



YICMG2026 Grading Principles

General Principles

1. Projects should fit the given theme.
2. This scoring guideline serves as a reference document for guidance only. Under the “Six-Country Zone” model, each core university can, based on its actual circumstances, independently formulate or adjust specific scoring rules applicable to its own national zone within this framework.
3. The evaluation is based on the principles of fairness, transparency, and consensus. Rules and results of the evaluation should be clearly known and agreed upon by all the judges.
4. The evaluation shall be subject to the confidentiality system. No judge shall announce or disclose the results before the completion of the whole evaluation procedure.
5. Evaluation criteria: thematic relevance, innovativeness, feasibility, integrity, and logic should be taken into consideration.
6. Academic Integrity: To emphasize academic norms and ensure fair competition, all submitted project proposals must be the original work of the participating team. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools to directly generate or ghostwrite core components of the proposal—including but not limited to the overall framework, main analysis, key arguments, and conclusions—is strictly prohibited. The Competition Organizing Committee reserves the right to employ professional tools during the evaluation process to conduct originality checks and identify AI-generated content. Any violation of these rules will be dealt with in accordance with the relevant regulations.
7. The Competition Organizing Committee will strictly follow the judges’ opinions and announce the list of finalists.

Grading details

1. Theme Fit (20 points)

A total of 20 points in this part is for judges to assess whether Contestants’ Projects are closely related to the theme of the competition. This can reflect on, but is not limited to the following aspects:

- a) The topic and content of the project are centered on the theme ***Resilient Infrastructure, Sustainable Industrialization, and Technological Innovation***.
- b) Sufficient investigation and regional cognition of the Lancang-Mekong Region;
- c) A broad and deep understanding of the theme of the competition, conducting in-depth exploration of it.

2. Innovativeness (20 points)

A total of 20 points in this part for judges to assess whether Contestants’ Projects have enough originality and novelty. This can reflect on, but is not limited to the following aspects:

- a) New techniques, new operation modes, and new operation ideals;
- b) The research ideas and design concepts reflect the unique perspectives of Contestants to observe and analyze the issues related to ***Resilient Infrastructure, Sustainable Industrialization, and Technological Innovation***.
- c) The research fields make up for the previous shortcomings and vacancies in the related fields to a certain extent.

3. Feasibility (20 points)

A total of 20 points in this part for judges to assess whether Contestants' Projects can effectively improve the cooperation level of Lancang-Mekong region in the field of ***Resilient Infrastructure, Sustainable Industrialization, and Technological Innovation***. This can reflect on, but is not limited to the following aspects:

- a) Sufficient investigation into the background, such as natural and social factors such as geography, culture, population, climate, and policy;
- b) The technology adopted in the project is sustainable;
- c) The great potential of the project's further development and improvement.
- d) Whether the project design comprehensively considers the actual conditions of different countries when involving multiple countries and regions, ensuring its feasibility and operability across various contexts; or, if the project is limited to a specific region, whether it demonstrates replicability and scalability, and can serve as a reference or model for other similar contexts within the region.

4. Language (20 Points)

A total of 20 points in this part for judges to assess whether the Contestants express their projects well in English. The appropriate language should include but is not limited to the following parts: no grammatical errors, fluent texts, appropriate vocabulary, and academic writing forms.

5. Logic (20 Points)

A total of 20 points in this part for judges to assess whether Contestants' Projects state the arguments logically. This can reflect on, but is not limited to the following aspects:

- a) Clear theme and opinions;
- b) Express ideas in an organized way;
- c) Reliable evidence to support the opinions.

Score Range Guidance (This guidance is for reference only)

To ensure fair and consistent evaluation, judges are advised to follow these guidelines:

a) 90 points and above (Finalist Tier)

- Reserved for truly exceptional projects that demonstrate outstanding quality in all evaluation criteria
- These projects will be strong candidates for the final round

b) 75-89 points (Recommended Tier)

- For projects that meet basic requirements but lack distinguishing excellence
- Expected to constitute the majority of submissions
- May require further development to reach finalist level

c) Below 75 points (Not Recommended)

- For projects that fail to meet core competition standards
- Typically show significant deficiencies in one or more criteria
- Unlikely to advance in the competition

This helps maintain consistency in judging standards and ensures a competitive yet fair selection process for the finalists.

Calculation method

1. Judges shall give integers as scores. (such as 13 or 14 but not 13.5)
2. The average score given by all the judges in their respective national zone is the final score of the project.
3. The final results will be announced after the Competition Organizing Committee compiles the evaluation results and shortlist from all national zones, and will be disclosed to all universities as soon as possible.