includes seven or more experts. If fewer experts are involved, all scores are taken into consideration.
2. Each expert's score for a given criterion is multiplied by the applicable weighting coefficient.
3. The weighted scores for each criterion are then aggregated, and the arithmetic mean is calculated.
4. In accordance with the Regulations, penalty points may be applied to a team.
5. All penalty points incurred by the team are added together, and the total is deducted from the team's final score.
6. Finally, the average scores across all criteria are summed to determine the team's overall final score.