

City Resilience Hack – Jury Evaluation Criteria

Jury - 7 members:

- one representative from each participating city — 5 members in total;
- one investor;
- one expert in civil protection, defense, resilience or a related field.

This structure would ensure that each city is represented, while also adding the necessary investment, technology and domain-specific expertise.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to identify the solutions with the highest potential to strengthen urban resilience and continue their development beyond the hackathon. The jury should assess not only the quality of the idea, but also its relevance to the challenge, expected impact, innovation, implementation potential, business viability, and the team's ability to successfully deliver the solution.

Each criterion is scored on a **scale from 1 (Very Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**. The final score is calculated using the weighting assigned to each criterion.

Evaluation Criterion	Weight
1. Relevance & Challenge Fit	25%
2. Impact & Value Creation	20%
3. Feasibility & Implementation Capacity	20%
4. Innovation & Technological Value	15%
5. Business & Sustainability Potential	10%
6. Team & Presentation	10%

1. Relevance & Challenge Fit (25%)

Does the solution effectively address the challenge and respond to the needs of the cities?

The jury should consider:

- How well the solution addresses one or more of the hackathon challenge areas.
- The extent to which it responds to the identified needs of the participating cities.
- The team's understanding of the problem and target users.
- The strength of the problem–solution fit.
- Relevance and practical value for cities and stakeholders.

2. Impact & Value Creation (20%)

What impact is the solution expected to create for cities and stakeholders?

The jury should consider:

- Expected social, economic and/or environmental impact.
- Benefits for the city, citizens and other stakeholders.
- Clearly defined outcomes and measurable KPIs or success indicators.
- Potential to improve resilience, preparedness and continuity of services.
- Scalability and long-term value creation beyond the pilot phase.

3. Feasibility & Implementation Capacity (20%)

Can the solution be successfully implemented and piloted?

The jury should consider:

- Technical and operational feasibility.
- Maturity of the concept, prototype or solution.
- Quality and realism of the implementation and pilot plan.
- Practicality of deployment in a city environment.
- The team's capability to successfully deliver the proposed pilot.

4. Innovation & Technological Value (15%)

How innovative and differentiated is the proposed solution?

The jury should consider:

- Technological novelty or innovativeness.
- Originality of the concept or approach.
- Differentiation from existing solutions.
- Innovative use of technology, data, AI or partnerships.
- Overall added value created by the solution.

Innovation does not necessarily require entirely new technology. Applying existing technologies in a novel or significantly more effective way is equally valuable.

5. Business & Sustainability Potential (10%)

Does the solution demonstrate long-term viability and value for investment?

The jury should consider:

- Business and commercial potential.

- Financial sustainability beyond the pilot.
- Scalability across different cities or markets.
- Return on investment (ROI) and value for money.
- Potential for future partnerships, funding or market adoption.

6. Team & Presentation (10%)

Does the team demonstrate the capability to develop and communicate the solution effectively?

The jury should consider:

- Relevant experience, expertise and complementary skills.
- Team commitment and motivation.
- Quality, clarity and persuasiveness of the presentation.
- Ability to clearly explain the solution and answer the jury's questions.
- Overall confidence that the team can take the solution forward.

Scoring Guide (1–10)

Score Description

1–2	Very weak. The criterion is poorly addressed or significant weaknesses exist.
3–4	Limited. The solution partially addresses the criterion but major improvements are needed.
5–6	Satisfactory. Meets the basic expectations with some strengths and some weaknesses.
7–8	Strong. Clearly demonstrates quality, credibility and implementation potential.
9–10	Excellent. Outstanding performance demonstrating exceptional quality, impact and potential for successful implementation.

Guidance for the jury: Evaluate each team based on the evidence presented during the pitch and Q&A session. Consider the overall balance between relevance, impact, innovation, feasibility, business potential and the capability of the team. The winning solution should demonstrate the strongest overall potential to create measurable value for cities and successfully progress beyond the hackathon.

Prizes:

- Prize 1: €30,000 (Valencia pilot)
- Prize 2: €20,000 (Valencia pilot)
- €25,000 for piloting will be distributed between up to 2 participant teams